

# ANNEX 6

## BUDGET CONSULTATION 2014/15

<b>CONTENTS</b>	
<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Background	1
The Consultation	1
Results and feedback from the consultation	3
Conclusions	6

<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>APPENDIX NUMBER AND TITLE</b>	
<b>A</b>	Your City Your Services 2013 Data Report – December 2013

## **ANNEX: BUDGET CONSULTATION 2014/15**

### **Summary**

Nottingham City Council is setting its budget within a context of difficult economic conditions, changes in national policy and continued substantial reductions in funding. In 2014/15, savings of £25.5m are proposed to be made. In line with the Council's commitment to citizen involvement, a full programme of consultation has been undertaken to support construction of the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP). This report details the consultation that has accompanied the preparation of the budget, and includes responses received up to and including February 12<sup>th</sup> 2014.

### **1 BACKGROUND**

#### Context

Budget consultation faces a number of practical difficulties. A unitary authority such as Nottingham City Council provides an enormous number of services which leads to a complex picture with many proposals to consult on. This is made more difficult by the short consultation period between the government notifying the Council of its funding levels and the annual budget-setting Council meeting.

#### Impact of Consultation

Nottingham City Council has a long term commitment to using the views of citizens to feed into policy making and service improvement. This helps the Council understand the issues and services that matter to local communities. This understanding was reflected in the priorities that guided the Executive Board in developing the budget proposals. These are:

- Protecting front-line services
- Protecting jobs
- Supporting the most vulnerable
- Keeping Nottingham safe and clean
- Bolstering the economy

### **2 THE CONSULTATION**

#### How we consulted

Consultation on the budget was conducted in two phases.

#### Phase 1

Before the budget settlement for 2014/15 was announced in December, pre-budget consultation was carried out between October and November 2013. Phase 1 consultation gathered views on:

- Which services are important;
- Issues of concern in the current economic climate;
- What the Council can do to do to make sure that the government's funding cuts are fair for all sections of the community.

Views were gathered via a survey which accompanied the Arrow magazine in October and which was also available online. There was also a programme of pre-budget consultation events with the public which were led by Executive Board Councillors. Consultation with Nottingham City Council colleagues was also undertaken.

The draft budget was approved for consultation by Executive Board on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

## Phase 2

Phase 2 consisted of consultation on the draft budget proposals between December 18<sup>th</sup> 2013 and February 7<sup>th</sup> 2014. A budget consultation form was made available online and in hard copy to enable everyone to have their say on the proposals. Events were arranged across the City, which were publicised locally by neighbourhood management teams. Discussions held at these events were recorded and attendees were also invited to provide individual feedback via the budget consultation form. Consultation with businesses, colleagues, One Nottingham partners and the voluntary and community sector was also undertaken.

### The consultation events

The events provide the opportunity for citizens to engage directly with Executive Board Councillors. The style of the neighbourhood events in both phases of the consultation varied depending on local need:

- In some cases an item was added to existing events and meetings;
- Some sessions were arranged specifically to discuss the budget;
- Some used a drop-in format to enable citizens to have detailed discussions.

Citizens also had the opportunity to discuss the budget during regular weekly surgeries with councillors.

Consultation with Nottingham City Council colleagues involved:

- Presentations by the Chief Executive and the Leader
- Briefings
- Articles in the colleague magazine

During both phases of the consultation, targeted events were held which had additional provision for equalities groups and communities of identity. British Sign Language interpreters were provided and the venues were fully accessible. Invitations were sent to members of the City's equality engagement groups and community groups from different backgrounds. These events were intended to ensure that people with specific access requirements could partake in the budget consultation.

A breakfast briefing was held to engage and consult with the business community and a One Nottingham Learning Network event concentrating on the City Council's budget was held for One Nottingham partners. There was also an additional event organised for representatives from Nottingham's Voluntary and Community Sector as part of the second phase of consultation.

## Feedback to services

Feedback received in phase 2 of the consultation has been circulated to the relevant service heads and directors for their consideration.

