

**WARDS AFFECTED: ALL**

**CABINET**

**14th FEBRUARY 2011**

**REVENUE BUDGET 2011/12 TO 2013/14 – GENERAL RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION**

**Report of the Director for Safer and Stronger Communities**

### **1. ISSUE**

Wide ranging consultation has been undertaken to develop the Cabinet's revenue budget proposals for the next three years. This report summarises the process and feedback received.

### **2. NEED FOR A DECISION**

There are statutory and Constitutional requirements around the adoption of the Council's Revenue Budget. Cabinet has made the decision to consult widely and this report gives both the statutory responses and the wider responses from members of the public and Council staff.

It is a Constitutional requirement that Cabinet consult for a period of not less than four weeks on its proposals to Council for the adoption of its Revenue Budget and that the outcome of this consultation be put to Members prior to the Budget Council meeting, which is to be held this year on Monday 28th February 2011.

It is also a statutory requirement that consultation is undertaken with non-domestic ratepayers about proposals for expenditure in the next financial year. The regulations require the consultation to have taken place by the 25<sup>th</sup> February each year. To this end, a Business Breakfast was held on 21<sup>st</sup> January attended by 60 businesses and business organisations.

Cabinet now needs to make its formal budget proposals for consideration by Council on 28<sup>th</sup> February.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

That in formulating its final budget proposals Cabinet takes account of the feedback from statutory consultees and the public, stakeholders and staff; in particular,

Feedback from businesses and Trade Unions – see Appendix A

The wider responses from residents, stakeholders and staff – see Appendix B

## 4. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 4.1 Cabinet members made an explicit commitment to consult widely and engage with residents as part of the deliberations about the Council's future spending priorities

Accordingly, an extensive consultation exercise was undertaken in Autumn 2010. More than 3,000 people took part and over 11,000 separate comments and suggestions were made.

Feedback from this process helped to inform the preparation of the draft budget and, in particular, Cabinet structured its proposals along the main themes identified by the consultation:

- Better ways of working and flattening the Management structure
- Reducing non essential expenditure
- Commissioning or involving others in service delivery
- Optimising income generation
- Value for money and procurement

The proposals were published on 17<sup>th</sup> January and Cabinet undertook a second round of consultation over the four weeks to 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

### 4.2 In order to meet the statutory requirement, two meetings were held:

- A Business Breakfast on 21<sup>st</sup> January, was attended by 60 separate businesses and business organisations. The Leader of the Council and the Head of Finance presented the proposals and answered questions from those present.
- The Council's Senior Management Team met with the following Trade Unions: ATL, NUT, UNISON, NASUWT, ASPECT, GMB, CYWIS and UNITE on 25<sup>th</sup> January

The notes of these meetings are attached to this report as Appendix A

### 4.3 The wider engagement took several forms:

Cabinet held a series of meetings to present their proposals and encourage discussion and comments.

- Public meetings were held on 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> January and were attended by 44 members of the public
- Staff meetings were held on 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> January and were attended by 136 Council employees
- Meetings were held with voluntary and community groups and with the Equality Forum

In addition, more than 170 people wrote directly to the Leader or to the [budget@calderdale.gov.uk](mailto:budget@calderdale.gov.uk) email address.

The Council's Community Consultations portal 'Engage' was also used to advertise the consultation and the [budget@calderdale.govuk](mailto:budget@calderdale.govuk) email address for any comments or questions people had in respect of the proposed budget.

- 4.4** Press and media: the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council briefed the Halifax Evening Courier directly on 17<sup>th</sup> January, at the start of the budget consultation process.

A press release was issued to all local and regional media on January 18th, the day after Cabinet produced its Draft Budget, outlining the consultation process and how people could make their views known.

A further four press releases have since been issued, all of which can be viewed on the Council's website [www.calderdale.gov.uk](http://www.calderdale.gov.uk) .

## **5. COMMENTS RECEIVED**

- 5.1** Appendix A summarises the feedback from businesses, the meeting between the Trade Unions and Senior Management Team and individual responses from UNISON, UNITE and ASPECT.
- 5.2** In addition to this, a total of 500 suggestions, questions and comments have been received to date. A summary of these is attached as Appendix B. As the consultation process is formally open until Monday 14th February any further comments will be reported at the meeting.

