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Appendix 1: Budget consultation questionnaire full results

Northamptonshire County Council 2020-21
Budget Consultation

The draft budget agreed by Cabinet on 12th November 2019 is likely to be the County Council’s final budget and lays the foundations for the transition to two new unitary authorities from April 2021. This draft budget continues the work of last year to stabilize the County Council’s finances.

The development of the budget has been mindful of the growing demand pressures in Adult Services and the need to bring improvements to Children’s Services following feedback from Ofsted and as it transforms into a Children’s Trust.

The draft budget has been published a month earlier than normal to allow more time for scrutiny and consideration of public feedback.

We want to gain a better understanding of peoples’ opinions and need you to help us shape the future design and focus of our services. What you say will be part of a report with many other people’s feedback, so you will not be personally identified.

Your feedback on this consultation is really important to us, and all consultation feedback will be analysed and considered, and will help Councillors make a final decision on the budget at the Full Council meeting on 20th February 2020. This meeting is held in public and anyone wishing to speak at the meeting must call Customer Services on 0300 126 1000.

Please read the related documents to gain a better understanding of the budget proposals before you comment on them. The budget proposals are listed on the Draft Budget webpage, and Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) have been prepared for those budget proposals that may have an impact on service users and/or the wider community. These are available on our website via the following link https://northamptonshire.citizenspace.com/

A lot of budget savings proposals relate to decisions that have already been made in previous budgets, the continuation of projects and financial adjustments to budgets with no service impact. These can be found listed in the Appendix to the Cabinet Report with the full list of budget savings but have not been included in this questionnaire. However, you can comment on anything within the Draft Budget in the comment boxes.

The following sections give details of the proposed council tax increase and budget savings proposals. You do not have to answer all of the questions or give us your feedback on every
section. If you do not wish to answer a question or give feedback on a specific section then you can skip those questions and move on to the next section.

**How can I have my say?**
Please tell us your views by completing this questionnaire. If you prefer, you can complete the questionnaire online by visiting:
https://northamptonshire.citizenspace.com/bipm/draftbudget2021

If you do not have internet access at home, it can be accessed free of charge to complete the consultation questionnaire at any one of the following libraries run by the Council:

Brackley   Hunsbury   Rushden
Brixworth  Irthlingborough Towcester
Corby      Kettering     Wellingborough
Daventry  Northampton Central Library Weston Favell
Duston     Oundle

Alternatively, you can email or send your comments in by post using the contact details below, or by handing it in to one of the libraries listed above.

If you have any queries, comments or would like a copy of this survey in another format (including easy read or large print) you can contact us by email, post or telephone. Our contact details are as follows:

**Email address:** consult@northamptonshire.gov.uk
**Telephone:** 0300 126 1000
**Postal address:**
Consultation, Equalities and Accessibility Team
Northamptonshire County Council
One Angel Square
Angel Street
Northampton
NN1 1ED

The deadline for completing this survey is **midnight on Tuesday 24th December 2019**.

Thank you for helping us by completing this questionnaire.
About you

Q. Are you: Please tick (v) all that apply

There were 432 responses to this question, with respondents being able to select more than one option if applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a service user</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local resident</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Northamptonshire County Council employee</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Northamptonshire County Councillan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Borough, District, Town or Parish Councillan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of the voluntary sector or a community organisation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of the local business community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of a Borough/District Councillan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of a Town/Parish Councillan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of a health partner organisation (e.g. Clinical Commissioning Group, Mental Health Trust)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A representative of a user group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If ‘Other’ please specify:
- An Armed Forces Veteran, service user, and local resident...and payer of council taxes.
- Human rights
- Parish Meeting Chairman
- Own a pre-school
- Student
- Volunteer with homeless
- Work for Northamptonshire Highways

**Proposed increase in Council Tax**

The Government is currently consulting on the Local Government Finance Settlement 2020-21, which includes the principle of a cap of 2% on the increase in the level of Council Tax allowed without holding a referendum. It also includes the principle of all local authorities with a responsibility for Adult Social Care (which includes Northamptonshire County Council) being able to increase Council Tax by a further 2% to be spent directly on Adult Social Care. Our proposed Council Tax increase and Adult Social Care Precept is based on the rules currently under consultation.

As part of the Draft Budget Proposals, we are proposing to increase the Council Tax rate by 3.99% from April 2020. This comprises a 1.99% on the core tax rate and a 2% Adult Social Care precept increase, which is currently under consultation.

For example an increase of 1.99% on the core Band D tax rate for an average (Band D) Council Tax payer would mean an increase of £24.60 per year (47p per week). Without the additional funding from raising Council Tax by 1.99%, the Council would not be able to deliver the planned draft budget and we would need to find other ways of saving the same amount of money, which would directly affect frontline services.

The equality impact assessment can be found at [www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21](http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21)

**Q. We are proposing an increase in Council Tax of 1.99%, which is an increase of £24.60 per year (47p per week) for 2020/21 for the average Band D Council Tax payer, which would be used to fund services. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (√) relevant answer**

There were 305 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 190 responses to this question.

- I understand the reason for the increase but I would like to actually see some improvements to the town if there is more council tax, for example fixing potholes and gritting more roads.
- I understand the need for the increase in order to pay for services needed.
- I’m a local resident but work in Childrens Services and we are woefully underfunded.
- There is more money needed to provide good quality adult social care. This is not just in Northamptonshire, this is nationwide and really money should also be coming from central government.
- I would be happy to pay more council tax to help increase funds for important services in our town.
- More money is needed- it’s that simple. This is a fair way of ensuring that all residents are helping to put more money into necessary services.
- Due to the decreasing Central government funding for local authorities it is vital that NCC raise sufficient revenue to pay for the services they are legally responsible for providing. Due to a long history of not increasing council tax NCC have depleted their finances and this has led to significant cuts to services and resources. An increase is too little and too late.
• The services that we - the public - expect and require from our local government, need to be paid for and, although I earn less than the national average, I am prepared to contribute to services that improve our community, so long as the LA spends and manages its finances properly, openly and fairly.
• As long as we see an improvement in services which didn't really happen in 2019-2020 when we had a high increase in council tax
• Council tax rates still fairly okay, the town needs serious re-investment asap and this is a good start point, average of £24.60 over the course of a whole town is a big increase in terms of income
• This is the 2nd year that you have increased the Council Tax at the maximum level available to you and the quality of my services as a resident have not improved. How can I trust that your planned increase is not going to be misappropriated and wasted. For example, refurbishing your building in Angel Square, excessive interest rates on poor lending decisions, extreme wage & benefit packages for a frequently changing Leadership Team. As a low earner employee my Council Tax increased by this amount last year and my income did not. This has caused me financial difficulties. You have promised employees a 4% increase next year, but we were promised an increment this year that never materialised. As a resident and a low income employee of NCC, I am finding it harder and harder to remain in a role I love, as you increase the pressure on me as a resident and deny me a market competitive wage as an employee.
• Improvement in some local services is essential and we should contribute to the cost of this.
• The money does have to come from somewhere.
• Adult social care is an important issue and if vulnerable adults are supported more then our community will become a better caring place overall
• I agree that the council needs to look at ways in which to increase the income.
• Essential to preserve existing services in the absence of adequate support from central government
• As long as the additional funds is used VERY WISELY and not wasted as in the past in efficiency, then I would be prepared to pay more for better services.
• It is necessary to pay for services.
• As long as the increase is actually spent on the services and not wasted on Management salaries.
• I feel it would be a better solution to the need to deliver the services required if the council would increase it more than that
• We find prices and taxes rising everywhere we go now. Many of us have not had a rise in real income for over 10 years and are struggling. Why is it that local government always seems to think it can act like a robber baron and just take whatever it feels like it needs from the rest of us. Learn to live within your means like the rest of us and don’t just assume you can plunder the community as and when you like. Northampton County Council is a by word for poor management and waste. Just today I see you intend to borrow £18m to pay off a £10m loan you made a poor judgement on, if the rest of us tried to live like that we would be like you in bankruptcy but unlike you we could not tax others to pay for our foolishness.
It is essential that the Council is able to fund its proposed budget spending.
I have a [child] who uses Social Care, and it is failing, hope with more funding it should improve
I am concerned about services for children and adults so do not object to paying extra council tax
NCC need the maximum revenue achievable to be able to deliver its services.
Public services have been cut to a bare minimum and resources need to be properly funded and start putting back what has been taken away over the last few years.
Because otherwise our county will continue to be impoverished, though alternative actions should be taken against the corruption that has happened and plunged our community into destitute. If any further corruption happens, our family will decide to move to a different town/city, where salaries are higher, businesses and locals prosper without crime from their leaders. It will take years for Northampton to become a desirable place to be now.
Clearly historically, celebrating being the lowest council tax paying council for all that time hasn’t work. Hopefully the money will be managed better, the Best Value report has highlighted some worrying habits formed in the NCC.
The council needs the cash.
Realise increase appropriate.
because if there is a great big hole in your budget the money has to come from somewhere
If Council Tax had been increased in previous years the County Council might not be in such trouble and would have probably remained one authority rather then being split.
It still needs to be higher, it's low compared with other county councils.
I appreciate the population of Northamptonshire is growing and therefore more services are needed.
i would prefer a greater increase so public services were improved
the government are becoming rich of us people it is not right/...
Don't want services cut any further
We cannot afford to have any more services cut due to lack of funding. A small amount more from every resident will help avoid this situation taking place
I believe NCC have wrongly focused on low taxation to the detriment of the ability to deliver services, increasing to a higher level makes sense.
Council tax precepts have been kept low for a number of years. I believe people are prepared to pay for the quality of services they want.
You should have increased it more in the past 5 years then we would not be in such dire straits
Seems like a reasonable amount in order to provide the services indicated.
If essential services need to be paid for a 1.99% increase seems reasonable if the extra funds are spent wisely where most needed.
Given the fact that council tax has continually risen year in year out but most people’s salaries have not risen at the same pace there has to be a time when council tax increases must start to be smaller. so I can see the need for the increase given the
poor financial control by the council but I am not entirely happy with it being so near to 2%.

- Due to the current administration wanting to keep Council Tax low to win votes it has resulted in the local authority not having the funds to invest or keep up with general price increases. This is probably where the council tax level should be if the slower increases had happened over the last 10 years.

- We require the additional funding as the finances have been poorly managed for many years. Perhaps only offer the 25% council tax reduction to those who are in genuine need and not those who own second homes in the area, also charge full council tax for properties which are laying empty instead of the landlord letting them out.

- I think the root to much of the council's financial issues has been the insistence of pegging back council tax. I am pleased that the council is utilising its ability to rise taxes to help fund local services.

- We need to have better facilities for elderly and youngsters so increasing council tax will go towards this.

- Because the County needs more money, to make this town a better place to live we have to increase Council Tax. The Government must also invest more to the county.

- Services do require additional funding.

- Because the council are broke.

- It is the fairest way of raising funds across the board from the people who benefit from the services provided.

- Accept we need to pay more but it would have been prudent if we had been gradually paying smaller increases over a number of past years. We need clear accountability of how the money is spent and not wasted.

- We need an increase to provide a safe level of service.

- Council has been very lenient with its citizens living here. Whilst other councils have put their taxes up with the increase of wages throughout the years. NCC hasn’t. It is necessary to increase the tax to fund the police so less anti-social behaviour occurs.

- Adult services and child services need to be resourced and funding which is limited at the moment.

- We need more services.

- Costs have to be shared by all householders. However I think the time has come for at least one but preferably two higher rate bands for Council Tax to reflect the rise in house values over the last five years. These could be on property values of £1 million and £5 million for example at an annual rate of £4000 and £10000 respectively.

- It’s a fair rate.

- 47p per week seems reasonable.

- It is a small increase providing there is a real increase in the level of services provided.

- We need to pay for services and minimal increases over recent years has resulted in some of these problems. I’m prepared to pay as long as I see it being used appropriately.
NCC has historically failed to raise sufficient funds from local sources by choosing to needlessly maintain council tax rates at ridiculously low levels for what appeared to be political motivation - and at various points crowing about having one of the lowest council tax rates in England. This has contributed to starving local services of resources. The proposed increase in council tax rate is necessary to mitigate the effect of previous poor financial decisions by the conservative run NCC (as evidenced by the council's financial collapse in 2018).

- Need to improve services
- We need to maintain the services we have and the increase reflects inflation.
- Local Council tax needs to be on a secure financial footing
- We need Council services. These need to be financed by the local population. Costs in all areas of living have risen dramatically over the last 5 years and Council services are not immune to this and need to be funded at an appropriate level.
- I agree that the council needs more money to be able to provide important services. My only reservation would be the effect on people who are already struggling financially, and I would like to be sure that enough is done to protect them. I realise that help is available for people on benefits, but I wonder about those whose income is slightly too high to qualify for support, who would still struggle to find extra money.
- To support services that are grossly underfunded
- This is a pretty nominal increase, really, but one which can keep essential services running. To begrudge 50p a week to help keep society working during these difficult times is nothing short of miserly.
- Do not mind increase if income used for adult and child social care
- Your track record is not the best at finance,
- I have no issue with paying a slight increase to fund services but I do want to see the impact of the increase in light of NCC shortcomings in recent years.
- We moved to this council in May 2019 and one of the reasons was a council tax which was a lot lower to where we were. Although this was a reason to move here it still seems low compared to other areas and a 1.99% increase is hardly going to affect most households.
- I believe that some services are underfunded, and an increase is required to address this; however, it does depend on how the money will be spent.
- Northamptonshire is a Cinderella County, forgotten by central government but because of it's location, is at the heart of everything, nationally. We are highly visible and we need improved services all round, particularly care for the elderly & children. An increase of 47p per week is less than half the cost of a cup of coffee. People object to paying more for services to improve daily life for everyone, and yet for example, buy breakfast at MacDonalds, smoke or get a tattoo every couple of months. Far be it from me to criticise their lifestyle, but I fail to understand their logic or rationale. Paying an extra 47p per week is at least taking some responsibility for their lives, not demanding 'their right'. I would prefer at least the cost of a cup of coffee per Council Tax payer to be the minimum increase to fund services next year.
- We all need to contribute to the services we use - this includes driving on the roads and waste collection - so a small increase in council tax feels proportionate
- I would like to see improvements in support to the Police.
- Because we need to ensure adequate funding for key services.
- Increases have been lower in recent years.
- I never agree with public sector budgeting because they are always "budgets to spend" rather than "budgets to beat", in other words it's a target that MUST be spent and there is absolutely no incentive to actually spend less.
- already paying FOR misgovernment by the CC
- It's too late. [MP’s names], aided by [previous Councillor] vanity, have ruined this council’s financial viability, and now service users and residents are suffering with poor adult social care, children's services in special measures, library and HWRC closures and reduced hours, potholes, and regular flooding. [Councillor] was at the helm for much of this time and [they] should do the decent thing and resign. Just like the liars at Westminster ruining the country, the Tories in Northamptonshire have ruined the county.
- Living in a rural we do not get much in the way of services and Transport has been cut, so what do we get for the rates we pay every month. However, given the predicament the County Council has found itself in over the last two years where they had failed to manage their budget and the ensuing consequences, it is understandable that rates would go up. I may not agree with this but I understand it is a consequence of the past financial situation.
- Council tax has been inexorably increasing beyond the rate of inflation for years, whilst accompanied by a marked deterioration in services.
- You are displaying this as if it is just £24.60 addition to the Council Tax, when there is also the 2% social care increase so overall the increase is likely closer to £50 p/a which is a lot more. If you could chose to pay one or the other or both its fine to show as separate questions but you will increase both regardless so you may as well show people the full impact of your "proposal". Most people would like to see improvements to front line services - buses, potholes, etc but its hard to see any notable improvements in these services - it would help if you showed people the impact of previous increases i.e. we increased your Council Tax by X last years and improved X services. All we ever hear is the cuts.
- I don't want to pay higher taxes but would do so if it were spent wisely
- The extra funds paid by households must be used to help improve roads/facilities as these have deteriorated substantially
- Would it ACTUALLY be ring fenced and spent on social care.... as I don't trust it would be
- I agree funding needs to be sought to ensure the smooth running of services in the county. I disagree that the staff of the council are not being given adequate pay rises which match the increased cost of living
- I feel that the Council Tax will be raised whatever the feedback is.
- This seems misleading because the additional £24.60 is for the council tax then there is an additional 2% for Social Care so the impact o the council tax payer is closer to £50 per year. I would tend to agree with funding services but when services are being cut (buses, gritting) and we are paying more what extra services are people
getting, other than schools and social care which are not accessed by all members of society.

- I agree we have an ageing population, and we do still have a low council tax for our area.
- Don't feel I am able to judge. We hope the councillors are doing their best for us.
- I am willing to pay the extra across the course of the year, as long as I see notable improvements across roads, town centres especially.
- I have little faith in your financial planning.
- Our pay is increasing by 4% but then increasing council tax by 3.99% completely counteracts our pay rise!
- 5% last year and additional again this year is ridiculous! I've lived in my property for 5 years and since that time my council tax has doubled which quite frankly we can't keep up with.
- As a resident, we are paying more money and receiving less service. If you have no children and no need for adult social care, you are paying for everyone else's cost.
- Some areas pay less than others, bring all areas into line with each other then review what is needed, stop just increasing just everyone the same as those who pay the most will continue by default to have larger increases.
- I feel disappointed that the appalling financial decisions of Northampton County Council are now being passed onto local residents to make up the short fall in funding for services without there seeming to be any come back on those at the top who led us to being in such a poor financial state.
- We seem to pay more and more for a reduced quality of service. The town in is an awful state it's full of people without homes, the shops are empty, there's litter and rubbish everywhere, the leisure centres charge more than most private gyms and the facilities are limited, the pollution in the town centre is awful as is public transport. I can't see why we should have to pay more. I struggle to cover the costs as it is monthly and to be honest I don't ever see the benefits of the money we give.
- I don't think tax payers have enough say on what their money is spent on and are charged for services that they might never use.
- With not having received ANY pay rise in the last 12 months and council tax being put up then, to then have another council tax rise would make the 4% payrise none effective.
- You always expect the taxpayer to fund shortfalls instead of addressing the issue of inflated pay for senior managers and consultants.
- Whilst I recognise the shortfall my personal experience is that the cost is increasing but the services are reducing. In short we are getting less for more money.
- We have not had a pay rise for years. I have been struggling for years to make ends meet. I have even had to turn to the food bank. Gas, electric, phone, water and basic food has risen over the years except for wages. Now we are suppose to be getting a pay rise and a part of it will be taken away. How are we going to catch up on our debts that has grown over the years.
- Not clear what additional benefits we will be gaining from this, in some districts we already have to pay for garden collection on top of Council tax. Would like to know where the additions will be going to and for what reason, so visibility see the benefits
of extra money. Not general 'fund services'. Nice to see the break down ad reason why we need it.

- Why should we all have to pay for the county councils mistakes?
- You don’t do a good job with all the money we pay you already, so why should we give you even more? Rubbish everywhere. Can’t move on footpaths for bins left out all the time and poorly parked cars. People camping in tents all over the town. Dog faeces everywhere. No visible enforcement. Services being reduced constantly under tory cuts.
- Does not give the whole picture- should include the 2% precept for Social Care. This must be the 4th year in a row when we have seen the max increase - and still we are in a precarious position and supposedly only 12-18 months until an overspending authority ceases to exist. It would have been helpful to see how district and Borough proposals dovetail or not assuming all budgets will be realigned to 2 unitaries. I fear another 4 years of maximum increases to pay for changes that are ideological rather than more likely to deliver improved services.
- Due to the Council incompetence we the public are the innocent victims
- The council needs to stop wasting money before it asks for more. The average resident could point out any number of clear examples of 'wastage'. Get your own house in order before asking us to fund your inefficiencies.
- Not needed
- We have paid good money for years to see it wasted with services cut year on year. Experience shows me when someone says they need more to do the job expected it’s because they have failed to use the money well in the first place. To ask a customer to pay more simply looses custom. In this case a well known scenario. To now say it’s going to cost more is simply very poor!
- Considering that inflation is at atleast 2% acrossnthe board. Even though 1.99% is an extremely marginal figure that 2% inflation is squeezing far too much out of the counties populace. The lower earners will be yet again squeezed beyond their finite limits. This needs re-considing on almost discriminatory grounds of earnings. The less you earn the morenyou are obviously effected. Any relief through benefits is negated through the minimal amount of alleged assistance afforded by those benefits.
- I don’t want to pay more council tax, considering the council’s mis handling of previous budgets.
- The Conservatives have bankrupted the county council and children are dying under council care. Yet the council [Councillor] drifts through life as if nothing has happened.
- The banding for council tax is squewed. My parents live in an affluent area in a semi detached property with a garage and front and back gardens. We live in a terrace in [location] with no garage or front garden and we have to buy a permit to park in the area BUT we pay the same council tax. How is that fair? Our road is in disrepair and our access behind the houses is inaccessible.
- The councils have a long history of misusing funds, and monies thus wasted should be recovered before penalising council taxpayers further
• I work part-time, I live on my own and am classed as disabled. I cannot afford any more increases in my household bills. I don't get pay increases every time my bills increase. I often struggle to pay bills as it is.

• We pay more every year and the services keep getting worse. Plus you have wasted millions of our money already. We need a change in council and a change in government. I'm not paying more while tax evasion keeps happening. Make corporations pay their taxes and help the people if this country to have a better standard of living. We will run out of money soon.. you are pushing us all into poverty!

• the money is not well spent

• I don’t understand why the residents of Northamptonshire have to pay for the mistakes that have been made in the running our council over many years. As a [job] of a [organisation] I have to adhere to very tight budgets with no room for manoeuvre. If I were to go over my budget I would be held to account and probably removed from my role. I would not be able to go and just ask for more money to bale my [organisation] out. As residents we have always paid our council tax without fail. Now we are being financially punished because of the incompetence of others.

• depends on what the extra money is spent on, a lot is wasted on unnecessary things

• Core funding from government needs to increase. Another rise above my annual pay increase, at least the 7th in a row !

• due to bad financial planning the end user is affected financially. this seems unjustified and is yet another cost to service users. council tax increased the previous year also, again due to poor financial planning

• Because the overall increase last year (combining NCC, local district/borough council, parish council and the huge 10% by the NPCC) put my bill up massively, so although you say it’s only an extra £24.60 per year, that's only takes into account your part of it, and not the extra ££ charges by the other authorities. It’s becoming unaffordable on a single income. Generally speaking, I think Council Tax needs an overhaul, but that's another conversation.

• we are scrapping services across the county so why make us pay more for less

• As a resident, I am fed up of being squeezed for more and more money. Isn’t it enough that the Adult Social Care levy was added and increased?! The repeated failure of the council's services should not be put upon the residents of Northamptonshire, we are already at a disadvantage living within a badly run authority !

• Personally as a payer of Northants Council Tax, I think it is grossly unfair to have to pay more Council Tax when I am stretched as it is having to pay all of my bills. It seems that this increase is being proposed on a regular basis. For me to have to pay 2% more to Adult Social Services when it is not a service that I use, I disagree with. There should be more done to claw back unpaid bills from service users - these can go in to tens of thousands!!

• The Council have proved they are incapable of managing our money before even through years of austerity, I do not think the taxpayer should have to bail them out again.
• Having worked for NCC and also still having friends who work there it is clear that there is still lots of waste in the organisation, including people not doing the job for which they get paid. There are too many senior members of staff who are not making the correct decisions (if they do make any) and therefore should no longer be employed there. Also the council still spend far too much money on non statutory things especially in the Childs & Adults health areas (including Mental Health). The council should be providing the bear minimum of their statutory responsibilities and not bother funding the nice to haves.

• I live in a two bed flat with my partner and children, we already pay £177 a month. We struggle to pay already, we don't have luxurious items, we don’t drive, have holidays, struggle to pay for our children's clubs etc. How is an increase to already cash strapped citizens an option.

• Already pay enough for sub standard services

• I believe more savings can be made from within the council. I don’t see why I should pay more to fund a payrise

• To many rises every year with nothing to show for it. Crime is extortionate. Bins are emptied less than ever. Roads are falling apart. No money for anything essential but plenty for vanity projects.

• Stop paying the chief executives big bonuses and paying silly money for consultants to come in. Far more money can be used from these savings rather than giving the hard working residents a further hike to their already ridiculous costs!!!! I pay £170 a month used to be £110 it’s a joke

• At a time when the rest of us aren’t receiving any pay rises it seems totally unjustified to be giving the council any more money. This council has a history of wasting money. I suggest you save more money and increase efficiency before asking the residents to pay more.

• The cost goes up and the service is cut. That is not how it should work.

• Because we already pay too much and have no return. Crime is rising, towns are stinky and dirty, more and more people are homeless, libraries closing or reducing hours and services. This council is a joke. And not a funny one.

• The utter financial failure of Northants county council should not be paid for by local people, especially those in other Northants areas. Increasing by the maximum is absolutely disgraceful and this budget should be immediately rewritten

• There was a large rise last year. In my village and surrounding roads there are a number of large potholes, the police are not visible, and any issues are not dealt with speedily. We are stuck in our rented accommodation due to the rent level and not allowing us to save any money and this is another increase without a real increase in money coming into the house, along with increase in utilities, food, fuel.

• why are we having to pay more for less services? is it to fund the bankruptcy that the same council created. why did you not keep the millions you squandered in your pointless reorganisations that squandered our money to fund ideological schemes. I am telling you this , knowing that it will be ignored because you have no interest in taxpayers views only your own count.

• I do not feel it is at all appropriate to increase council tax to pay for the failings of Northamptonshire County Council in managing a proper budget.
• Need to be gradual
• We just pay more and more for less and less - on the face of it 47p doesn’t sound much but its nearly £2 monthly and presumably doesn’t include rises for County Council items. The continual raise in tax and reduction in service affects the elderly on fixed low incomes more than other groups. In our area we have avenues and parkland that the council won’t maintain, we have pretty well lost our bus service over the past years (when you are in your late [age], you can’t walk nearly half a mile or stand in all winds and weathers to take advantage of your bus pass - mine not used in nearly [number] years), increased parking charges and lack of free parking in the week and in the evening affects the elderly mainly - can’t pop in to the bank - and general lack of parking places is a problem - nightmare if you want to visit the Derngate - distance and safety at night are an important factor for all, especially the elderly.
• Our council tax has continued to increase, with cuts to our local services being made regardless. It is unaffordable for us to continue to have such large rises, this is going to impact house prices and make the area less attractive to live. This could lead to a negative impact on the local economy.
• You are not trusted.
• Northamptonshire Council has failed over the previous years to adequately budget increases - even now they still continue to comment on how low the council tax is. If proper management had been adopted then large increases of this nature would have been avoided. NCC employees have suffered greatly over the past years by the inability of the council to provide pay increases, and yet they suffer increases in all service areas - particularly council tax. Yet NCC can find the funds to pay high cost management / consultancy fees, particular at the current time. So in summary, I still believe poor management continues.
• The extra money would probably not all go the intended services.
• Why should tax payers have to pay for the awful way the council has managed the budget in past years.
• It seems relatively small amount, but on top of other small increases, utilities, food etc and my wages have been reduced in real terms for 9 years now I think working people would not be able to afford this
• Cost of living increase but wages aren’t raising to align with this. Why not cut your management wages?
• We had a significant increase in our council tax bill this year too.
• We are in this mess because
• I think that some responsibility has to go to the family in respect of adult services; we are increasingly providing money or services to people that do not really need it. Perhaps there should be a better way to assess and provide a service where people pay a percentage according to their household income
• Because services are declining in South Northamptonshire, while council tax keeps relentlessly rising.
• The County Council lost control of spending, I asked one Councillor what was the major cause, [their] reply was social care, my next question was what do similar
councils pay for social care and if ours is excessive why is that? [They] didn't know because no comparison has been sort

- increase in my opinion is to bail out the council not improve services, be honest!
- I cannot afford the increase I live on my own
- I'm paying too much already and getting very little in the way of services, disgusting.
- Totally disagree. Why give more money for more mismanagement. All councillors need removing
- The local council tax has increased exponentially over the previous few years through complete financial mismanagement and through no fault of local residents. As with an individual a council should be held accountable for these losses rather than individual residents.
- My income and the income of my peers is going down in relative terms. An increase in outgoings is not good until income starts increasing.
- If each year the council tax increase, but there is no increase in the wages of workers. Some people only have one wage coming in due to redundancy, so how are they meant to find that extra funds to pay for the increase.
- Because it's not creatively thinking about how to run services, it's simply passing the ineffective leadership, management and financial decisions on to residents. Making taxpayers pay for the mistakes of officials is terrible practice when poor practice in service delivery, design and operating models is still rife. It's a cheap tactic with a disproportionate penalty on the public, the public that local authorities are in place to support and keep safe.
- council tax has been increasing every year anyway, I believe this blanket increase is illegal
- The residents of Northampton are picking up the slack from poor financial decision making in order to fund services. This is not acceptable
- Staff have a 4% pay rise which will be taxed and then you propose to take 3..99% council tax increase which so basically staff have received no extra income the pay is a disgrace in care for the work that is expected, lone working, administering medication helping which finances and a whole lot more, Even privatised company's are paying their staff more.
- I believe the council had been trying to compare itself to Borough of Westminster when setting it's budget previously. Increases in council tax hit's those who are already struggling to pay bills. Not everyone's wages keep up to pay for the increase with less access to services.
- I cannot see why the rise in Council tax only covers those bands that pay the least. Why are all Council bands not paying the increase and, if the increase is proportional, it would be much fairer as this would the cover ALL residents.
- There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed increase reflects an increase in levels of facilities or services. Wage increase for certain sectors of NCC have not kept pace with inflation and in some cases there has been no pay increase at all.
- Council Tax was significantly last year to cover the shortfall in the Council's budget, and it appears the same applies next year. It had not been increased in previous years which I assume was to ensure that Counsellors were re-elected. I think it is unfair that local residents are penalised for the mistakes/unwise decisions of others.
• There has already been the highest level of increase this year so another increase of this scale is too much too soon. Also employees have not received a cost of living pay rise for some time now so the pay rise will simply be to cover the additional rise in council tax.