### **3 RESULTS AND FEEDBACK FROM THE CONSULTATION**

#### Phase 1: Pre-budget consultation

2,524 responses were received from the pre-budget consultation. 90% of these came from the survey in the October Arrow magazine; the remainder responded online or completed a form at a consultation event.

Respondents were asked to rate a cross section of 24 council services on a scale of 1 (Not important) to 5 (Very important). For each service a mean average has been calculated out of 5. The services rated as the top 5 most important by respondents were:

1. Tackling crime and antisocial behaviour (4.4 out of 5)
2. Services to elderly and vulnerable people (4.3 out of 5)
3. Refuse Collection (4.3 out of 5)
4. Child Protection (4.3 out of 5)
5. Public Transport (4.1 out of 5)

The top 5 services remained the same as in 2011 and 2012, although the order changed slightly.

The full results of the survey are given in **Appendix C** to this report.

#### Phase 2: Consultation on the budget proposals

##### **Responses via the budget consultation form**

A total of 171 submissions were received. The main themes were concerns expressed around:

- The impact of changes to social care services
- The Home Safety Service, Home improvement Agency, Meals on Wheels, Age UK Notts Kindred Spirits Service and a general reduction in funding to Age UK. (It should be noted that Age UK Notts have been proactively campaigning around these changes)
- Planned reductions in services provided by the Public Health Nutrition team
- Reductions in library services
- The impact on citizens of a rise in Council Tax.
- The changes to Children Centres opening hours.
- Changes to housing related support (i.e. hostel closures)

In many cases, feedback showed that citizens were supportive of the Council and felt that it was doing the best it could, given the difficult circumstances.

## **Feedback from events in neighbourhoods**

Nine events were organised in neighbourhoods, and a total of 197 citizens attended to give their views. Most sessions received a presentation from an Executive Board member, followed by a question and answer session; one event was a drop-in enabling one-to-one discussion with councillors.

- Concerns were raised about reductions in social care services and the impact this will have on elderly and vulnerable people
- Questions were asked about the reasons for certain projects being undertaken in the current financial climate (such as investments in the Broadmarsh centre, work on Trinity Square and the planned 20mph zones)
- Comments were made around the cost of parking in Nottingham (including, but not limited to, the Workplace Parking Levy)
- Questions about the amount of money owed to the Council in unpaid taxes and tied up in Icelandic banks.

There were also concerns expressed about the scale of the reduction in money for Nottingham from central government, and citizens acknowledged the difficulties this resulted in for the Council.

## **Equality Issues**

Nine people attended a session organised for Communities of Identity, which mostly focussed on the impact of budget proposals on equality groups. In particular, they highlighted proposals around reductions in adult social care, early intervention services, and the Council's ongoing commitment to the voluntary sector. The need for an overarching Equality Impact Assessment of the proposals was also emphasised

## **Feedback from the business community**

At the briefing session for the business community, 11 businesses were represented and there was a wide-ranging discussion on a number of areas of the proposals. Much of the discussion focussed on potential for business growth in the city, although questions were also raised around Council efficiencies and property management/disposal.

## **Feedback from colleagues**

Six consultation sessions were organised at a variety of venues for colleagues to ask questions or make comments on budget proposals, and approximately 200 colleagues took part.

The main themes emerging from these sessions were:

- Concerns around the ongoing increment freeze whilst living costs continue to increase
- Concerns that reducing the flexi allowance to one day per month would not save money (unless it forced colleagues to buy additional unpaid leave) but would impact on colleague wellbeing
- Concerns that reductions in the number of front-line staff could result in worse services.
- Questions around the proposed redundancies
- Concerns about the impacts of parking costs for colleagues, citizens and businesses (including the Workplace Parking Levy).

- Concerns around reductions in Early Intervention services (such as home care, children's centres) and the long-term impact this could have on vulnerable service users.
- Questions about investing in the Broadmarsh centre when budgets were stretched.

