Lancashire County Council

Cabinet

Thursday, 5th February, 2015 at 2.00 pm in Cabinet Room 'B' - The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston

Budget Consultation Responses

Part I (Open to Press and Public)

No. Item

Budget Consultation Responses

Jo Turton Chief Executive

County Hall Preston



Responses from Dalton Parish Council

Email-

I am instructed to comment on behalf of Dalton Parish Council with regard to the proposal to implement a charge for the tipping of DIY rubbish at council run recycling centres.

Residents are entitled to have their rubbish dealt with without additional cost to them. To implement an additional charge is complicated, time and money wasting. The recycling centre staff will be required to enforce and monitor the system, people will not bother and will fly-tip instead, leading to additional Council costs to clear up.

In Dalton Village fly-tipping happens all the time already; it is accepted that this is probably trade waste, but should local residents find themselves presented with a bill to tip the rubbish following DIY projects, they will soon find out of the way places like our village to dump it in instead.

Mrs Elizabeth-Anne Broad

Clerk to Dalton Parish Council

Burnley County Council Budget		
Jennifer Mein		
Leader of the Council	Our Ref	CE/LCC/FLL
Lancashire County Council	Your ref	
County Hall	Date	26 th January 2015
PRESTON		
Lancashire PR1		

Dear Jennifer

Consultation on the County Council's Budget - 2015/16 - 2017/18

Thank you for giving the Council further opportunity to comment on your revised budget proposals.

In addition to the comments in our letter dated 15th December 2014, I would like to raise the following points:

1. Supporting People.

It is noted that there is a proposal to cease funding for sheltered housing, with effect from 31st March 2017. Burnley Borough Council is concerned that this move could compound the potential pressure on our services from cuts in other areas previously announced, for example, Family Intervention. It is therefore, essential that Lancashire County Council do undertake further consultation with this Council on the impact of these changes and how they can be mitigated.

2. Public Health.

It is noted that the latest proposals include a significant additional saving of £8.5million from the Public Health Strategy/Budget. As Burnley is an area of significant health deprivation, I would be

pleased if you could explain how these savings would not have a disproportionate effect on areas such as Burnley.

3. County Information Centre at Burnley Bus Station

You will recall from my last letter that the Council requested further discussion with the County Council for ceasing the County Information Centre in Burnley Bus Station with the loss of information and ticketing provision, when it appears that the similar service will be retained in Clitheroe and Nelson, which it is felt are probably not as busy as the facility in Burnley. Neither Officers, nor myself, have received any further information regarding the rationale, although I did read in the Lancashire Telegraph dated 8th January 2015, that a Lancashire County Council spokesman said "the County Council rents the space for the Information Centre within Burnley Bus Station from the Borough Council, whereas we own the interchange facilities at Clitheroe and Nelson'. I accept that this is true, however, it is worth highlighting that the rent for the facility is £8,296 plus a re-charge for services such as Business Rates, heating, water, electricity etc. of £7,120 (both excluding VAT). Burnley Borough Council is keen to retain the Information Centre service at Burnley Bus Station, and as a result, I would be willing to forego the rent for the premises of £8,296 for a period of two years. As the different costs that make up the service charge element will also be payable in Nelson and Clitheroe, I hope that this would then move to a position where all three facilities can be fairly assessed on the basis of usage, in determining the community impact of any cessation of service.

I sincerely hope that you will take into account the above points, when making your budget decisions for next year.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Mark Townsend Leader of the Council

Lancashire Youth Council Budget Consultation Response

The following feedback on the Lancashire County Council Budget is offered by Lancashire Youth Council. We are a diverse group of young people aged 12-25 from across the county, supported by the Young People's Service.

As we were involved in the informal stage of consultation, we have had time to consult a wider group of young people and now offer the following feedback as part of the formal consultation opportunity. At our elected member meetings, we considered the service offers, in particular the Public Health and Wellbeing information, specifically focussing on Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help.

As there is currently no detail about the intended structure of those services and no consultation questions to shape our response, we wanted to put together a list of priorities which we feel are vital to remain for young people in Lancashire as the County Council changes.

Our priorities are:

✓ We feel that young people who are vulnerable in some way should have access to 1-1 support. They may need support with motivation, self-confidence, access to training and education, help developing their CV or directing to positive activities to do in their spare time. We feel this may need to be conducted alongside specialist support if that is what the young person needs.

✓ We feel that young people who may particularly need support are those who are NEET (Not in Employment, Education and Training), those at risk of committing crime or those involved with the Youth Offending Team, those with mental health issues, suffer from abuse, become homeless or have unstable or unsupportive home lives, have issues with substance misuse or who have Special Educational Needs or Disabilities.