• It makes a mockery of the supposed pay rise of 4%. There is no pay rise in essence, it is an equalisation or an attempt to try to move staff to a less disadvantageous position based on the "austerity" by the conservative government politics. Then you increase the council tax to diminish the "pay rise".

• No reason the council has done nothing not waste money

• I would like to know what your plans are fir this extra funding, wheres it going to, we already had a large increase last year to go to the police, to employ another 100 police officers, have they been employed and if so where? Have you employed an accountant to keep your accounts in check and control Councillors Spending!

• We have no money ourselves, and raising a child is more expensive than ever. We will end up going to food banks to eat and putting more pressure on local services as a result due to poor health and services.

• Residents are being penalised again for years of poor performance by the Conservative led council. However I would prefer paying this increase than to even more cuts to community services.

• Council tax is already very expensive for many households. Whole your reason for a band D might not seem much to others it can mean the difference between saving that few pennies extra for future use or having to use savings now. How can we be sure that the extra increase will be spent on Adult services whilst you’re closing down local libraries?

• Northants council need to manage the finances so as to remain inside budget parameters as opposed to keep increasing the Council Tax to bail them out each time... As an unemployed individual I cannot and will not continue to meet increase in the council tax to cover the ineptitude and financial mismanagement of the Council....

• Why should we pay for the Council mistakes in their finances no one will agree to that question.

• Council tax charges are high enough - the town and district elements along with the police and fire service will all go up to so instead of £24.60 per year it will be more. We will have to cope with the changes for unitary when all the councils will be aligned - Bet the charges wont decrease!!

• I live in Desborough and the increase of council tax is absolutely outrageous.

• already pay too much

• Keeps going up and and up and the place is getting worse and worse. Services are less and less this place is a disgrace you should be ashamed of yourselves!

• It’s not going to solve the problem. There needs to be a strict control on money spent by the Council as they have proved to a huge degree they are unable to control their spending and have gone further into debt by bad borrowing. There needs to be someone who is solely in charge of spending and who does not work in the council chamber as this doesn’t work. It needs to be separate. All spending needs proper reviewing and structure by a forward thinking elected separate body. The council
bosses needs training on money management also to get a better understanding of where our money is going. They must be accountable. Free lunching and dinners and social staff activities should be axed asap. No large companies do free lunching or dinners and have not done so for some years possibly 20 odd years so why are the council still feeding their faces on public money and entertainment.

- Services have declined yet NCC want to increase charges. How can this be justified?
- The question is in the wrong place, without information on what the increase is to be spent on how can it be answered? If it is to get a bad council out of debt then the answer is no. If on the other hand it is to be spent on people and their immediate needs then the answer is yes.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 100 responses to this question.

- No one will be better off. For people who do not have a pay rise and elderly in the community, this may have detrimental effects on their money and ability to live. Some people live hand to mouth and even an increase of around £24 a year could be a struggle
- as above
- We had a big council tax rise last year, its now my second biggest monthly bill after my mortgage and before gas which is also huge. Another big hike is not going to go down well, unless people start to see an improvement in services that affect them.
- The only negative impact I can see is I am sure people will moan about it and I am sure some staff will say getting a pay rise in one hand and giving it back in another.
- It is increasing the stresses for people in the town. It's an increase proposed with no evidence or promise on how this money will help to benefit the town.
- members of the public in Northamptonshire have lost all respect for the council and the elected representatives. This is due to the loss of essential services around the county. Members of the public read headlines only and focus on reports of football loans (NBC) and Angel Square. They need to see positive outcomes for people they know personally, family, friends and neighbours. All they see now is a "posh fancy building". NCC need to rebrand as there is no confidence and respect left.
- see above
- It will have a negative impact of what people can afford as the full increase is 3.99% - every penny makes a difference to people and if we don't see where the money has gone it feels as we are being robbed
- The impact as always hits the residents, the council still deliver the same poor service. Unfortunately the issue is too great for any simple answers but maybe a little late to ask for suggestions on how to do your job.
- Negative impact on pay rise. There must be another way to increase wages without we having to bear the blunt of another financial stress.
- Some low/no income families may struggle with increase.
• Negative impact- disgruntled resident. Make sure there are clear outlines of what this increase is for and how much people will be affected (i.e hammer the £24.60 point, it sounds better than 4%). Spaces on buses, the papers, leaflets through doors after the election so people can read and understand, not just see 4% as a chron headline and end up complaining on social media and further distrust in NCC
• I feel I have answered this in my previous response.
• Negative to local residents views on the council and spending. Mitigate with providing further detail on the spending so residents can look out for this and become more engagement on where they are getting more value for money. Good to also compare and contrast the services to another local council and their costs+ rate of increase to put things into perspective.
• This increase may have a negative impact on some people on a low income
• I believe it will have a negative impact on many, who will not be able to afford the increase. In light of the possible change in Government, there are many unknowns and my concern is around how many other increases there will be and impact on income in the household.
• negative impact on those in our community who are currently just coping- driving more people into debt and poverty. £1 per week extra is a lot when you have nothing now
• The impact was felt years ago, it shows in the County in many ways now. To mitigate any negatives maybe we should vet our Councillors better with a full CV before we are asked to elect them.
• How much more do you think the residents are going to stand before they have to give up their own 'way of life' [including heat/light/power and food] before they simply refuse to pay anything at all. Your cost of enforcement would far outweigh your proposed increase.
• Many people’s wages didn’t increase at all
• The poorer members of the community will be hit hardest, as always! Th3re is too much poverty and homelessness already. Unless the raise in costs is going directly to offset food banks, child poverty and deprivation its not acceptable.
• Create revenue through a review waste contracts and costs. Sell off resources such as buildings and land. The devil is always in the detail...get a better look at contractual agreements....and check the [expletive] detail! it'll save public money by ensuring services aren't.locked into wasteful, long and costly contracts.
• The more tax our pathetic excuse for a County Council takes from us the less we have to support our families and local business. If you want to know why many of us shop online rather than in the High Street its because we have not got the money to do otherwise. Council tax has reached the point now where it is a major expense many of us are struggling to meet. Last time I told a councilor that he just shrugged and walked away!
• We need properly funded services to help the poor people in the area
• It would undoubtedly have a negative impact on people who are currently struggling to manage their finances. Introducing and advertising a scheme for people to contact a special section within the Council to discuss their difficulties might be possible, as long as it was not portrayed as 'charity'. This would cost money to set up, but would
be more than paid for by the receipt of Council tax that otherwise wouldn't be paid by those individuals.

- more people will be unable or unwilling to pay an increased amount
- If council tax is increased, many people like myself will really struggle to pay household bills. More residents will go in to debt or further into debt. We don't see much of where our council tax is spent (apart from refuse collections).
- We don't have more money to keep giving you. You need to better organise your management of the finances.
- Council tax is a legal requirement and many families struggle financially due to the low salaries in this area. The negative impact would be if heads of families went to prison/court because they couldn’t afford to pay this. These families reputations will be damaged as will their future prospects of employment due to the criminal record. Also the cost of prison and social care of the children if they were to go to jail. The psychological trauma and stress of bailiffs and actions. Council tax is already too high here for the return of services. There are no Children’s centres here and families will be the ones most harmed by the impact of non council tax payment. This potentially could increase pressure on social services generating further need for funding.

- n/a
- The impact would be negative on many households who are already struggling due to the unfairness of our society. Charge those that can afford it more not those that can’t.
- Tories out.
- Do not suppose everyone will agree.
- For some residents it will have a negative impact and those residents should get support to be able to manage this increase.
- the organisation should have closer financial monitoring. there should be more robust budget monitoring put into place. there is still wastage internally which could be avoided or minimised. Adult Social Care do not plan sufficiently resulting in unexpected costs which are not budgeted for. the organisation invested heavily an a building it could not afford and is constantly changing its systems and processes which are aimed at cost savings yet its difficult to see what the financial benefits are
- Although it could help your budget - which I understand and appreciate - the impact on householders having to find that increase on top of every other increase that comes their way is starting to become more and more unmanageable. Councils shouldn’t bolster their budgets by making living difficult for working people that already pay into the system.
- because citizen are becoming homeless due low income...
- Less faith in the council. Residents are sick of seeing huge pay-outs to senior staff members leaving, having already done their damage There is no accountability!
- People like myself are not going to be able to afford to pay their bills, especially with inflation rising in such a quick rate. The Council should spend more time clawing back debts from service users not paying their personal contributions, or spending their Personal Budgets inappropriately and not as agreed.
- Years of austerity have dragged the standards of living down, while the resulting surfeit has been squandered and awful PFI loans have made the matter worse.
Increasing council tax would result in bringing standards for those struggling to survive even further down while the cap (band H) on the tax continues to protect the rich.

- No negative impacts.
- Do not increase, I know I cannot and other people cannot afford the increase. It shouldn't be a choice of council tax or food.
- Resulting in more people having less money to spend in the town
- People have no money. Where are they supposed to find more? Remember the conservatives have no magic money tree? Well nor do the people
- Stop paying silly money to the top people
- At a time when the rest of us aren’t receiving any pay rises it seems totally unjustified to be giving the council any more money. This council has a history of wasting money. I suggest you save more money and increase efficiency before asking the residents to pay more.
- This proposal would cause a huge amount of cynicism in the local area as well as hitting residents financially. The only way to mitigate is to reconsider the increase.
- Household income has stagnated, whilst outgoings are again increasing
- we the people are paying for your mistakes and are getting less for it cuts to services continue and the most vulnerable people, children’s education and elderly+ disabled services shrink . You have already decided to raise taxes and cut services, so this cynical and pointless exercise is just cynical manipulation of the public.
- The negative impact is likely to be another shortfall in council money. Not sure how this can be rectified without a larger increase in council to which I am not in favour.
- People will moan that don’t understand the bigger picture of where the money is being spent and forget the good value service each individual is getting and the community as a whole. Possibly publish a mock invoice as part of the positive publicity on some of the actual costs to walk down a street: path road maintenance, street lights, gritting, abiding health and safety standards, road sweeping, insurance cover and claims, clear up after an accident, signage, traffic lights, electricity..............
- This proposal would have a negative impact because it will cost taxpayers more. My suggestion on how any potential negative impact could be mitigated is to not foist the cost onto council tax payers and reduce the vast, over inflated salaries paid to senior managers and Councillors within Northamptonshire County Council.
- That 1.99% can seriously affect vulnerable children, adults, people, people on benefits, families, working parents, parents paying rent, this can increase food bank use, hospital admissions and the vulnerable could lose their homes and life’s, this increase could be a death sentence for some vulnerable people and families.
- Clearly a negative impact on budget for all residents, but especially for those on fixed incomes - you have to cancel something to pay anything new.
- The negative impact is that those residents who are already facing financial hardship may feel additional pressure
- House prices would decrease, less attractive to live in the area and could impact the local economy. This could also impact attracting teachers, police officers, nurses, doctors etc, meaning more strain on our local services. I would suggest looking at reviewing the council tax bands first.
- What guarantees do tax payers have that monies ring-fenced will not be used on "general expenditure" again? What changes have been made to the use of Section 106 cash having seen NCC misuse £13m-worth of Section 106 cash paid by housebuilders to offset the impact of new developments? KPMG found that £41.2m which was "ring-fenced" for projects was actually used for general purposes. I have no confidence in this authority to adopt the correct checks and balances of public expenditure under its current leadership.

- The negative impact is continued no confidence in the council or senior management. The reflection to the public is one of a company that believes its self to best by having a strategic high cost / high profile leadership, but lacks any understanding of the market. It is my opinion it is too late to mitigate negativity; the sooner we have to local authorities the better and with hope, cost effective management.

- I do feel though the timing of this increase has reflected negatively on staff at the Council, many of whom have not had a pay rise for over 5 years. There is now a perception that this tax increase is to support the pay rises.

- As above and the people who are entrusted to carry out these services are in all probability the same people who allowed the situation to occur earlier and simply cannot be trusted to carry any proposals. Replace all who were employed at the start of the crisis and employ people who know their jobs.

- People including council employees are struggling to make ends meet so this will put additional strain on already tight household budgets.

- We are all struggling to live as it is, without the increase in tax.

- People cannot afford constant increases!

- Only negative if not used for proposed services

- I feel that a rise in payments of council tax come from the pockets of the staff who work in the council also. The pay rise barely touches the cost of living increases, it feels like the staff are being given in one hand and taken away from the other. I feel this change could mean talented experienced staff may wish to re-locate in favour of other counties around them who offer better pay conditions.

- For people ‘just about managing’ any increase in bills can cause a great deal of anxiety and hardship.

- Get rid of those fat cat salaries. Pay a realistic salary instead.

- You must show to the Council tax payers you can manage spending before asking for them to bail you out. Also, if you cut services you have to throw the net over everyone not some feeling the burden than others. For instance you cut bus services completely in my village but we still paid the same council tax like other residents but received less of a service than other parts of the County

- It may have a negative impact on the future prospects of local conservative politicians - this is a positive development!

- I cannot afford the increase I live on my own

- Get your house in order, get rid of all the waste, streamline processes, reduce staff, increase productivity.

- A larger increase for higher band and a lower increase for lower band. This is socially fair.
• Cant expect residents to bailout mismanagement
• As we are in such frugal times and as an employee of NCC, we have not had the standard of living increase in years, it is unfair to raise Council Tax prices. Let alone for those people on a low income.
• You suggest increasing staff wages but in line with the increase of council tax! Therefore, employees will be gaining nothing from this process and it is time they were recognised for their hard work.
• Putting further financial pressure on taxpayers could push those on borders of social and financial deprivation into being further relying on the welfare state. Council tax is a priority debt but if people have the choice between council tax and feeding their family, putting the heating on or paying their mortgage, reports from IRRV, housing associations and central government demonstrate that these are prioritised over council tax in times of difficulty. This means the additional council tax uplift could actually put more families at risk, affect the livelihood of more families, children and adults and ultimately cost the overall system of government and welfare more rather than increasing income. Fundamentally it's not sustainable to charge the taxpayer more without considering significant changes inside the organisation responsible for delivering the services taxpayers are already funding first, equally, there's little evidence in the lead up to this budget that the impact of increasing financial pressure on the taxpayer has been researched (3.99% is a contrived number that isn't quite the 4% it could be, where's the evidence that 3.99% equates to a calculated, required amount of money?)
• it will hit hard on lower income families, that are already struggling.
• See above.
• I don’t know how we can change it, but I do know that staff if the proposed 4% pay increase is implemented feel that they are given it with one hand and it's taken back with the other, usually the care sector is the lowest paid, and with all the responsibilities that they are required to do, such as lone working, medication, working unsociable hours, feel very undervalued, and are looking for employment elsewhere outside of care, which is a crying shame, as they are highly trained staff.
• On a personal level an increase would mean less money into the family home whilst working for the local authority that has kept me on the same pay grade since 2012. As a county council you should be aware lack of funds leads to a negative impact on overall well-being.
• Northampton tried to keep up with the Borough of Westminster in charging low council. However, the demographics were different. Westminster borough is a small in comparison to Northampton and has more affluent people living in the borough and a lower concentration of older people living in the borough. Whilst Northampton has a higher proportion of older people living in the area whose needs to use the support services are greater and who are not as affluent. Therefore, the council tax should have been charged at a realistic rate which have kept the budget on balance. Instead of having to charge higher rates now to cover the deficit and cut to services to balance the books. A way of trying to improve services is have joint meetings between the council, NHS, the voluntary sector and third sector agencies who provide services to the local community. Using these agencies would help identify
which services which work well and one's underperforming. To encourage services to share intelligence to provide better service provision and share resources. To introduce community development workers who can feedback to the council and commissioning teams about the gaps in services within the community. As well as providing information which would assist the council working with local partners to create new services and enhancing/streamline existing services.

- It feels very much as if the Council are again only concerned with those who are the poorest in our community, not those who have a greater disposable income! Council tax bands A-D are often those who struggle as it is - pushing pensioners (and prospective voters) further towards the poverty line, without including those who actually earn the most within the County. My cynical thought is that this would be likely to affect more senior council officials (Bands E-H) and as "We are all in this together" it would be a more profitable proposal.

- There appears to be more negative impact especially as services have been cut back throughout the years, i.e. policing, road repairs etc. Continued cut-backs does not help the community. If the proposed increase was reflected in the level of increase to services then this would be more palatable. Each community needs evidence of what will be achieved by any increase in payment and there needs to be more transparency and consultation.

- The negative impact is that it makes it harder to make ends meet for residents. As a member of staff also, I had to pay the increase in CT, but had not had a pay rise to cover this. Next year, I will get a pay rise, but will have to use some of this to pay an increase in CT. I appreciate that an increase is necessary, but maybe it could be a smaller percent

- Financial for employees and the wider community. Do not increase as much.

- It is not for the staff to offer suggestions of remediation of issues created by the previous cabinet and leadership. The current leadership and cabinet are paid the "big bucks" to make those decisions.

- It would hinder all families and elderly

- Please give me a positive impact on this extra funding and where its going.

- This could seriously damage childrens and adult services. Don't forget the other council in Rotherham with cuts causing children to actually die. Do you want the same in this county? Their blood will be on your hands for every child that dies after this budget is passed.

- As explained above. Decrease the rise and use the money on services needed locally

- A rise in payments will always bring negative comments and can only be damped by having a higher visibility to the work that is being done. Constant social media story's about issues that get highlighted by the public and addressed will show that the council is listening and in a better position with the rise to resolve them
Driving already stretched personal finances even further with the result of making individuals financially bankrupt.

Don't increase it cut it instead.

The County appear to be bankrupt and yet have wasted tax payers money on Angel Square - how on earth can this be justified?

It would be a big negative impact on the residents of Desborough as we always are worse of from the others in the county.

You overspend in the wrong places. You underspend in the most important this place is a disgrace we should get a reduction. The fact you are asking for more money is laughable you clearly are a bunch of fools with absolutely no idea what a real life is like.

I fear that we will have to continue to pay more in tax, with no difference to the standard of living at all.

Saving on planned expenditure at The Square

If the council carry on the way they currently are throwing away public funds they will drag Northampton lower and lower and get deeper into debt each year. The residents already have a low opinion of this council as they have put us in an embarrassing situation through lack of knowledge which needs addressing.

Many people already struggle to pay the current level of council tax. With increasing reliance on food banks, I feel raising the tax even further, then punishing those that struggle to pay is ridiculous. I personally know several hardworking parents who struggle to make ends meet and rely increasingly on food banks and ventures such as shop zero, just to survive. Increasing the council tax when wages aren't rising to meet the cost of this means even more struggle for those already hit hard.

As well as increasing Council Tax by 1.99%, the Council will be allowed to add a further 2% increase to be spent on Adult Social Care, subject to the outcome of the Government’s consultation on this.

Q. We are proposing to increase Council Tax by a further 2% as part of the Adult Social Care precept, which is an increase of £24.72 per year (48p per week) for 2020/21 for the average Band D Council Tax payer, which would be used to directly fund Adult Social Care. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (✓) relevant answer

There were 264 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 135 responses to this question.

- Social care is a great concern country wide and understandably we need to pay more tax to help fund the services. However, those services should be provided with value for money in mind.
- I am happy for the increase as it is needed for the cost of necessary services.
- Central government funding has dropped too far in austerity.
- The money has to come from somewhere. the government appear to not realise how important funds are to maintain adult social care and would rather give it away to other countries.
- I know this is an area which needs particular help. I think there are other areas that need the money too but appreciate that this is a choice offered for this area at this time.
- NCC have concentrated on having the lowest council tax in the country. This has resulted in the closure of day centres, Surestart centres and other essential services for our vulnerable adults and children. I do not begrudge paying additional taxes if the income is used directly for Adult social care. This does not include hospital services and discharges where the main focus of social care has been in recent years.
Community services have been seriously depleted in order for NCC to manage hospital discharges. This needs to be more effectively balanced.

- Again, we need to take care of those who are vulnerable and in need, a core principle of our society and this requires appropriate funding.
- More funding for adult social care is needed.
- Adult social care funding is in crisis and needs an urgent increase in resourcing
- More needs to be done for Adult Social Care.
- I can’t see any other way of helping to fund Adult Social Care appropriately.
- I consider that it is essential that social care should be improved to reduce pressure on the NHS and to address problems caused by the years of austerity imposed by the present government.
- As in my previous response...I also prepared to pay more for better services....if it is used most efficiently and not simply wasted.
- The costs are increasing, they need to be paid for.
- Adult social services have been neglected for years, they are in desperate need of better day centres and more home care.
- The service is inadequate. The lazy MPs wont press the government to provide enough money for the county
- This is probably the area with the most need for as much funding as can be given to it, in view of the predicted increase in the age of the County's population.
- Adult social care is important
- NCC Adult Social Services need this added revenue to be able to cope with increasing demand.
- The Care situation in this country is appalling. Closing state run Care Homes and Cottage Hospitals has been compounded by a society, who feel that caring for their family members is the responsibility of the state. To many people depend on State Support and believe now that this is their right rejecting any personal responsibility. Unfortunately until people in this country regains their personal values and accept their responsibilities it will be up to the majority of right minded people to fund the Care Sector to protect people who need protection and attention.
- Northamptonians have already overpaid for services. The council could be more innovative by generating funds as a business would, but it has a spend only strategy. While our leaders have this leaky bucket mentality, I guess the Northampton people have to top it up.
- As per last question
- Provided it actually gets used for this purpose
- Needs the money
- because the current provisions for Adult Social Care are clearly not enough and the voluntary sector cannot pick up the pieces/fill in the gaps for ever
- the county need to address the shortfall but also need to manage their services more effectively than they currently do. that would then help prevent revenue being taken from highways to support this poorly run service
- I am aware there is an ageing population who will need more care and support
- Services need to be improved
- us people on benefits need council tax reduction
- There is an expectation for ongoing, and improved levels of social care, and I believe that the population needs to and would understand contributing towards this.
- I don't wish to see Adult Services reduced further
- Social care is overstretched generally, with an ageing population, and far too much focus on 'cost reduction' rather than outcome improvement. While more money is part of the need, designing services similar to Wiltshire Council would be a far better VfM direction.
- Provided it is spent on adult social care and not wasted
- Seems like a reasonable amount in order to provide the services indicated.
- There is an urgent need for increased funding for Adult Social Care.
- If the Adult Social care is properly funded, the bigger picture will mean that beds in hospitals will be freed up to enable adults to move on to more appropriate care. Although the next generation of elderly people didn't fight a war, in the main they have worked hard all their life and paid tax and contributed to society in some way. they can also still enrich our lives too.
- Trust issues
  - as previous answer
  - there are more elderly people in the village than youngsters and these are the ones who need our help
  - Again, we need to invest more into the county. There have been so many cuts, children are staving, homeless and vulnerable adults have been made to suffer, we have to help pay towards this
  - Adult social care has been neglected for years so additional money is desperately needed.
  - the pure principal is okay but am concerned that the funds raised could be reallocated from the ideal to other uses by suggesting peripheral expenses are categorized as 'adult social care'.
  - we need to look after the vulnerable adults in Northamptonshire
  - We have a duty to care for the elderly and infirm and this age group is growing every year.
  - It's fair, your talking roughly £1 a week
  - The increase is a smal amount so long as it produces positive results.
  - Same as my previous point really
  - Increase is required to counter the negative effects on local services from conservative local and national politicians putting ideology ahead of the needs of the most vulnerable members of the community by starving social care services and universal community services of resources.
  - Adult social care is inadequate at the moment and need to improve.
  - We must maintain Adult Social Care.
  - If you are raising the adult social care precept why are you reducing funding. Its disingenuous to continually talk about these increase separately you aren't giving residents a clear picture of what you are doing.
  - Social care is in urgent need of additional funding
• As previous answer - the extra funding is desperately needed for services; as long as the poorest people are protected, I would have no objection to paying more tax if I knew it would go towards care services.
• Adult social care is extraordinarily expensive, but it’s something many of us may need in the future. It is simply something that a sane society must do - we must care for the vulnerable. We must keep these services running. To do otherwise is to prioritise pennies over people, which is pretty dreadful behaviour.
• Adult social care is an important part of our lives and there are those who deserve more than they are currently receiving. Vulnerable people, in particular, need support, accommodation, care and it is important that we recognise this and make provisions accordingly.
• Your saying directly going to adult serv, you just need to make sure they do, no diverts.
• I think this is a needed service but with 2 increases I think this will be seen as a negative by most people.
• We all have relatives which need some care - if not then we may need help one day ourselves. Again a small increase in council tax feels proportionate.
• Only if the money is spent on ASC and is accounted by them.
• Because unless we pay more it won’t be possible to fund services adequately and year on year the funding gap will increase.
• I’m not sure how underfunded Adult Social Care is but Children’s Services is bad
• Something needs doing to address this so I see the need for it. In Germany, people pay into a social care tax during their career - like a pension - if we did this, then it would help to fund any care needed later in life
• I would like social care to be funded but it needs to be balanced with what the public can afford. I think it is important to look after vulnerable adults.
• as before need to show the current state of the service and what the extra money is going to bring, not just fund standard services, what are we going to do differently and enable adults to be more independent
• Having worked with social care professionally the wastage is vast as the productivity is shockingly poor.
• It’s too late. [MP’s names], aided by [previous Councillor] vanity, have ruined this council’s financial viability, and now service users and residents are suffering with poor adult social care, children’s services in special measures, library and HWRC closures and reduced hours, potholes, and regular flooding. [Councillor] was at the helm for much of this time and [they] should do the decent thing and resign. Just like the liars at Westminster ruining the country, the Tories in Northamptonshire have ruined the county.
• If necessary have to go along with it.
• I do not agree that we should be taking extra monies for the Social Care Precept. The majority of residents do not use the services of Social Care & Health. I believe that the authority should be making representation to the government to get the correct funding for the services they have to provide.
While there is an obvious need for increased adult social care provision, I resent lining the pockets of outsourced companies for a scandalously poor and expensive service.

