

# Public Relations, Consultation and Engagement

## Corporate Strategy 2018 - 2023

**Full Council – 20/02/2018**

**Appendix B – Corporate Strategy 2018-  
2023 and Budget 2018/19 Consultation  
Final Report**



## Contents

|                                                                 |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary .....                                         | 5  |
| 1 Introduction .....                                            | 15 |
| 1.1 Context.....                                                | 15 |
| 1.2 The Corporate Strategy 2018-2023.....                       | 15 |
| 1.3 The budget challenge.....                                   | 15 |
| 1.4 The Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation ..... | 16 |
| 1.5 Other related consultations .....                           | 16 |
| 1.6 Scope of this report.....                                   | 17 |
| 1.7 Structure of this report.....                               | 17 |
| 2 Methodology .....                                             | 18 |
| 2.1 Survey .....                                                | 18 |
| 2.2 Online survey .....                                         | 18 |
| 2.2.1 Paper copies.....                                         | 18 |
| 2.2.2 Alternative formats.....                                  | 18 |
| 2.3 Interview surveys .....                                     | 19 |
| 2.4 Public meetings.....                                        | 19 |
| 2.5 Other correspondence .....                                  | 19 |
| 2.6 Publicity and briefings .....                               | 19 |
| 2.6.1 Objective.....                                            | 19 |
| 2.6.2 Bristol City Council channels.....                        | 20 |
| 2.6.3 Members.....                                              | 20 |
| 2.6.4 Bristol City Council Partners .....                       | 20 |
| 2.6.5 Non-domestic rate payers.....                             | 20 |
| 2.6.6 Media Relations.....                                      | 21 |
| 2.6.7 Social Media – posts, outreach and advertising .....      | 21 |
| 2.6.8 Media advertising.....                                    | 22 |
| 2.6.9 Public events .....                                       | 22 |
| 2.6.10 Young People .....                                       | 22 |
| 2.6.11 Materials distribution .....                             | 23 |
| 2.6.12 Focus groups.....                                        | 23 |
| 2.6.13 Budget Simulator .....                                   | 23 |
| 3 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics .....     | 24 |
| 3.1 Response rate to CS&B Survey.....                           | 24 |
| 3.2 Geographic distribution of responses.....                   | 24 |
| 3.3 Characteristics of respondents.....                         | 24 |

|            |                                                                                             |    |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 3.3.1      | All CS&B survey respondents .....                                                           | 24 |
| 3.3.2      | Differences in respondent characteristics for self completion and interview responses ..... | 25 |
| 4          | Survey responses on the budget proposals .....                                              | 29 |
| 4.1        | Council Tax 2018/19 .....                                                                   | 29 |
| 4.1.1      | All respondents .....                                                                       | 29 |
| 4.1.2      | Differences between self-completion and interview responses .....                           | 29 |
| 4.2        | Social Care Precept 2018/19 .....                                                           | 30 |
| 4.2.1      | All respondents .....                                                                       | 30 |
| 4.2.2      | Differences between self-completion and interview responses .....                           | 31 |
| 4.3        | Budget savings proposals 2018-2023 .....                                                    | 31 |
| 5          | Survey responses on Corporate Strategy 2018-2023 .....                                      | 45 |
| 5.1        | Overall views on key commitments .....                                                      | 45 |
| 5.2        | Other key commitments the council should make .....                                         | 45 |
| 5.3        | Key commitments which respondents think should not be priorities .....                      | 54 |
| 5.4        | Reasons why respondents did not support specific commitments .....                          | 56 |
| 5.5        | Other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy .....                                        | 65 |
| 6          | Other correspondence on the CS&B consultation .....                                         | 70 |
| 6.1        | Overview .....                                                                              | 70 |
| 6.2        | Responses from members of the public regarding the consultation .....                       | 70 |
| 6.3        | Responses from other interested parties regarding the consultation .....                    | 71 |
| 7          | Feedback from meetings .....                                                                | 74 |
| 7.1        | Public meetings .....                                                                       | 74 |
| 7.2        | Corporate Strategy partner briefing .....                                                   | 74 |
| 8          | How will this report be used? .....                                                         | 75 |
| Appendix A | Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation .....                                    | 76 |
| A.1        | Introduction .....                                                                          | 76 |
| A.1.1      | Existing arrangements .....                                                                 | 76 |
| A.1.2      | Proposed savings measures .....                                                             | 76 |
| A.2        | Methodology .....                                                                           | 77 |
| A.3        | Results .....                                                                               | 77 |
| A.3.1      | Survey response rate and respondent characteristics .....                                   | 77 |
| A.3.1.1    | Response rate to Financial Assessment of Care Services survey .....                         | 77 |
| A.3.1.2    | Geographic distribution of responses .....                                                  | 77 |
| A.3.1.3    | Characteristics of respondents .....                                                        | 78 |
| A.3.2      | Survey results .....                                                                        | 81 |
| A.3.2.1    | Views on proposal 1: financial assessment of Special Guardians .....                        | 81 |
| A.3.2.2    | Views on proposal 2: practical support according to assessed need .....                     | 82 |