✓ We feel that we should continue to work with other partners for the benefit of the young person and if need be broadening our age range to work with young people at a younger age before possible issues they may have become a major issue.

✓ We also feel that a young person can get more effective support if their wider family are involved. If this is suitable, we feel the staff responsible for meeting with these young people and their families should be sensitive and supportive.

✓ We feel we should offer open drop-ins for young people to get impartial information and advice, particularly around accessing training and work.

✓ We feel that Youth Zones should continue to offer a variety of provision, including open youth clubs and discreet / closed groups (e.g. LGBT – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender groups or young men's/women's groups) as are necessary. We understand that the offer in these venues may have to reduce but we feel that where possible we should continue to have youth provision open in different parts of each district rather than only having a single Youth Zone venue. We also feel that the offer in each district should be tailored to that community and reflect the needs of the area. As transport can be infrequent in the evenings and costly at all times for young people, we feel it is important to consider how young people will access certain provision, in particular how they will get home safely at night. We feel that staffing ratios are important to maintain a safe environment for young people and run a high quality service.

✓ We feel that continuing to have Youth Councils is of the upmost importance. Lancashire Youth Council have developed to be a significant group of young people in the county who have led their own campaigns, influenced change, represented young people positively and are regularly part of advising LCC and partners on a variety of issues.

✓ We feel that the YPS is a vital preventative service for young people as the opportunities that are available through the YPS provide stability, give young people safe places to socialise, prevent young people's isolation, help them learn about others and build tolerance and give them someone impartial to talk to. Informal learning also builds confidence and contributes to a greater sense of wellbeing and independence, allowing young people to take responsibility and improving their chances in their chosen futures.

Responses from Longton Parish Council

Email-

Longton Parish Council wish to make the following observations:

- 1. It considers any reduction in PROW funding to be unacceptable
- 2. There should be no reduction to funding for green space
- 3. There should be no reduction in rural bus service provision nor school crossing patrols
- 4. That this Council opposes any rise in Council tax

W V McEnnerney-Whittle

Clerk to Ingol & Tanterton Neighbourhood Council 01772 733829

Responses from Newburgh Parish Council

Email-

Dear Sir/Madam,

In addition to the comments we have made previously regarding the proposals to cut subsidised bus services (now withdrawn) and reductions to the Highways Service, Newburgh Parish Council would like to comment on the proposal to limit how much non household (DIY) waste people can dispose of for free at recycling centres. Newburgh Parish Council has concerns about this policy as it will lead to an increase in fly tipping in the Borough of West Lancashire, which already has a problem in certain areas. We do not agree with the comment made in the Service Offers document which stated that the increase in fly tipping would only be for a short period of time. In addition, it is our opinion that the scheme appears to be complicated in terms of how much people can dispose of for free and the fact that a permit will be required and will need to be well publicised so that everyone understands how the system will work. We also feel that the scheme will be difficult for recycling centre staff to enforce and monitor.

Regards

Sandra Jones

Clerk to Newburgh Parish Council

Address: 10 Priory Close

Burscough

Ormskirk

L40 7UY

Tel: 01704 892520

Email: <u>newburgh.pc@btinternet.com</u>



Suseet@aol.com

3rd February 2015

Dear Councillor Mein,

I am writing on behalf of Lancashire Parent Carer Forum (LPCF) to express our concern about the proposed cuts to the budget for short break services in Lancashire.

As you know, LPCF represents a significant number of parent carers from across the county. We recently addressed a number of Councillors at a Bite size briefing session with Sally Riley, Head of IDSS. We explained what it's like to be a parent of a child or in many cases children with special needs. Disability is a very isolating experience. No one prepares you for the grieving period for the loss of the child you thought you had and the life you thought you had. Often friends disappear and family don't always get it. Most of us make a conscious choice to have a child but none of us choose to have a child with a disability. We are robbed of our future..... many of our parents have been professionals in a chosen career but suddenly the only promotion they can look forward to is that of parent carer to carer. It's a job for life with no retirement plans in place.

We are aware that the Local Authority has a commitment to protect the vulnerable groups so we would like to remind you that our families tick more than one box in that way. If you have a child with a disability, you have a carer or carers, and potentially a young carer as many of the siblings take on responsibilities beyond their years.

We know that short breaks are an essential support service for families with disabled children. Research by the charity Mencap has consistently shown that 8 in 10 families with children who have learning disabilities are at 'breaking point'. Contact a Family research shows that 76% of families with disabled children experience stress or depression and 72% suffer from lack of sleep. Short breaks are well recognised to be a vital part of the support which addresses these problems and helps keep families with disabled children together, not just surviving but thriving.



This is why we are so concerned to see the proposal to reduce spending on non-assessed short breaks in Lancashire.