Copies of all the comments have been placed in Party Group Rooms and can be viewed on the Council's website [www.calderdale.gov.uk](http://www.calderdale.gov.uk)

A number of key themes appear to be emerging:

- People are reiterating how important it is for the Council to reduce its management costs and to protect front-line service delivery. Some of the comments received recognise the work being done to flatten the Management structure and the fact that the majority of the budget proposals reflect a desire to find better ways of working. In particular, the cross-Council savings are aimed at streamlining the organisation and improving efficiency.
- In terms of specific services, a number of comments have focussed on the importance of libraries and local voluntary organisations to community life.
- A number of respondents have commented on the potential impact of specific cuts on vulnerable people. This valuable first hand evidence for how people use services and the impact they have will help to inform how the savings are implemented. From the outset, Cabinet have made explicit their aim to protect vulnerable people and all the proposals have been the subject of equality impact assessments. The Council's robust approach has been commended by JUST West Yorkshire (a regional body representing the interests of minority communities and voluntary organisations).
- Staff are asking Cabinet to continue to examine the opportunities for saving money by taking advantage of the potential flexibility of the workforce in terms of across the board reductions in hours or pay. Some changes in terms and conditions have already been agreed, and there will be an opportunity to examine others in the future.

- Voluntary and community organisations have positively recognised the way in which the Council has continued to provide support for their work despite the financial challenges it faces.

Robin Tuddenham  
Director for Safer and Stronger Communities

---

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THIS REPORT CONTACT:**

Andrew Pitts Telephone: 01422 393264

Email: [andrew.pitts@calderdale.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.pitts@calderdale.gov.uk)

**DOCUMENTS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE REPORT:**

Responses to budget consultation

**DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR INSPECTION AT:**

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Northgate House or online at [www.calderdale.gov.uk](http://www.calderdale.gov.uk)

**1. Summary of points raised at the Business Breakfast held on 21<sup>st</sup> January**

- More needs to be done to support local business, particularly with the expected reduction in service from Business Link. Suggestions included networking opportunities; encouraging innovation and local procurement
  - Manufacturing is still important to the borough and needs more support
  - Re rates: low and stable business rates are essential for a thriving local economy
- 

**2. Summary of points raised at the meeting of Senior Management Team and the Trade Unions on 25<sup>th</sup> January**

- The main concern raised was about potential redundancies but the meeting agreed that it was a positive that the number of jobs at risk was comparatively low compared to other Councils. However, the meeting was clear that for any individuals at risk this would be a very difficult time and everyone would need to play their part in providing support where possible.
- 

**3. Response from UNISON**

**Budget Consultation response**

UNISON is concerned that the opportunity to consult directly with Group Directors was not offered to trade unions this year, with the exception of Adult Health and Social Care (who made their own arrangements) our comments are therefore based on the evidence available.

In line with other Trade Unions, UNISON would like to see compulsory redundancy as a last resort and would urge the council to look at voluntary redundancy under the existing policy.

We believe that all council employees should be offered the chance to take voluntary redundancy to give a maximum spread of available redeployment opportunities.

**Cross Council**

**Corporate Admin Review**

UNISON is concerned that savings have been identified without identifying the individual posts which will be deleted, it is clear that this will have an effect on jobs.

This is true for the process re-engineering and shared services option.

**Adult's Health and Social Care**

**Reablement Service**

UNISON is not surprised that this service is under threat, as we warned that we had concerns over the modernisation process. We understand that there are posts in the Home Care Service occupied by temporary and agency staff, we would strongly recommend that these posts are terminated to release posts for possible redeployment.

We also understand that some of the private contracts are not performing as well as they should, we believe that the council should be looking to terminate contracts and return the work in-house, this would create further opportunities for redeployment.

#### Refocus of the Out of Hours Service

We are concerned over this proposal, most (if not all) of the users of this service have a critical need; our concerns are that reduction of this service will result in a greater need in residential care, something that the council is seeking to avoid.

#### Review In-House Day Support Service

UNISON is concerned that the reduction in staff will have a detrimental effect on the service, although we support the rationalisation of buildings.

#### Ceasing provision on NVQ training

Whilst we understand that the service no longer required the NVQ function we note that there is a new qualification route, we believe that a study is undertaken for the feasibility for the service to provide in-house the Health and Social Care Diploma.