|                                                                                                   |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A.3.2.3 Views on proposal 3: financial assessment for voluntarily accommodated children           | 83  |
| A.3.2.4 Other comments on the proposals .....                                                     | 84  |
| A.3.3 Other correspondence .....                                                                  | 85  |
| A.3.4 Public/stakeholder meetings .....                                                           | 85  |
| Appendix B Culture Services consultation .....                                                    | 86  |
| B.1 Introduction .....                                                                            | 86  |
| B.2 Methodology .....                                                                             | 87  |
| B.3 Results.....                                                                                  | 87  |
| B.3.1 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics .....                                   | 87  |
| B.3.1.1 Response rate to Culture Services survey .....                                            | 87  |
| B.3.1.2 Geographic distribution of responses.....                                                 | 87  |
| B.3.1.3 Characteristics of respondents.....                                                       | 88  |
| B.3.2 Survey results .....                                                                        | 91  |
| B.3.2.1 Views on proposal 1: charging for adult entry to Red Lodge and The Georgian House         | 91  |
| B.3.2.2 Views on proposal 2: increasing major event income.....                                   | 92  |
| B.3.2.3 Views on proposal 3: making Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions self-financing ..... | 93  |
| B.3.2.4 Other survey comments on the proposals.....                                               | 94  |
| B.3.3 Other correspondence .....                                                                  | 98  |
| B.3.4 Feedback from service-led public/stakeholder meetings .....                                 | 98  |
| Appendix C Neighbourhood Action consultation.....                                                 | 99  |
| C.1 Introduction.....                                                                             | 99  |
| C.1.1 ‘Your Neighbourhood’ consultation on funding for neighbourhood action .....                 | 99  |
| C.1.2 Consultation on further reductions to funding for neighbourhood action .....                | 99  |
| C.2 Methodology .....                                                                             | 99  |
| C.3 Results.....                                                                                  | 100 |
| C.3.1 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics .....                                   | 100 |
| C.3.1.1 Response rate to Neighbourhood Action Survey.....                                         | 100 |
| C.3.1.2 Geographic distribution of responses.....                                                 | 100 |
| C.3.1.3 Characteristics of respondents.....                                                       | 101 |
| C.3.2 Survey results .....                                                                        | 104 |
| C.3.2.1 Support for the proposal to remove grant funding for neighbourhood action .....           | 104 |
| C.3.2.2 Other comments on the proposal.....                                                       | 104 |
| C.3.3 Other correspondence on the Neighbourhood Action consultation.....                          | 109 |
| C.3.4 Feedback from public/stakeholder meetings.....                                              | 109 |

## Executive Summary

### ES1 The Corporate Strategy 2018-2023 and Budget 2018/19

Subject to Cabinet endorsement on 23 January 2018, on 20 February 2018, Full Council will consider the council's budget for the 2018/19 financial year. On the same basis Full Council will also consider the council's [Corporate Strategy 2018-2023](#)<sup>1</sup>.

The decision on the council's budget is in the context of the need to make £108m of savings over the next five years, due to inflation, increasing demand for services and further cuts in government funding. This means service budgets will be affected again.

### ES2 The Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation

The Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation was open between 6 November 2017 and 17 December 2017 and sought views from the public (including businesses and organisations which represent non-domestic rate payers) about the 2018/19 budget proposals, future savings proposals to 2022/23 and the draft Corporate Strategy 2018-2023, before decisions on the 2018/19 budget are made by Full Council in February 2018.

The CS&B consultation sought feedback on:

- the scale of Council Tax increase in 2018/19;
- a proposed Social Care Precept<sup>2</sup> of 3% on top of the proposed increase in Council Tax;
- savings and income proposals which would deliver £35m of savings and additional income in 2018/19 with further savings/income in subsequent years to 2022/23<sup>3</sup>;
- the council's draft Corporate Strategy, with specific questions on the 23 key commitments and suggestions for other key commitments the council should include.

The CS&B consultation comprised an online [CS&B consultation survey](#). Paper copies of the survey and alternative accessible formats were available on request. Paper copies of the survey were also available in all libraries, Children's Centres and the Citizen Service Point.

Additional survey responses were garnered through face-to-face interviews in Broadmead (on 5 December), Broadwalk Shopping Centre in Knowle (7 December) and City of Bristol College (14 December).

The consultation was widely publicised through media, social media and communications with the public, including partner organisations, representative non-domestic rate payers and other stakeholders, as described in section 2.6.

The consultation was also promoted at a number of public meetings and views expressed at these meetings were recorded (Section 7). Comments, requests and suggestions received in letters and emails during the consultation were reviewed and considered alongside the survey results (Section 6).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Corporate Strategy sets out Bristol City Council's contribution to the city as part of the One City Plan, which will be delivered by many partners. The Corporate Strategy sets out the council's vision, values and 23 key commitments. It is our main strategic document and informs everything the council does.