The cause is good, but again it is the elderly who will struggle to pay this extra amount. If this really meant that the council would assist all those who need help to remain in their own home rather than being deposited in an institution, it would be worthwhile going without something to pay for this. If it meant that elderly people did not sell their homes to pay grossly inflated rates in substandard homes and subsidise others who the council were assisting, it would be good. If everyone was treated fairly and equally I would not disagree.

As previous question
Can’t retain social workers as it is. Maybe concentrate on retention and improved leadership instead of chucking more money and rebranding
Would it ACTUALLY be ring fenced and get spent on social care??
Only thought overall increase would be 47p per week any other increases?
Please see previous response
same as previous answer bring all areas into line with payments don’t just do the simple thing of giving everyone the same increase. Those in Northampton should pay the same as those in Corby or Kettering or Wellingborough... then review what increases are needed. The cost of services in all areas is the same so why should some towns pay a lot less than others
see previous answer this increase and last years increase makes the pay rise ineffective.
You need to become more professional and businesslike
Again I recognise a need for the service however this seems like throwing good money after bad. The service needs a significant over hall, ie scrap and start again, not throw more money at it and hope it recovers. My own experience of the service has been shocking.
How about raising taxes for those earning 100.000 a year and can afford to live in expensive housing in attractive areas rather than those that have been penalise over the years living in poverty and feed their family from the food bank and struggling to make ends meet
I believe the monies should be spent on education, not adult social care.
What does the council do for adult social care? All done through the NHS is my experience. I’ve disabilities and mental health issues and never have I been helped by the council; the opposite in fact...
I dont appear to be able to get care and I have worked all my life.
My [spouse], who died recently, had dementia and frankly we got no help whatsoever so why would I want to pay more for a service that doesn’t seem to be fit for purpose?
Not needed
See last page statements. These still count here.
This is an OAP tax in the guise of Council Tax. Maybe a tax on industrial areas that have previously benefitted off those aged workers efforts would be better placed.
• Why not recover the millions you wasted on loans to football clubs rather than clobber the hard working community to make up for the millions of our money you have allowed to vanish into thin air?
• I work for a charity providing adult services and we have to beg for funding I dont beleive this money will help
• This is completely unfair on Band D council tax payers. These are the people who could afford private care. They should not be forced to subsidise the council further.
• As much as I feel sorry for the financial Adult Social Care, I can't )at the moment) afford to pay extra on top of what I already pay. I'm on a low wage, work part-time and I get the single person allowance off my council tax.
• the money will be wasted be the council
• As before, this should be financed from other sources, not directly from our pockets. Whilst I agree that there needs to be a dramatic improvement in social care I don’t understand why the cost should fall on us.
• adult social care should be funded by central government and not individual councils.
• see previous response
• As outlined earlier - this increase only accounts for one part of the council tax. It may only be £24.72, but that combined with every other increase from the D&B councils, parish councils and NPCC comes to far more than £24.72 and is starting to become unmanageable - it’s not fair to make people that are already scrapping by poorer, to pay for care of older people or indeed children in care. You need to start looking at ways to separately fund this without keep passing on the cost to tax payers. Robbing Peter to pay Paul...
• You are displaying this as if it is just £24.72 addition to the , when there is also the 1.99% council tax increase so overall the increase is closer to £50 p/a which is a lot more. If you could chose to pay one or the other or both its fine to show as separate questions but you will increase both regardless so you may as well show people the full impact of your "proposal". The ever widening criteria for accessing social care support is good, but central government who widen the criteria should ensure that they fund local authorities appropriately to the criteria they agree, not the local people many of whom don’t access the services.
• Please refer to previous comments!
• Please see below page. It is not fair for the standard working household to have to pay more towards a Council which cannot spend their money appropriately. More should be done claiming money back from greedy people who do not spend it as they should.
• Too much is already spent in this area
• There is already enough money in the social care area at NCC it is just it is wasted by people who are too focused on the client and not focused on the costs. Well meaning people will always lead to Bankruptcy.
• As before, we cannot afford any increase.
• Because the money is being spent on profit over patients. How about bringing social care back in house without leeching corporates charging thousands in private fees. Whilst the people being cared for are neglected
• At a time when the rest of us aren’t receiving any pay rises it seems totally unjustified to be giving the council any more money. This council has a history of wasting money. I suggest you save more money and increase efficiency before asking the residents to pay more.
• The constant mismanagement of both adults and childrens services is one of the major reasons for the dire state of the council. Sort the management out first otherwise it's just money down the drain.
• See previous response
• I don’t agree with the principle of funding this through a tax on the value of a persons property. In my opinion, it should be funded through other means more proportional to the persons ability to pay (ie income tax), or should be funded by a tax per head.
• As a resident how would we see proof this has been directed into adult social care, My [spouse] has suffered with Mental Health issues and this would be a drop in the ocean.
• Tory govt has cut £6.7bn from social care across England and Wales. We the taxpayers are expected to cover this deficit, by paying twice.
• Forgetting the purpose of this part of the tax the whole increase is 3.99% and that is too high. adult care is still part of council financial duties so the need is for the council to work within a budget with say a max total increase of no more than 3%.
• The council tax should not be increased by any amount. Indeed, given the reduction in services Northamptonshire County Council now offers in many areas, the Council Tax ought to be reduced. I do not see why Council Tax payers should pay more money when they are receiving reduced services.
• Our council tax has continued to increase, with cuts to our local services being made regardless. It is unaffordable for us to continue to have such large rises, this is going to impact house prices and make the area less attractive to live. This could lead to a negative impact on the local economy.
• use current budget more wisely - and many many services require improvement and funding. Adult Social Care is essential but does not have a link or any involvement with many many households - and shouldn't just be used to subsidise one service.
• It’s not down to hard working tax payers to fund Adult social care! As a band C in the [location] ward, since buying my home in 2014, our monthly council tax has risen by £24 a month! I understand rises are necessary but the onus shouldn't be on us to contribute towards adult social care.
• Funding should be focussed on improving roads, gritting the road network properly and maintaining services for all.
• I feel that this should be funded by central government not local.
• Ditch Adult Social Care funding.
• I agree that there is a need for better adult social care, but increases in Council Tax will not be well received until income stops decreasing in relative terms.
• Again as per my previous answer, if the cost of living keeping going up and up and there is no wage increase to go with this, how are people to pay the increase and still have a roof over their heads in some cases. Why have say a 1% increase each year until the 4% is reached. I feel that wages of top and senior management should be reviewed too.
Same as previous answer.

Adult Social Care should be funded centrally through the NHS budget. Other Government taxes could be raised to cover this.

Staff have a 4% pay rise which will be taxed and then you propose to take 3.99% council tax increase which so basically staff have received no extra income the pay is a disgrace in care for the work that is expected, lone working, administering medication helping which finances and a whole lot more. Even privatised company’s are paying their staff more.

The financial mess by the conservative government and mismanagement of national debt has meant less money to local governments and so the citizens are being penalised for their mistakes. And asked to fund what should be the responsibility of central and local government.

Whilst I understand the money has to come from somewhere, don’t see why it’s fair that the public has to pick up the bill for the overspending on your part.

I don’t have the money for this. I am already in debt, and that £24 that you want extra could go towards my debt, which will mean I pay over 2 years £80 less interest, so your "only £24" turns into my £104.

See my previous answer.

I haven’t seen clear explanations of what this money would be used for. The link to the council pages accompanying these decisions is seriously heavy reading. I want money to go towards Policing and I haven’t seen that mentioned anywhere.

Already answered in previous answer. How can we be sure that this money will be spent on Adult Social Care? Also, why so specific? Why not child social care as outlined is needed by OfSted?

See previous answers.

So now the proposed increases are up to almost £50 per annum - if the services were run efficiently in the first place this would not be needed.

More money should be invested in helping children.

This money doesn’t go to the people who actually need it. You keep taxing people harder and more and more people will need the care due to the suicide and depression you inflict on people!

Once again the money is being wasted. What once seemed to work or what could be covered up doesn’t work any more. We need fresh approaches not keep throwing good money after bad and never sorting out a better solution. This council needs a good overhaul of bosses which are too many… and they need to start earning their money. I don’t think this council has those people we need in office. Thry need to apply for their positions again with potential new recruits for the job.

NCC have badly managed funds and continue to do so.

I don’t know what other services need money - maybe more so?
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 65 responses to this question.

- Same as before.
- I think more money needs to go into Childrens Services
- N/A
- People will moan and could see getting a pay rise in ASC for it to then be taken back by CT.
- The public have no trust in the councillors or politicians in this county. This is caused by the press releases and comments from the current leadership team referring to historical practices and decisions made leading to the current financial concerns. Most of the current leadership team were in place and were involved in the historical decisions yet they do not acknowledge this.
- If payrise for council staff was reflective of cost of living increases over the past 4 years then paying more into the public purse would be affordable for your employees and local residents.
- as above
- will be felt all round. people will be in more debts and at risk of losing their homes. it might not sound a lot but when you are already struggling to pay out an extra penny is a lot.
- Low/no income families may be adversely impacted.
- same as before, just commniciate clearly with residents (forums, leaflets through doors that the increase isn’t that much and will be used for xyz...)
- public engagement with what ASC dies, many people have no idea we are responsible for funding elderly people and younger adults in 24 hour accommodation and I think a better understanding would make the general public more understanding and accepting
- image of council and involvement to aid adults not just pay for them, be better to show funding to non monetary options.
- There has been a lot of wasted monies spent on social care over recent years by NCC. Other services have been hit because of this.
- A negative impact on my wallet. Mitigate by cutting senior council officer wages.
- The impact is because it is too late and too selective
- People’s wages hadn’t been increased
- As previous last page
- The negative impact would yet again be incurred on lower earners...these would pay the greatest percentage of their overall earnings! Mitigate it by ensuring that costly contracts put in place by Council linked staff are ‘better’ investigated for saving efficiencies.
- As a service user of the adult care system, recently paying towards my [spouses] care package, the increases of our contribution over the last 2 years (£[amount] per month to £[amount] per week) has made [their] care package unaffordable and is one (not the only one) of the reasons [they] chose to stop his care package this year.
I am concerned that increasing the council tax and also increasing the cost of care packages hits service users twice in the pocket which could lead to decisions to cancel care packages putting people at risk.

- As above
- The same as my answer to the previous section.
- Further bad feeling towards the current councils and their lack of management and abilities
- Adult Social Care is under-funded and that is shameful. The money which has been allocated has, I have read, been misspent. If all these top executives that have been brought in to help 'advise' the County Council, took a pay cut, I’m sure the Adult Social Care would welcome that extra money, as would other services. These 'top' execs come & go, whereas these societies will remain.
- The Northampton town image is run down and low offering. This maybe the straw that breaks the camels back.
- n/a
- Tories out.
- Again others may disagree.
- This proposal will have a negative impact in that some residents may not be able to afford to pay their rates due to the extra funding required for Social Care & Health. However it you tried to raise the funding from customers this would mean many customers would cut down on services they need to have a reasonable quality of life
- Again, you are hitting families and individuals who are already struggling. To say it's only £24.72 is clumsy when that only equates to one part of the overall council tax bill. I know that when you deal with budgets that run into 100s of millions, that £24.72 is small in comparison, but that £24.72 plus whatever the increase for D&Bs, Parishes and NPCC is for next year is crippling for those families and individuals who are already on tight budgets and scrapping by. If someone has pretty much zero left after paying bills and monthly fuel and food costs, then what are you leaving them for emergencies or unforeseen expenditure? I appreciate that you have to find funding somewhere, but budgets are tight everywhere - perhaps look to further cut the nice things that happen at NCC that don't have to happen - kites in the atrium as part of a fostering campaign for example - waste of money when you don't have any to spare...
- us citizen can't get jobs cah they judge us not having qualifications.../
- Please refer to previous comments!
- As prior page.
- None
- As above.
- At a time when the rest of us aren’t receiving any pay rises it seems totally unjustified to be giving the council any more money. This council has a history of wasting money. I suggest you save more money and increase efficiency before asking the residents to pay more.
- See previous response
• It would make economic sense if Adult Social Care were to be merged with the NHS. National Insurance contributions should be increased or a new Social Security contribution levied to cover this funding, as for example in Germany.
• So now we are expecting to having a average of £50 increase to C tax, what is the other increase for?
• Yes try reversing the cuts and not borrowing to squander money on a new office not fit for purpose.
• Again people not understanding the bigger picture.....may be fast forwarding 40 years where the current 30/40 year olds who pay the majority of tax can see that by investing now can help to evolve the social care system so that it continues to evolve, so that when they eventually need it the system won't be like stepping back to the 1970s.
• This proposal would have a negative impact in that it will burden Council Tax payers with an increased Council Tax bill. The way this could be mitigated is for Northamptonshire County Council to not increase the Council Tax for the Conservative government to properly fund local authorities.
• Yes, some will struggle to pay. Every service that the council does not provide directly (as councils used to) but pays a profit making company to supply, is clearly more expensive than it would otherwise be - not fair on those who are paying the bills.
• House prices would decrease, less attractive to live in the area and could impact the local economy. This could also impact attracting teachers, police officers, nurses, doctors etc, meaning more strain on our local services. I would suggest looking at reviewing the council tax bands first.
• What assurances have we that this is enough to avoid another massive overspend?
• As previous question
• I fear that the money won't be used sensibly due to the shambolic mismanagement of the senior management.
• We cannot afford this!
• You need to manage your money better and stop paying ridiculous salaries and bonuses to big wigs and actually get efficient and properly educated social/care workers! The system is a disgrace and needs a overhaul from the top down.
• For people 'just about managing' any increase in bills can cause a great deal of anxiety and hardship.
• Attempts to mitigate the harm inflicted on local social care services will not have a negative effect.
• By increased funding from central government
• Please see previous response
• I feel better services could be implemented by more intelligent use of resources rather than more money being invested.
• Same as previous answer.
• Not all council tax payers require this service and should not be discriminated against being forced to pay for this. Adult Social Care should be funded and provided centrally through the NHS budget where the specialist service providers can...
maximise the effectiveness and efficient use of the funding across the country rather than in smaller areas. Other Government taxes could be raised to cover this.

- The only negative impact is that there are those who know how to answer questions when trying to get what they want from NCC, I would argue. There are those who do not know what they are entitled to and do not know the best way of achieving the optimum for either themselves or someone in their care. Perhaps with more resources there could be a fairer assessment of those who get too much and those who don't get enough so that costs could be "smoothed" so that all concerned could achieve that which is justifiable.

- It is a case of giving with one hand and taking away with the other. Moral is not good, staff are stressed, I have [number] out of [number] staff struggling with stress and anxiety, I am not doing to well either and for some it will be a case of 4% and yet £50.00 tax. For those at the higher pay scale this will mean nothing but for those at the lower end with all that Brexit entails and the financial impact that will have, this is a kick in the teeth. As for suggestions, it that not why the politicians and senior managers are paid the big money?

- Cut the stupid salaries that the big bosses have and stop having council award functions that cost money!

- More people will become in poverty, which means more people will seek services due to mental health issues, so any extra money you do spend by getting it this way will be swallowed up by the increased service users due to this budget.

- As long as this is used for Adult Social care the only negative impact I foresee is the cost to people who already pay expensive rent/ mortgages.

- I think with the 2 increases it could be seen as a double tax and although the council tax rise is fair in my opinion people who have lived here will see other issues that they will see as more important. Again positive stories on how the extra money is used and helping could damped the negativity it may receive

- See previous answers

- Residents are getting fed up paying more and more for services - our wages don't go up in line with this.

- Your ruining peoples lives. Try being in your twenties and trying to create a life your crippling my family.

- The people are poor enough any increase by a profligate council would have negative outcomes.
Q. The Government has not yet confirmed the rules around the allowed percentage increase for 2020/21 before a referendum is needed. If the Government rules change to allow the Council to increase Council Tax by more than 1.99% (with a further 2% for Adult Social Care) to fund frontline services, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Council Tax should be increased beyond 1.99% to help fund public services? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 256 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response category</th>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northamptonshire Adult Social Services (NASS)

Adult social care in Northamptonshire is having to change, because like all Adult Social Care services across the country, we cannot meet growing levels of demand within the budget we have if we don’t think differently about care and how we keep people as safe and well and in their homes and independent for as long as possible. This is even more important as predicted demand over the next ten years is set to grow, particularly within our elderly population, but also for younger adults who often have complex needs.

While it is proposed that we make savings in 20-21, it is also proposed that the service budget will increase in £10.5m. Within these proposals, there is a focus on investment and plans that will create more effective ways to support people in their own homes or communities for as long as possible, to avoid hospital admissions, delay or reduce the escalation of need and better ways to meet people's need through what we buy or “commission”. This will include some new accommodation, closer working with health and growing our reablement and short term support offer.

We also recognise we are not organised in a way that makes sense to our customers and that we are taking too long to do some things. We want to change this and to help more customers achieve their outcomes by changing some of our processes and practices. In the coming year we will be improving how we work and manage the requests we get from service users, carers and families in order to make things easier for people and be more efficient. This will include ensuring we spend more time face to face with customers and less on paperwork.

Commissioning & Procurement

18-001-16 Specialist Centre for Step Down Care – Mental Health and Acquired Brain Injury

- Moray Lodge development by Northampton Borough Council and Northampton Partnership Homes to provide specialist and step down supported living for people with an Acquired Brain Injury and Mental Health support needs. This is forecast to deliver savings of £114,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 225 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 69 responses to this question.

- We need to provide support for people that need it and we also need to balance that with cost effective sources of care
- Think they have enough experience to carry out the task.
- Mental health is a growing area of need and I have experience of having a friend with an acquired brain injury and centres like this are a lifeline to families
- This is a much needed facility and we need more like it.
- Any savings likely to have positive impact on budget.
- Don't know alternative to strongly agree too proposal
- There is a urgent need for more supported living accommodation for vulnerable young adults
- They have little choice, but for help from the community
- All savings welcomed provided level of care as good
- While I have every sympathy with those that suffer health problems the council must understand that many of us are at the very limit of what we can pay put to help others. Every time tax rises now it has a direct impact on the lives of many who have to pay it and why should the council by its waste and mismanagement be allowed to impose such burdens on us?
- Hopefully the savings can be made without a detrimental affect on the service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>55 24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>75 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>47 20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>13 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>15 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>20 8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Mental Health Services are severely underfunded and understaffed so any extra support that can be given to them should be. Also, there is such an increasing number of people suffering with mental health problems, and the numbers of suicides are frightening, so more support is urgently needed in this area.
• Cost cutting can always be made. Families need to take more responsibility for their parents/children/grandparents etc... rather than expect the tax payer to top fund all or their care and rehabilitation.
• Provided it does make a saving this would be a welcome facility within the county that I am happy to contribute my tax to with the hope that I don’t have to use it, but if I, a friend or family member did, it would be fully accessible for local people or who ever needed it.
• Mental health support needs to be vastly improved across the county, so I support any funding to increase in this area. There is very little information however to fully understand this proposal.
• Seems like it would provide a good and efficient service
• It is an important specialist sector that needs attention.
• In house provision is more cost effective and would be managed more effectively than commissioning from private providers.
• This has been on the cards for years just get on with it.
• Is good to maximise the use of our current assets
• Any support with mental health is a positive for the county as many services related to this are closing.
• There is a local need for this service provision.
• It may fulfil a need but is a tiny drop in the ocean
• Needs to be supported
• Despite being a savings model, I would hope that this will be an effective partnership and put in place very much needed support for people with brain injuries and mental health needs.
• I hope there will be adequate safeguards to ensure that people really receive the full care that they need, and saving money doesn’t mean reducing service, or asking staff to offer the same service with fewer resources.
• Because I believe that especially the Mental Health services in Northamptonshire need improvement to provide people with health issues more support when needed supported living will greatly improve their lives. I think that we should also provide a specialist Mental Health service that works directly with the Police and Hospitals to help someone in crisis and they receive the correct support network.
• Purely because care for those who suffer these tragedies needs to be met by the government.
• If the savings are being generated via efficiencies that is a good thing but it may be better to reinvest the money into the care of people at a different point where there may be a gap in service e.g. in supporting them more before they use this facility or when they move from it to home.
• It is not clear what is proposed.
• My concern is every time there is going to be a planned "saving" on an annual basis announced, it seldom comes to fruition. The spend to save idea has not been a
successful concept in this area. I doubt that this development will save money ultimately.

- Never heard of Moray Lodge.
- I don’t have sufficient information. It is not possible to comment on specific items, it is up to councillors to take these decisions and take responsibility for them.
- No skills in this area
- It’s too late. [MP’s names], aided by [previous Councillor] vanity, have ruined this council's financial viability, and now service users and residents are suffering with poor adult social care, children's services in special measures, library and HWRC closures and reduced hours, potholes, and regular flooding. [Councillor] was at the helm for much of this time and [they] should do the decent thing and resign. Just like the liars at Westminster ruining the country, the Tories in Northamptonshire have ruined the county.
- Too Northampton Borough centric - need more geographically spread solutions
- why the savings, on what areas? where will those savings be spent?
- Northamptonshire doesn't have enough diverse support whether that be in the community, supported living or mental health hospital admissions, it difficult to know what will work better as it is so disjointed and unacceptable now. vulnerable people will die if this continues
- I have little knowledge in this as a subject or as something in Northamptonshire.
- do not know enough about the specific project. i do not generally support projects of mixed public and private responsibilities as it leads to a 'blame' culture.
- How are they making the savings? By cutting staffing or the support for the patients to save money will mean a drop in care standards which is unacceptable
- The statement is not clear. Is it proposed to cancel this service?
- Quality of care needs to come before savings
- it is obvious any health benefit would be good if its properly run, i dont have the confidence in this council that it would be
- How is the savings going to occur? Very unclear. How can I say this is good or bad without knowing what they are saving on?
- resources should be put in place to provide any support for adult social services - these are vulnerable members of our society and should not be targeted with cuts to those services
- De numbers didn’t change drastically
- I do not have enough in-depth knowledge to answer this. I do not believe NBC have the right skills or experience to deliver this project and should tender it out to with the already established local St Andrews hospital that specialises in mental health to manage or run.
- How will people be looked after? You have a duty of care to these people.
- because I have seen the council far too many times shove the burden on to some sort of public/private partnership which looks all modern and shiny but in the end a costs fortune. Prospective savings in the first year are tiny measured against the overall budget but in years to come what will the costs be?
- this is an important service and should be supported
- Who will be profiting from this? There should not be profit in caring.
• I am not sure there is room to make savings and still provide a good level of service.
• Mental health is just as valuable as physical health. Mental health funding needs to be increased not cut, are the physical health going to be cut also?
• there are not enough services for the mental health service users in the community and reducing the budget for them will diminish them even more
• Funding should be equally spread across the county rather than focussed on Northampton and the north of the county.
• Should be funded centrally and managed the same way not locally
• If the savings will result in a reduction in the care available, I cannot agree. Mental illness requires at least the same care as physical illness.
• St. Andrews can pick this up, they make enough profits.
• I feel this needs to be overseen on a case by case basis. Not all adults in that situation would be able to cope.
• Adult Social Care should be funded and provided centrally through the NHS budget.
• These people need the help plus in the grand scheme of things that money isn't huge. Once again a whole review if expenditure is needed. It's easy to spend especially when no one is being made accountable. Times have changed and the council must change but once again who we employ seem not capable. Applying for the jobs they have again together with interviewing 8 new candidates and getting the right person. This happens all the time in company's so why not the council.
• These people need help and should not have spending cuts enforced on them.
• Because such services are vital and if effective ultimately save costs elsewhere.
• This question does not make sense.
• Does acquired brain injury include dementia and such illness, or just those unlucky enough to have accidents. As it is, from experience of my friends, the NHS and Council Support seem to have an aim of just passing people from one to the other as rapidly as possible to avoid taking any responsibility and to reduce costs, without due consideration of the individual.
• A forecasting is the easy part, delivering is the prof.
• It wasn't clear what the proposal was, therefore unable to agree or disagree.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 24 responses to this question.
• would cost NCC more in the long run by not providing services and improving wellbeing for adults
• There might be a negative impact on those living there if it isn't suitable or run appropriately with well trained staff
• See above
• Many people will be unable to survive if the taxes are increasing due to the inbalance created
I would perceive this to be a form of neglect. The council has demonstrated it is incapable of delivering adequate services and these people will be of the most vulnerable. I believe it would lead to a death.

Tories out.

The negative impact I can see is that four or five years down the line, the "partnership" will come cap in hand to the county council saying they need a great big lump of money - cue headlines in all the papers, interviews with end users crying because Moray lodge will close, and all that hoop-la.

negative impact

Not sure it is appropriate to cut funding to this necessary service

None

As above.

The headline is positive, but savings sound like a cut to a service, efficiencies would sound better with a clear plan on where that savings is being spent

People not appreciating that ANYONE of us could need a facility like this at any point, and when in such a horrendous situation the last thing you want to worry about is where or how this care can be delivered locally.

Mental health illnesses, life's and affordability.

Again just the added costs, forever escalating for those with fixed incomes.

My partner suffers from mental health issues and we have personally seen the impact that it has already had on the services, so reducing the budget even more will have an even more detrimental effect on these over stretched services

Local people supporting local issues? But why when you are not effected and get the bill for others? Also from county to county will vary and the care will be a postcode lottery.

If this is a money saving exercise, then it needs to be for the right reasons for the individuals concerned.

Local Councils do not have the specialist understanding to be able to provide this service efficiently. By being forced to do this, the core provision to the locality is suffering.

Poor quality of care would counteract the proposal. Bringing in bank staff that do not care and are there to do the minimum for their job

Depends entirely on what they are saving on. Care? No. Cleaners? No. Paying council members to sit and tell people they need less help? Yes.

Money will be saved and the people of Northampton will respect the council more if the right people are sort for their jobs. Its a fact of life things can't go on. No free rides any more that's what we want.

Any cuts must involve less staff or less resources so must adversely affect users.

The requirement to make these savings will have an adverse impact on service capacity. These services should be funded from increases in council tax.
19-001-06 New Learning Disability Service provision
- Proposal with Northampton Borough Council to build eight specialist bungalows for clients to live more independently, creating savings from less use of residential care. The build will be funded by Homes England and Health. This is forecast to deliver savings of £406,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 224 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 79 responses to this question.

- So long as the bungalows are well built and will keep the residents safe it would be a wise decision, however the quality of the build and workmanship should be closely monitored
- Important for people to be independent where possible
- Great idea, helps people with LDs live more independently
- Saving money is key and getting services which reduce cost is always a win win.
As this is not NCC funded, it is a good investment, however the homes need to be built to accommodate the Northants demographic, ensuring the transport links work, house designs fit and people using this can merge into the town.

don't know the dis benefits, seems a good idea initially

8 will not be enough

This sort of provision is preferable to using residential facilities for people who are able to be more independent and want to do so.

Sounds good if it saves this much money.

If eight saves £406,000 why are you only building eight? Build more save more!! It also points at the costs of residential care being outlandishly high so tackle that as well?

More adults needs to be able to live independently and this is an excellent proposal.

savings welcomed

In the long term this provision would save expenditure in other areas, eg the NHS.

If the professionals from the original project side with this proposal then I will too. Their say would reflect my feelings on this as they would know the true impact. This question provides too little information.

To give the users more independence.

8 - it's a drop in the ocean!

great idea

I hope the right people get to live in the properties

There is not enough provision for Learning Disabilities Services so this should be considered. Also, Residential Care is costly and if placing younger adults whose life expectancy could be another 60 years plus, this would save a lot of money.