We believe that the impact of these cuts will disproportionately affect a specific group, those with hidden disabilities. It would appear that these are the groups that it is thought can be supported in the universal setting. Lancashire Break Time (LBT) exists because Lancashire County Council recognised the benefits of short breaks to families, especially where universal services were unable to meet the needs of our children. Please be mindful of the "Illusion of Inclusion". A fine line exists between inclusion and exclusion. Is inclusion about being in the same room, or is it about being a part of the group?

Parents tell us again and again that access to Lancashire Break Time, as little as a few hours break a month, keeps them going, enables them to continue caring, and prevents them tipping into crisis. It is just enough to stop them applying for an assessment for statutory support. For some families LBT supports and supplements a small package of assessed care. Remove LBT and those families, by default, will require more extensive statutory support for their assessed need.

"It keeps me from breaking point and restores hope where there is none"

"After a break I am able to see her lovely personality, not how difficult her needs are"

"When I am struggling with my mental health, just knowing an 'easier' day is coming up has really helped"

"It has been great for our child with additional needs, our marriage and our other children too"

"Break Time has saved my marriage"

Short breaks are a break from caring, how do you ensure we get that break if you remove LBT?

We are being hit by austerity measures in every area of our lives. Cuts are already starting to impact on some of the organisations and charities which have supported families, resulting in criteria for access to help being raised. Only recently we heard that the Time for Me grant previously available to parent carers will, moving forward, be available to just carers of adults. Support to help our young people into employment



is reducing which will impact on YP who have the potential to work but need help and a little longer to become established in the workplace, and increase the likelihood of them becoming NEET. All this is leading to increased stress upon families who are already living on the edge of crisis.

We recognise the challenges you face as an authority and the difficult decisions that you have to make. We ask only that you consider the impact that some of the changes to services will have not just on our families, but also, in the long term, on the Local Authority. To take away a little bit of support from our families now could result in a need for more long-term demand and dependency on statutory services.

We are aware that some of our families are already being directed to "Early Help", but this is currently a "mainstream" service aimed at wellbeing and prevention. Most of our families are at crisis point before they even seek help from services because they live on the edge all the time. We do not believe that services such as Early Help are currently fit for purpose when it comes to supporting our families. However, we have been offered the opportunity by Louise Taylor to be part of your discussions and we can give you valuable input into what is realistically achievable. We want our children to be part of society and so why wouldn't we want to be a part of shaping these initiatives so that they are right for all?

We would urge you and your fellow councillors to stop and think before any decisions are made about cuts to the short breaks budget for 2015/16. We would strongly argue that cutting the funding for short breaks and support for families of CYP with disabilities would be a false economy, as cutting short breaks is likely to lead to the need to fund expensive crisis interventions for families who can no longer cope.

Please consider the impact that these cuts will have. As no monetary value has yet been given to the proposed cuts to short breaks we are all unable to assess the impact this will have on families.

- Is there any evidence to show if LBT has reduced assessments? What has been the impact of LBT on LCC spending?
- Have you considered that if you reduce LBT how do you then assess who is eligible for a break? Will there be criteria to access LBT? Has the cost of carrying out these additional assessments been considered?



- What work has been done to identify potential impact on the Local Authority of increased request for statutory assessment?
- Have you looked at alternative methods of raising revenue to protect vulnerable groups like ours? Parent carers, children with disability and siblings.
- Don't cut anything until there is something in place that is fit for purpose
- Give us time to work with you to put things in place to alleviate impact.
- Carry out an accessible consultation on the proposals to cut the short breaks budget.
- Consult with CYP who are being affected by these cuts.

The current documents on the LCC website does not have any questions specific to any of the budget proposals, the documents are not written in a "citizen" friendly format and young people have not been consulted with about the proposals that concern them. Neither is it clear that this consultation is any different to the "Have your say" that ran in the Autumn. We would respectfully question the viability of this consultation in regards to its accessibility to all people as it lacks clarity as to what the proposals are and what is being asked about them.

We look forward to your response and would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and fellow councillors to discuss our concerns and see whether the proposed cuts can be avoided. Whilst we work in partnership with the LA we are duty bound to support the families which we are here to represent. It is clear that our families are very concerned about the prospect of losing the right to a break from caring. Our families are at the heart of everything we do and for that reason we are keen to engage with you in dialogue as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely, Sue Titterington

Chair, Lancashire Parent Carer Forum

Responses from Whittingham and Woodplumpton Parish Councils

Email-

Whittingham and Woodplumpton Parish Councils note the consultation and the proposed cuts in services and requests that the rural areas are not adversely affected as service provision is already limited.

In particular Whittingham Parish Council hopes that County Councillors will recognize the need to maintain present level subsidies to protect rural bus services throughout the County to benefit young people, the elderly and the disabled who would otherwise become isolated and unable to access essential services and activities.