<sup>2</sup> The Adults Social Care Precept is a dedicated budget which local authorities can raise to help fund adult social care - these are services which help people with physical or mental disabilities or mental health needs carry out their daily routines. Councils are allowed to levy a charge of up to 3% of Council Tax as an Adult Social Care Precept, on top of any rise in Council Tax that would happen anyway. The total increase cannot be more than 6% over the three years 2017/18 to 2019/20.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the savings in the consultation are proposed to be phased over more than one financial year between 2018/19 and 2022/23. Full Council will only decide on the budget for 2018/19 on 20 February 2018. Proposed savings for subsequent years will be noted by Full Council.

### ES3 Other related consultations

When Full Council decides the council's annual budget, it sets the overall amounts each part of the council has to spend over the coming year; it does not approve all of the detail on how the savings will be made. For some proposals, further consultation may be undertaken on the specific savings measures that would deliver the service within the agreed budget.

Four consultations commenced on 6 November which requested feedback from the public on proposed specific measures that would achieve some of the savings required<sup>4</sup>.

Three of the consultations on proposed specific savings measures were open for six weeks from 6 November until 17 December 2017 and the results are included as appendices in this report. These are:

- [Prioritising allowance needs for Special Guardians and families with children who are voluntarily looked after by the local authority by introducing Financial Assessment](#) (referred to as 'Financial Assessment of Care Services' consultation)
- [Increase income generation and efficiency across culture services](#) (referred to as 'Culture Services' consultation);
- [Removal of remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action](#) (referred to as 'Neighbourhood Action' consultation)

The [Parks and Green Spaces consultation](#) opened on 6 November and closes on 29 January and will be reported on separately.

### ES4 Scope of this report

This report describes the methodology and presents the findings of the CS&B consultation and three related consultations on proposed specific savings measures. It includes:

- Quantitative data and analysis of free text comments from the 696 responses to the CS&B survey which were received by 17 December 2017;
- Comments and suggestions received at public and stakeholder meetings held between 6 November and 17 December 2017 where the consultations were publicised;
- Other relevant correspondence received between 6 November and 17 December 2017.
- Quantitative data and analysis of free text comments from survey responses to the three related consultations received by 17 December 2017.

This report does not contain the council officers' assessment of the feasibility of any of the suggestions received nor officers' proposals for the delivery of future services, having considered the consultation feedback.

### ES5 How the report will be used

This report will be taken into account as final proposals are developed by officers to put to Cabinet to recommend to Full Council. This consultation report will also be considered by Cabinet and Full Council in making its decisions about the Corporate Strategy and the 2018/19 budget at the Full Council meeting on 20 February 2018.

---

<sup>4</sup> These are the four savings described in the section 1 of the Appendix to the [Corporate Strategy and Budget \(CS&B\) Consultation Information Booklet](#).

As noted above, Full Council will set the overall amounts each part of the council has to spend over the coming year; it does not approve all of the detail on how the savings will be made. The three consultations on specific savings measures (Financial assessment of Care Services consultation, Culture Services consultation, Neighbourhood Action consultation), which are reported in Appendices A, B and C, address how some of the savings could be made in 2018/19 and in future years. The results of these consultations will be taken into consideration in developing a set of final proposals that will be considered by the Mayor and Cabinet when they take those decisions on 23 January 2018<sup>5</sup>.

Cabinet decisions will be published through normal procedures for Full Council and Cabinet decisions at [democracy.bristol.gov.uk](http://democracy.bristol.gov.uk).

## **ES6 CS&B consultation - Key findings**

### **ES6.1 Response rate**

696 responses were received to the CS&B survey, via the online and paper-based surveys, including alternative formats and face-to-face interviews. 37 (5%) respondents completed the survey on paper (including large print and easy read formats), 181 (26%) completed the survey in face-to-face interviews and the remaining 478 (69%) self-completed it online.

606 responses (87%) were received from postcodes within the Bristol City Council area, 24 (3%) were from North Somerset, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) or South Gloucestershire, 13 (2%) postcodes were from further afield or were unidentifiable. 53 (8%) respondents did not provide a postcode

A map of response rate by ward for the Bristol responses is presented in chapter 3 along with the details of age profile, gender and other respondent characteristics.

50 responses were received to the Financial Assessment of Care Services' survey. Details of respondent characteristics are included in Appendix A.

124 responses were received to the 'Culture Services' survey. Details of respondent characteristics are included in Appendix B.

239 responses were received to the 'Neighbourhood Action' survey. Details of respondent characteristics are included in Appendix C.

### **ES6.2 Council Tax 2018/19**

Of the 696 people who responded to the CS&B consultation, 670 (96%) expressed a preference for the level of Council Tax increase, selecting from four options (Figure ES1).