Is eight units sufficient?

Should be more than 8

This sounds like a good solution which should help people in a good way.

Independence is a clear goal for all customers of the council,

supporting more vulnerable residents is always going to be a good thing but it will depend how the criteria to access one will be as often people who would benefit from a bungalow don't have the opportunity to have one

Fantastic where appropriate to save peoples self esteem and allow for support.

It's a small number, but vitally needed.

Mental health is very important and to live semi independently.

Seems like it would provide a safe and efficient service

I agree that there is a need for this type of provision, but the operational side needs to be full defined and possible under some form of managed service.

residential care has its place but is not necessarily suited to everyone. the specialist bungalows will allow options/choice.

Helping some one to live independently in their own is more beneficial to the service user in the long run, and also reduces the impact on the residential homes

Vulnerable citizens independence is a better outcome than being in residential institutions

Independent living is definitely a positive for these people.
Independent living is fantastic BUT is it going to have the input to make it a success for the residents….or will they get put in the home and then have their care needs "reassessed" and care packages reduced
Creating any area to help independent living must be a good thing.
This is centrally funded and yes a good proposal
A far better use of the money.
This provision is needed locally
Only 8?
I strongly support more care in the community as long as appropriate levels of staff support are built in.
seems to be a good idea. Not against NEW BUILD but Infra Stucture needs to be much improved to support all the new houses or properties.
This is a fantastic step forward to support people with learning disabilities to lead their lives more independently.
If this can be done within budget, it’s a substantial net gain for everybody: more independence for clients, less reliance on services and lower overall costs. Also, the investment in tangible assets that can be used again and again is a solid idea. These bungalows could go on providing benefits to the community for a generation.
I agree that independence should be promoted as much as possible, so that people are better placed to help themselves.
more specialist homes are always good
It has to be of good quality with good person centred plan with good quality care
Money in the right direction for this scheme. We want them to have as decent a life as possible but not make us bankrupt by doing that. Less people would need to be employed by the council which is a good thing. Applying for their own job again and new recruits if they right people aren’t to be found in existing staff.
Because it is more appropriate to promote independent living for those who can benefit from this.
Eight bungalows will not solve this problem.
Good that support and saving will benefit all.
Why do you need to increase taxes etc if “The build will be funded by Homes England and Health”?
Too little too late. 8 bungalows is way too small and feels like a token move! The % of people in the borough needing this service needs to be made known if a realistic response is seriously asked for! As it stands this makes me suspicious!
as per prior question
Too Northampton Borough centric - need more geographically spread solutions
Again I have no knowledge to be able to make a decision
as not in northampton itself so villagers would not benefit from this scheme it should be on bourough tax not county
Short term money saving. Waste of time.
Eight bungalows is not enough to cover the need in the town
there is a world outside Northampton
• I do not believe that these savings will be forthcoming. My concern also is the quality of care for all. Is there really a need to build more facilities, when many facilities appear to be standing half empty? Utilise what you have, do not build new.
• Selective buildings cost money and more for carers
• More PFI nonsense? Short term saving = long term costs.
• The number of people with learning disability didn’t grow so much in order to justify the increasing spending
• Our County Council has made a mess of most things it has done and its forecasts of savings will almost certainly be wrong again.
• A very loaded question the homes might be paid for by what about the running costs etc... not enough detail to comment properly but I suspect that there won’t be an actual saving of £406k because it won’t have taken into account ongoing costs etc...
• Who and how will this be supported?
• Where are just 8 bungalows going to spread themselves, when you consider the number with a need. Again fairness and equality is unlikely in allocation. A difficult one - obviously those who have had support from early in life expect this to continue which is reasonable, but those who find suddenly themselves in need of support in advancing years are often neglected.
• I cannot see how these units will save £406k in the 20/21 financial year. The units will barely be built by March 2021. That figure needs further clarification.
• Private companies have offered to do this and not followed through by commissioning in the past.
• Spread the available funds fairly across the whole county rather than always focusing in the north.
• Not enough care in the community to service independent living
• No thanks unless one of the bungalows is for me.
• Would this put more pressure on families?
• Is 8 properties a sustainable solution to the system? 406k seems like a lot of money but it’s presumably only 8 people....there is an ever-increasing population. This solution isn’t focused on addressing the problem for service users, it seems to be a desperate attempt to save some money without considering the ongoing, increasing scale of the problem.
• This will help as long as there is adequate staffing levels. We are having difficulties with recruiting and keeping good well trained staff( That NCC have trained at a cost ! ) as our care staff wages are £[amount] and a little more in residential. The wages across the Social Care Services all need to be revised. Over the Years I think that the NCC buildings have been some what neglected and they are not pleasing to the eye of our customers and then they look else where and go private. Money then gone from the NCC budget. This is very apparent in our Day Service Provision for people with disabilities. We have the buildings and quality staff we need to retain them and keep monies within NCC.
• Only 8? So that’s 8 people that can live independently from savings but costing back on nursing care for the others who need constant care?
• As above
• See previous question
• I’m not qualified to know if this proposal will have a positive impact on the people who use these services. Will they receive less support than at present, will they be able to manage with this lower level of support.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 19 responses to this question.

• What about any provision for the north of the county.
• may isolate people
• See above
• Less impact if built as units to cut staffing costs
• The money taxed from the people will create a vacuum in their homes hard to be filled
• Only negative affect is the one that has already been created and now compounded by a poor response.
• I am concerned that many vulnerable people are lonely and perhaps we should be looking at more upmarket/less institutional communal living rather than individual units
• Ask the staff and patients.
• I strongly disagree that moving people out to bungalows gives them a better life than living in residential accommodation which unfortunately costs more but has more to offer the residents
• None
• Is this a profit situation or genuine care by the council?
• Will to remove funding from other areas?
• If there is no on site support overview monitoring for when the residents condition changes and they need more support. or they move in for a short time as they already have high needs.
• No idea - I see the problems and the unfairness. You can’t set the clock back to the extended family support that worked a generation or two ago, as families however much they care are split by distance and the fact that all parents are expected to work to sustain their family. Maybe the council can devise some better method of helping families assist in their relatives care.
• Putting the pressure back on families to make financial savings is a fine line that will require careful managing
• The investment could be spent on roads or footpaths or a decent waste collection service.
• Don’t build them in a bad area full of chav scum, it will be ruined
• What about those that need constant care? What it not make sense to apply savings to get more care assistants? Or is that what you’re saving was based on?
• If not properly implement with good person centred planning.
19-001-12 Shaw Public Private Partnerships (PPP) Review of Packages

- Review of supplementary care costs over and above contract hours and closer management of periods of voids charges. This is forecast to deliver savings of £80,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 205 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 56 responses to this question.

- We need to better manage the funds available to the county and ensure that people are accountable for the management of those funds so that Northamptonshire county is not paying more than it should
- Good to have all the information about the supplementary care costs
- Saves a lot of money, good idea
• We need to monitor closely what is being provided for and the cost attached. Improve turnaround in filling vacant beds by either increasing Brokerage team or give control back to ASC workers to fill these.

• (if my understanding is correct). Clients receiving care via NCC sometimes go years without financial and care needs assessments, so they are paying less money for more services. A routine of yearly assessments and brokerage actually brokering deals, not just signing of all forms of care would save a lot. A policy perhaps were care begins at a minimum of say £5 a week, and people who would be nil cost contribute £5 would generate a lot more than the above figure. Even starting at £3 is a big amount due to the number of nil cost clients. The knock on means people who say pay £25 a week, goes to £28 or £30 generates a lot more money.

• This is great if customers/service users do not miss out on day centres and socialising as a lot of service users can be lonely and social activities with groups of people.

• Again- it is saving money.

• If you're only saving ~£80k on this then you're not really trying.

• a review of packages isn't a bad thing if it is done in a person centred way with the person at the forefront

• Should be what happens now

• Any review of efficiency is welcome, as long as the result is not an arbitrary reduction in service provision.

• Its about time these services were managed correctly

• Why isn't this done already?

• They are paid a substantial amount of monies for this contract and the Council should be monitoring this very closely to ensure that they are getting value for money, that Shaw are complying with the contract and that customers who use this service are getting they require.

• Care costs should be reviewed regularly, it's an on going process

• The fact that the Shaw Homes had such a huge contract is absolutely ridiculous. They pick and choose who they agree to support and this was not in their contract, but they feel they have the freedom to do this. When Respite is refused at one of the Shaw Homes, often more costly private establishments have to be approached, so the Council ends up paying twice.

• More savings need to be found.

• there should be legal opinion sought to get out of this agreement given the press coverage that this is a much under utilised resource or to have a contract variation that they will take the clients you need them to

• Should have been constantly reviewed

• Sounds like it needs to be done to keep the services in line with funds available.

• Costs need to be managed more closely, contracts need to be reviewed

• What are the investment costs for these to be reviewed? will it cost more that £80k resulting in no saving.....what are the reasons behind these over changes - maybe reviewing what the reasons are and possibly what NCC/NBC can do.

• Efficiency should always be encourage

• Any savings are good?
• I agree as long as it is managed and not just applying pressure to deliver within selected timeframes
• I find it hard to comment without knowing more but in principle this sounds like an appropriate thing to do.
• Will savings mean less staff to cover current workloads.
• this should be managed as part of BAU?
• Too Northampton Borough centric - need more geographically spread solutions
• No knowledge to make a decision
• NCC continual try's to reduce the costs paid to external provider, but this impact service users.
• I hope this doesn’t penalise those with little or no money to pay. The most vulnerable in society.
• I favour social care being brought in-house as part of a programme to integrate social care
• Not Understood the question
• I don't feel I know enough about this issue to make an informed or useful comment.
• Not that great a saving but staff numbers need looking at again. Thats where the money is wasted.
• I do not agree with PPP in principle it always feels that business makes more money from these than the benefit they purport to have
• Will it really make any savings? What is the evidence to support this idea? Has it made a difference in any other county?
• The council have always told the public they are cutting costs, mainly to keep themselves in power and pay
• The justification of such spending isn’t realistic
• Savings? Agreed are required where funds have been spent unwisely, but savings off a very needy aspect of the community is strange way to behave!
• see previous comment re private/public partnerships
• What exactly does that even mean? Illusions and smoke mirrors in the use of a question. Will this mean employees are shafted on money or will it mean you’ll stop wealthy greedy fat cats from creaming their profit further
• PPPs lock up funding too long and are not adaptable to changes in circumstances
• What does "supplementary care costs " mean, get rid.
• The services are already stretched to the bone - more workers are needed not closer management!
• You think people shouldn’t help others outside of contracted hours? Can tell it’s a Conservative council. What happened to that money in the football club again?
• I call [redacted] on this one
• Never heard of 19-001-12 Shaw Public Private Partnerships (PPP) Review of Packages
• As above
• I don't know the answer to this question but I have no faith. in the County Council what so ever
Read the paper as directed, but it seemed to say things would be reviewed, but not exactly what any service reduction would involve. I would need further clarification to answer.

I have no knowledge in this area.

What does this actually mean? - Review of supplementary care costs over and above contract hours and closer management of periods of voids charges. ?? Bamboozle the reader to just see the 80K saving to click agree. Terrible loaded question. Plain speak would be good

See previous response

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 11 responses to this question.

- Will savings mean less staff to cover current workloads.
- Service users/customers could lose out on social aspects
- Is being unfair for the tax payers to fill unjustified spending
- Care costs already are failing to provide a proper service to needy users. What is required is a full service review that leads to better working conditions for the providers and a sensible amount of time for recipients.
- None
- As above (2)
- it will cost more to do than it saves, resulting in a decline in support and service
- See previous response
- I call [redacted] on this one
- Less pay means less care which means those in need are missing out further. Save money from paying out for ridiculous things like footballs clubs and put it into those actually in need

19-001-05 Care Home Review

Review of Evelyn Wright care home viability and building investment and alternatives to meet need more effectively in the area. Consultation on this proposal began on 11 September and closes on 19 November. If you would like to give your views on this proposal, please complete the separate questionnaire by 19 November available at https://northamptonshire.citizenspace.com/bipm/evelyn-wright-care-home-2019/
Policy and Practice

19-001-16 Fair Contributions Policy

- Proposal to revise the allowances of a number of client groups in line with national and local levels. Consultation on this proposal began on 11 September and closes on 3 December. If you would like to give your views on this proposal, please complete the separate questionnaire by 3 December, available at https://northamptonshire.citizenspace.com/bipm/faircontributionspolicy2019/

Technology and Innovation

19-001-07 Brain in Hand

- Use of Assistive Technology to support clients with specific focused care needs and to promote independence and life skills. This is forecast to deliver savings of £78,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 190 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 48 responses to this question.

- It is better to provide the technology to help people help themselves in dignity rather than ask them to rely on expensive care services that could be better utilised elsewhere.
- Lots of new technology available.
- Great idea - technology can do so much to help people with extra needs.
- We are all for maintaining as much independence for our customers as possible and being able to utilise AT in achieving this is fantastic.
- May enable specific clients with their needs - which could reduce financial impact elsewhere.
- This would be great to enable people to be as independent as possible as long as they have been assessed correctly.
- Any independent living needs to be carefully viewed and for the right persons.
- It is important to facilitate as much independence as possible - good for the service users' mental health.
- Great.
- This is a service which needs more advertising as people know nothing about the service, it also needs to be promoted throughout the council so employees know about it.
- Technology is good (except if it fails) but must not in the case of care replace the human interaction.
- This is to the benefit of the individuals concerned and to the wider community.
- Any use of technology to promote independence and life skills is a good thing. The savings are fairly immaterial.
- Great idea.
- So long as people get the right equipment.
- I often refer people for assessment by Assistive Technology and they can provide a good support. However, sometimes equipment is just not good enough, or adequate enough, so it shouldn't be seen as the be all and end all.
- Again should have been looked at ages ago.
- Move with the times, and allow people to me more independent.
- From the knowledge I have this seems a good idea.
- If the users and staff are trained on the assistive technology and are able to use it to the full, and is innovative not just something that a mobile phone can do.
- Technology is a help to people with disability to lead a more independent life.
- It increases independence and saves money as well.
- Again any promote of independence and life skills is a brilliant proposal.
- How are you saving this money? Is it by reducing their care packages?
- Amy saving is good.
- Sensible.
• All in favour of this as long as the primary emphasis is on promoting life skills and quality of life, not just on saving money. Assistive technology could be a godsend to some people but may not be appropriate or sufficient for others.
• In general, anything that can be used to promote independence is a good thing, so long as these technologies do not replacement human involvement. Isolation is a significant problem.
• technology is great, we need it
• Making sure adult is safe and independent but not replacing care support which is needed
• More independent living is vital to individual's mental health and if AT can make that more widely available and so the money goes further – excellent
• I tend to agree where it is appropriate for individuals.
• This has to be person centred not a money saving task-this isn't something that should be put upon people as the only option. This will be great for some if it's what is right for them and what they want as part of their package. PERSON CENTRED PLEASE!
• It is cruel to ask the public to decide on the needs of an individual without giving details of how it will impact their lives.
• this might be a good thing for some and not for others if this is a money saving option it is wrong because support should be person centred-people are not getting the support they need and you mention you want to do more face to face but it worries me this will reduce that. Unfortunately staff are failing vulnerable adults in their service and an audit should be carried out ASAP to prevent serious case reviews
• Difficult to assess, without detail. Technology is great when it works, but people do like human contact and care. Also, having worked in the computer industry for over [number] years, and spent a great deal of voluntary time since my retirement helping elderly people with technology, I know how difficult it can be for some who have not used technology previously. With care and correct individual tuition, it can work.
• I read this as meaning - 'Get rid of the problem.' (Use of Assistive Technology to support clients with specific focused care needs and to promote independence and life skills.) Make people pay for and look after themselves.
• Because the council cuts the emergency Services why is needed to spend money on people that are not contributing to the society?
• Why savings, this needs more investment surely. Homecare will increase with demand, assistive technology complements homecare.
• What is assistive technology? What exactly am I meant to take from that? Is it a amazon style robot going in twice a day to help [name] with her tea?
• I think that there would likely be little reasonable room for such savings and still be able to meet fair needs and requirements. client support is best provided by specialist charities operating workshops within the council's facility.
• Use of Assistive Technology, not required.
• Again for just making savings, the impact on individuals needs to be managed
• What do you classify as those that can have life skills? Adults with learning disabilities? Sure, but adults that cannot physically do anything for themselves? Then no.
- [Redacted] again
- Not a huge amount but once again staff numbers waste money. Sometimes 2 people or more people are smothering the job when one will do. Accountability again of staff chosen who can manage without constant supervision and be trusted to get on with it.
- These are too specific questions which members of the public are not qualified to answer and shouldn’t be asked. Obviously it makes sense to save money, who is likely to say otherwise.
- This will not have been costed correctly what about the installation costs, equipment costs, on going maintenance and replacement of equipment costs, monitoring costs, costs of managing the contract, I could go on....

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 13 responses to this question.

- I can see people being told here you go brain in hand is the only option we have and that’s the end of your support this will be absolutely stupid for a lot of people. How can you estimate what you will save unless you have thought about how many people will be given it and the reasons why they will be given it
- Redirect the money to the emergency Services that are saving lives of fit people that can contribute to the society effectively
- It could do, I dont know what level of assistive technology is. Will it replace social aspects of care and human interaction? Will it mean breakdowns and maintenance. complete restrictions to peoples lives? Will the council get sued?
- I am not convinced this is a benefit to clients although it is cheaper to provide this type of service
- None
- As above. Explain yourselves
- if it isn’t forward thinking and innovative.....and just something additional to carry and get lost.
- It will be OK as long as recipients are happy.
- As above
- the council being taken for a mug and being overcharged by companies that offer a cheap product, then slap on lots of licence and maintainance costs. Most technology assist today is open source and can be used very easily with community support forums
- [Redacted] again lies lies lies
- As long as used appropriately then helpful.
- If replaces care support at night
Demand Management

19-001-11 Mental Health Review

- Complete review of mental health packages and opportunity to step down care or support an individual to return to independence following a period of intervention and crisis care by Adult Social Services. This is forecast to deliver savings of £200,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 180 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 44 responses to this question.

- It is best to support individuals to improve/manage their mental health needs and work towards integrating back into the community
- Review is over due
- Seems a good idea as long as people are supported appropriately and monitored
• Everyone should be regularly reviewed so budgets can be correctly set and used.
• should already be part of BAU
• I agree there needs to be a review.
• I've always found council social care services to be excessively intrusive so stepping back on this is a good thing.
• Mental health is one of the areas requiring urgent attention.
• great idea
• All packages should be reviewed regularly to make sure people get the right support and the council gets value for money
• As I said previously, any additional support that can be given to Mental Health services should be.
• The question is now, with so many potential savings, why now, why has this not been done before.
• I feel this is a good strategy
• circumstances change, however it may also result in additional requirements for an already stretched service - more investment could be required to support the step down or is that just moving the issue to another public sector provider - NHS, Police etc
• Publicity has shown that this is badly needed
• the current arrangements are dated and not suited to modern day. they need scrapping altogether and a new model developed to meet future demands.
• A review to ensure changes are up to date is always welcomed.
• Excellent idea promoting independence
• If - NCC still ensure individuals support needs are being met appropriately
• Really good intervention and crisis care would be essential
• How can I be expected to know if this is a good thing or not. Reviews should be happening anyway as good practice not to save money.
• Having experienced "...following a period of intervention and crisis care..." I only saw NHS services in use????
• Do not understand how you can suddenly come up with £200,000 saving?
• again regular reviews should be happening as good practice but not for a money saving opportunity and again it worries me that this is what this is and people will lose the vital support they need
• How are you saving the money with this?
• I am unsure that savings in this area are either desirable or realistic
• I don't feel qualified to comment on this issue. I am surprised that mental health is seen as an area where less support and funding might be needed, given the many media stories over a long period suggesting that it is chronically under-resourced (nationwide, not just in Northamptonshire).
• Concerned that money will be wasted in the same way as the 'first for wellbeing' assessment schemes.
• I think it's money that's needed for this particular package. Staffing levels and number of staff eat the money when one will do.
• This scenario appears to prioritise savings over vulnerable service users. Mental health has not had the investment it needs, as although funds have been put in by central government, like the NHS as a whole, it isn't an investment as it has been nowhere near in line with the economy and inflation. Whilst intervention crisis will be a good step, there is the potential for users who return to independence to be left to the wolves. If there is adequate provisions in place (supported living with wardens, day centres, night time crisis helplines and centres) it has potential

• This proposal reduces help from the people who need it most

• I agree there needs to be a complete review of mental health packages, but I doubt very much there will be any form of savings.

• What packages? We got nothing when we needed help and support.

• Mental services need a drastic restructuration as this service has far too many people

• Public private partnerships are expensive and profit led. To continue this route is to become Americanised! The NHS is going this way so why am I bothering!

• Mental health has been the symptom of corruption, there should be no savings in this area.

• It might deliver savings in 20/21 but who knows what it will cost longterm both in money and in health

• It'll almost certainly lead to worse outcomes for the residents being cared for.

• Because this will lead to less care, less support, less staff and more profit.

• I do not think there is any room for savings in this area.

• Ditch Mental Health services, not working, the more that is provided the greater demand.

• You dont help people at all I know this first hand its pathetic

• People in crisis need continued human contact this should not be reduced!

• As above

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 11 responses to this question.

• Just the risk of relapse and subsequent cost of this

• Would support to clients be detrimentally impacted. Will it be harder for adults to receive support they need?

• I doubt this will be positive as the support is dire, staff have little or no understanding of how they can support and they have no empathy of people's situations. I know a few people who have eligible needs and have been waiting for years for the actual support. This is very worrying as I can imagine that people will be left with even less and no support to step down will be in place or correct. The whole system needs to be better not worse. New staff, new managers, new training, listen to those with lived experiences of what is needed and what works-let them train staff, give them jobs to mentor others because staff are hopeless unfortunately.

• Too much money spent in a service that never function properly
- Profit led approach is a negative for public services.
- Mental health should have more investment in this area, due to low quality of living standards and alcohol abuse. Maybe ask for sponsorship from [local business], as it appears to be the cathedral of Northampton.
- As above
- Given services for clients with mental health are nationally underfunded would want to make sure this isn't adding to the problem - early intervention and prevention (and maybe longer intervention at the beginning) would stop expenditure further down the line
- Investment, in time and finances.
- Your pathetic
- Again and reductions in the already stretch system could be catastrophic.

19-001-14 Strengths Based Working

- Transformation of Adults Social Care pathways and processes to ensure a focus on client outcomes, independence, better decision making and best practice approaches to reduce delays and spend. This project is funded by the Business Rate Pilot at assessment stage and is now out for tender for the implementation of new Target Operating Model (TOM) service design. This is forecast to deliver savings of £3.5m in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 173 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 42 responses to this question.

- We need to deliver on the budget and stop wasting money, anything that can deliver savings without compromising safety is a good decision.
- Good to have new ideas.
- We are all for this but budgets become a barrier, preventing service users from remaining in their homes.
- Due to a poor personal experience I really hope that this new TOM is successful and that things improve.
- Clients should be at the heart of all of our services. If we can focus on them, they will in turn focus on themselves and then break free from government intervention. This means a service user can leave the service, equipped and not needing to come back.
- This is a great idea if staff are competent in ensuring the best for customer/service users. Communication can be poor in this area.
- The whole service needs transformation so this could be positive but if it’s to save money it could be negative.
- Need to engage people from all areas who are already working within the Adult Social Care to see exactly what is needed and not just a team of people looking at papers.
- Care must be taken after reviews not to change things for the sake of change, actual benefits must be evident.
- Innovative thinking is needed to produce acceptable results in this area.
- The social care in this area is so poor and fails to meet needs, it would be better just to shut it down completely and hand council tax to the established local relevant professional charities that have proven success. Build emmaus type communes for adult social care. Emmaus charity for homeless has a better and proven model, rather than the council who just tick boxes and pass the ownership of problems but to service users. The council funded the dont kill will kindness marketing campaign which cost money to deliver, while a homeless person died, that money could have paid for warm accommodation for that person.
- A chance to improve the care for the users.
- This would be wonderful if it actually meant that someone with a bit of common sense would take over and sort out what was happening, but I expect it will be left to
a load of jargon-loving "woke" graduates who if they had to spend a day in real life with some of the people they deal with on paper would faint. The whole process needs to be taken apart from the bottom and simplified. Great if you think you can do it.

- hope the people in charge make the right decisions for residents in this county
- The way many social workers practice is out dated and to risk adverse! They over prescribe care packages, they offer limited flexibility in care packages and do not follow up by way of a review. Any change in this would be welcome!
- This does seem to be proposed every few years so I am hesitant to think it will bring about any real changes, particularly when the costs of the consultants are factored in. But if it does work then great.
- Questions of standing still need to be answered, savings of this size should be a concern
- the service needs to continue to evolve with the growing population requiring Adults Social Care, if the consultation has been with the frontline workers to understand the actual challenges not just how to balance the books.
- If it gives the savings and leaves all recipients and applicants happy, I agree.
- I agree, provided the TOM is carefully a sensibly thought out, in consultation across the department, including front line staff.
- Efficiencies in care pathways and processes is encouraged
- Savings unbelievable sounds too good to be true?
- structural changes should be after the service is stable
- seems to be cuts, cuts and cuts when services should be looked at and continue to provide
- A thorough overall of adult social care has been needed for a long time but it needs to be done independently looking at failures so you can learn that your service doesn't work for a lot of people. This sounds good but again is it a money saving task to say people don't need the support they are getting and reduce or cut support. The whole adult system is very worrying in Northamptonshire. You would benefit from having a panel of service users, carers and professionals to regular and randomly review cases to ensure they are getting accurate support
- A good saving but only if the scheme is successful and Since there can be no certainty on this I am not able to agree or not agree
- It's hard to do without things when people have an expectation that is what they should have. We should only be providing facilities if we can afford them. Its time for Northampton people to not expect what can't be delivered we haven't the funds.
- all people should pay the same
- Why do you need to increase taxes etc when "...forecast to deliver savings of £3.5m..."???
- You seriously need to talk to users who can tell you what it's like in the 'real world'. NASS is, from our experience, not fit for purpose.
- Reduce the numbers of the service providers
- Out for tender. Really? So some rich greedy company/friend/business can make a further billion from the misery of others.
How can you save £3,000,000 in 1 year? Are you scrapping the service? If you can save that money why was it not spotted earlier and who is being reprimanded for not spotting it earlier

I think this should be an in house service and that the savings proposed sound rather high when aiming to provide good service level long-term.

Not required.

I do not support cutting social care budgets. The exercise can be undertaken and efficiencies reinvested in services.

If it is out to tender you are not performing a legal consultation on the possible impact before going ahead.

This is all crap you put stuff like this down to guilt people into this tax do you think im stupid

This is a huge area and to put it out for tender strongly smacks at an economics game!

As above

The description is in comprehensible.

not sure what this means as isn't clear

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 8 responses to this question.

• change curve for staff and users
• Reducing the size of the service will provide more money
• I am beginning to feel very negative about the way this Council is heading!
• The risk is that clients may be forced down a path for the benefit of the delivering agency rather than for the individual. This should be borne in mind when making decisions. The pathway should therefore be tailored for each individual.
• If the council are responsible for care then we might as well give up because they dont care. They pay high salaries to [redacted] to tick boxes and hand problems back to service users.
• timings and consideration of actual cost if it is out to tender and the consequence of having a lower cost provision to meet the budget against having a quality provision.
• Do you think im stupid trying to pull to wool over our eyes with this guilt trip
• Illegal process as you have already starting the tender process without taking on consultation views on impact
Operational Efficiency

19-001-02 Direct Payment High Balance Review

- The recovery of the backlog of unspent sums from customers’ personal budgets or Direct Payments when they are not used in the required period or consistently underspent in line with practice and policy. This is forecast to deliver savings of £500,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (✓) relevant answer

There were 171 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>81 (47.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>41 (24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>26 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>8 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7 (4.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 54 responses to this question.