### **Economy and Environment**

#### Review of Environmental Health

UNISON is opposed to this budget cut. The service operates at barely above the statutory levels and many aspects of the service are seen as poor by the general public (ie dog wardens, out of hours EHO service) reducing staffing levels further will be a concern for our members who already have excessive workloads

#### Streamline housing strategy and access service

UNISON is concerned that this proposals will have a detrimental effect on staff at what could be their busiest time, no study has been undertaken to ascertain if there will be an increase in the number of homeless applications and it is essential that excessive caseloads and not placed on the remaining staff.

#### Transfer of schools crossing patrols

UNISON is opposed to this option, we do not believe that it has been fairly represented, it is proposed for no redundancies when the implementation seeks to replace crossing patrols with existing schools staff and volunteers. Clearly we believe there is a possibility of over 60 redundancies in this model.

UNISON is appalled that a directorate seeks to make savings by simply passing the buck onto another service area, with little or no consideration for the knock on effect for schools budgets.

### Workwise and ISCAL service review

UNISON is opposed to the outsourcing of work to an outside body; given that the projected savings are small this amount could be recovered from other service areas.

### Building Design and Maintenance review

UNISON fully supports the submission of the BDM teams to the budget consultation, we believe that insufficient evidence has been provided to accurately prove the proposed cuts.

## **Safer and Stronger**

### Rationalise events organisation in the Piece Hall

UNISON is concerned that further budget reductions are taking place in the Piece Hall, already staff have raised the issue that the staffing levels have decreased in recent years leading to a reduced capacity to provide events.

CMBC have come under some criticism over the handling of the Piece Hall in recent months and should review carefully the effect this budget cut will have on this historic building in Halifax.

### Neighbourhood and Community Engagement service redesign

UNISON believes this cut is a 'done deal' given that Cabinet have already given approval to consult on the changes. The cost saving does not give enough information; therefore UNISON is opposed to this budget cut.

### Library Service Review

UNISON is opposed to the decimation of the library service as proposed by this budget cut.

## **Children and Young Peoples Service**

### Growth bids

UNISON is supportive of the growth bids in children's social care and the independent reviewing section and support the Cabinets stance of making these area's a priority.

---

## **4. Response from ASPECT**

### **Calderdale Budget Consultation 2011 -12**

I fully appreciated the very difficult position that elected members of the council find themselves in. Without entering the debate on the reasons for financial difficulties the country finds itself in and the scale of the cuts being made by central government the reality is elected members have been faced with an impossible position. The need to maintain services balanced against the need to make millions of pounds of savings. Whilst as a trade union we are opposed to any job losses I have to be honest and when I found the draft budget indicated the need to lose 209 jobs over 3 years with 149 in the first year I felt

relieved. I felt things would have been a lot worse. The council has done well to keep the potential job losses to such a small number. However this relatively small number masks a difficulty for me personally. Most of my members work for Learning Services and this area of the council will take a disproportionate number of the losses. Twenty nine posts from a workforce of just over sixty staff. However again I have tried to keep a measured view on the situation and realise that the cuts to some grants, such as the Standards Fund, make it even more difficult for the council. It may be possible to find some extra efficiency savings across the council and take some of the pressure off areas like Learning Service but I feel the reality will be there will be job losses on the scale proposed under the draft budget.

However I have two areas of difficulty with what has happened so far. To say the council has managed the budgets well and is making a relatively small number of potential job losses why has the approach to working with the Unions and creating good industrial relations been such a disaster? We have a situation where staff have taken a vote of no confidence in three of the officers of the council, procedures linked to budget cuts and the potential job losses are totally ignored by the council, Unions are looking into what actions they can take including the use of industrial tribunals and we have no agreement to the structure to how we intend to achieve these cuts. I speak regularly with regional reps from many of the Unions. They all tell me other local councils with much greater potential job losses than Calderdale are handling the process by working with Unions, with employees and by seeking wherever possible to find staff who are in position to consider voluntary redundancy. In Calderdale we do not even have an agreed structure to the events that are about to unfold. I go to meetings where I do not know what I am meant to be consulting on. Am I consulting on the budget, am I consulting on redundancies or am I consulting on the re-structure of Learning Service? Dependant on which meeting it is I get a different answer. Do we have a simple and clear structure so that I and your employees can see when and how each stage will happen? Have we mapped out when and where appropriate meeting will take place to give us the meaningful consultation we are entitled to? If we have can someone give me a copy?