373 (56%) respondents preferred the proposed Council Tax increase of 1.99%, which was described in the consultation information as the maximum increase permitted without requiring a referendum<sup>6</sup>. A further 109 (16%) respondents favoured a Council Tax increase of more than 1.99%.

The option with the second highest level of support - 121 respondents (18%) - was 'no increase to Council Tax' in 2018/19. 67 (10%) respondents wanted Council Tax to increase by less than 1.99%

---

<sup>5</sup> Decisions on the final proposals for Parks and Green Spaces will be made at a Cabinet meeting in 2018, following consideration of the Parks and Green Spaces consultation results, which will be published in a separate report. The Council's forward plan ([www.bristol.gov.uk/forwardplan](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/forwardplan)) will give 28 days' notice of the Cabinet meeting at which the decisions will be made.


<sup>6</sup> The consultation closed on 17 December, before the government's announcement that councils would be able to raise Council Tax by up to 2.99% in 2018/19 to fund local services.

**Figure ES1: Preferred level of Council Tax increase in 2018/19****ES6.3 Social Care Precept 2018/19**

Respondents were asked if they would support a proposed additional charge of 3% on top of Council Tax to help pay for adult social care.

669 (96%) of the 696 respondents to the CS&B consultation expressed a view, of whom:

- 478 (71%) would support the proposed annual 3% social care levy on Council Tax;
- 191 (29%) disagreed with the proposed annual 3% social care levy.

**Figure ES2: Views on the proposed 3% social care levy in 2018/19**

## ES6.4 Savings Proposals 2018-2023

290 (42%) of the 696 CS&B respondents provided free text comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023. The comments are categorised in section 4.3. The greatest number of comments was on the following themes<sup>7</sup>:


- 127 (44%) comments about Council Tax;
- 154 (53%) comments giving suggestions for saving money;
- 62 (21%) comments on generating income;
- 66 (23%) comments on which services the council should prioritise;
- 30 (10%) comments about the scale of budget savings;
- 28 (10%) comments concerned about the impact of savings proposals on services.

## ES6.5 Corporate Strategy 2018-2023: overview of key commitments

491 (71%) of the CS&B respondents provided their views on the 23 key commitments in the draft Corporate Strategy using a five point scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. (Figure ES3). Of these:

- 286 (58%) respondents agree or strongly agree with the key commitments overall.
- 146 (30%) respondents neither agree nor disagree with the key commitments overall.
- 59 (12%) respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the key commitments.

**Figure ES3: Views on Corporate Strategy key commitments overall**



<sup>7</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 290 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are expressed as % of the 290 responses.

## **ES6.6 Corporate Strategy 2018-2023: other key commitments which should be included**

190 (27%) of the CS&B respondents specified additional key commitments they thought the council should make. The priorities identified by the greatest number of respondents were:

### **Theme 1: Empowering and Caring.**

- 13 (7%) respondents stated the council should prioritise social care and support the most vulnerable people in Bristol.

### **Theme 2: Fair and Inclusive**

- 14 (%) wanted commitments to address housing.
- 13 (7%) thought the council should prioritise education, including early literacy intervention, support for people with Special Educational Needs and access courses for colleges.

### **Theme 3: Well Connected**

- 27 (14%) wanted improvements to transport of whom 19 (10%) want to reduce cars in the city and to promote public transport and healthy travel.


### **Theme 4: Wellbeing**

- 33 (17%) requested commitments to maintain existing assets which contribute to wellbeing including: parks, libraries, public toilets and street trees.
- 24 (13%) called for commitments to make Bristol sustainable, including cleaner streets, improved household waste and recycling, measures to deliver clean air, stronger commitments to tackle climate change and promoting green energy and home efficiency measures;

The suggested additional corporate commitments are described further in section 5.2.

## **ES6.7 Corporate Strategy 2018-2023: commitments which should not be high priorities**




282 (41%) of the CS&B respondents identified one or more of the 23 key commitments which they thought should not be corporate commitments. Figure ES4 shows the number of respondents who thought each key commitment should NOT be among the council's highest priorities. The reasons provided by respondents are categorised in section 5.4

**Figure ES4: Key commitments which respondents think should NOT be priorities**

**ES7 Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation – key findings**

50 responses were received to the Financial Assessment of Care Services (FACS) survey. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with each of the three proposals, as shown in Figures ES5, ES6 and ES7.

In addition there were 15 free text responses which are described in Appendix A.


**Figure ES5: Proposal 1 - financial assessment of Special Guardians****Figure ES6: Proposal 2 - practical support according to assessed need****Figure ES7: Proposal 3 - financial assessment for voluntarily accommodated children**

## ES8 Culture Services consultation


124 responses were received to the Culture Services survey. A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with each of the three proposals, as shown in Figures ES8, ES9 and ES10.

In addition there were 49 free text responses, which are described in Appendix B.