- Public funds need to be strictly managed and if individuals are not using the funds provided, they need to be proactively recovered to be allocated elsewhere
- Money should be spent not saved
- Good idea, prevents wastage
• I can only see bad support planning and regular reviews not being carried out being the cause of this. If it is not needed, why fund it??
• PBSS is currently indifferent to the amount of money in customer's accounts. I am aware of one customer who has in excess of £[amount]k in [their] account and the reaction of PBSS was oh well it will be repaid at some point. More work needs to be done as to the payment process and working out why so many customers have excessive funds in their accounts.
• Some DPs for clients are misused and people are employing friends and giving favourable rates, or monies are unspent and are not reclaimed by NCC. Clients who elect to have a DP should be required to complete a monthly returns to NCC and MAP, or even weekly. This way the monies owed will not be sat for a long time, but will be accurate and consistent.
• I have witnessed service users having to spend there money on things they don't need as they have too much money in the bank. I have also witnessed service users who have no money spare and cannot afford their own toiletries.
• should be part of BAU
• Of course.
• This suggests that huge sums are being poorly estimated, recovery is good but better planning would be better.
• Re-assessment of direct payment clients needs should also be carried out. Clients who have received direct payments for years have the same funding as when they were initially assessed but on todays criteria would probably not receive as much.
• Completely agree, there needs to be a tighter grip on personal budgets as many of them are being spent incorrectly.
• This is obvious and should be standard practice
• This is a sensible way to run services.
• Agree entirely, unspent money should be put back into the system.
• because the money wasted in the way is phenomenal and it's about time you got a grip on it
• why hasn't this been done before?
• I do not understand why this is not happening it should be part of the process that occurs to ensure unused monies are returned to the Council. I fail to understand why this is an issue given it was part of the process from the time when Direct Payments were introduced. It raises the question as to why procedures have no been followed. I raised this during the consultation that took place last year around Direct Payments as I was aware of a number of customers who had monies sitting in their Direct Payments and even though they called the council the money was not being recovered.
• proper financial reviews should be on going for customers and stakeholders
• If the monies allocated isn't used then yes it should be recovered. This money is council tax payers money and therefore go back into the Adult social care budget.
• Direct payments are vastly abused !! To have any kind of "claw back" is welcomed!
• This is URGENTLY required and should be done before the money is spent inappropriately. One instance I know of is a family having at least an extra £[amount]
in the bank and [they] has done for over a year, since they became partly CHC funded. NCC is aware of the CHC funding but still continues to pay the same amount.

- This is something I've helped councils achieve before. Avoiding overpayments via improved design is even better!
- May I suggest that the payments are not as high in the first place and then you won't have to try and recover them. If you actually make sure people only get what they need rather than what they can get you will find you can help more people.
- and better monitoring to ensure this doesn't need to happen again in the future
- I think that this is a good area to tackle.
- need to manage budgets better and spends, I have seen first hand from working here the lack of interrogation of the finances, and ownership
- I feel this is essential
- If people don’t need the money, and it is checked that they don’t need it, it should be put to better use.
- there is obviously an administration problem that needs addressing.
- Any overpayments of social care resources needs to be reimbursed to help others in need.
- You can’t afford to let this money drop into a black hole.
- Wow how come so inefficient worrying really
- Sometimes you need to spend to recoup money owed. At last, a sensible business management plan.
- Again I hope money can be saved but without putting pressure on vulnerable people - particularly if their needs change from time to time so that the amount they need is not consistent.
- That money could help other service users. However, it would be important to recover it in a fair and non-threatening manner. It mustn't descend into anything resembling the tactics employed by the DWP - that would do damage to the community and reputational damage to NCC above the value of the recovered funds. Something to consider.
- If the money is not being used then it should be reallocated to help a wider range of people
- I agree if unspent or consistently unspent in a required period unless this is for a good reason that has been agreed during the period concerned in order to fund something specific.
- I would not agree if the backlog is caused by system errors on NCC's part and where there have been delays in referrals being processed. Currently the process for our vulnerable customers to make a referral for direct payments is very confusing, long winded and difficult. It would need to be made clearer and more straightforward to our customers the total payment they are receiving and what it can be spent on as well as informing them clearly what will happen when not spent.
- All income/savings generated is likely to benefit wider council.
- There is a lot of waste in the present Council system. The four needs to be on high wages for leaders and expenses that are way to big! Cuts here would return far more than the sum stated! But this will not happen will it!
• The question should be raised as to why the budgets were not used. Is that due to a lack of provision to supply.
• If they have not spent what has been paid to them, this should be investigated as to the individual’s needs
• some allowances need to accumulate….the cash is spend long term on items not purchased weekly...also how much does the scheme cost
• if people haven’t spent the money because the staff haven’t done their job right to support people then they should be allowed to spend the money that was for them to help them. I know people that have money sitting in the bank because staff don’t help them or tell them what they should be spending it on. no clear objectives to know what to spend it on.
• Has the question been asked as to why there is an underspend - especially as these people may well have mental health issues? Is the support available to them, to assist in spending the monies on the right services in the first place? There needs to be a different system of support to spend money wisely, and then an assessment of how to get the support. Where would the money come back to? The development of mental health services and support for adults?
• Again why do you need to increase taxes etc when "...forecast to deliver savings of £500,000 ..."]?"
• Redirect the money towards a more efficient services
• It’s theirs. Not yours
• How do you assess the amount not used
• I tend to disagree as a lot of people want to spend the money but have no support from the social workers to understand what they can spend it on and this is not right at all because people are being failed and left with inappropriate or no support
• were personal budgets not assigned to individuals? should they not keep them to spend how and when they want?
• Send them to prison and reduce the costs of housing them in the first place.
• As above

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 5 responses to this question.
• Unspent money in budgets - could it be classed as clients trying to save money to purchase bigger essentials at a future point?
• Cut the founds to certain services in order to produce more money to another
• In other words, make the most vulnerable people less well off as a punishment for previous poor care. their finances should have been managed properly by their previous care.
• If the individual has to repay they may have no money which would cause hardship
• There may be a perception of the authority not supporting the individuals to spend the budgets or understanding the policy/process and just wanting to claw the money back to cover other debts.

19-001-04 Reviewing catering facilities at day services

• A review of catering provided at three in-house day services (Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester, Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby and Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton) and food options for in-house day services. There is a separate questionnaire for clients and their family members to give their views on this proposal, and they have been contacted directly. This is forecast to deliver savings of £100,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 163 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 28 responses to this question.

- Time for new ideas
- This is a service which is not used as much as previous as the people who attend the centres tend to come and go and quite often are not there at lunch time.
- This should be ongoing, review, recosting and provision of good nutrition and wanted food, treated like a business.
- The best possible service should be sourced, while still providing an acceptable standard of food.
- A chance to improve the service to users.
- Again, how difficult can it be to provide nourishing meals to a budget? Most families can do it, it’s only when it gets in the hands of middle management that it all goes wrong.
- Anyone attending these centres will be given an allowance in the benefits they already receive and therefore it is not beyond the realms of reasonableness to expect them to bring their lunch with them.
- A good thing to try to save money on but I think that the target saving sounds very high.
- A very good idea to review it but lack of detail means I cannot strongly agree
- Agree provided this is about eliminating waste, not reducing cost and quality
- Again it’s an expectation of the users but not one we can afford so a learning curve for users but one that can be done and is easily achievable. Things are on the change and however hard at first we haven't the funds at the present time.
- I do not know enough about this proposal to make any comment on it.
- Don’t know enough to judge.
- What are the arrangements going to be instead?
- No idea no clear here to comment on
- In order to maintain continuity of service to customers/service users who look forward to a cooked meal each day I would like to know if there is another way of preserving this service, albeit by raising cost of meals perhaps, or are we predominantly looking at ways in which staffing costs can be reduced?
- Will quality of food be reduced as a result of any cuts?
- So you propose to take a hot meal opportunity away from people who may not be able to cook one! Nice move.
- This service at the [redacted] centre has been there since centre opened [date], and has provide a valuable asset to the service. Its been a teaching kitchen and we have [number] of our customers on a [number] hour a week paid employment. I feel very let down that for one the prices of the meals have stayed very much same since I started working there [number] years ago. Prices rises have been literally pennies. The number of customers that have a hot meals can be, between [number] (from my forecasts) per week. In these numbers this also includes [redacted] ..who get their meals free of charge while they are on their [redacted] and are not included in the paid numbers that get put through, but I supply food for. We have been working to our own budget ie.. Ordering online [redacted], working out the price of a plate.
of food. Which is £[amount] for one course or £[amount] for two courses. Your talking about Mc Donald's happy meal prices here. I feel that this service has been let to run down with this closure proposal . ....[redacted] also runs a meal service at [redacted]. At this location which isn't a county council property , the kitchen space , utilities and amenities and facilities are all free to NASS. The meals charges are set at £[amount] for a two course meal regardless . [Redacted] attend there twice a week who transport in [number] of our vulnerable elderly citizens along side [number] of [redacted] of which eat a daily meal provided from the onsite Kitchen. This service has been running for at least [number] years and has been a most valuable one too. In the last [number] years we haven't had hardly any younger inferals that could have developed cooking skills in the [redacted] kitchen which was designed as a training kitchen. We pride ourselves through our experience and training to provide a nutritional menu with choice , using fresh produce which is planned  along with our customers. The kitchen at [redacted] should be making money if the price increases to the customers were increased to a reasonable level. The numbers using the centre should have increased. These two things together would have made the kitchen profitable. I believe that we have been let down by the council by ill thought out strategy from the council for the unit. You are withdrawing a properly cooked meal from the most vulnerable in our society where some of our customers will be living on processed ready meals on a regular basis. I'm not sure what percentage of the £100 thousand pound loss Is from [redacted], however I am positive that we can make money or at least not lose money at the [redacted] kitchen. .

- Let me guess? Company fatcat will come in and offer to complete the contract for £2 per person per day. Then they will use 12p per day. People will get poor nutrition, poor care leading to more ill health. But hey. You've saved money
- In house catering should be retained
- My [child] attends [redacted] and has the hot meal at lunchtime. [They] has [medical condition] and she is always provided with the healthy option meal . We are told [they] enjoys this and think it is vital that this service carries on. Snacks and sandwiches will not replace this meal cooked on the premises. We could pay a little bit more to keep this service.
- how would the service users access food and drink if its not provided? if there are vending machines - surely the prices will be high and the costs will be on the service user and someone to manage the machines.
- Don't review, just stop providing the service.
- Where are all the charity contributions going then? Your thieves
- This may be the only decent meal a day people get. I would hope that the views of users and their families influence the final decision
- This should be down to families and users
- I believe there are vulnerable people using day services for who a change in meal provision could have a negative impact
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 8 responses to this question.

- People in a position where they are vulnerable and unlikely to look after themselves well require better attention than this proposal. It feels very bad!
- Care should be taken that a substandard diet is not the result.
- The negative impact would be packed lunches. With processed, high sugar, high fat, low or no nutritional value to our most vulnerable customers. Which will not help the health crisis of Obesity, diabetes, allergies etc... The loss of highly skilled and trained staff and a much need service. Sitting at a table eating altogether is a most valuable and social interactive event. Will certainly be a sad time for us all if service was to ended.
- It may be cheaper but not better
- why is the catering not being done in house with the clients to aid their independence and those that are able can do the catering for those that are not? And this becomes part of their package of support and gives them meaningful activities?
- If catering is outsourced quality and freshness plummets
- It could make our [child’s] mental health and behaviour worse if [they] develops [medical symptoms].
- Service users not being able to access food or drink while at these sites.
Children First Northamptonshire

Children’s Social Care is subject to government intervention and needs to demonstrate rapid improvement. These services will move into a new organisation, a Children’s Trust, which will report to the council, in 2020.

The savings proposed for Children First Northamptonshire are grouped into themes which will help it transform to be more responsive and effective in making a positive difference to the lives of our children. The proposals are part of our overall improvement plan to ensure our services are designed around and meet the needs of children and families, is affordable, and is delivered by a strong and stable workforce who are well supported to deliver quality services.

For 2020/21, the service has a gross budget of £136.5m, which is an increase on the 2019/20 budget of £5.3m, in recognition of the required improvements in Children’s Services.

Commissioning and Procurement

19-002-02 Improvement in capacity building in Foster Care
- Increasing our CFN foster carers who can care for young people with complex needs. We are using business rates to fund specialist training for our foster carers to increase their skills and confidence to care for young people with more complex needs. This will mean young people can be cared for within a family rather than in a children’s home if this is in their best interests. Residential care costs more so this proposal is forecast to save £941,000 in 20/21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 136 responses to this question.
### Consultation, Equalities & Accessibility Team v1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 42 responses to this question.

- Social Care is currently in crisis and lots needs to be done to improve the quality of care that our young people are receiving.
- Foster Carers need the specialist training because although they do their best, sometimes it is not enough to keep the young person in place. With the extra skills gained from training, the placements will have more chance of success.
- When children are removed from family, it is through not fault of their own but can be made to feel that if placed in a children’s home rather than foster family home. Foster carers are very few and far between and to increase this, especially to support special needs would be beneficial.
- The savings are good and putting children into actual homes with families who can care for them is a huge plus. However, we need to make sure the homes are available and the families to take the children are plentiful.
- It is very important that every child has the support of a family environment. It is essential to their mental health and future. Residential Care is too impersonal.
- Good training and support for foster carers is essential. People who could provide a valuable service in this area do not appear to be receiving the support they need.
- A sadly neglected area for far too long. This Council has not provided adequate support for carers for too long.
- This saves money in an acceptable manner and places the children into a family environment.
- This is great but care homes should be the beacon not the least best option.
- A loving, secure home is always best for children to grow up in.
- If Foster Care within a family is in a child’s best interests then it is right to enhance the training required for Foster Carers. I write as a former [redacted] who served on a Fostering Panel.
- Children are our future and we should make every effort to provide a first rate care and support until they reach maturity. Not sure that Business Rates should be used for funding as the way the High Street is going this source of revenue is a diminishing resource.
- Great idea
• Savings are all very good, but if you can't find the foster carer to upskill, as this is a
limited pool of people who can do this, then you can't make the saving. Savings
should surely have some element of being able to be controlled.
• However at the same time please review the amount of money foster cares can claim
for things like taxi's to get the child to and from school/club's etc.... they already get
more than enough to raise a child but all claim extra because they can.
• Children need homes, support and love with the money available for people to do
this.
• Family care is always a better option for those young people that will accept family
care - it isn't for all of them. The issue will be retaining those carers and not losing
them to IFA's and to keep the training going to keep a pool of carers going. But this
isn't just about training it is also about the support to foster carers from the childrens
social workers as well.
• As someone who has adopted I understand and value the work done by foster carers
and believe that good foster care is preferable to residential care.
• Should always be looking at keeping children in family units, care homes lead to
potential problems going forward in behaviours and ability to build trusting
relationships.
• To support children within families is always preferable, particularly with complex
needs.
• There is more than training required in order to retain foster carers. They need
better and closer support from social workers. The fees and charges also should be
reviewed to be more favourable and compete with agencies.
• As long as you focus on staff retention too. Foster carers don't just need good quality
training, they need consistent support from social workers.
• Children prosper better in a home environment.
• Sounds a positive move for children.
• I support foster care and bringing children closer to home.
• A home environment is better for children than a Children's home.
• We've tried this before - unlikely to happen.
• I believe that the children would be better looked after within the family (extended
and immediate) with help and support rather than in residential care. Yes there may
be one or two cases where the child may need live in a residential setting.
• A good method of raising funding for a service that does not impact homeowners
directly. Does this mean that business rates will increase?
• Children should be in loving homes and taught the life skills they should get though
being in a family.
• I am a teacher in a secondary school so I see the extra help and support children need
either at home or in school is required. Especially for those who come from difficult
backgrounds and families.
• I'm not sure about this. It might help but you also could lose foster carers for any
other reason, so I'm unsure.
• Training won't always relate to additional supply.
• Significant concern over trying to find the right foster carers for young people with
complex needs. So many foster carers start off well, but the most complex needs
children need carers with knowledge and experience. Foster carers need significant and appropriate support from social care. Many foster carers report that support is not given to them when they request and subsequently placements can breakdown.

- So many businesses are closing down or laying off staff, but if business rates are increased to help fund the CFN, then it must be so. I feel sorry for staff in these businesses, but if landlords helped in some way, then the brunt wouldn’t fall so hard on the business rates.
- Think about improving the skill of the children own family.
- I think staff numbers should be looked at and can definitely be cut. Reapply for job positions again and seek new applicants for the positions to get the right staff and right number. Cant afford any free rides any more.
- My [relative] is a Foster Carer. [Their] LAC social worker cancels half of [their] appointments with [them]. While [they’re] sent on lots of courses [they] feels very under supported. If we send children to foster carers we need to support both the children and the foster carer better than we do now.
- Young people with complex need should have always be a priority. Money have been wasted on un-necessary buildings and extravagant lifestyle at the expense of workers that could not get a pat rise. Now we are to be punished further to pay for the damage to the finances that has been mis-spent. How much of it did the lower paid workers get.
- Guilt trip again this is all smoke and mirrors
- Children and young people need the support to be able to live in this kind of environment. There aren't enough regular foster carers so how could others be encouraged to be one of these specialist carers?
- the use of business rates is inappropriate. fostering policy needs urgent review.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 8 responses to this question.

- Lack of homes to accommodate the children, potential for support for families taking the children not be good enough. We need enough homes and families ready to take the children and ensure support is there from NCC if families need it.
- N/A
- As above
- focus on better paid for Foster carers needs addressing to encourage them to be internal rather than external FC. agency FC is costing NCC more overall and prevent FC coming internally.
- Foster Carers being pushed to have more than approved children and not any breaks between placements.
- These facts you bring out are [redacted] you lot are incompetent
- This would need to be managed and quality assured robustly with relevant families fostering and not being overloaded, which is a situation I have observed historically.
Does this mean that business rates will increase? - If yes, this could have further negative impact on generating jobs and further income in the area.

19-002-10 In-House Foster Carers

- We will increase our recruitment and retention of foster carers in Northamptonshire who can meet the needs of our children in care. This will reduce our need to purchase more costly independent foster care placements. This is forecast to deliver savings of £271,000 in 2020/21.

**Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?** Please tick (✓) relevant answer

There were 133 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>63 47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>48 36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>11 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>4 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2 1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:**

There were 33 responses to this question.

- There are too many children being placed in children's homes and also in independent living which are not ready for that level so more foster carers that can cater to the needs of more complex young people would be excellent.
• When recruitment levels are low I struggle to see how you can guarantee that this proposal will be successful and how you can forecast the suggested saving?
• Financially and in terms of safeguarding, I think the LA should have and retain its own fostering arrangements rather than use independent placements.
• It is very important to invest in finding the right people to support children and then look after them to ensure they can maintain the important role they play in a child’s developing years.
• About time. This has been required for a very long time.
• Because it makes sense. Costly contractual arrangements are not cost efficient, do not serve the community and are far too convoluted when it comes to taking action against failures by the provider. What is proposed above is a positive move. But you need to consider other wasteful contracts!
• I’m interested how you increase your retention rates - what are you going to do differently with less money???
• Common sense, and makes it easier to place children in case of emergency.
• The right course to take.
• Getting more FC is good but as long as finances are also improved.
• Appears to be a cost effective solution and a good way to provide Care and Support in the community.
• Excellent news - if it happens.
• Need to get the support package right - it isn’t always about the money but about the support and being listened to. The availability of social workers and managers to sort out issues before they become major to provide stability to placements and to carers.
• I agree with this proposal in principle, however the process is 6 months and very stressful with applicants dropping our or stopping the process and then need closely managing, reviewing through the panels on their anniversary - so not sure if this will be a saving or just a moving of the spend.
• Still unsure if this is achievable without other measures in place - see previous answer.
• Review scrutiny of foster carers.
• The people aren’t out there. NCC foster caring prices can’t compete with local fostering agencies.
• More foster carers is a big positive.
• Yes, we need more foster carers who would be willing to look after children.
• How will you do this? This is sounding like a political statement that has no chance of succeeding without costing more!
• Recruitment is an expensive part of any business and not having a good staff retention increases the need for recruitment which also includes training cost so staff retention and improvements are a benefit.
• Out of options this is the best one.
• We have some children who need to go out of county for their own safety - especially in the case of the frequent absconders and those with gang involvement. While it’s great to save money we need to make sure the needs of the children aren’t lost in this. Not every child we are involved with can live with a Foster Carer for a variety of reasons.
• As per last question, I'm not sure. The principle is good, but whether it will actually work remains to be seen.
• Not convinced there will be much cost savings in doing this. How can you be sure that you will retain the new foster carers? Is the incentive for them going to be more money? If so are they the right people in the first place? The system needs to ensure there is significant and ongoing support for foster carers right from the start, with good training in complex needs.
• I think you have to do what suits the individual. Some children are better off in foster homes, whereas other are more suited to multi-person homes. You have to look at each child separately.
• Invest in family orientation funding before foster care
• Sounds great but how exactly are you going to get more foster carers?
• That will depend on who will be paying for it and at whose expense
• How are you planning on getting more foster carers? NCC not competitive with agencies and a lot of kids are more challenging and will therefore need a higher level of care and support. Can't attract and keep foster carers now. Even when there is a noticeable increase in enquiries they are processed too slowly or fault is found in the applicants.
• [Redacted expletive comment]
• Any savings should be invested in foster carers
• It is easy to recruit but not so easy to retain!

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 6 responses to this question.
• Some people only do foster care for the money so this may not actually help to support the young people in care.
• N/A
• as above
• I think the time to deliver this proposal is ambitious, and just moving the cost to an already stretched NCC staffed provision.
• [Redacted expletive comment]
• Overloading families with troubled children can be a catalyst for concern. Managing this carefully would be statutory.

Interested in becoming a foster carer?

Help us to provide our children with a loving, caring and stable home. Apply to be a foster carer by visiting www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/foster
19-002-09 Supported Accommodation

- Improved supported accommodation for young people. We will commission independent accommodation for young people leaving care to give them good quality housing and the support they need to prepare for adulthood. We will achieve better value for money and this is forecast to deliver savings of £197,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 132 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 29 responses to this question.

- The current placements for young people are not that great and the support they receive isn't amazing. Currently, too many older children are stuck in unsuitable circumstances due to the lack of supported living.
• The support needs to include a financial/budgetary education - it's a big step to go from being in care to managing your own finances.
• This support would reduce homelessness, crime and abandonment.
• It is unclear how this will be achieved. The Equality Impact Assessment just says 'to increase the amount of accommodation available on the framework' but it is unclear what that means, what value that adds and how it saves money.
• positive overall
• Young people leaving LA care need a special type of support to enable them to live independently and safely and to promote their positive mental health
• This seems to make sense.
• Accommodation for young adults leaving Foster Care needs to be supported: otherwise it would be all too easy for the YAs to go off the rails!
• This is a good idea as it will teach young adults to adapt to living independently. If they are housed in apartments with one person over-seeing things, at least they have support if they should require it.
• Please see my previous comments
• People under 30 are no longer are eligible for housing benefit and therefore require assistance.
• young people leaving care still need to be 'looked after' but also need independence
• These care leavers need vital support!
• help the adolescents to become everyday citizens with support and caring environment
• this is very important but also for adults because children grow into adults
• Supporting the young people leaving care is a valuable and often overlooked service NCC provide.
• The social workers
• For over18's, a sense of independence and pride of their own accommodation is a great idea. Better that than them on the streets.
• Without fully understanding what is involved it sounds like a good saving
• The savings here seem odd compared to the need for this provision. There is a need to improve provision no doubting, but the young people need better services and a cut feels strange when this has to be a priority provision
• I think this could be a really good thing, however I also see it being used as an excuse by members of staff to throw money away on things that aren't crucial. My personal opinion is that children are used as an excuse to waste money at NCC - it's a historic problem.
• Give these children options whether they would like to go back to their own family or to see them.
• Who will actually "tailor the support " to ensure the child has the correct support?
• Trying to sort the right people to take advantage of this service is key and staff numbers once again to cut down
• These schemes are usually ill thought out. Will this be a whole package option? Addressing the many complex and varied needs for these children?
• parental contributions should be enforced. supported accommodation should be a last resort. the public should not be asked to support persons just because they do not want to live with their parents anymore.
• Lies
• I cannot see how this will produce savings in the current environment
• Improve the education provision of these young people to enable them to get a job. Invest in the local schools to be able to increase staff to deliver a better service to reduce the incidents of unemployment.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 12 responses to this question.
• not sure
• need to make sure process in place to slowly remove the support *(timeframe) based on provisions given, ie. don’t want them to still be in the housing 10 years down the line, need to learn to be independent like all children moving into adulthood, regardless of their circumstances
• N/A
• The support element of this is SO important, and should be provided for adequately.
• None
• As above - it really could be a great thing if it’s done in the right way and spending is tightly controlled. However, it could also be used to waste a lot of funding that could go towards other things.
• Possibly depending on what is involved
• I agree you need to get the framework right but why are you supporting so many over 18’s whose housing responsibility is a district council function as they have housing rights and are able to claim benefits to pay for their housing ? This would give you a budget saving. The support would come from their personal advisors and housing needs would be met like every other person or they meet the criteria of adult services and are supported that way.
• This is also an ambitious saving proposal, giving the cost of housing in Northants in general, which results in the only affordable housing being part of a hostel, or located in areas where the young people can be exploited. Does a saving have to be imposed in this area?
• Again, needs to be managed and young adults not just set up and left to their own devices. Learning how to manage money and be taught living skills would be paramount.
• Stop telling lies
• Improve the education provision of these young people to enable them to get a job. Invest in the local schools to be able to increase staff to deliver a better service to reduce the incidents of unemployment.
19-002-11 Disabled Children’s Domiciliary Care Framework

- Domiciliary care for children with disabilities. We will commission domiciliary care for children with disabilities to meet their needs and deliver better quality and better value for money. This will give CFN increased certainty over costs and is forecast to deliver savings of £100,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 125 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46 36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>44 35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>17 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>4 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9 7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 22 responses to this question.

- Children need far more support than they are currently getting
- Get them costs on the framework to manage a better budget.
- Every child matters equally, regardless and should be looked after and supported in the same way as all children, to meet their needs to the best of our ability.
• This is taking control of costs. Get rid of wasteful contracts. A review of every single contract and potential beneficial links to any Council links needs to be conducted. By an independent.
• On the premise that "Domiciliary Care" means care in a Children’s Home maintained/approved by NCC/CFN, I strongly agree!
• Health need to be held account for their funding for SEND children and not cost shunting to the LA by making it difficult to access the funding. Assistive technology should be a default position before care staff are put in (needs led).
• Case by case basis, but delivering the right care for each individual.
• Sometimes the re-commissioning does result in physical savings, but it can also result in getting more for our money, if the contracts are monitored and managed closely a lot of the benefits that our built in to the contracts can be realised. If the contract management is more collaborative, than adversarial.
• The contracts with the third parties will need to be robust, easy to say but NCC doesn’t have a good track record.
• However I wonder what percentage of that will be absorbed by management.
• Again not fully understanding what is involved means that I can only look at the potential savings.
• Not convinced that this will save any money.
• Another focus on savings above realistic provision. Feels like cost cutting is more important than the children’s development and social needs. What is required is less private tendering and more direct provision. Cut out the high wages and costly private provision/consultants.
• There will always be children with disabilities and they need support if their own families cannot cope. Education is important as is care. Families need assistance as many can’t cope especially if there is a severe disability.
• Again. What do you mean?
• Again how do u propose to carry this out?
• A lot of the cases we’re dealing with involve children for example with ADHD who are staying within the family home but are violent to their parents/carers to the point where the Police are involved. The parents/carers rarely press charges but they are not coping. Likewise we have parents exhausted caring for children with serious illnesses with little or no respite and support - the idea that every parent/foster carer can cope and every child should be at home may cause us more problems than it solves in that it may increase family breakdown.
• Why are children with disabilities given dom care? Surely parents are responsible for this? Many parents are full time carers, so why would they need dom care? Surely by being a full time carer, you expect to be providing care to your child? If parents are working, then I can see the need for this. Sometimes I feel the tax pay pays twice, benefits for full time carers, but then dom care on top of this! Its like transport, many parents claim for disability cars and associated benefits, but then expect transport for the child to and from school. This is using tax payers money twice!
• [Redacted expletive comment]
• Needs to be managed carefully.
This area needs to be cut substantially. I have [number] kids and often feel I need a break however can’t just dump them with someone else to look after! People need to take responsibility for their actions if you have kids make sure you can look after them.