Regards

Mrs Julie Buttle

Clerk to the Parish Council

01772 761637

Responses from Adlington Town Council

Email-

Adlington Town Council discussed the LCC budget proposals at its meeting last week, and would like to submit the following responses:

- it is unclear whether or how the County Council proposes to increase its level of income generation
- it is important that services are retained in rural areas and that these are not concentrated in larger town centres, particularly Preston, as Lancashire covers such a large area and residents in the south of the county would have a long way to travel if this was the case
- in order to reduce the cost of school transport, consideration should be given to "shared" transport for a number of schools in a local area, for example one bus from Adlington could take pupils to all Chorley high schools.

Regards

Linda Crouch



County Councillor Jennifer Mein Leader Lancashire County Council PO Box 78 County Hall Preston PR1 8XJ Phone: 01772 533114 Fax: Email: Steve.freeman@lancashire.gov.uk Your ref: Our ref: SF Date:

Dear Councillor Mein

Consultation on the County Council's budget

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on Lancashire County Council's budget proposals.

A general comment that I would like to make is that the consultation document states that a number of reviews will take place to decide the detail of service changes. Where these impact on the services provided by my Office and by Lancashire Constabulary, I would welcome further opportunity to comment and be involved as further details emerge.

I recognise the significant funding issues the County Council faces in 2015/16 and future years and understand that you face some very difficult decisions as you determine the services you will provide to the people of Lancashire. I face a similar scale of challenge in providing funding for the policing of the County and would therefore request that we engage in a collaborative dialogue in respect of the services that we have some cross-over in responsibility.

I am keen to ensure that wherever possible we work together to ensure we can provide services in the most efficient way possible and seek to engage together in areas such as mental health, community safety partnerhips and child protection services and suggest that we continue to seek opportunities for collaboration in the delivery of services in such areas.

I would also like to suggest that we look to work together in other areas where we might achieve increased value for money such as the use of property and assets and

the provision of support services as improved efficiency in these areas can free up much needed resource to our respective front line services.

I look forward to having the opportunity to comment further as the reviews you identify take place and that together we can work towards the provision of quality services to the people of Lancashire.

Yours sincerely

Clive Grunshaw The Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire

Lancaster University

30th January 2015

Cllr. J. Mein Lancashire County Council PO Box 78 County Hall Fishergate Preston Lancashire PR1 8XJ

Dear Councillor Mein,

Re: Response to Lancashire County Council budget proposals 2015/16 to 2017/18

I am writing in reference to the County Council budget proposals for the period 2015/16 to 2017/18 which are currently out for public consultation. Although several areas of the Council budget are of interest to the University I write in particular to comment on the proposed reduction in funding for cultural services. The proposals outline reducing the net spend from £15.3M in 2015/16 to £11.7M in 2017/18.

Lancaster University is a significant presence in the creative arts, benefiting from both the world class research at the Lancaster Institute for the Contemporary Arts and a wealth of creative provision on campus. In support of this, the University is at this moment developing a public arts strategy. The University has made a strategic commitment to engagement within the region and we see the arts as one of the means through which to achieve these aims. The city of Lancaster has gained a strong reputation for its cultural vibrancy and we wish to see this underpinned and strengthened.

In 2014 the University formed a 'cultural partnership' with The Dukes theatre in Lancaster. Under this agreement we provide funding to undertake additional projects complementary to The Dukes' core work, this funding is not made available to support The Dukes' core activity. Through this partnership we have progressed many initiatives, such as the MAKE programme that aims to inspire groups traditionally underrepresented in higher education. Much of the funding we provide is tied specifically to widening participation initiatives. In order for partnerships such as this to be sustained longer term it is imperative that the level of financial support for the arts in Lancaster generally, and The Dukes theatre specifically, is maintained. We see major benefits to the county of having a strong and well-funded arts organisation in Lancaster.

We understand that at this stage in the budget setting process specific spending decisions will not yet have been made. We would support an approach that seeks to minimise the adverse impact on

arts organisations in Lancaster, preserving the advantages these create for residents and the local economy.

For their information I have copied this letter to the relevant portfolio holders within Lancashire County Council; the Leader of Lancaster City Council and a representative from Arts Council England.

Yours sincerely,

A.M. Amerton

Professor Andrew Atherton Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Cc:

Cllr Marcus Johnstone, Cabinet Member for Environment, Planning & Cultural Services, LCC Cllr David Borrow, Deputy Leader, LCC Cllr Chris Henig, Lead Member for Libraries and Cultural Services, LCC Cllr Eileen Blamire, Leader of Lancaster City Council Alison Clark-Jenkins, Arts Council England