**Figure ES8: Proposal 1 - charging for Red Lodge and The Georgian House**



**Figure ES9: Proposal 2 - increasing major event income**



**Figure ES10: Proposal 3 - Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions to be self-financing**




## ES9 Neighbourhood Action consultation

239 responses were received to the Culture Services survey. Of 236 (99%) respondents who provided their view (Figure ES11):

- 149 (63%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal;
- Less than half this number - 70 respondents (30%) – agree or strongly agree with the proposal;
- 17 (7%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

In addition there were 145 free text responses, which are described in Appendix C.

**Figure ES11: Support for removing grant funding for neighbourhood action**



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Context

On 20 February 2018, Full Council will set the council's budget for the 2018/19 financial year. Full Council will also be asked to approve the council's Corporate Strategy 2018-2023.

The Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation was open between 6 November 2017 and 17 December 2017 and sought views from the public (including businesses and organisations which represent non-domestic rate payers) about proposed increases in Council Tax and Social Care Precept in 2018/19, budget savings and income generation proposals for the period 2018-2023 and the council's draft Corporate Strategy 2018-2023, before decisions on the 2018/19 budget and Corporate Strategy are made by Full Council in February 2018.

## 1.2 The Corporate Strategy 2018-2023

The Corporate Strategy sets out Bristol City Council's contribution to the city as part of the One City Plan, which will be delivered by many partners.

The [draft Corporate Strategy](#) lays out our vision, values and 23 key commitments under five themes to make sure the council plays its part in creating a city that is successful for everyone. It is the council's main strategic document and informs everything the council does including how we respond to the opportunities and challenges facing us now and in the future. Among the most important challenges facing us is the council's budget.

## 1.3 The budget challenge

Over the next five years the council must find £108m of savings to balance its budget. It will cost more simply to maintain services at their current level due to inflation and increasing demand for services such as social care and education because of the growing city population. In addition, further cuts in government funding are planned in the coming years. This means service budgets will be affected.

The £108m gap in council finances assumes no Council Tax increase above current rates. If Council Tax is increased by 1.99% each year<sup>8</sup> and an additional 3% in 2018/19 for the Social Care Precept, this will increase the money available by £29m by 2022/23 contributing a significant amount to bridging the budget gap.

The council has also taken the opportunity to review all the pressures it faces, and has identified ways to mitigate against some demand and inflation pressures, and changes in funding to reduce the gap by a further £14m.

This leaves a funding gap of £65m over the next five years. The [Corporate Strategy and Budget \(CS&B\) Consultation Information Booklet](#) presents savings proposals which would bridge the £65m gap.

---

<sup>8</sup> The consultation included the council's proposal to increase Council Tax by 1.99%, which was the maximum permitted without a local referendum. The consultation closed on 17 December 2017, before the government's announcement that councils would be able to raise Council Tax by up to 2.99% in 2018/19 to fund local services

## 1.4 The Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation

The [CS&B consultation survey](#) sought views on the following issues.

### Budget 2018/19

- Preference for four options for the scale of Council Tax increase in 2018/19:
  - Option A - a proposed increase of 1.99% (the maximum without a local referendum);
  - Option B - no increase to Council Tax;
  - Option C - an increase below 1.99%; and
  - Option D - an increase above 1.99% which would require a referendum.
- Support for a proposed Social Care Precept of 3% for 2018/19 on top of the Council Tax increase, to help fund adult social care and protect vulnerable people.

### Budget savings 2018-2023

- Views on our savings and income proposals which would deliver £35m of savings and additional income in 2018/19 with further savings/income in subsequent years to 2022/23.

### Corporate Strategy 2018-2023

- Overall views on the [23 key commitments](#) in the draft Corporate Strategy.
- Suggestions for other key commitments the council should include in its Corporate Strategy.
- Any key commitments which respondents think should NOT be among the council's highest priorities, and the reasons for this.
- Any other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy.

The CS&B consultation was open between 6 November and 17 December 2017. The consultation comprised an online [CS&B consultation survey](#), with paper copies of the survey and alternative accessible formats available on request. Paper copies of the survey were also available in all libraries, Children's Centres and the Citizen Service Point.

Face-to-face interviews using the online survey on 4G enabled tablets generated additional survey responses in Broadmead Shopping Centre (on 5 December), Broadwalk Shopping Centre in Knowle (7 December) and City of Bristol College (14 December).

The consultation was also promoted at a number of public meetings and views expressed at these meetings were recorded.

Comments, requests and suggestions received in letters and emails during the consultation were reviewed and considered alongside the survey results and feedback at meetings.

## 1.5 Other related consultations

When Full Council sets the council's annual budget, it is not approving all of the detail on how the savings will be made; rather it sets the overall amounts each part of the council has to spend over the coming year.

For some proposals, further consultation may be undertaken on the specific savings measures that would deliver the service within the revised budget.

Four of the savings proposals presented in the CS&B consultation Appendix Section 1 were the subject of separate consultations which relate to specific savings measures and which also commenced on 6 November. Three of these consultations were open for six weeks until 17 December 2017 and the results are included as appendices in this report. These are:

- [Prioritising allowance needs for Special Guardians and families with children who are voluntarily looked after by the local authority by introducing Financial Assessment](#);
- [Increase income generation and efficiency across culture services](#);
- [Removal of remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action](#).