People in this situation need all the help they can get, not cutbacks.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 7 responses to this question.

- Not sure
- The idea that every parent/foster carer can cope and every child should be at home may cause us more problems than it solves in that it may increase family breakdown
- N/A
- None
- Expectations of public, service user and service providers, if these are managed and realistic.
- Stop telling lies
- As above - individual needs considered

Policy and Practice

19-002-03 Disabled Children’s Review

- Joint funding of care packages for children with disabilities. We will work with our NHS colleagues to agree a joint funding formula for agreed packages of care for children with disabilities who have health and social care needs. This will help us to better manage and forecast costs. It is forecast to deliver savings of £400,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 122 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 21 responses to this question.

- Much better support if this is rolled out.
- It works in ASC so why have we not utilised this in childrens services?
- It is very important to liaise with similar organisations that make similar provisions and share resources and expertise rather than duplicate efforts. This allows us to better support more children.
- linking up to partnership for best care
- The EHCP system has been in place for many years in Northamptonshire. Which is supposed to be tripartite funding. Rarely is health funding made available to fund the EHCP. Are the three services going to sit round the table and agree to pay? Are the services from health going to improve for disabled and complex needs children?
- It shares a social burden of cost and resource with the National Health Service. This makes sense over funding through increases in council taxes.
- I’m amazed that this joined up approach is not in use already
- This is common sense: ensures effective commitment of resources and guards against duplication and delays which, in spite of best efforts, can develop when Councils & the NHS operate at arms’ length, with no effective communications at all levels!
• great idea, but relies on good management which the county has been found to be lacking
• Please cut this area to the bare minimum of what is statutory.
• Health need to be held accountable for their share to packages and not have such a difficult assessment tool that makes it very difficult to access their funds. The whole system is challenged for funding but they need to pay their way
• More collaborative working and communication between NHS and Social Services with shared goals can only be a good thing.
• It is vital that Health & Social Care Services work together for the benefit of service users.
• Savings again! When will we see realistic provision that provides the service and not costly partnership committees?
• I don’t agree with social care packages for disabled children, I only agree to Health care packages. The tax pay is paying too much money towards this! Families needs support, agreed, but there is a tendency to over support!
• Need to include next of kin, parents always
• As with all the services are they properly forecast percentage wise as this is where a lot of public funds go. However if we haven’t got the funds we shouldn’t provide the facility as with all services
• These never work. Yall never talk to each other. No money, no appointments, no staff, no connection, no correlation.
• You lie lie lie
• I cannot ee how this will produce savings if services are maintained
• See my previous answer

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 5 responses to this question.
• Not sure
  • agreement may take a while if parties are not willing to agree on needs of care and who would supply what, externals pressures present
• N/A
• Speed of review and award of funding is essential.
• Struggles with differences between the 2 organisation IT systems, structure, policies, beaurockracy and directions of the organisations.

19-002-06 New Contact Offer
• Improved contact service for children and their birth families. We will make improvements to our contact service which supports children and families who no longer live together so they can continue to have contact with each other. The
improvements will increase the quality and value for money of the service and is forecast to deliver savings of £100,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 116 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response number | Percentage (%)
----------------|------------------
39              | 33.6%            
38              | 32.8%            
21              | 18.1%            
4               | 3.4%             
9               | 7.8%             
5               | 4.3%             

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 21 responses to this question.

- It is important for children to still have contact with birth families where possible and ensuring there is better support for them and their families will help keep or build relationships.
- I am all for keeping children in contact with their parents / family but there is always a cost to this. I understand train fares are purchased for parents to travel to see their children, staff have driven children across the UK so they can have contact, surely there needs to be some sort of budget management to better manage contact.
- Contact provisions seems to have slipped down the priority list for Social Support and families have been left without adequate facilities in order to facilitate contact. It
urgently needs to be supported so that we can facilitate this service for more families. It may even enable more families to be re-united and put back together, consequently saving overall care costs in the long term.

- Family contact is only beneficial if the family units are functional. However, if this saves money through contract removal, then it has my support.
- This is positive and potentially useful.
- As a [relative] who has no contact at the moment, I firmly believe that this needs improving. How the council are going to improve this, I'm interested to see. I think each case has to be dealt with individually though, as no two cases are the same. I have yet to go down the route of seeking access, so information about this would be very welcome.
- sounds good but you need to improve the venues which can present as shocking at times.
- Also look at sourcing contact local to the child so you are not paying for them to be transported to contact and also hold providers accountable for contact within their contract
- Contact with birth families is important for some cared for children but the quality and management of this contact is vital to ensure it is beneficial to all parties
- Need to understand the contact service and how it works for the children, this seems to be led by the Parents and courts, with the children being left waiting, what do the children want, need to hear their voice in these cases, where appropriate
- I agree in principle but am not sure how this can safely be achieved particularly when a number of Sure Start Centres with the capabilities and Skills have been closed down or outsourced. Each contact should be monitored closely to ensure the child is the important person.
- Contact is very important, if things improve fast tract to move a child back for a weekend, then a week, going to children centres, medical appointments, family plans, holidays or day visits.
- More statements about fund cutting!
- I don't feel this should involve much cost in this day and age of Skype, facebook, mobiles etc
- I'm not sure the tax payer should be footing the bill for this in the first place.
- Would like to know the safety nets surrounding this.
- the families need to shoulder more responsibility
- Nothing wrong with contact centres. That money could be better spent on early help and stopping families get to the point in needing children remove. Public health, early intervention....
- [Redacted expletive comment]
- They should fund this themselves.
- not enough detail on the proposal
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 7 responses to this question.

- Some children or parents do not want contact so there may not be much more of a demand for this.
- In the case of my [relative] the children are worse after contact – [parent] tells the children they are going to go back to live with [them] and they are so upset afterwards and so distressed telling my [relative] [they] doesn’t love them anymore and [they’re] abandoning them. It usually takes several days to convince them they aren’t going back - then contact happens again and they are distressed all over again. Contact isn’t always good for the children.
- needs to ensure children who have the option for contact with their birth family are not forced for contact, that it is merely an option that is available.
- no current awareness of their provision and how the savings are made from improvements, as naturally these would be related to cost? Unclear
- There may be an element of over stressing existing resources. but cost and results need to be balanced carefully.
- no good improving this if the venues they are held in are not fit for purpose.
- That inappropriate sites will be used with staff supervising without training, and opportunities for unsupervised contact outside of the appointment. sometimes safety does cost more.

Demand Management

19-002-07 Improved children’s outcomes

- Right care for children. We will improve support and interventions with families of children who are close to being brought into care so that the best interests of children are met. This will mean families are better supported for children to safely remain in their care, that families are supported for children to return home from care quickly. If it is not possible or suitable for children to return home we will seek for children to live within their wider family network or to be adopted. Research shows this generally helps children to achieve better outcomes. Our spend will be reduced on fostering and residential care spend. This is forecast to deliver savings of £588,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 115 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 24 responses to this question.

- It may feel that Social care are just putting the responsibility on someone else who may feel forced to care for the child but don’t necessarily want to.
- I agree with OFSTED in that we have left children needing to be removed in families hoping that they can affect a change - we need to improve the interventions we have with children
- This should have always been the case.
- This service is absolutely essential to the community and reducing safeguarding issues and consequently the cost of children in care. We have lost touch with our communities and supporting young people to be good parents. Initial investment here would inevitably save a much larger sum on a long term basis.
- unclear how this improvement will be made, contact, technology etc?
- The difficulties in the current arrangements have been well-publicised. Improvement is essential.
- My gravest concern is that there are not enough well skilled social workers to ensure that this happens. Safeguarding in the authority is not good enough, i don’t believe that yet another change in system and structures will fix the system. Those children in care or are near to care are in crisis and all services need to work together, which
includes health authorities; GPs social care and Police all listening, hearing and acting upon concerns.

- Common sense.
- This is positive and practical. It will need effective management, case by case, including effective line management.
- Again. I would be interested into how this is going to work. Using the wider family network is good, as long as all parties are involved (as needs must).
- This is not enough money to cover what is needed. I agree but need more finding to ensure all services are offered in the locations of families
- Because children in care have a higher abuse rate. He current anti family system can have a negative affect.
- need to have the right people to deliver this
- I like this. Children should feel as if they belong.
- Funding for early intervention and prevention is always the first to go but this gives long term benefits in money and to childrens outcomes.
- Whilst I tend to agree, I would want to see robust arrangements in place to ensure the safety of children being returned to immediate or wider family, and not just a cost saving exercise.
- I agree with the sentiment but how are you going to deliver this frontline service, when social care and social workers get such bad press that people don't want to work in the front line and any support staff are reduced in saving exercises?
- The principle is okay but the NCC's history of assessing situations is not good and needs remodeling.
- Would like to see better organisation and leadership. The current child protection proceedings are horrifying and a real worry for the amount of mistakes being made
- This sounds sensible.
- You need to involve the parents, next of kin in full and the parents consent, knowledge throughout all your interventions. You need to show all your records and information sharing with the parents not in meetings, assessments as false records and information sharing can occur that leads to fraudulence to take away a baby or children under false pretenses by Northamptonshire County Council is illegal and fraud.
- [Redacted expletive comment]
- Research also shows some families are never going to improve! Care is needed with this proposal. Same statement as last page re fund cutting!
- I cannot see how savings will be achieved here. This is a priorty are for service development
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 5 responses to this question.

- It may feel that Social care are just putting the responsibility on someone else who may feel forced to care for the child but don’t necessarily want to
- N/A
- As long as all the family network has been involved or looked into. If not, it could have a detrimental affect.
- we need shorter time frame for any resources to start working with families
- Each individual has different needs that may reflect differently to this outcome.

19-002-08 Reduction in Residential Care

- Reduction in the use of residential care for children and young people in our care. Where it is in the best interests of children in our care who live in residential homes, we will help them to move into foster care, so they can live with a family. This will help support better outcomes for children and young people and reduce our spend on more costly residential care. This is forecast to deliver savings of £276,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 112 responses to this question.
### Additional Responses

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 23 responses to this question.

- It will help them to feel as more of a family.
- Children's home should be a thing of the past.
- I do wonder how you can forecast this saving when there is not yet an increase in the amount of foster carers to meet need and therefore reduce the use of residential care for children.
- I mentioned previously, a child in a family will always be more mentally stable and able to manage emotionally in the long term, with life. This will always be good value investment if done right.
- Only is significant support is given to the foster carers long term, so children can benefit and new families can be truly supported in the emotional harm children suffer by being in care.
- Foster care is by far preferable to residential.
- Family care is better than an institution.
- It is always best for children to be brought up in a family situation.
- Foster Care, I think, is to be preferred, to residential care. Having served, when an [redacted], on a Fostering Panel, I have no doubts on this!
- As long as there is support all round but the council have no support staff.
- Also to review any internal provision as to its cost effectiveness - there will always be a need for residential settings but due to local authority terms and conditions on a financial front it is cheaper for this to be provided by the private sector as long as quality is checked.
- This should never have changed as a policy.
- Again, I would want to see the needs of the children met with regards their safety.
- If this setting is appropriate for the child/young person.
- Yes, but the criteria for a foster parent needs urgent review.
- I support the greater use of foster care.
- Is this not double counting the other foster care savings?
- I think it depends on the individual. The cost & needs of a child living in a residential home or in foster home should be closely looked into because each child is different and the needs of each child must be met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>52 46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>37 33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>11 9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>5 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4 3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- A better option would be to offer larger council properties to people who are currently caring for children, so that the doors of fostering are available to them and increase employment opportunities of parents of younger children whom may not be able to work due to care commitments. Currently fostering requirements state that carers must have an additional room, therefore the carers maybe elderly or less suitable than those already parenting.
- Need more courses and families.
- We have a lot of children who for various reasons violence towards parents/foster carers, frequent Mis-per’s, Gang involvement and those who have been groomed cannot stay in a Foster setting, because they'd walk or it could be dangerous for the foster carers... we cant make this a 'one size fits all' policy because we have so many children that Foster Care isn't going to be suitable for
- [Redacted expletive comment]
- This can't happen until more foster carers are engaged, which could take 5 years to significantly increase, therefore this saving can not be predicted to take effect this year.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 8 responses to this question.
- Some children may take time to find the right foster carer and may suffer rejections.
- We have a lot of children who for various reasons violence towards parents/foster carers, frequent Mis-per’s, Gang involvement and those who have been groomed cannot stay in a Foster setting, because they'd walk or it could be dangerous for the foster carers... we cant make this a 'one size fits all' policy because we have so many children that Foster Care isn't going to be suitable for
- No
- as above
- Children may prefer the current setting as foster children can not settle in one place without being moved. This is traumatic for children, at the least the current situation maybe more stable.
- If this can happen within the financial year specified, what funds are available to grow the in house provision, for appropriately trained Fostering Social Workers to train, monitor and support the Foster Families?
- How can you manage to lie so much
- I'm feeling that the less sensible outcomes of a swat analysis are being used! Was it a long meeting?
Operational Efficiency

19-002-12 Transport Optimisation

- The Social Care Transport Project will:
  - Review our policy for providing travel assistance to ensure that it is fit for purpose to meet children’s needs and helps them to achieve good outcomes and independence; and enables good value for money to be achieved
  - Review and improve our processes for approving and requesting travel assistance
  - Review and improve the way we work with Kier and other travel providers
  - Review and improve the way we monitor spend

This may result in us applying our policy more consistently; or changing our policy. We will consult in early 2020 on any proposed changes to our policy and we will ensure that the support provided meets children’s needs and helps them to achieve good outcomes and independence. We plan to implement any changes to the policy from 1 Apr 2020, subject to approvals. This is forecast to deliver savings of £600,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 112 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 22 responses to this question.

- I agree that the system needs reviewing but carefully. The recent suggestion that children with learning difficulties/disabilities may lose their right to transport to their schools, and have to find their own way there is frankly a massive step backwards. These children need our support. Most want their independence, but when they are ready, not when it is thrust upon them. This needs to be very carefully planned and monitored. Your statement that you will "ensure that the support provided meets children’s needs and helps them to achieve good outcomes and independence", suggests to me that someone, somewhere will decide how independent a child should be and base this on generalisations, rather than assessing each individual situation. The cost of assessing may outweigh the cost of the actual transport if this is done in the best interested of each child as it should be. It may be better to offer transport to all and give them the opportunity to opt out once they decide they/their families decide they are independent enough.

- As an employee and someone who has to arrange travel sometimes, this is an area that leaks a considerable amount of money. We do not appear to get good value with our mileage rates and we have a very limited framework to work from, that does not include good value out of county transport requirements. This means that we are always paying over and above to transport a child to school. For example; 1 child for 10 days on a 10 mile radius round trip can cost a minimum £1000.00 on an adhoc basis. Having met with Kier transport team, to discuss these costs and whether they get them cheaper, it appears they don't and they work with the same framework. Surely, they should be given the flexibility to negotiate ongoing contracts to deliver services more cost effectively. This is insane money!

- Improved efficiency is always desirable.

- Timely & welcome!

- NCC spends far too much money on travel for so this area. for instance where it says we must provide travel it does not say if this needs to be a taxi or an old minibus to pick them up. Please always go for the cheapest option.

- And that appropriate managers sign off request that hold budgets or who are accountable to ensure they are following process that has been agreed
• The Dog should wag the tail, not the other way around, there needs to be a move to bring service in house, commissioning for outsourcing so many key components has led to terrible service and high costs
• I tend to agree subject to ensuring that services provided are sensitive to boundaries to avoid the negative impact that can occur around boundaries.
• know some people manage to get a disability funded car and then also get transport provided to take their children to school, surely they should not get both if they get the car then they should take their child to school, if they can not do that due to work then why get the funded car for it to sit on a drive all day, I also understand some do not work but still get the car and the transport
• There isn’t a proposal for what those changes look like so I cannot comment.
• More cost cutting above realistic need?
• Does Kier actually provide the best service for cost?
• I think that Social Care Transport is important especially if assisted travel is required. However, if a family can help in some way, then they should be allowed to help either financially or use their own transport.
• Probably best to do another financial scrutiny of Kier looking at their poor financial health at the moment.
• Not a fan of Kier. Not impressed by how they work
• I do not agree with the recent proposal to have 'drop off ' and 'pick up' points for children accessing specialist school’s I found the rationale behind it insulting. I do think there needs to be a change in the transport arrangements for students accessing alternative provisions but to make this realistic and successful there needs to be an increase in provisions available, especially within Daventry and South Northants as without the current travel arrangements these students would be disadvantaged as they have to travel long distance to the provisions due to lack of anything locally and a bus route is often not feasible.
• Is this just a fancy way of saying cuts? Making disabled kids walk miles to school? Shame on the Tories.
• I don’t know why the tax pay is paying for disabled children to get to school when many parents receive mobility benefits!
• Some of the existing arrangements can be reviewed for savings in how travel assistance is requested etc, however the policy currently has to work in a rural county with limited Public Transport access, which then limits anyone striving for independence.
• this should only be provided in extreme cases and not as a general principle. Families must shoulder their responsibilities.
• This is all myth!!
• Considering you don’t know what you’re actually doing there. I can’t give an answer
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 3 responses to this question.

- See above
- Care should be taken to ensure that children's needs are assessed sensibly, so that they are not left at a disadvantage for the sake of savings.
- This is a very emotive subject and may cost more than your predicted savings in working out individual arrangements and reassurances for parents.

**Non-customer facing proposals**

In addition to the proposals already discussed in this consultation, we are making a number of budget proposals in Children First Northamptonshire that we believe can deliver savings without having an impact on customers. These are set out below.

- 19-002-04 Reconfiguration of Social Work Academy (£300,000 saving) – Remodelling our learning and development offer for children's social care practitioners
- 19-002-05 Reducing reliance on Agency Staff (£138,000 saving) – Business Rate Pilot funded proposal to increase the proportion of permanent staffing within Children First Northamptonshire and reduce the reliance on agency staff, through a refreshed Workforce Strategy and Quality Assurance Framework that creates a strong and stable workforce.

**Reconfiguration of Social Work Academy**

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 109 responses to this question.
Reducing reliance on Agency Staff

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 104 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35 32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>36 33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>26 23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>4 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4 3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate & Community Services

Corporate and Community Services is made up of a number of teams which deliver both back office and public-facing services to residents of Northamptonshire:

- Library services
- Community Safety, Emergency Planning and Resilience
- Country parks and outdoor learning
- Sports and leisure
- Archives and heritage
- Customer Service Centre
- Business Information and Intelligence
- Legal and Democratic Support
- Financial Management

For 2020/21, the service has a gross budget of £19.2m, which is an increase on the 2019/20 budget of £0.1m, in order to continue to provide excellent services to our customers both internally and externally to the Council.

Workforce

19-004-05 Customer Service Centre

- Delete vacant training post and reduce opening hours to 9am - 5pm (currently 8am to 6pm) in line with demand patterns. This is forecast to deliver savings of £136,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 143 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 28 responses to this question.

- Why should you be paying for something that historically is not needed.
- I don't think this would massively impact on people and saves a bit of money
- Traditional Business Hours are 9-5pm. To offer a service out of these hours seems unnecessary and is likely not utilised much. It is a good way to save money.
- why don't you do staggered shifts with staff to achieve previous opening hours?
- I agree with the proposals as long as opening hours are not further reduced
- If the council is coping without this member of staff then there is no need to fill the post.
- Inevitable, in present times when purse-strings have to be tightened to concentrate what money NCC have on greater priorities (e.g. Children's Services & Highways).
- The demand patterns were engineered by reducing it out of demand times.. Ideally later closing allows for after school activities and after work use.
- Seems a constructive move.
- Makes sense - normal working hours.
- I don’t understand how this will save £136k though.
- Sounds reasonable.
Although I would rather not see any reduction in opening hours, 2 hours a day is the least worst option. That said, Northamptonshire County Council needs to ensure that the website offers those customers who have access, ways of doing things online via self-service methods.

Sounds like the resource is currently not required and could be used for other service areas

Amazing who thought of that?

I think reducing the hours could have a negative effect - some people do not have access to a phone at work and this gives them no leeway before or after work to call. However, if CSC statistics show that the numbers of callers before 9 and after 6 do not warrant the staff working these hours then in makes sense to change their hours to reduce costs.

I agree that the vacant post should be given up however should working people require the customer centre they may not be able to visit 9-5 therefore I think the current office hours should remain.

Do the staff involved agree with this? Seems like you’re saying here have a massive hike in council tax but a massive cut in wages

I would not agree with any change that reduces the responsiveness of the Customer Service Centre or that makes the service harder to reach or even more impersonal.

I enjoy working from 8-4 as it's easier for my home life and the traffic is far better

Could put pressure on emergency services, pressure on families who work office hours to sacrifice their breaks/lunches as they will need to call within these hours, potential for staff leaving/being let go

already struggle to get through and this would make it worse - people work varying hours not just 9-5

This would, in my opinion, make it much harder for some people to reach you.

Csc should be open until at least 7 pm to allow people who are at work all day access to it also Saturdaymornings

There should always be provision for training posts to enable staff to learn on the job an ease the pressure on an already stretched team, by reducing opening hours, will you be open on Saturdays? as most people work 9 - 5 and not everyone has access to computers and the NCC website can be confusing and slow.

this would be very bad for anyone who works as it would mean the phones would only be covered during most people's working day

I take the point about demand patterns; however I think that even if only a few people need the service after 5 pm, it's important to provide it. Perhaps a compromise would be to offer later opening on certain days? Unclear about what deleting the training post might mean for long-term quality of service; for the customer on the phone, it's really important to be able to talk to someone who is well-trained.

Most people work those hours and how are they meant to contact the council?
Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 13 responses to this question.

- Why delete the vacant training post? Surely the customer service centre need someone to train them in how to do their job?
- The library is a free place for people to visit without negative influences.
- Reduction in staff hours means staff who already earn very little will earn even less.
- Again some will be negative.
- So long as there is somewhere (on line?) people can contact outside opening hours
- If someone works 9am to 5pm and needs to contact the council, these hours might be prohibitive
- Still need to fill training post. Although vacant at present it is important for succession planning and development. Possibly start at 09.00 and finish at 5.30 or 6.00?
- Less hours is detrimental to service users
- As above
- Less access to report and get the information to assist residence in the county, making the Council feel less accessible.
- If there is a need to reduce hours why not start later in the day and run into the evening
- I agree that customer services availability times should reduce. However, vacancies are there for a reason and rather than close them off we should look to modify them in line with the new customer service availability times.
- I am concerned that this could have a negative impact on services - see above.

Policy and Practice

19-004-06 Complaints

- Change to working practices for advanced stage complaints – these will be investigated independently from the service but in-house, rather than being contracted out to external investigators. This is forecast to deliver savings of £50,000 in 2020/21.

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (√) relevant answer

There were 141 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 30 responses to this question.

- If it saves money it should be done.
- Makes sense to have things in house, saves money
- In house investigators have easier access
- In house is better value for money.
- Outsourcing is never effective use of tax payers money as contracts are usually paid for regardless of the quality of the service delivered and with no penalties for this, we usually end up with a budget service for a champagne cost.
- In house as opposed to contracted out can only be for the good provided support and training is realistic for staff delivering!
- Dealing with this in-house is a much better way to deal with this matter.
- As long as you have the correctly trained staff this will be beneficial
- care must be taken to be genuinely independent
- I totally disagree with services being contracted out. This is always unnecessarily costly
- Sensible!
- You should have the capability in-house to do this. Proper managers should take this in their stride.
• Seems sensible move.
• well, frankly if I was an external investigator the first thing I would investigate is how deep the council's pockets are with a view to putting in a great big bill. And Northamptonshire's pockets seem to have been the deepest in the land, the way money has been thrown away up to now.
• agree providing the county has the capability to undertake the task
• where possible all services should be handled internally and not outsourced at significant cost
• Good idea
• I've had complaints being handled that simply disappeared, greater independence of review is needed. It would be more pleasing to reduce the causes of complaints!
• train managers to handle complaints and use the resource you have whilst enhancing their skills
• I think this is a very good way to do things.
• Agree, but where will the provision be sourced from the over stretched authority?
• Not clear but sounds good
• As long as the independence can be assured.
• I thought this was the current practice
• There will be some complaints that I believe should be investigated independently an externally from the Council.
• Assuming you do not intend to recruit to this role you are expecting already overburdened staff to take this on. There is potentially a conflict of interest in having complaints investigated internally. The cost saving is minimal and does not justify the increased risk of investigative bias
• The council will brush complaints under the carpet if it had this.
• Can you be honest and impartial!
• An external investigation is always preferable to an in-house investigation
• I do not see how Northamptonshire County Council investigating it's own advanced stage complaints is a good thing. The process needs to be independent from the council when complaints reach that stage, otherwise there may be a tendency to simply find in the council's favour in order to save money and resources.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 5 responses to this question.
• Neglect of staff needs would impact on this proposal.
• Again others will view negatively.
• no control when you out source
• Public opinion is already fairly low on the council this may look like there is less opportunity for public scrutiny.
• Keep it external.
Non-customer facing proposals

In addition to the proposals already discussed in this consultation, we are making an additional budget proposal in Corporate Services that we believe can deliver savings without having an impact on customers. This is set out below.

- 19-004-03 Communications and Marketing (£55,000) – resource efficiency in Communications and Marketing team

Communications and Marketing

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 140 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place Services

Savings and efficiencies continue to be targeted and this budget includes savings proposals for Place Services which are grouped into themes to help it grow revenue, shape place and enable communities to live well and businesses to thrive and generate prosperity.

However, this budget will also facilitate the increased growth in recycling and the treatment of more residual waste. Continuing to ensure the safety of the highway network, retaining control of the management of school travel assistance and making sure that our policies are fit for purpose and consistently applied remain a key priority.

For 2020/21, the service has a gross budget of £134.6m, which is an increase on the 2019/20 budget of £3m.

Operational Efficiency

18-006-10 Targeted delivery of roads maintenance
- Optimised route-planning using improved decision-making on when to carry out gritting activity. Detailed consultation to be held with borough, district, town and parish councils in respect of any future planned changes to existing routes. This is forecast to deliver savings of £500,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 105 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 23 responses to this question.