The second area of concern to me and my Union links back to my earlier comments on the removal of grants such as the Standards Fund. Many of my members are employed in posts whose funding are reliant on the Standards Fund. It has been known for well over a year that this grant will end on March 31<sup>st</sup> 2011. Staff have sat waiting for over a year knowing the funding was about to end therefore knowing their jobs would go and the council has done nothing to support them. This is not the case in many other councils. It is not the case in other areas of Calderdale Council that have seen the end of specific grants. Why are my members being treated differently?

To sum up my views the council has done the first part of its task well, it has worked hard to create a viable budget whilst keeping potential job losses as low as possible. However it has done the second part of the task poorly. I do not believe that is the intention of elected members but that is the view of much of your workforce. If things do not change I believe we are heading for conflict. We need an agreed clear structure to future consultation and discussion. By an agreed structure this does not mean one imposed by a few officers of the council. The offer of voluntary redundancy needs to be put on the table at the earliest opportunity. We need serious discussions as to how we can then encourage the right balance of staff to look at the offer. We need to work together to find a way through these difficult times.

---

## **5. Response from Calderdale NUT**

In responding to the proposed budget cuts the NUT would wish to preface our response by stating that as a Union we are totally opposed to any cuts in jobs and services. However, we recognise that the Council is faced with a drastic reduction in its funding from central government and that it does have to make budget reductions.

Whilst recognising this, the NUT is, nevertheless, extremely concerned about the process being followed in the consultation on the Draft Budget as proposed by Cabinet. As a Union our role is to represent members in education and as such the majority of our response is directed at the proposed budget cuts in CYPS.

We have repeatedly been told that consultation on the budget and consultation on proposed redundancies are two separate processes, yet they are clearly inextricably linked. Although figures of reductions in particular services have been identified and groups of staff have been told that X posts out of a complement of Y are at risk of redundancy and, indeed, individuals have been told that their post is at risk of redundancy we have simultaneously been told by the Group Director of CYPS:

*“will not be in a position to put forward any proposed new structures until after Budget Council decisions on the 28<sup>th</sup>.”*

*(email on 3/2/11 from Janet Donaldson to Calderdale NUT)*

It is extremely difficult to comment on the proposed budget in CYPS, when the Director of CYPS is making proposals on cuts based on a proposed structure that has not been shared.

An examination of the CYPS Budget Workforce Equality Impact Assessment shows that the document is also based on specific proposals which are not part of the actual budget consultation process. For example looking at the “protected characteristic” of age, staff in each group up to age 34 are positively affected by approx 5% whereas those aged 35 to 64 are negatively affected. To be able to reach these conclusions of potential age discrimination the author has clearly identified groups and individual members of staff whose posts are in danger of redundancy. However, despite this, one can conclude that the budget cuts are potentially age discriminatory!

A stated objective of the Cabinet in making these proposals is to protect front-line services, an aim that the Union would fully support – yet there is no definition of front-line services - many of the cuts proposed could easily be seen as front-line services or as having an impact on the ability of front-line services to support, for instance, children and young people. A good example of this is the proposed cuts in the Education Welfare Service and the Education Psychology Service where the cut identified will have an impact on the ability of the Council to deliver high-quality front-line services.

It is the NUT’s view that in the School Improvement Service and also elsewhere in CYPS, decisions have been made about budget cuts based on an insufficient knowledge of the services provided by these employees. This is certainly the case in that there has been some misunderstanding about the role of officers whose job title is “consultant”, the “consultants” employed in CYPS are officers employed directly by the Authority not bought in to do a specific task.

The other area where there is a clear misunderstanding of the role of a group of employees is where proposals are made to cut the Children’s Centre Teacher posts (QTS) as it is stated that their role could now legally be carried out by staff with Early Years Professional Status (EYPS). In practical terms this is an impossibility due to the number of EYPS staff in post, it

also makes an assumption about the desirability of such a transfer of roles which isn't necessarily supported in the field of Early Years education.

Throughout the budget documents reference is made to potential savings which could be made as part of the Council's budget setting process under the guise of 'Better Ways of Working'. There are undoubtedly ways in which some parts of the Council could operate more efficiently. Where the term 'Better Ways of Working' is a euphemism for privatisation or outsourcing the Union is completely opposed to this approach. We would strongly oppose any reduction in Council services in favour of the private sector as we believe wholeheartedly that all such services should remain in the public sector so as to ensure public accountability and democratic control.