The [Parks and Green Spaces consultation](#) opened on 6 November and closes on 29 January and will be reported on separately.

## **1.6 Scope of this report**

This consultation report describes the methodology and results of the CS&B consultation and three related consultations on proposed specific savings measures.

It summarises and quantifies the views expressed in the consultation survey responses, in other written correspondence received between 6 November and 17 December 2017, and verbally by attendees during four public meetings at which the consultations were publicised.

This report does not record the results of the [budget simulator](#) which was not a formal part of the consultation<sup>9</sup>.

## **1.7 Structure of this report**

Chapter 2 of this report describes the CS&B consultation methodology.

Chapters 3 to 7 present the CS&B survey results:

- Chapter 3 presents the CS&B survey response rate and respondent characteristics;
- Chapter 4 describes the survey feedback on the Budget 2018/19 proposals (Council Tax and Social Care Precept) and the budget savings proposals 2018-2023;
- Chapter 5 describes the survey feedback on the draft Corporate Strategy 2018-2023.
- Chapter 6 describes feedback received in other correspondence (letters and emails).
- Chapter 7 describes the feedback on the budget proposals and draft Corporate Strategy received at the Corporate Strategy partner briefing and public meetings at which the CS&B consultation was publicised;

Chapter 8 describes how this report will be used and how to keep updated on the decision-making process.

Appendix A describes the feedback to the separate consultation on prioritising allowance needs for Special Guardians and families with children who are voluntarily looked after by the local authority by introducing Financial Assessment.

Appendix B describes the feedback to the separate consultation on increasing income generation and efficiency across culture services.

Appendix C describes the feedback to the separate consultation on removal of remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action.

---

<sup>9</sup> The budget simulator was available to the public during the CS&B consultation to enable citizens to explore the challenge of setting service budgets and to understand the likely impacts of raising or cutting those budgets. It was provided as additional supporting information but was not essential to enable respondents to make an informed response to the consultation.

## **2 Methodology**

### **2.1 Survey**

#### **2.2 Online survey**

An online CS&B consultation survey was available on the city council's Consultation Hub ([www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub)) between 6 November and 17 December 2017. The online survey pages contained:

- an overview of the Corporate Strategy and Budget (CS&B) consultation and the council's budget challenge;
- links to the draft Corporate Strategy 2018-2023, the Corporate Strategy and Budget Consultation Information Booklet and the survey questions;
- downloadable alternative formats (Easy Read, Audio and British Sign Language);
- links to four related consultations on specific savings proposals, described in section 1.5.

The survey questions included four sections:

- Budget 2018/19 (questions on Council Tax and the Social Care Precept);
- Budget savings 2018-2023 - questions on savings proposals to bridge the £65 million budget gap by 2022/23;
- Corporate Strategy 2018-2023 – a request for feedback on the 23 key commitments and any other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy;
- 'About you' - this section requested respondents' postcode and equalities monitoring information.

Respondents could choose to answer some or all of the questions in any order and save and return to the survey later.

##### **2.2.1 Paper copies**

The following three documents were produced which together provided all the information that was available online:

- Corporate Strategy 2018-2023 Draft for Consultation, November 2017;
- Corporate Strategy and Budget Consultation - Information Booklet;
- Corporate Strategy and Budget Consultation - Survey (a questionnaire).

Paper copies of the three documents were made available with Freepost return envelopes in all libraries, at Children's Centres, in the Citizen Service Point, and on request by email and telephone.

##### **2.2.2 Alternative formats**

The following alternative formats were made available on request:

- Braille;
- Large Print;
- Easy Read;
- Audio file;
- British Sign Language (BSL) videos;
- Translation to other languages. (No translations were directly requested by citizens.)

Easy Read, Audio and BSL formats were also available at the survey webpages.

## **2.3 Interview surveys**

In order to increase overall response rates and responses from groups which are often under-represented in surveys, citizens were invited to complete the online survey facilitated by interviewers in Broadmead Shopping Centre (on 5 December), Broadwalk Shopping Centre, Knowle (7 December) and City of Bristol College (14 December).

Respondents were asked for their views on the level of Council Tax and the proposed 3% social care levy for 2018/19 (questions 1 and 2 of the online survey) and were asked for their postcode and equalities monitoring information. Any other information they provided which helped explain their views was also noted. Their responses were recorded using 4G-enabled tablets.

Respondents were then given the option of submitting their feedback on the budget proposals straightaway or completing the remaining survey questions on the Corporate Strategy at home<sup>10</sup>. Of 181 interview responses, three were further completed by respondents after the interviews. The methodology prevented double counting of surveys which were started in an interview and completed later by the respondents.