### **Feedback from One Nottingham Partners**

55 partners from the public, private and voluntary sector attended the event. There were questions for the Councillors from the floor about:

- Reductions in services for the elderly and vulnerable, particularly the potential for them to result in additional costs at a later stage
- The alternative uses for money saved from the Public Health budget
- Measures which the city have put in place to mitigate the effects of welfare reform
- The long-term impact of some of the proposed cuts, particularly those relating to social care and children's centres.

### **Feedback from the Voluntary and Community Sector**

21 people attended a consultation session, representing 19 different voluntary and community sector organisations.

Discussions were wide-ranging, but the main themes emerging were:

- Concerns around the difficulties for city-wide organisations in engaging with the Council's increasingly area-based grants process.
- Questions on efficiencies being made within the Council and the potential for outsourcing services in future
- Concerns around the impact on citizens of the reduction in value of the Council Tax Support Scheme

### **Formal responses**

In addition to the survey responses and comments made at public meetings, a small number of formal submissions were received. The full content of these submissions has been supplied to relevant service head and directors, and the main issues highlighted in each are summarised below. Copies of the full submissions are not appended due to their length, but are available from the Corporate Policy team.

#### **(i) Nottingham Community & Voluntary Service**

Nottingham Community & Voluntary Service (NCVS) were encouraged by the Council's ongoing commitment to the voluntary sector, the strengthened relationships between the Council and voluntary sector, and the protection of money to the voluntary sector.

They expressed concerns about:

- The ongoing difficulties in accessing funding for city-wide groups
- The reduction in funding to One Nottingham (part of which has previously been distributed as small grants)
- The additional costs incurred by groups functioning as part of consortia
- The potential for groups to be asked to take on services the Council can no longer provide and provide them at a lesser cost.

## **(ii) Age UK Nottingham & Nottinghamshire initial submission**

Age UK Nottingham & Nottinghamshire are concerned about the potential impact of the proposed changes to social care on elderly people, including three services which they are currently commissioned to provide: the Home Improvement Agency, Home Safety Service and Kindred Spirits Service.

In particular, they feel that:

- The removal of Early Intervention Services could result in more long-term costs as former service users may develop critical care needs sooner.
- The reduction in these services may decrease the quality of life for former service users, including increased loneliness, and reduced health.

## **(iii) Age UK Nottingham & Nottinghamshire second submission**

Age UK Nottingham & Nottinghamshire also sent in a second submission focussing particularly on the work currently done by the Home Improvement Agency and Home Safety Service, the improvements these services have made in citizens' lives and the potential impact on citizens and the Council of ceasing these services. They supplied details of the number of people assisted, and case studies to illustrate the impacts of their interventions.

## **(iv) Nottinghamshire Police & Crime Commissioner**

The submission from the Police & Crime Commissioner's office focussed on the proposal to cease funding the jointly commissioned Appropriate Adult service. It emphasised the legal requirement for local authorities to provide such a service, and that the Police would have to use social services if this service were not available, with additional costs therefore being incurred by the Council. They also highlighted the economies of scale which could be achieved by having a jointly commissioned service covering both the City and County.

## **(v) Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement**

A lengthy submission was received from Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement, covering the potential impact on citizens, particularly those with additional needs (including disabled people and those with English as a second language). Specific concerns and questions were raised in relation to a large number of additional proposals. They also expressed concern about the overall effects of the budget proposals and the disproportionate impact they could potentially have on disabled and other vulnerable people, and proposed that services and facilities aimed at supporting the most vulnerable people, such as care for older people, disabled people, children at risk of harm, and early intervention services aimed, such as welfare support should face the lowest level of cut; with universal services like bin collection, litter clearing, parks, libraries and leisure services facing a higher level of cut.