- Rural areas need to be addressed as well as streets with poor access out, i.e. my street has a dip in the middle that you have to go down to come back up, any ice and snow it's dangerous to go down due to other cars and houses.
- People safety is always essential to saving money in other areas in the long term.
- Gritting requirement needs to be open for the unknown.
- I have paid out hundreds of pounds in repairs to my car due to damage caused by our terrible roads. I have tried to claim some of my costs back from the council but every time I am told "we have a defense". Yet more money out of my pocket to prop up the poor excuse for a County Council we have in Northamptonshire.
- Gritting needs to be reviewed rural area.
- Why on earth hasn't this been done before? Seems only logical to me.
- Gritting sometimes unnecessary as temperatures are not below 0º.
- This would be useful, providing rural areas where not left more isolated with elderly unable to get to shops or the doctors.
- Operating more efficiently is welcomed.
- I think it’s very sensible to make decisions rationally, based on data and sound principles, so the council isn’t vulnerable to having to cover those areas where people are most vocal, but which might not give the best results.
- This is a topic of considerable concern to my village as roads are not adopted. We think that the procedure whereby a developer has to invite NCC to examine the roads (i.e. can’t inspect of its own volition) is cock-eyed in the extreme. Under those rules we doubt our roads will ever be adopted.
- Gritting needs to be done where it is needed. I work in a school in a small village. The roads are not regularly gritted and this has caused accidents in the past years. Roads near schools need to be gritted for the safety of stall families and pupils.
- We need to grit more residential roads to ensure people can get to work and can leave their houses safely, community grit bins need to be returned as well so people can work together in their own communities.
- Important that someone actually makes a decision.
- The report is vague about what is really proposed. Any cut in gritting and maintenance would have an adverse affect on safety.
• Today we have flooding on the A45 so we need more spending on roads not less
• all road should be done we pay our road tax
• you tried this last year, at the first sign of ice you went back to the original plans. i cannot see you having the backbone to support this change
• Just last week following the freezing weather, there was a road between Daventry and Northampton which had at least 6 car crashes / leaving the road due to slipping on ice. People's safety should not be jeopardised in order to save money.
• How many accidents the other day because of this policy? 11 I believe. How hard is it to check the forecast?
• I have concerned that the more rural areas of the county will be ignored as per usual.
• I don’t know what the improved decision process will be and how often will NCC consult with the lower tier councils?? What are the 'existing routes' the ones left after NCC removed lots of routes during the last couple of years? The parish and district councils are best positioned to be making decisions on non-highways not NCC. If you want everyone to get to work, including NCC staff /schools/hospitals/care homes etc AND the county to function then the roads must be safe and usable during the winter months.
• The service level impact assessment has not been completed therefore this ‘saving’ can not be accurate or fully resolved. Excerpt from the EIA: There may be a potential service impact dependent on the saving option(s) agreed. The specific service impact will not be known until the proposal is worked up more fully.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 12 responses to this question.

• Gritting routes are not something which can be cut any more than it already is. It's far too dangerous and puts people in harms way which then put more pressure on hospitals who will already be full over winter. It doesn't save money it just moves the cost somewhere else.
• Concerned that this may reduce the already inadequate service in remoter villages.
• isolating communities in winter is a disgrace.
• Others may be negative.
• All major roads around Northamptonshire should be gritted otherwise people are going to be seriously hurt or die. It is not fair.
• This service needs expanding not reducing. Don't need to waste money on additional consultations to reduce this service. leave it as it is or increase provision but don't reduce it.
• Huge impact. People will die or be seriously injured
• This needs to be intelligence led and not a wholesale cut - we have already lost the local gritting service and the facility of the grit bins to do it ourselves
• More education to Drivers to not sit directly behind the gritter....to enable the grit to go on the road and not on their bonnet.
yes as per my previous comment

The current level of service provision is not good enough and the EIA states that it could get worse because of the saving. Not a robust strategy as of yet - revisit the impact assessment.

The major roads are very busy and not all get to the rural villages - there is a need for each community not to feel isolated/prevent travel of children to school and adults to work etc.

19-006-06 Superfast Broadband

- Remove dedicated operational budget for technical, commercial and business case support. This is forecast to deliver savings of £65,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 103 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22 21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>26 25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29 28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>8 7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>12 11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 12 responses to this question.
- Makes sense.
- enough project teams to deliver this
- Positive action to save.
- It depends how much it would affect the worker, as it is well known throughout the Council about the computers crashing, throwing you out of the system and losing work.
- The next government will deliver this centrally - if they dont, it will be there problem not NCC! Good spot by whoever put this proposal together – [name]?
- Do not know enough about this issue to comment meaningfully.
- Don’t understand what that support did
- this might actually save money in the long run by keeping it. It's a minimal saving.
- Encouraging local businesses to become more efficient would in the long term mean more income for the Council.
- The targets are being missed already - cutting this will hardly help
- I know nothing about it
- Not enough information given.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There was 1 response to this question.
- Others may feel negative.

Commissioning and Procurement

19-006-07 Economic Development
- Reduce the operational budget and cease undertaking the Local Area Assessment, reduce the project delivery to support economic growth, business skills and job creation. This will in part be mitigated through increased collaborative activity with partners. This is forecast to deliver savings of £85,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 105 responses to this question.
Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:
There were 11 responses to this question.

- These services were a con. They made it sound like they were available for businesses but instead were high paid consultancy of junk signposting.
- Good thinking.
- With the plans for Rail Central and Roxhill developments these will bring jobs, economic growth and business skills to the area from the initial ground preparation to the running of the new operations for a number of years to the county. So the provision by the authority will need to be to keep an over view.
- Joint working is a good idea
- Let businesses fight it out themselves. A shame for the startups though, however there is funding and support available elsewhere.
- not enough detail
- Don't know what the local area assessment is. 'Reduce the project delivery to support economic growth, business skills and job creation’!! - is that what NCC wants to do - for the sake of £85k??!!!
- We need to focus on supporting locally based businesses and not international firms. This enables council money to be recycled into the local economy
- It feels too short sighted? Pulling away from areas that may be cost saving?
- I don’t know enough about this subject to comment.
Not enough information given.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?
There were 4 responses to this question.

- As above (2)
- Others may feel negative.
- Lots of people apposed to development, despite the opportunities it will bring for the local economy and environmentally for the country.

Policy and Practice

19-006-05 Management of Closed Landfills

- Risk-based approach to the management of historic closed landfill sites during 2020/21. This is forecast to deliver savings of £100,000 in 2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 103 responses to this question.
### Consultation, Equalities & Accessibility Team v1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 10 responses to this question.

- Its should be handed over to businesses in the area. Ie sixfields Kfc and mcdonalds.
- Positive approach.
- Seems silly to leave sites untouched when they could be making money.
- What guarantees will there be that the 100K will be reinstated to the budget the following year.
- This is an issue I do not have much knowledge about and the impact a reduction here would have. I cannot comment
- Once a landfill is finished with it should be managed. Risk based approaches only work if you can correctly assess the risk...what would this cost by comparison?
- Need to ensure that if the worst case scenario events happens that the services is given the funding to mitigate and stop environmental damage.
- Need to source future landfill sites can't do without them
- This feels like cost cutting above safety for the community as such it is not acceptable. These landfills were made by NCC they need to keep the sites safe. To say watching and may need in future is not acceptable.
- Given how lumpy the road at Sixfields is, I'd suggest you're not doing a good job at the moment so cutting it further isn't going to help.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 2 responses to this question.

- Can not see negativity here myself.
- Not sure this is an appropriate saving

19-006-15 Commissioned Services from Third Parties

- Remove the budget for service level agreements with environmental bodies in line with practice over last two years. This is forecast to deliver savings of £46,000 in
2020/21. To read the Equality Impact Assessment for this proposal, please visit www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/eqias20-21

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 102 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you would like to tell us why you answered the previous question in the way that you did, please do so here:

There were 10 responses to this question.

- If it's not been spent then it's not needed and undoubtedly that money has not been accruing a reasonable rate of interest whilst its been idle.
- savings related to trends
- Again positive.
- Very sensible...what has the 92K been spent on over the last 2 years then?
- I don't understand the impact of this proposal
- Veolia have done a super job. Do not cut them.However there could be cuts in other departments of the borough council in this field.
- what is an environmental body - some examples would be helpful!!
This is a considerably small saving but may have deeper impact for those services that rely on these service level agreements.

Weston Favell Library has had a defective lift for 2 years. A service agreement would have enabled this to be maintained.

Clicking on your link does not take me to the specific area needed to review this. Too many links on the page. Too much time taken in trying to work out which one to look at. This seems to be true of the whole of this consultative document. I did look at the proposals first but there is far too much information and the information is not given in a clear, precise and easy to read manner that an ordinary person can easily and quickly read. This makes it very difficult for a lay person to comment on many of these proposals, unless they have several days to spare.

Q. If you feel this proposal would have a negative impact, please tell us what you think that impact would be, along with any suggestions on how any potential negative impacts could be mitigated?

There were 3 responses to this question.

- If it impacts the current waste disposal work.
- Others may be negative.
- Need to assess the impact of this on the county - are any of these monitoring SLA and therefore losing the protection of the environment?

Non-customer facing proposals

In addition to the proposals already discussed in this consultation, we are making a further budget proposal in Place Services that we believe can deliver savings without having an impact on customers. This is set out below.

- 19-006-04 Professional Fees (£115,000) – removal of the budget for external consultancy and technical work

Professional Fees

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 104 responses to this question.
Consultation, Equalities & Accessibility Team

Professional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LGSS

LGSS provides back office services to Northamptonshire County Council alongside Cambridgeshire County Council, Milton Keynes Council and other public sector customers including a number of Northamptonshire schools. Services provided to NCC include:

- Transactional Finance services
- Audit and Risk
- Pensions
- Procurement
- Insurance
- Human Resources Advisory, Policy and Strategy including Health, Safety and Wellbeing
- Transactional HR services including payroll
- Learning and Development
- Information Technology services
- Business Systems
- Language Services

A review of the future operating model for LGSS services is currently being undertaken which may impact on the future budget for LGSS services. In advance of the conclusion of that review, the service has a gross budget of £19.4m for 2020/21, which is a decrease on the 2019/20 budget of £0.2m.

Non-customer facing proposals

We are making a further budget proposal in LGSS that we believe can deliver savings without having an impact on customers. This is set out below.

- 19-005-01 Wide Area Network (WAN) network replacement (£595,000) - migration onto the Health and Social Care Network via EastNet, delivering significant savings as well as significant service improvements and opportunities for the STP (Sustainability and Transformation Partnership)

WAN Network Replacement

Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal? Please tick (v) relevant answer

There were 102 responses to this question.
Consultation, Equalities & Accessibility Team

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fees and charges

The Medium Term Plan (MTP) requires the Council to review opportunities for income generation. Full details summarising the main changes to fees and charges for 2020/21 can be found in the summary and schedule published with the Cabinet paper.

In summary, the proposed fees and charges increases relate to:

- School Effectiveness
- Moderation fees in schools
- Laminating fees in NCC run libraries
- Hire of drama sets in NCC run libraries
- Priority Copy Certificates in Registration Services
- School swimming lessons
- Meals and accommodation at Knuston Hall
- Some Archives and Heritage Services
- Trading Standards
- Highways and transport
- Rights of Way

Q. If you have any comments to make on these proposals, please tell us which and give us your views below:

There were 23 responses to this question.

- I think time to review these services, there may be better ways to do things using technology
- I agree with the proposals
- Library fees - glad to see the majority are not increasing due to the reasons stated in the document. The proposed increases for laminating and Playsets appear realistic.
- Seem reasonable
- There is a balance between increasing fees and costs becoming so high, that people stop using the services and they become unviable. Careful consideration should be made to secure not to discourage people using the services.
- Their so be a lot more easy read information for me & Disability & Disabled People a long time go out in the community & Day Services for us & Carers & Personal Assistant PA Worker back in Northamptonshire and a lot more better good choice of rights & Life & Social Skills out in the community & Day Services and out own Business & Employment & Support & PA Worker with a lot more hours for us or to be come MP & Carers & PA Worker and rights & Life to work for the NHS & Community & Day Servers for me & Disability & Disabled People and what would you do about it for us who it so of be a long time go and a lot more pay work & Pay Jobs back in Day Centre for me & Disability & Disabled People out in the community & Day Services for us today now and about the Learning Disability Partnership Board & The National Forum for Disability & Disabled People in the East Midlands & The Local Mencap Committee Group & Advocacy Group & 1 To 1 Support & PA Worker & Community Housing & Support Network & Business & Employment Network Group for Disability & Disabled People and it my Life Group for me & Disability & Disabled People to be on for us today now.
• We need to enable people to access services so have to be value for money
• Increases are unavoidable: impacts should be kept in view!
• Archive services are at minimum and need further funding to pump prime outreach services, note that in Leicestershire as an example. Chester Farm development will only work if services are extended to allow more easy access to records. There are a number of "local" archives in the Country that will not pass information into the Northants Archive Service because of its uncertain status. This county material could be lost unless an initiative to bring together local and village archives is undertaken. Further cuts will be the end of the archive service as a viable service will be certain.
• I strongly feel the costs of parking at country parks should not be increased ANY further. The costs at present is too high and yet again will price out lower income families - the use of country parks in school holidays will be reserved for the more well off families in their gas guzzling vehicles. The local county parks are a great resource for families in Northamptonshire and have until recently provided great entertainment for less well off families that may not be able to go aboard or away in school holidays in my experience the recent price increases have changed this - I think overall Npton CC will lose money with the price increases as families will visit less frequently. I also think it a disgrace that the Duston pool has been left out of action for so long absolutely disgraceful when you have other better off schools in Northampton having a wealth of faculties at their disposal absolutely disgraceful the imbalances.
• Increasing library fees for laminating by silly amounts will just mean the staff and customers have to use copper coins. Why not stick to the nearest 10p or 5p? You haven't thought this through, have you?
• Would like public transport regularly in rural area.
• I totally disagree with increasing the cost of school swimming lessons.
• Library services must still be supported
• Libraries cannot afford to have their prices increase as this would discourage use and ultimately reduce income. Opening Chester Farm sooner would help increase income. Don't think parking should be charged at Chester Farm as this will discourage visitors and users. Could make income by providing cafe facilities.
• Increase across the board by 20%
• Please do not charge more for things that people need. Parking for example at the country parks. We need people outdoors being active not prevented by fees
• Should either be frozen or restricted to inflation
• A good idea to keep them under control and fair.
• Charging customers to use their own cameras in the archives seems an excessive charge.
• In regards to fees and charges in the libraries, I think these are already too high. For example, £1.50 to reserve an item from another library in the county. This is much higher than other authorities in the surrounding area. In addition, the time frame to receive reservations does not justify the high cost. In addition, printing and photocopying is expensive. There are other local shops and organisations which offer public printing and photocopying (e.g. Coleman's Stationers) at a cheaper rate.
- I think Chester Farm really needs attention - how on earth did this white elephant happen!1
- Sell Knuston hall and invest the money for the long term. Remove Chester Farm from the NCC portfolio of services. If the provision of Adult Learning Services is not statutory, get rid of it - other commercial stakeholders will provide services if the demand is there. Childrens’ Services - the Appropriate Body function is charging 23% more that the other organisations are charging - if it is not a statutory service, cease the service. Leadership and Governance service can be removed as almost all Secondary schools are now Academies and the remaining Primary schools can access this type of support externally from NCC. Trading Standards could reduce their costs by removing the equipment verification service - companies can access other organisations to get stuff tested. Increase cost of residential parking permits - residents will have no option to have to pay more.
Other comments

Q. The Council must set a balanced budget. If we do not go ahead with any of these proposals, do you have any other ideas about how we could save the same amount of money or generate the same amount of income (as shown in the appendices to the Cabinet paper)?

There were 50 responses to this question.

- No. I agree with the proposals.
- Speak to your service users using plain English and context. I am an educated professional and do not understand some of the information in this questionnaire and attachments. I am sure most of the residents and service users in the county will not understand it either. Put things in basic terms - this costs £*; you pay £*, we pay £*. Speak to your staff. The TOM is continually referred to but I am not aware of any communication with front line staff directly who can give specific details on their experience. Get a good PR representative to rebuild the council's reputation.
- Avoid paying extortionate wages to Senior management within the LA. Some of these wages seem to be in line with private sector. We are not private sector and I do not believe high pay = high outcome, as has been evident from the LAs past record (and in the private sector.) Please employ managers who actually care about the public they serve and not about the wages they receive or if they do receive a disproportionately high wage, they must produce highly positive outcomes.
- The council sets a balanced budget but without proper monitoring or taking responsibility, nothing ever changes. All your assumptions are always made assuming savings but rarely achieve them
- Pay the executives less.
- Stop paying ridiculous amounts of money to staff- managers. A person does not necessarily know more, or have expertise just because they hold academic qualifications. Good people basically just care about others. This is especially true where children are concerned.
- Cut down on the huge pay for the managers
- Get rid of the Police and Crime Commissioners and their staff. Reduce the exorbitant salary package of the CEO and other senior staff. Introduce more enforcement officers and keep the money generated by fines.
- Get back dept money for a start and recover monies lost in bad ventures.
- Some of these proposals would be acceptable. However, back office support can be costly. Extra curricular non organic services can be a false economy. Sell resources such as buildings or land to cover current costs.
- Cane the MPs for not protecting the funding for the county
- They could look at how things are monitored and united internally,
- Cut councillors’ allowances
- Yes. There are many people (top execs) who are brought in to 'manage' the finance of the council. I think that if these people weren't paid such obscene amounts of money, then there would be more money to spend on needy services.
• increasing wages in children services to front line permanent workers by £10 k would basically eradicate agencies workers who are on about 30k more a year. This would mean the agencies workers would convert to permanent saving more than the spending on the agency in front line children’s SW. spend to save!! pay the front line staff what they deserve. Save on parks funding- children safety are more important that parks

• Increase the tax on the rich and end austerity would help! Make corporations pay their taxes in this country and stop Brexit

• Happy with the proposition and the budget, let's get the county back to normal, and stop being the laughing stock of local government in England.

• Yes. Please see the Emmaus village, this model is great for social care, mixing various needs and generating an income at the same time. Collaborative services, ie Elderly and childcare social centre, have grand parent type foster care for families that need support and elderly that need company. Look at social housing, can people be moved to accommodate more people ? Look at the market of low income people/self employed local people, create tenders that are available only for them not large corporates. Make mini-economies; make more self employed people with mini contracts that are tailored around the councils current offering ie 1) environment services and waste: pay for litter picking or planting 2) have technologies in cars which allow regular public to capture penalties like littering for a small reward, but enough for sustainable mini business, 3) childcare /transportation car type uber service vetted dbs but great for parents flexi hours, 4) similar uber meals on wheels 5)open up community buildings specifically for community care/childcare, 6) lobby governments for greater assessment of mental health of homeless 7)improve the image of Northampton through branding 8)invest in local people not corporations 9) open up schools for longer and have more ofsted registered activities so that they are affordable 10)make schools extended hours on a privatised basis 11)make communities for single parents  12) look to local businesses and charities for support 13) transparency 14) do not allow the old boy network in the council to do back handers, look to younger less fortunate and vulnerable people for the answers. 14) local arts and gardening projects to improve morale of citizens and motivate them to enhance the town 15)have a better newspaper that promotes positive opportunities across the town,

• You are going to unitary (subject to parliament), which means you won't exist in one year. Why will you need £40m in reserves, i know you are required to have some statutory reserves, however you won't exist. You need to get your priorities right, taking away £300k from the VCSE sector and having a £40m reserve pot, i would question if your financial officers skills ability in this situation.

• It's too late [MP’s names], aided by [previous Councillor] vanity, have ruined this council's financial viability, and now service users and residents are suffering with poor adult social care, children's services in special measures, library and HWRC closures and reduced hours, potholes, and regular flooding. [Councillor] was at the helm for much of this time and [they] should do the decent thing and resign. Just like the liars at Westminster ruining the country, the Tories in Northamptonshire have ruined the county.
• None, it is a sad reflection on how the Council has been run.
• Fine comb all areas of expenditure.
• I think a lot of money has been wasted over the years. a lot of big redundancy payouts and bonuses to high positioned staff.
• sort out the management at the top and reduce Councillors allowances
• it appears we make price increases on the one hand and reduce services on the other. the constant change in senior management coupled with an inability to manage staff retention is a major cost to the organisation. there appears to be inequity in salaries across the organisation and the constant move to the left or right means unnecessary of tax payers money
• Use your resources more effectively. You have assets that could be bringing in cash that are unused (space at front of Angel Square, roundabouts, sides of buildings etc) - be quicker with making decisions so that funding can be generated. Historically Uni students don’t pay CT, but is this something that can be explored? They use services so they should really contribute towards them, even if it was a nominal amount per year. I realise this isn’t an NCC decision, but perhaps something that could be filtered upwards to central government by the Commissioners? Students aren’t poor, if they can afford regular shopping trips, take outs and nights out, then surely it’s only fair to ask them to contribute a small amount towards the services that they also access. How much would be generated for the county as a whole (inc NCC / D&BS / Parishes) if they all paid £100 per year? I’m talking about university level students, not anyone still at school or college. If we as a county and the country as a whole want to explore ways to generate more income, this is one of the easiest and fairest ways to do it - £100 x tens of thousands of uni students = a lot of extra income to put towards services.
• yes stop helping people with jobs and judging the people on benefits u frauds...
• Services to local businesses that income generate is a massive opportunity, that is in part lost.
• Council Managers need to come out and look properly at the front line services. Then make a proper assessment.
• Not waste our money on continual re-organisation and just get the council to run efficiently.
• Already answered in previous questions
• Yes, pitch your council charges appropriately and increase annually. Ensure everyone pays their share. Put a salary freeze on staff wages or only increase in line with national salary increases. Do not decease Rights of Way budget but need to increase this as they have previously been reduced too much. It has not helped in the protection of our footpaths and bridleways as reduced staffing has had an impact on the service available. Same is true for the definitive map team. These are vital services that have have been cut at the expense of Highways.
• Let’s have a multipart referendum, and work to get rid of out sourcing
• The consultation is silent on the increase in highways repairs backlogs circa £30M per annum. Not even referencing this makes me very concerned for what else is being swept under the carpet. I can have no faith in an organisation that hides major problems within a consultation.
- Yes reduce the amount of money (£) spent on senior management across all areas and social care. NCC needs to do proper performance management and get rid of inefficient members of staff of which there are many.
- Another review of library services since hours were cut it is impossible to use them if you work 9-5 also they only serve a small section of community
- Bring services back in house. No more extortiate outside agencies. No more tendering to what is commonly perceived as jobs for the boys. Treat people well and they will reciprocate. Happy healthy employees have less days off. Children able to attend school via transport, learn and become independent. No more stupid vanity projects. I cannot possibly know the intricacies of the councils workings but I can assure you that people are treated unfairly. We are residents not cash cows.
- Stop paying stupid bonuses
- The section on LGSS wasn't very open - why hasn't the max calder report been actioned given his comments were that NCC was subsiding CCC - this would generate a saving with no impact to the residents of NCC and should have been actioned some time ago. And look at options to claw back which could have been added to reserves. I am not happy to sign up to council tax increases when every avenue hasn't been explored and this I believe is a big avenue.
- It is not down to me to suggest ways in which you could generate funds. The complete and utter failure of the county council is a national disgrace and residents should not pay for their incompetence.
- Get rid of some councillors and stop using consultants
- Look at how much senior employees are paid and if such employees jobs are effective in their entirety or if they are over paid and can be more efficient.
- Reduce the amount of Consultants brought in, for short periods, or link their pay to deliverables. Utilise the property portfolios more effectively, either staff the buildings or sell them off. Focus more on the buildings for social care and children than plush offices for staff
- Yes how about the pointless councillors all resign and save £500k in the process. How about telling the Tory govt. to re-instate the 50% cuts to local govt. Why not go bankrupt again you managed it once before and the seven tory MPs can pretend they give [...] about anything OTHER THAN THEMSELVES AND ASK THEIR GOVT. FOR MORE MONEY FOR NORTHANTS.
- Unfortunately, due to gross incompetence, the Council has been very badly run recently. All those involved in making bad decisions e.g. the Councillors who have been helping to run the Council, should all be replaced as soon as possible, particularly if the change to a unitary authority will take more than a year to implement. These people have proved themselves to be unworthy to hold their current posts and need to go.
- With all the future development planned in the county utilise these opportunities with accessing funds to improve the public transport - particularly with rail central - have a local railway station at Roade and Blisworth to enable residence to get to Northampton town Centre easily but also open up employment opportunities to London, Milton Keynes and Birmingham. while reducing cars on the road and Bus
transport can be rerouted to remote rural areas who are suffering with facilities closing and no footpath.

- Reduce the extortionate wages of senior staff and managers.
- Stop fraudulence.
- Increase the use of on street parking enforcement officers by schools at 15:00 - 16:00 and actually issue parking tickets. This will generate lots of income and also improve the safety for young children walking home. If you are able to employ a team to find vehicles that are un taxed, insured or MOT’d the fees to release the vehicles can increase income and if the vehicle is not claimed it can be sold - this increases income and improves safety of all pedestrians and road users in the county - this would also reduce crime by criminals coming into the area if there is an real increased risk that their stolen or illegal vehicle will be identified and actually dealt with.
- Examine the staffing levels at HQ. Reduce now prior to Unitary so that the impact of redundancy is minimised.

Q. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the savings proposals in this draft budget?

There were 18 responses to this question.

- Take responsibility for your own historical decision making which has led to the current financial instability.
- I assume that when there are two unitary councils, all residents in the West will pay the same amount in rates, as currently Northampton is extortionate compared to surrounding districts and boroughs. If disparities are not addressed in 2021, I assume you will be reducing the amount Northampton residents pay to match the lower cost areas.
- Front line workers and lower management are left with increased responsibilities and are receiving poor pay, I understand there might be a 4% pay rise but this is insignificant to the increase in day to day living. All roles need looking at as the difference between pay as a front line staff to line management is very small, this can have a negative effect on job roles as they have changed so much and management have increased responsibilities which does not reflect the pay.
- I think its fantastic there is a pay increase for staff in the budget however would like to point out if this is agreed and the 4% pay increase is applied; we would not really benefit from this as we are also agreeing to a 3.99%, increase in council tax. I believe the big wigs at the council really need to look at the staff who work tirelessly working with families and children who go over and above to support these vulnerable children. Management should look at the workloads and try to recognise those who do not work in social care but who work in education services and who are working ridiculously hard, over our hours and dealing with un-manageable cases as opposed to paying new recruits additional money to join the council.
- The proposal all tend to cut services.....but not the number of officers...who are the greatest cost.....
• lot more help & Support for me & Disability & Disabled People in Northamptonshire to budget with a lot more hours with a Carers & PA worker for us today now
• Get rid of the Shelton road incinerator plant. It would be a 'costly' exercise to use public money to defeat a well organised crowd funded resistance to this. As there is no guarantee that it would provide electricity or heat to local business...it throws it into question. It wouldn't be a popular decision. Even if it did allegedly generate revenue through business schemes. It's an outdated method of industry.
• be more clear in funding what the people need and not offering what they want. Needs are more important than wants
• Many of these ideas seem sensible but I wonder why they have not been done before and why I should believe that they will actually be done successfully now!
• Tories out.
• All savings welcome even more so if we could get public transport rural areas.
• we should operate more like the private sector. we should have a clear pathway which delivers cost savings. The constant movement of systems and processes results in more costs both monetary and in terms of staff training etc. we remove systems that work, introduce new systems that do not which results in wasting staff time trying to get their work done
• Overall I think it looks quite good but my main concern is the increase combined with whatever the increases from the D&Bs and NPCC are. If the NPCC puts the tax up another 10% as they have this year, Northamptonshire tax payers are set for another huge increase overall next financial year. I appreciate that is out of your control but it is a problem for households.
• Please stop NCC being an embarrassment in the papers!!!
• in the past I made a real effort to make a proper and substantive contribution to these consultations and of course I was ignored. I am unwilling to play this pointless game any more because the council is an utter waste of time and money. This is a pointless, cynical exercise to claim you have consulted the people and it will be noted, but ignored and the council will carry on with its pre-determined agenda anyway. Why bother?
• This document needs to be set out so that a lay person can have easy access to the links associated with each section. The link should give a brief overview of proposed changes and then a longer discussion about they whys and wherefores. Many sections only link to the budget proposal document, which has far to many links on it. This document needs to be easy to read for people with busy lives, who may not be familiar with all the ins and outs of the Council’s work.
• Some proposals appear well thought through with an appropriately identified outcome. Some sound as if they were written on the back of a fag packet on a Friday evening down the pub.
• Invest in parents with mental health illnesses, disorders and disabilities, traumas.
More about you

Q. Are you responding to this consultation as an individual or as a representative on behalf of a user group/organisation? Please tick (V) relevant answer

There were 188 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an individual</td>
<td>183 97.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a representative of a user group/organisation</td>
<td>5 2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you’re replying on behalf of an organisation or community group please tell us the name of your organisation and your job title/role:

Organisation
There were 4 responses to this question.