In the budget proposals reference is made to 'Flattening the Structure'. As far as we can see there is no evidence that the current proposals for CYPS make any moves towards flattening the structure, without being given the opportunity to compare the existing structure with that proposed it is a little difficult to confirm that view. The proposals certainly seem to suggest a significant number of job cuts lower down the structure without a commensurate, or even greater, reduction in the tiers and layers of management.

In the words of both Councillors and Officers "CYPS are taking the biggest hit" in the proposed budget cuts. Although as it is a large Directorate we would expect a significant part of the proposed budget reductions would fall on CYPS, it does seem that a disproportionately large cut has been offered up by the Directorate. It is the view of the NUT and our members that this is due to a lack of knowledge of the work of employees in CYPS and a failure to 'champion' the cause of the Directorate by senior officers.

Our members do not believe that the process has been properly handled to date and whilst accepting that there will have to be cuts we would urge councillors to ensure that all appropriate steps are taken to avoid compulsory redundancies arising from these cuts. To this end it needs to be an open and transparent process with clear offers of voluntary early retirement and voluntary redundancy made to the widest possible number of employees prior to any compulsory redundancies.

The Union would welcome written confirmation from the Council it will offer voluntary redundancy prior to any decisions being made about compulsory redundancies.

It does need to be emphasised that the Council was aware of funding cuts to some posts (e.g. those posts which support the National Strategies) many months ago and it is unfair and unethical that colleagues in these posts have been kept hanging on for the apparent purpose of the Council making further savings through a reduced redundancy package. These posts could have been removed from the structure prior to the budget-making exercise and ironically, if voluntary redundancy had been offered under the current scheme at an earlier date, the Council would have made a significant saving on salaries as employees would have left the employment of the Council at an earlier date. Even redundancy on the up-to-104 week scheme would have led to a saving to the Council in the short-term and would have been advantageous to staff as they would have been able to enter the job-market at a significantly earlier date.

### In conclusion

It is an impossible task to comment on a budget in CYPS that seeks to identify 52 posts at risk of redundancy, 29 of those in Learning Services:

1. when a number of people have requested voluntary early retirement and to date we do not know how many in CYPS have been made an offer of VER;
2. no structure has been shared with the NUT on the reshaping / redesign of Learning Services;
3. the budget documents states "the Council has indicated a desire to reduce the number of posts at higher salary levels..... The posts highlighted fall within this criteria" how can this be the case when we - and all other unions - have been informed that CYPS "*will not be in a position to put forward any proposed new structures until after Budget Council decisions on the 28<sup>th</sup>.*"

*(email on 3/2/11 from Janet Donaldson to Calderdale NUT)*

How can any posts be identified for redundancy without a structure?

**Calderdale NUT**

8/2/11

### **Summary of key points by Directorate and service area**

Overall, there were around 500 individual comments received. Not all services were mentioned, and some services were mentioned just once or twice.

The summary below gives an idea of what was said about each service, but not how many people said it. Eg one person gave some suggestions about ICT improvements, more than 20 people expressed support for libraries.

Of the 500 comments, approximately 70% were from members of staff and 30% from residents and organisations.

## **1. Chief Executive's Office**

### **Human Resources**

Support for reducing all staff hours across the board, including disappointment/ anger that this suggestion has not been explored since the autumn consultation

Suggestions that market supplements should be scrapped

Suggestions that senior officers' pay should be cut

Other suggestions for reducing staff costs, e.g. reduce sick pay

Concerns about fairness: proportion of redundancies coming from a single service, changes to the redundancy offer, impact on staff with protected characteristics

Comments about the way the process of speaking to staff about their jobs has been handled

### **Finance**

Comments about reserves and transparency

### **ICT**

Specific suggestions to improve ICT use

### **Legal Services**

Support for reducing the number of Council Members and their allowances

## **2. Adult Health and Social Care**

### **Residential and nursing placement**

Opposition to charges

### **Home care/ personal support service**

Opposition to charges

Concern about the ability of the reduced service proposed to deliver quality service to user

Some suggestions where money could be saved without impacting on the user

### **Reablement service**

Suggestions that the Council should look at contracts and agency staff as well as in house provision to find savings

### **Day services**

Opposition to specific proposals within the budget, especially around the change of provision from Hipperholme Church and Clay House.

Evidence from users about the impact these services currently have.