**(vi) Association of Educational Psychologists**  
**(vii) Educational Psychologist colleagues**

Two submissions were received which highlighted concerns over the proposed deletion of a vacant management post and the management of Educational Psychology within the wider Family Community Teams. These concerns related to the specialist nature of educational psychology and the impact on colleagues and service users of these posts being managed by someone who is not as knowledgeable about this field of work. They already provide services to external partners, particularly schools, and anticipate a future increase in demand, both of which they feel would be potentially jeopardised by this post deletion.

**(vii) Joint submission from colleagues in Housing Aid, Nottingham City Clinical Commissioning Group and the Council's Mental Health Social Care team.**

This submission related to the proposal not to proceed with the award of contract for a new short-term supported accommodation service for citizens with mental health support needs, and suggested that if this proposal were implemented, potential service users would be forced to access alternative services already committed to by partners, which would incur a greater cost. They are also concerned that it may result in an increased risk of homelessness for vulnerable service users.

#### **4 CONCLUSIONS**

Throughout the consultation a large amount of feedback has been received from a wide-ranging group of respondents, and this information has been fed back in order to inform the final decision-making process

Some of the issues which have emerged repeatedly relate to proposed reductions in Early Intervention services, and their potential long-term impact on both citizens' lives and Council budgets. These include changes to adult social care, housing-related support and children's centres. It should be noted that these have been amongst the proposals highlighted in presentations and online as key savings area, which may have contributed to the number of comments received about them.

Citizens have also expressed concern about the potential cumulative impact of these proposals on some of the most vulnerable citizens; this has been addressed in the Equality Impact Assessments carried out.

Overall, colleagues, citizens and businesses have recognised the difficult position the Council faces in having to make savings on this scale and have appreciated the opportunities to express their views and concerns through the consultation process.



## **Appendix A: Your City Your Services 2013 Data Report – 5 December 2013**

### **Background**

This report presents the latest findings from the 2013 Your City Your Services (YCYS) Survey. From the beginning of October 2013 the YCYS survey was available online (Intranet/Internet) and a paper version was distributed to every household across the City in the autumn edition of the Nottingham Arrow publication. The survey was also circulated and administered at a variety of community/neighbourhood meetings across all areas of the City during this time period.

The 2013 YCYC survey used a self-completion approach and fieldwork concluded on 29 November 2013.

A total of 2,524 responses were achieved from across the City compared to 1,308 in 2012 and 1,421 in 2011.

2,276 Arrow leaflets returns, 145 from events and 103 online submissions.

The information from the survey will be used to inform Councillors decisions in the 2014/15 budget making process.

### **Interpreting the data**

Please note that, as the Your City Your Services survey did not use a truly random sample, the confidence intervals stated within this report should be used as a guide only.

Percentage figures quoted have been rounded up/down to the nearest whole number. Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of “don’t know” categories, or multiple answers.

The base number of respondents for each question is given as (n = base number)

## Postcode Data

2,088 (83%) respondents provided full post code data. Table 1 provides a breakdown of these responses by Area Committee and Ward.

<b>Table 1: Response by Area</b> Base: n = 2,088		<b>Number of responses</b>
Area 1	Bulwell (116), Bulwell Forest (131)	247
Area 2	Bestwood (123), Basford (110)	233
Area 3	Bilborough (128), Aspley (78), Leen Valley (85)	291
Area 4	Sherwood (180), Berridge (119)	299
Area 5	Arboretum (64), Radford & Park (76), Dunkirk & Lenton (33)	173
Area 6	Mapperley (152), St Ann's (89), Dales (85)	326
Area 7	Wollaton West (194), Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey (41)	235
Area 8	Bridge (108), Clifton North (92), Clifton South (84)	284
	Area Total	2,088

<b>Table 2: Response by Locality</b> Base: n = 2,088		<b>Number of responses</b>
North	Area 1, Area 2, Area 3	771
Central	Area 4, Area 5, Area 7	707
South	Area 6, Area 8	610
	Area Total	

Like in 2012 Area 6: Mapperley, St Ann's and the Dales had the most responses (326). All Areas except Area 5 (173) had more than 200 responses.

Demographic data about the respondents can be found in appendix 1.