- OCS/ NASS
- Ncc
- Parish Meeting
- A Parish Council

Job title/role
There were three responses to this question. We have not listed the roles / job titles of respondents within this appendix in order to ensure respondents’ anonymity is retained.

Please only complete the following section if you are responding as an individual.
Q. What district / borough of Northamptonshire do you live in? Please tick (V) relevant answer
There were 177 responses to this question.

If ‘Other’ please specify:
- Work for NCC
- None - I am an employee only.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. It can be handed in at any of the libraries run by Northamptonshire County Council (listed on page 2), in a pre-paid envelope, if you requested one, or to the address below. Please return it by Tuesday 24th December 2019.

Consultation, Equalities and Accessibility Team, Northamptonshire County Council, One Angel Square, Angel Street, Northampton NN1 1ED
**Equality monitoring**

As an organisation, we collect specific demographic information from the people who take part in our consultations or complete surveys to build up an accurate understanding of the communities that we serve so that services and policies can be delivered to meet the needs of everybody, and make sure that everybody has an opportunity to have their voice heard.

Please feel free to leave any questions which you do not wish to answer.

Any information you choose to provide will be treated confidentially and in accordance with data protection legislation and regulations.

**Q. Are you:** (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 173 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?** (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 168 responses to this question.
Are you currently pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. How old are you? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 172 responses to this question.

How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. Do you have a disability? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 169 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If ‘Yes’, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?

There were 29 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. What is your religion or belief? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 170 responses to this question.

![Graph showing religious beliefs]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/Belief</th>
<th>Response Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to specify</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion (please specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- Spiritual (2)
- Jedi knight

Q. How would you describe your ethnic origin? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 160 responses to this question.
### How would you describe your ethnic origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White – British</td>
<td>116 72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Irish</td>
<td>5   3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Other White Background</td>
<td>6   3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Indian</td>
<td>2   1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Pakistani</td>
<td>1   0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Chinese</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Other Asian Background</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>2   1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – Other mixed / multiple background</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>1   0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – African</td>
<td>1   0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Other Black Background</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Arab</td>
<td>0   0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group (please state)</td>
<td>7   4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>19 11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- English (3)
- Human
- Anglo-American
- Irrelevant
- green like the grinch
Q. If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 162 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Man</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Woman / Lesbian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 160 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. What would you describe your marital status as? (Please tick the appropriate box)

There were 163 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-habiting/Living together</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow / Widower</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Review of catering facilities at day services questionnaire full results

Note: the following is a copy of the questionnaire used for service users. Another version of the questionnaire was used for family members and/or carers which has not been reproduced within this appendix as both questionnaires asked similar questions with the differences between them being minor changes to the language used that made the questionnaires more personable for the respondent, i.e. the word ‘you’ was used within the service user questionnaire and this was replaced with the wording ‘your family member/person you care for’ for the family member / carer questionnaire. The feedback published below contains the feedback received from both questionnaires.

2020-21 Budget proposal:
Review of catering facilities at day services

Questions we want to ask you

Service user questionnaire

Introduction

As part of the Council’s budget proposals for 2020-21 we are consulting you about whether we will continue to provide a full hot meals service at the following services:-

- Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby
- Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton
- Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester.

The reason we want to carry out a consultation is that:-

- The number of people wanting meals has gone down a lot
- We want to look at how we can offer alternative options through the use of the snack bars.

The feedback from the consultation will help Northamptonshire Adult Social Services to decide whether to carry on providing hot meals at day services, which is part of Northamptonshire County Council’s 2020-21 budget proposals. This will be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 11 February 2020 and then a final decision will be made by Full Council on 20 February 2020.

How to have your say
This questionnaire should be completed by service users who attend one of the above day services. There is another questionnaire for family members and/or carers of a service user.

Please fill out this questionnaire and tell us what you think about the above proposal. If you prefer, you can fill out this questionnaire online at www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/CateringReview

Your feedback will be part of a report with many other people’s feedback, so you will not be personally identified.

You do not have to answer all of the questions. If you don’t want to answer a question, or don’t know the answer, then move on to the next question.

You can also give us your views by emailing or writing to us. Please see our contact details below.

Please contact us if you need any help in filling out this questionnaire.

Completed questionnaires can be returned at Riverside Resource Centre (Towcester), Patrick Road Resource Centre (Corby) or Gladstone Road Resource Centre (Northampton) or in the pre-paid envelope provided. You do not need to put a stamp on the envelope.

Before filling out this questionnaire please read all of the supporting information, including the equality impact assessment, which is available on our website www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/CateringReview

If you have any questions, comments or would like a copy of this questionnaire in another format (including easy read or large print), you can contact us by email, post or telephone. Our contact details are:

Email address: consult@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Postal address: Consultation, Equalities and Accessibility Team, Northamptonshire County Council, One Angel Square, Angel Street, Northampton NN1 1ED
Telephone: 07834677233

For more information including a copy of the 2020-21 Budget Cabinet paper or to take part and give us your view on the other proposals within the 2020-21 Budget consultation please see our website https://northamptonshire.citizenspace.com/bipm/draftbudget2021

The deadline for returning this questionnaire is 24 December 2019.

Thank you for helping us by filling in this questionnaire.
About you

Q. Are you:

There were 28 responses to this question, with respondents being able to select more than one option if applicable.

- A service user and have a hot meal at Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester
  - Number: 1
  - Percentage: 3.6%

- A service user and have a hot meal at Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby
  - Number: 5
  - Percentage: 17.9%

- A service user and have a hot meal at Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton
  - Number: 13
  - Percentage: 46.4%

- A family member and/or carer of someone who has a hot meal at Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester
  - Number: 2
  - Percentage: 7.1%

- A family member and/or carer of someone who has a hot meal at Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby
  - Number: 5
  - Percentage: 17.9%

- A family member and/or carer of someone who has a hot meal at Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton
  - Number: 2
  - Percentage: 7.1%

- Other
  - Number: 0
  - Percentage: 0.0%

If ‘Other’, please specify:
- I have a family member who has hot meals at BOTH [day service] and [day service].
Getting a hot meal

Q. Do you currently have another hot meal on the day(s) you attend the day service?

There were 28 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes, I have another hot meal as well as the one I buy at the day service

No, the only hot meal I have on the day(s) I attend the day service are those I buy at the centre

Not applicable – I do not have hot meals at the day service

Q. As mentioned earlier, Northamptonshire Adult Social Services is proposing to stop selling hot meals at the following day services:

- Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester
- Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby
- Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton

If this were to happen, please tell us where else you would be able to get a hot meal on the day(s) you attend the day service? For example, if you no longer had a hot meal when at the day service, you may have a hot meal at another time of day.

There were 26 responses to this question.
I would/my carer would cook me a hot meal

Someone (for example a carer) and/or an organisation other than Northamptonshire Adult Social Services would deliver a hot meal to me at home

I would visit someone else’s house and eat a hot meal with them

I would attend another day service that provides hot meals

I would not be able to have a hot meal on the day(s) I attend the day service

Other (please tell us below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If ‘Other’, please specify:

- At the moment my carer does not cook me meals. I only have a carer in the morning for [number] mins who makes me breakfast. Carer in the morning makes me a sandwich/roll and puts it in my fridge for meal time.
- The only time I can have a hot meal is [number] times a week.
- [Name] does have carers who would offer to cook [them] a hot meal but [name] said [they] wouldn't have one.
- A hot evening meal but would need a hot snack or meal at lunchtime as [medical condition].
- I could cook a hot meal for the person I care for but [they] has always been used to eating [their] hot meal in the middle of the day and would be too tired to eat it in the evening.
- I would have to cook a meal at night but a midday meal is much better than eating at night disabled, aren't very mobile and they tend to put on weight.
Impact

Q. As mentioned above, we are proposing to stop selling hot meals at the day service you currently attend. You can still have a choice about whether you buy food from the day service or bring in your own food. We will still offer a selection of hot and cold snacks to make sure you are able to get food if you choose not to bring something in with you, for example sandwiches, salads, hot rolls.

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is ‘No impact’ (it would make no difference) and 5 is ‘Significant impact’ (it would make a big difference), how much of an impact do you think the proposal will have?

There were 26 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Significant impact</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you think this will have an impact (it would make a big difference), please tell us what impact you feel this would be?

There were 19 responses to this question.

- I would not get a hot meal on the days I at the [day service].
- Our [child] is [medical condition] and really struggles with change, and would find this very difficult to cope with
- I would starve .... I cannot cook meals I would eat junk food and be unhealthy
- Even though I have the opportunity to have another meal when I get home, I look forward to my meal at the centre because it gives me to socialise on another level. I will miss not having a hot meal at [day service].
- It would be utterly devastating not to have a "Home Cooked" hot mid-day meal and pudding on the days that I attend the centre. I get fed up with the rubbish processed microwave meals that get served to me at home by my carers.
- I look forward to my meals at the [day service] as the cooking if first class. Snacks are not healthy meals will there be any vegetables?
- It would make a massive difference to me as I have stated I only have [number] hot meals a week witch I have at [day service].
- [Name] said [they] enjoys have a full cooked lunch and items which are at the snack bar are not sufficient to [them].
- I have [medical condition] so have my food put into [dietary requirement] which I cant do myself as I have [medical condition].
- [Name] enjoys [their] hot lunches and enjoys the social side of eating a meal with [their] friends. A hot meal helps to keep vulnerable adults warm during the day.
- My [spouse] would have to cook me a meal and [they] appreciate not having to cook for me when I have been to day centre. [They] also has a disability.
- For the [number] days that I come to day centre I eat in the afternoon which is the best recommended by the doctors due to my [medical condition] so that food can digest before my bed time. It makes me [redacted medical condition]. Which I wont have proper meals on those [number] days and I take medication. Thank you hope the kitchen will stay running.
- My [parent] relies on hot meals [they] receives at [day service]. [Their] care plan takes into account that [they] will have hot meals on these days and [they] does not receive a carer to make [them] a snack on these days like on other days. [Days of the week] are days where [they] gets a decent hot meal and can choose what [they] wants to eat.
- The service user is used to the routine of having a hot cooked meal at the day centre and [they] does not take a change to [their] routine well.
- Our [child] is severely disabled and needs [dietary requirement] and a hot lunchtime meal.
- People in supported living HAVE to HAVE a hot meal in their day services provision .... supported living do not make hot meals they just make a tea like dinner for them .. eg pizza or beans in toast ... this is not a hot cooked meal... service users as usual will be the ones to suffer .... Do not Stop this service ... it will give you more costs elsewhere you will have to employ cooks in supported living houses that are capable of making hot meals.
- The person I care for has to have all [their] food [dietary requirement] so [they] would be unable to eat anything bought from the snack bar. Great care has to be taken in getting it to the [dietary requirement]. The kitchen staff at the [day service] have always been excellent at providing [them] with a hot meal [they] can eat. I cannot praise them enough.
- DISABLED PEOPLE ARE EASY TARGETS. I am [name] main carer and I'm nearly [age]. It makes a great difference to me only having to do sandwiches or cheese on toast rather than having to pack a lunch ([they] is very fussy what sandwiches [they] eats) and then having to cook at night.
What you are proposing is yet another cut in services in order to save money. One of the reasons in moving Daycentres to [day service] is that it had a canteen and the other one did not.

Q. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is ‘Not important’ and 5 is ‘Very important’, how important is it that the food for sale at the day centre are healthy balanced options?

There were 27 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If Northamptonshire Adult Social Services were to stop selling hot meals at these three day services, what do you think needs to happen to make sure you are not affected much by this?

There were 19 responses to this question.

• They need to provide us with hot food
• There needs to be a good choice of hot snacks available
• Keep things the same that’s what I would like.
• You will have to provide someone to make me a nice cooked dinner everyday
• My personal budget would need to increase so that I could have a tea-call to cook a hot meal on the days I go to the day centre
  My personal budget has not increased for [number] years and my care provider WILL NOT decrease their charges because they are running at loss on the allowance that the NCC expects them to provide a good service
• I will require a tea-time carer to cook me a meal.
I think it should still provide hot meals with a slight increase to customers on payment for dinners.

More range of hot food at the snack bar.

I think the hot meals should still be offered to us all. As we pay enough to use the centre and some people would find it difficult without hot meals.

I would have to have Ready Made Meals or take aways.

That a healthy substantial lunch is on offer or maybe healthy snacks throughout the day.

A decent hot meal needs to be provided as this is for some the only hot meal they get.

Explain to [them] the reasons for the change in good time to allow [them] to get [their] head around it, this should be done at least a month before the change is effected. In addition [their] opinion on the options of snacks to be provided as substitutes should be taken in consideration when deciding what snacks will eventually be provided.

We will have no other choice but to provide a [dietary requirement], which may not always keep warm enough, as a snack bar would not provide a suitable alternative for [their] needs, but our [child] has this option as well as an evening meal at home. We understand from talking to other people at the centre that a lot of people rely on this one hot meal a day and believe it would be a poor cost cutting measure.

I will have to cook a hot meal in the evening

What are you going to replace it with .... who is going to supply a nice hot cooked dinner for these service users not capable of cooking themselves a nice meal .... someone has to be accountable for doing and ensuring this happens.

Carers need to extend their hours to ensure sufficient time for them to cook a healthy balanced meal. Often the carers do not have time to cook, or are not able to cook the necessary meals.

I cannot see there is anything that can happen that can prevent [them] being greatly affected. Unfortunately [they] has developed a mind set that [they] will not eat [dietary requirement] at home. [They] only has [dietary requirement] in the evenings and weekends. We have to watch [their] weight very carefully as [they] easily becomes underweight.

I visited [day service] when we went to see [venue] as s possible venue for respite it was very well used and we were told several people attending there lived alone that was their main meal and they were able to prepare some light meal at night. They probably would need a carer to visit them to help.

**Different suggestions**

**Q. We have explained why we are considering no longer selling hot meals at our day services. Do you have any different suggestion you would like us to consider?**

There were 27 responses to this question.
**Q. If you have answered ‘Yes’, please tell us your different suggestion below:**

There were 11 responses to this question.

- Scrap the 4% wage increase for NCC staff then you can continue with the current arrangements there by protecting valued staff members jobs. People attended in day centre have now had to pay for there physio at [day service] because funding has been with drawn from this valued service how much more will they be loosing how little does there council think of there duty of care to these vulnerable people.

- Do not supply snacks ... this is junk food not healthy do dinners or nothing I would say that you should utterly hang your heads in shame NASS for even considering such a terrible action, considering that the incorporating of [redacted] and [redacted] are now in the centre, and they all look forward to a mid-day meal as well. In fact the kitchen at our centre is so busy that all staff have been barred from ordering any food or meals from the kitchen According to your figures this centre is loosing £33,000+ a year, but we have not been asked to contribute more for our meals for ages, this is a management decision and not ours as customers In my opinion if you really want to gain money then you should look at the mothballed buildings around the county under your control and liquefy property assets to save our services

- Just an increase in prices.
- Keep selling hot meals.
- Yes to sell some type of food thats warm if needed at the day services.
- Have you considered having an external mobile vendor provide the service?
• Why don’t you bring in an outside caterer, that brings in hot meals on the basis of what is sold, similar to the catering vans that provide to local companies, but are in house paid for what they sell and understand the constraints some users require.
• Get the Government to finance NCC properly then all the problems about finances will go away.
• STOP cost cutting in important areas that will affect the poorest people who are incapable of cooking themselves a hot well balanced nutritional meal. Demand is high ... as a council you are just stopping it because it is going to save you money.
• Is it possible to supply a microwave for the customers to heat up food they bring into the day centre. This would enable them to have a hot meal of their choosing.
• The only alternative is that [they] would have to be [dietary requirement] we had hoped to avoid this whilst [they] is still able to [medical condition].

Any other comments

Q. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about Northamptonshire Adult Social Services proposing to stop selling hot meals at day services?
There were 19 responses to this question.

• I would be Very Upset if they Stop Selling Hot Meals.
• Need to please providing us with hot meals, yet again you cutting back on people who need this service. But you never cut back on executive managers salaries
• Comments on previous page
• This is going to effect me greatly I can not make hot dinners for myself I would starve and be hungry all the time and unhappy
• I am fortunate that I have someone at home who can cook me a hot meal. I worry about other service users where the hot meal available is the only hot meals they have access too.
• My personal budget would need to increase so that I could have a tea-call to cook a hot meal on the days I go to the day centre
My personal budget has not increased for [number] years and my care provider WILL NOT decrease their charges because they are running at loss on the allowance that the NCC expects them to provide a good service
• As I am of advancing years I look forward to my meals at the [day service] as the cooking if first class.
• I think it is disgusting it will make a big difference to my health as I suffer from [medical condition] at least at the moment I can have [number] meals a week.
• N/A
• If you stop selling hot meals at day centres people will go where meals are provided for them.
• Myself and others rely on this service and no we will get a good home made meal the days we attend.
• I would only eat sandwiches for 7 days.
If cuts need to be made due to a lack of finances, then taking a vital service away from vulnerable people, for which able bodied people take for granted is not the best place to cut the money from. An able bodied person, probably like the people considering and proposing these changes will never understand what it is like to not have the ability to have a hot meal every day. Please stop taking vital services away from people who are not in a position to defend themselves due to being vulnerable.

- No
- Don't cut costs on the vulnerable in society
- All we have to say on the subject is "let your conscience be your guide"
- This is an important service for service users and it should not be stopped.
- I am sure they will not be the only person to be affected considerably if this proposal goes ahead. I hope you can understand how greatly this will affect us all. For more details: tel [redacted]
- I have been told it's just a consultation, we were told that last year when you closed Eleanor Lodge which I had booked thinking I could enjoy a holiday in [month]. It was [date] I was told they could go to Eleanor they hadn't closed my holiday was [date].

Demographic information

We are asking the next questions because we want to make sure that we have asked lots of different people for their views.

Please tick the boxes that are right for you. We will keep this information private and will look after it according to the law.

You do not have to answer these questions if you do not want to.

Q. Are you:

There were 26 responses to this question.
Q. Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?

There were 25 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. How old are you?

There were 26 responses to this question.
Q. Do you have a disability?

There were 25 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. If you do have a disability please tick the box or boxes to say what type it is:

There were 20 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Impairment</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. What is your religion or belief?

There were 26 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other religion (please specify)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:

- No ‘Other’ comments were received.
Q. What is your ethnic origin?

There were 26 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White – British</td>
<td>22 84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White – Irish</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Other White Background</td>
<td>1 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Indian</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Pakistani</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Chinese</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British – Other Asian Background</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background – Other mixed / multiple background</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Caribbean</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – African</td>
<td>1 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British – Other Black Background</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – Arab</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group (please state)</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2 7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- No ‘Other’ comments were received.
Q. If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

There were 23 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Man</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Woman / Lesbian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. Is your sex (called your gender identity) the same as the gender you were given when you were born?

There were 23 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. Are you:

There were 25 responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-habiting/Living together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow / Widower</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Written submissions

- I am a [age] year old widow living in [location], with absolutely no means of transport to the most basic of amenities, having lost the County Connect bus service in September 2018, which replaced the public bus service which was lost some years before. This village has many people in similar circumstances, many of whom need regular doctor/hospital appointments, have no internet, no shops, or post office, so are effectively isolated, so have to rely on Volunteer Action, who are struggling to find volunteer drivers. Taxis are almost impossible to obtain, even if they were affordable. We contacted our [local] MP last year, who approached the Northants Council, but to no avail. We appreciate the financial problems of NCC, also the difficulties in Children’s social care, but we are a forgotten generation, presumably because we have lived too long and have outlived our usefulness. When I was a child in the 50s, I lived in a village in [location] similar in size to [location], and we had buses every hour every day, a shop, access to doctors, and the elderly were cared for. None of us have any expectation of being listened to, or of the transport problem being resolved but I know I speak for most of this village – if this is ‘progress’, then bring back the old days!

North Northants District & Borough Councils’ Response to: Northamptonshire County Council’s – Draft Budget Proposals 2020/21. An identical response was also sent by South Northamptonshire Council.

- Key Messages

  i. The Councils welcome the opportunity to comment on Northamptonshire County Council’s (NCC) draft budget proposals for 2020/21 and medium term projections.

  ii. The Councils recognise the significant financial challenge facing the County Council now and in the medium term and the pressures associated with demographic changes / social care / health continue to be well documented at a national level.

  iii. The Councils note and welcome the improved financial position and more robust approach to financial projections in financial monitoring reports over the last 18 months and the efforts and impacts made by NCC’s leadership are recognised.

B. Other Comments

The Councils have made the following general comments;

2019/20

i. The Councils recognise the financial challenges that NCC have had during the current financial year in meeting its budget figures and savings targets and the
improvement in financial performance compared to previous years. NCC still has a challenge to deliver a balanced budget position during 2019/20 and this is an area we remain cautious about especially considering the extent of the pressure in children’s services and the increased demand on the county’s services during the winter period. This must be considered as a key area of focus for the remainder of the financial year.

2020/21
ii. The Councils recognise the significant improvements and welcomes what appears to be a much more robust budget with a net £30m growth in funding and services that addresses unachievable savings of around £23m from previous years and includes growth in nearly all directorates. The Councils also welcome the additional contingency of £2m taking the total contingency to £4.1m and the contribution of £4.9m to reserves. This is a significant improvement compared to recent years where deliverability of the budget has been questionable at the time of being set.

iii. In order to better understand the budget assumptions it would be helpful to see a schedule on the status of the savings to understand whether the savings have
- been delivered ahead of 2020/21 or are to be delivered during 2020/21
this will put into context where there are risks to the deliverability of the savings and the mitigations that could be put in place to rectify this or alternative proposals if necessary. This would help to further gauge the robustness of the draft budget and would act as a good template to monitor and scrutinise as necessary, the use of a RAG rating would significantly assist in this process.

Medium Term (2021/22 – 2023/24)
iv. Whilst we recognise that a budget will contain a number of assumptions – it is the robustness of these assumptions both in terms of pressures and savings that is fundamental. Whilst the budget assumptions around pressures are a matter for the professional officers the scale of the pressures from 2021/22 onwards are less than previous years and raises the question as to whether they are fully reflective of the demand and forecast change in demographics that is more than likely to occur.

v. It is anticipated that these pressures could increase significantly this time next year when reviewed in more detail and items such as MRP phasing could also increase the budget gap. It’s vital that the MTFP reflects the actual levels of savings to ensure decision making is based on the most accurate forecasts, enabling fully informed decisions to be made, particularly around Council Tax harmonisation. Clearly the national reviews around the Fair Funding Review and the Business Rates Retention Scheme increase uncertainty over the medium term.

Reserves and Balances

vi. A key part of the financial resilience of NCC going forward will be the level of reserves that it has – and we recognise the £20m revenue reserve carried forward and the £4.9m projected transfer to reserves set within the 2020/21 budget.
The level of NCC’s reserves (and appropriateness of) should continue to be reviewed in the light of the above comments regarding assumptions and robustness of estimates and the level of reserves at 31st March 20 will be influenced by the 2019/20 outturn position - it is however pleasing to see a projected contribution of £4.9m being made to reserves in 2020/21.

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has reviewed the public consultation that the County Council are currently running in relation to its draft budget proposals as we cover residents who are served by the GP practices in Oundle and Wansford.

Following discussion of the potential impacts at our Strategy & Planning Committee, a subcommittee of the Governing Body, the CCG has decided that it is important that the CCG responds formally to the consultation. We have assessed the relative impacts of the proposals as set out in the appendix below. The CCG would like to express our concern not only about the scale of the proposed changes, but is also about the groups that will be affected.

The CCG is acutely aware of the financial pressures faced by the County Council and we know that you understand the significant financial difficulties facing the local health system currently.

The CCG is concerned that there is adequate scrutiny of savings that are made in both the local authority and the NHS, as well as a true understanding of the impact of changes on our residents and on our respective statutory authorities. As both local authorities and the health system are struggling to maintain service levels, we believe that it is essential that we work together closely to minimise the impacts of changes on our most vulnerable residents.

The CCG has also been reviewing the budget savings of our neighbouring local authorities, where we provide services for our residents and the cumulative savings are considerable. We believe that these will certainly impact the numbers of patients needing to access health services due to the reduced support in their local communities. The savings that we are particularly concerned about (these are red rag rated) rise to over £13 million across the four local authorities that we cover. This makes it even more important that we work together to support the most vulnerable in our society.
Appendix 1 CCG Analysis of Northamptonshire County Council proposed savings

Children First Northamptonshire Savings - Note this includes safeguarding, early help support, placements, risk assessment and intervention services. It is unclear what the impact will be on services for children. As childhood is a critical time for development and these services are used more frequently by the more deprived the CCG recommends that savings are made without decreasing the quality or capacity of these services.

Improved Funded nursing care income from CCGs to NCC for nursing beds and care that is currently funded from social care budget. As a CCG we currently have high referrals per head of population for CHC care. We are also over spending on CHC compared to comparator CCGs. This move to shift costs on to the health sector is unlikely to benefit patients.

Continuing health care- continuation of 2019-20 maintenance challenge on health funding liabilities. As a CCG we currently have high referrals per head of population for CHC care. We are also over spending on CHC compared to comparator CCGs. This move to shift costs on to the health sector is unlikely to benefit patients.

Adult Social Care Transformation adults pathway and processes revised. Details unclear so unable to make a Recommendation.

New falls service aims to reduce admissions and longer term care. Details unclear. In general we would be supportive of falls prevention services.

Improved adult social care contract management. Unclear how the savings are derived so unable to make a recommendation.
Improved pricing, outcomes and step down for learning disability provider framework. Unclear how the savings are derived so unable to make a recommendation.

Extension of successful single handed project. Unclear how the savings are derived so unable to make a recommendation.

Savings in Learning Disability residential care through collaborative provision with Northampton Borough Council. Unclear how the savings are derived so unable to make a recommendation.

Disabled children’s review. No recommendation

Reduced funding for Moray Lodge development (for supported living for people with acquired brain injury and mental health support needs). We are currently reviewing our provision for this group of patients and would welcome a collaborative approach for our Northamptonshire patients

Review catering provision at day services. We note the high levels of malnutrition in patients admitted to hospital are high (27-35%) https://www.bapen.org.uk/pdfs/nsw/bapen-nsweng.pdf And recommend that any changes to day centre food enhance rather than decrease the nutritional status of clients

Disabled children’s domiciliary care. No recommendation

Income for adult social care: The details of the fair contributions are not clear. So there is no specific CCG recommendation

Review of Evelyn Wright Care home viability. No CCG recommendation

Reduction in long term care placements from hospital through increased reablement and return to independence. There is some evidence for medium term (6-12 months) benefit of reablement- see for example https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30700255 The CCG supports this proposal

Recovery of backlog of unspent sums on personal budgets or direct payment. No CCG recommendation

Increased use of assistive technology (canary systems) to assess requests for increased care. No CCG recommendation

NCC care home ownership. No CCG recommendation

Closure of day centre – clients to go to new services. Centre closed July 2019. Assuming that the services are provided in a non-day centre setting no recommendation
Staff turnover and vacancy management. No recommendation

Review mental health packages. No recommendations

Stop care block contracts. No recommendations

Eleanor Lodge converted to supported living for vulnerable adults. No recommendations

Review of packages through Shaw PPP. No recommendations

Private development Saxon Court, which offers additional supported living accommodation for complex young adults. No recommendations