Suggestion that members of a specific team be asked to reduce their hours to reduce redundancies

## **Direct Payments**

Support for allowing users to continue to buy in Council-run services

## **Prevention services**

Support for preventative services for older people

Support for keeping lower levels of care as well as crisis care

## **3. Children and Young People**

### **Surestart Children's Centres**

Opposition to reductions in this service, including detailed information about the impact, value and performance of this service to argue for keeping the service at the current level

### **Support for extended schools**

Opposition to stopping this service, including information about the impact and value of the service

Evidence for how the service impacts on the lives of vulnerable individuals

Suggestions for how the service could be delivered for less money

### **Nursery education (including providers and services to support quality provision)**

Opposition to reductions in this service, including detailed information about the impact, value and performance of this service to argue for keeping the service at the current level

### **Youth work**

Support for the role of the voluntary sector in delivering youth services

Opposition from a funded organisation whose funding to deliver services is being ended

Ideas for streamlining the service

### **Support to schools to help them improve**

Opposition to proposals around this service

### **Children's Social Care**

Support for growth bids in this area, but concerns around the detailed implementation, and whether this will actually produce growth.

### **Residential care for children**

Concerns about there being enough money for this service

### **Support for children with special needs**

Opposition to stopping this service, including information about the impact and value of the service

Concern about the impact that losing large proportion of administrative and support functions

Suggestions from providers about how reductions could be better managed

Evidence of how the service impacts on the lives of vulnerable individuals

## **4. Economy and Environment**

### **Maintaining roads and pavements**

Concerns about maintaining streets and lighting with less money

Opposition to parking charges

### **Road safety**

Ideas for streamlining the service

Opposition to the proposal around school crossing patrols

### **Environmental health**

Opposition to the proposals around Environmental Health, with the argument that this service is already run on a minimal basis

### **Bin collections and recycling, waste disposal and landfill tax**

Concerns about existing service from Sita

Support for more recycling

### **Housing**

Suggestion that bringing a loan scheme in-house would produce savings

Comment about monitoring of housing benefit

### **Planning and Building Control**

Opposition to cuts to the Planning Enforcement team

Suggestions for restricting to achieve savings through fewer management posts

Opposition to outsourcing much of the Building Design and Maintenance service, including detailed information about the risks and impact of that proposal

### **Business and Employment Development**

Support for some specific areas of this work in the current climate, particularly helping

## **5. Stronger Safer Communities**

### **Parks, playgrounds, open spaces, countryside, rights of way**

Support for this service

Concern about losing amenities

### **Community Safety**

Ideas for streamlining the service

### **Libraries**

Support for keeping libraries as part of a community and as part of cultural life

Evidence of the impact that libraries have had on individuals

Suggestions for ways the library service could be maintained for less money, e.g. reduction in ICS

### **Leisure facilities and swimming pools**

Concern about income targets and their impact on users, particularly those using facilities as part of their management of health conditions

Also concern about income targets in terms of whether they are achievable

Evidence of the impact of teams within the service, particularly around sports development

### **The Victoria Theatre and Hebden Bridge Picture House**

Interest in raising prices or changing delivery.

### **Public Halls**

Concern about the impact on the Piece Hall

## **Tourism**

Suggestion for tourism centres to be run from existing buildings

## **Customer Services**

Support for cutting back or stopping Customer First

Support for stopping Calderdale Call.

## **Grants to Voluntary Organisations**

Support from voluntary organisations for the proposal to meet current commitments to them

Opposition to the proposal to reduce support to the Ground Floor Centre

Concerns about the impact of cuts from other funders/ grants outside the Council's mainstream budget, e.g. Area Based Grant.

## **6. Cross Council**

### **Corporate Issues**

Suggestions for streamlining specific services and teams

Concerns about the equality impact assessment of the proposed budget

Support for flattening the management structure, but also some support for specific managers whose posts will be restructured

Support for 'back office' functions such as research and consultation, administration in some services

Concerns for the Council's ability to deliver equality within the proposed redesign

## **7. About the consultation process itself**

Support for the process, and for the opportunity to give comments

Comments about a lack of information and evidence about proposals

Questions about the outcome of suggestions put forward in the autumn consultation exercise

## **8. Other, including general political comments and comments on national policy**

Opposition to the overall national approach to reducing the deficit

Support for different political parties' approaches

Requests for information about other agencies, eg PCT, Pennine.