### How important are services?

For question 1 respondents were asked to rate on a scale of 1 (Not important) to 5 (Very important) a cross section of 24 council services.

For each service a mean average has been calculated out of 5. The top 5 services rated most important by respondents are:

1. Tackling crime and antisocial behaviour (4.4 out of 5)
2. Services to elderly and vulnerable people (4.3 out of 5)
3. Refuse Collection (4.3 out of 5)
4. Child Protection (4.3 out of 5)
5. Public Transport (4.1 out of 5)

Although the top 5 services remain the same as in 2012 **services to elderly and vulnerable people** has moved up one place to the second most important service to respondents. **Child protection** has dropped from second to fourth, while **refuse collection** has moved up from fourth to third.

The services seen as 'lowest' importance by respondents remains the same as in 2012 i.e. **Museums** (3.0 out of 5) and **Events** (2.8 out of 5)

**Table 3: Overview of 2013 service mean averages:**

Tackling crime and anti-social behaviour remains the most important service to citizens.

2013 Ranking		2013 Mean Score	2012 Ranking & Mean Score	Ranking Up/Down compared to 2012
1	Tackling crime and antisocial behaviour	4.4	(1) 4.4	Same
2	Services to elderly and vulnerable people	4.3	(3) 4.3	↑
3	Refuse Collection	4.3	(4) 4.2	↑
4	Child Protection	4.3	(2) 4.3	↓
5	Public Transport	4.1	(5) 4.1	Same
6	Schools	4.0	(6) 4.0	Same
7	Street cleaning	3.9	(9) 3.8	↑
8	Recycling	3.9	(7) 3.9	↓
9	Parks and Open Spaces	3.9	(10) 3.8	↑
10	Highway maintenance	3.9	(13) 3.7	↑
11	Job Creation	3.8	(8) 3.9	↓
12	Community Protection Officers/Wardens	3.8	(11) 3.8	↓
13	Street lighting	3.8	(12) 3.8	↓
14	Youth Services	3.6	(17) 3.5	↑
15	Housing	3.6	(15) 3.6	Same
16	Libraries	3.5	(16) 3.5	Same
17	Welfare Advice/Citizens' Advice	3.4	(14) 3.7	↓
18	Training	3.3	(20) 3.3	↑
19	Planning	3.3	(22) 3.2	↑
20	Leisure Centres	3.3	(21) 3.3	↑
21	Sure Start/Nursery Education	3.2	(19) 3.3	↓
22	Support to Voluntary Sector	3.2	(18) 3.3	↓
23	Museums	3.1	(23) 3.0	Same
24	Events	2.8	(24) 2.8	Same

In general, the mean scores across service areas in 2013 have remained the same or have a slightly higher weighted score than in 2012. This indicates citizens are viewing Council services about the same as they did in 2012 or slightly more important to them overall.

### **Which services have moved up/stayed the same/down?**

Although there has been minimal change in mean scores compared to 2012 the overall ordering has seen some change.

The top six remain the same, but the order has changed with 'Child protection' down two and both 'Services to elderly and vulnerable people' and 'Refuse Collection up one.

In the middle third of the table, 'Street cleaning' has moved up two places to be ranked seventh and 'Highway Maintenance' has moved up three places to be tenth. 'Youth services' is up three places at fourteenth. 'Job Creation' has moved down three places and is ranked eleventh in 2013, and 'Welfare Advice/Citizens' Advice' is down three places to seventeenth.

The bottom six remain the same as in 2012, although again there has been a change to their order: notably 'Planning' has moved up three places to nineteenth and 'Support to the Voluntary Sector' has moved down four places to twenty-second.

**NB: Whilst orderings in certain instances have changed slightly up/down it should be remembered that mean scores have not significantly changed since 2012.**

### Further savings

Respondents were asked if they have any suggestions where further savings could be made. A total of 955 comments were received.