## **2.4 Public meetings**

The CS&B and 'Removal of remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action' consultations were promoted at the following public meetings:

- LDub Arts Club Funding Meeting on 15 November 2017;
- 'Love St Paul's' (a post Partnership transition meeting) on 21 November 2017;
- 'Team Southmead' meeting on 28 November 2017;
- Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum on 28 November 2017.

Views expressed at these meetings are summarised in chapter 6.

## **2.5 Other correspondence**

Emails and letters were logged during the consultation and are summarised in chapter 7.

This feedback will be considered in formulating final proposals.

## **2.6 Publicity and briefings**

### **2.6.1 Objective**

The following programme of activity was undertaken to publicise and explain the CS&B consultation. The primary objective was to ensure that information was shared across a wide range of channels, reaching as broad a range of audiences as possible in order to maximise response rates, including feedback by groups that are often under-represented in surveys.

---

<sup>10</sup> Respondents could choose to have the part-completed survey emailed to them so they could complete it online, or they could complete a paper copy and return it using a freepost envelope.

## **2.6.2 Bristol City Council channels**

Copy and electronic material were shared via the following council and partner channels and networks:

- Our City Newsletter – 3,200 recipients;
- Ask Bristol Bulletin - 12,000+ recipients;
- All Members / Councillors;
- Letters to 10,000 Council Tax payers (randomly selected). The survey response rate more than doubled in the week following this mailing;
- Email to 800 involved tenants;
- Millennium Square digital screen displays;
- Benefit recipients – information and link to consultation included on email signature for all communications responding to benefits enquiries.

## **2.6.3 Members**

Copies of all survey materials were provided to the party offices for Members to collect and distribute.

All members were sent the Member's Social Media Toolkit which included template articles, electronic and social media material to help promote the consultation through their networks.

## **2.6.4 Bristol City Council Partners**

A marketing tool-kit including template articles, electronic and social media material was shared widely amongst communications teams for the council's partners including the police, fire service, NHS providers and commissioners, schools, universities and voluntary sector organisations (via VOSCUR).

On 22 November 2017 the Mayor hosted a Corporate Strategy partner briefing (a roundtable discussion) about the Corporate Strategy and proposed council budget reductions with key partners including Avon and Somerset Police, the Police and Crime Commissioner, Business West and Destination Bristol. The meeting considered how partners or their networks might take a role in providing services historically provided by the council and future opportunities for collaborative working. Feedback from the meeting is summarised in section 7.2.

## **2.6.5 Non-domestic rate payers**

The council has a statutory duty to consult each year with representatives of non-domestic rate payers about the authority's proposals for expenditure in the forthcoming year. The following activities were undertaken:

- The promotional material and links to the survey were emailed to Business West, the Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) and Destination Bristol with a request for them to circulate to their contacts;
- Consultation copy and electronic material were shared via email to 4,000 Business Rate payers. Respondents were asked to provide their feedback via the consultation survey;
- Awareness raising through media and social media activity was undertaken as described in 2.6.6 and 2.6.7;
- Destination Bristol and Business West and other key partners met with the Mayor and Section 151 officer on 22 November 2017 at the Corporate Strategy partner briefing, as described in 2.6.4.

The promotional activities above requested businesses and other organisations to provide their feedback via the consultation survey. The survey responses are reported in chapters 3, 4 and 5. The survey responses did not identify the respondents and it was not possible to establish which or how many responses were from non-domestic rate payers.

Seven letters and emails about the CS&B consultation were received from organisations in addition to the survey responses. This feedback is described in section 6.2. There were no direct emails or letters received from Business West, the Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) or Destination Bristol.

Feedback from the Corporate Strategy partner briefing is summarised in Section 7.2.

## **2.6.6 Media Relations**

Press releases were distributed on 6 November outlining the overall budget, Corporate Strategy and consultation, plus a separate press release on the longer parks consultation.

This resulted in coverage in all regional media outlets including:

- BBC TV and local radio
- ITV West Country TV
- commercial local radio (Heart, Breeze)
- community radio (BCFM, Ujima)
- Bristol Post
- Bristol 24-7

Material was also shared with Bristol's hyper-local community titles (The Week In, The Voice series).

A media release and photo were issued on 21 November about the Mayor's visit to Bedminster Down School where students used the specially commissioned Budget Simulator to try to balance the council budget.

A second press release was distributed in early December with 'two weeks to go' reminder.

## **2.6.7 Social Media – posts, outreach and advertising**

Regular posts on Bristol City Council's social media channels (Twitter and Facebook) were made for the duration of the consultation, with increased posts at launch, 'two weeks left' and in the final days.

92 tweets in total resulting in 428 clicks on links, 155 likes, 255 re-tweets.

15 Facebook posts reached 17,424 people and resulted in 129 likes, comments and shares and 848 clicks.

There were three waves of paid for Facebook advertising, targeting people with protected characteristics:

- i. Bristol, 18-65+, BME, disability, LGBT;
- ii. Bristol, 18-65+ in key wards with low engagement in previous consultations;
- iii. Bristol, 18-24 in key wards with low engagement in previous consultations;

Social media outreach activity was carried out calling on 59 council partners and stakeholders with a combined following of over 640,000 to share information and consultation links / material via their Facebook and Twitter accounts.