The main areas identified by respondents for potential further savings were:

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
Staff - Cut staff numbers / salaries / travel / perks. Cut managers. More efficient staff.	199
Publicity - stop arrow / publicity / mailed out surveys / political advertising	81
Democratic services – reduce the number of councillors / expenses / meetings / travel	79
General efficiency - General efficiency / less duplication / reduce non-essential (unspecified) costs and wastage. Focus on essentials	69
Volunteers / unemployed use volunteers / unemployed / offenders to help with city upkeep	55
Events - stop events / beach / ice rink / civic events / Christmas lights	50
Tram - stop tram	47
Bins / litter / street cleaning - more efficient / reduced frequency / charges / fines / use to make energy	46
Cut services - cut or reduce services (libraries, parks, leisure centres, CPOs, hostels...)	41
Street lighting - reduce street lighting	36
Welfare - cut / audit welfare claims. Control fraud.	35
Income and jobs - economic focus - income generation / job creation / retail rents etc.	29
Finance - better finance - investments / collection of charges / general fines / traffic cameras / increase charges	27
Energy efficiency - be more energy efficient	24
Transport projects - cut / reduce highways projects or repairs / traffic calming	21
Amalgamate functions - amalgamate functions / reduce duplication - with other agencies, other councils	20
Citizen responsibility	14
Assets - sell assets / buildings	13
Consultants - stop use of consultants	13
Buses - buses should be self-financing / reroute / cut costs	10
Bus Passes - charge small fee instead of free bus pass	9
Procurement / commissioning - better procurement / contracting / commissioning	9
Council tax - change council tax - increase / don't pay for benefit / everyone should pay	9
Preventative - preventative services	5

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
Resist cuts - resist / lobby	4
Lottery - City lottery	3
No suggestions - no suggestions / too many cuts already / already doing as much as poss.	34
Other - misc./unrelated	138

## **Generate Income**

Respondents were asked if they had any suggestions on how the Council could generate more income. A total of 824 comments were received.

The main areas identified by respondents on how the Council could generate more income were:

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
More fines (e.g. for antisocial behaviour, litter, dog mess, parking on pavements)	72
Better tourism promotion	61
More events	37
Cut waste, become more efficient, sack inefficient staff	33
Rent out empty shops at very low rate to encourage new small businesses	31
Cut expenses rather than increasing income	26
“Workfare” - get unemployed people to do work for free	22
Reduce car parking charges (so more people use city centre)	21
Chase outstanding debts, including business taxes	21
Create more jobs	21
Sell services to residents & businesses (eg MOT test centre, gardening)	21
Charge for services that are currently free, or increase charges for services	38
Sell advertising & sponsorship (eg on buildings, vehicles, roundabouts, parks, Arrow, at events)	20
Small fee for free events	19
Sell off assets	19
Audit benefits, prevent fraud	18
Charge for on-street parking & residents permits	18
Cut Council staff salaries, pensions & sick pay	17
Small fee for OAP bus passes	16
Have a Nottingham lottery	16
Hire out venues (e.g. parks, Council House, libraries)	16
Promote inward investment	15
Cut spending on communications (e.g. Arrow, this survey, banners)	13
Cut Councillor costs, cut number of Councillors	12
Sell services to other Councils	11
Charge to collect garden waste all year	10
Take all available money from national government, or lobby national government for more money	10
Increase Council Tax	10
Fewer managers	9
More partnership working with businesses and other Councils	9
Sell plants, compost, wood, fruit & vegetables	9

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
Fee for bulky waste collection	8
Increase parking charges	8
Charge foreigners more, reduce immigration	8
Fundraising, jumble sales, raffles, donations	7
Charge students (Council Tax, parking fees)	7
More markets	6
More recycling	6
Increase rents on Council housing	5
Put wind turbines or solar panels on Council buildings, reduce energy use	5
More use of volunteers	5
Scrap tram extension	5
Contract out work/privatise	5
Charge people outside Nottingham more to park, visit venues etc	5
Charge pubs for litter, damage & policing	5
Turn vacant shops and offices into housing	5
Small fee for free bus	4
Build more houses (income from selling some houses and from extra Council Tax)	4
Fix road surfaces to reduce compensation claims	4
Charge blue badge holders to park	3
Other	114

## Areas of concern

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of concern on a number of issues during the current economic situation. The following table provides an overview of respondent's level of concern.

<b>% Very concerned/Concerned</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Significant at 95% confidence level</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>
Cuts to public services	93%	No	90%	92%	94%
Debt problems	64%	Yes	58%	63%	61%
Losing my job	51%	No	54%	61%	52%
Welfare changes	77%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impact on my health	73%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Compared to 2012 respondents are significantly more concerned in 2013 about debt problems (+6 percentage points). Levels of concern about debt increased with age up to people aged 45 to 59 (where 73% of people were concerned about debt), then decreased for the older age categories.

Although there is a 3 percentage point fall in the amount of people concerned about losing their jobs this is not significant.

Three out of four respondents are concerned about the Welfare Changes (77%) and the impact to their health (73%) of the current economic situation.

Respondents were given the opportunity to state any other areas of concern that they have. 840 comments were received.

The main topics of 'further concern' were around:

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
Employment, jobs - Local Jobs for Local People, lack of, availability	116
Welfare benefits - bedroom tax, Council tax, struggling to pay	108
Public Services - cuts, spending	99
Energy - fuel prices, utility bills	80
Transport - buses, parking, highways, removal of bus passes	73
Environment - street cleaning, bins, recycling	62
Health - physical, mental, NHS, hospital	51
Elderly - OAP, pensions	50
Youth – lack of opportunity	49
ASB/Crime - increase	48
Food - cost of living	47
Vulnerable – homeless, old	45
Housing - social, private	37
Money - debt, mortgages	32
Migrants - immigration	27
Education - primary, secondary, further	24
Empty properties - retail shops, houses	21
Equalities	19
Adult Social Care	16

<b>Comment theme</b>	<b>No of respondents</b>
Disabled	12
Children Social Care	8
Voluntary/Community sector	7
Budget	5
Other	88

---

**For further information/analysis contact:**

Tony Leafe  
Consultation and Engagement Officer  
Direct line: 63342

Jacqui Walker  
Research, Engagement and Consultation Manager  
Direct line: 64934



## Your City Your Services 2013 Survey Demographics

<b>Base:</b>	<b>Census 2011</b>	<b>YCYS 2013</b>	<b>+/-</b>
Male	50%	40%	- 10%
Female	50%	60%	+ 10%
Disabled	18%	32%	+ 14%
White	72%	89%	+ 17%
Black	7%	4%	- 3%
Asian (including Chinese)	13%	4%	- 9%
Mixed	7%	2%	- 5%
Other	1%	1%	0
16-24	27%	3%	- 24%
25-44	35%	24%	- 11%
45-59	19%	27%	+ 8%
60-64	5%	10%	+ 5%
65+	14%	35%	+ 21%

The sample is over represented by female, disabled, white and all age groups over 45.

The sample is under represented by male, Asian, mixed and age groups below 45.

## **Annex Report Information**

Report authors and contact details:

Jacqui Walker, Research, Engagement & Consultation Manager  
0115 8764934, Jacqui.walker@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Other colleagues who have provided input:

Tony Leafe, Consultation and Engagement Officer

### **LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS OTHER THAN PUBLISHED WORKS OR THOSE DISCLOSING CONFIDENTIAL OR EXEMPT INFORMATION**

Your City Your Services Arrow and Online Survey October to December 2013

Comments made via online survey form - Jan/Feb 2014

Notes of consultation meetings across the City - Jan/Feb 2014.

Detailed budget submissions from Age UK Nottingham & Nottinghamshire, Nottinghamshire Police & Crime Commissioner, Association of Educational Psychologists, Nottinghamshire Disabled People's Movement and Council colleagues.

### **PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS ANNEX REPORT**

NCVS response to Nottingham City Council's budget proposals 2014/15