In addition the Neighbourhoods Team, which was publicising the related Neighbourhood Action consultation, publicised the CS&B consultation as follows via Facebook and emails to contacts and groups (Table 1).

**Table 1: Facebook and email publicity by Neighbourhoods Team**

| Date        | Publicity                                                        | Reach |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 08 Nov 2017 | Emails to 3517 contacts and groups                               |       |
| 09 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - south area              | 151   |
| 10 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - north area              | 92    |
| 28 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - east and central        | 25    |
| 28 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes link to budget balancer - south | 108   |
| 06 Dec 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes BSL version – south area        | 85    |
| 09 Dec 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes BSL version – east & central    | 23    |
| 10 Dec 2017 | Facebook: one week left link to consultation - Fishponds         | 268   |

### 2.6.8 Media advertising

Community radio advertising was purchased on Bristol's leading community radio stations, which target the city's under-represented groups:

- *BCFM*: 3 weeks of advertising with 8 plays per day (20 Nov to 10 Dec) plus interview slots on breakfast and drive programmes;
- *Ujima*: 1 week of advertising with at least 8 plays per day (25 Nov to 4 Dec).

### 2.6.9 Public events

Citizens were invited to complete the online survey facilitated by interviewers in Broadmead Shopping Centre (on 5 December), Broadwalk Shopping Centre (7 December) and City of Bristol College (14 December), as described in section 2.3.

### 2.6.10 Young People

Introduction and weblinks to budget, Corporate Strategy and consultation material were shared via:

- Bristol Youth Council;
- Creative Youth Network;
- Schools (via weekly email to head teachers) with a request to carry a link in their weekly newsletters to parents and carers;
- City Hall events attended by children and young people;
- Reconstruct (which runs the children in care council);
- Youth Moves;
- Young Carers voice;
- Listening partnership;
- Knowle West Media Centre;
- Juicy Blitz youth project;
- Envision.

### **2.6.11 Materials distribution**

Postcards, posters, summary and questionnaire booklets, plus freepost return envelopes were distributed via the following centres and networks:

- Libraries;
- 25 Children's Centre locations;
- Citizen Service Point.

In addition posters and/or postcards were distributed to:

- City Hall;
- Museums including M Shed, Red Lodge and Georgian House;
- All GP surgeries in Bristol postcodes;
- 98 pharmacies;
- 166 community groups;
- 49 community centres;
- 18 sports centres.

Translated versions of the posters and postcards (in Polish, Somali, Urdu, Arabic and Pushto) were distributed to Easton and Lawrence Hill which were showing very low response levels to the consultation. Translated materials were distributed to doctor surgeries, community centres, an ESOL centre, mosque, the Junction 3 Library and one children's centre.

### **2.6.12 Focus groups**

The consultation activity plan included convening focus groups targeting young people and under-represented groups in particular. Positive contacts were made with these networks. However opportunities to run focus groups at forums/events attended by these groups proved difficult since their meeting timetables did not coincide with the six week consultation period.

Instead, additional efforts to reach these groups were made through public engagement, targeted radio and social media advertising and dissemination of information to their community group and advocate networks (as detailed in 2.6.6, 2.6.7, 2.6.8, 2.6.9, 2.6.10 and 2.6.11).

### **2.6.13 Budget Simulator**

A budget simulator was also launched on 6 November. The online tool enabled people to try their hand at dealing with the budget gap and better understand the consequences of making savings. Individuals could share their results on their social networks but they were not considered as formal responses to the consultation. It was accessed 1,884 times during the consultation period.

### 3 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics

#### 3.1 Response rate to CS&B Survey

696 responses were received to the CS&B survey, via the online and paper-based surveys, including alternative formats and face-to-face interviews. 37 (5%) respondents completed the survey on paper (including large print and easy read formats), 181 (26%) completed the survey in face-to-face interviews and the remaining 478 (69%) self-completed it online.


#### 3.2 Geographic distribution of responses

606 responses (87%) were received from postcodes within the Bristol City Council area, 24 (3%) were from North Somerset, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) or South Gloucestershire, 13 (2%) postcodes were from further afield or were unidentifiable, and 53 (8%) respondents did not provide a postcode.

The high response rate from Knowle is partly due to 96 responses submitted during face-to-face interviews at Broadwalk Shopping centre in Knowle.

The geographic distribution of responses from within Bristol is shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: geographic distribution of CS&B responses in Bristol**



#### 3.3 Characteristics of respondents

##### 3.3.1 All CS&B survey respondents

674 (97%) people answered one or more of the equalities monitoring questions.

The most common age of respondents was 45-64 years (34%), followed by 25-44 (29%). The proportion of responses in the age categories 45-64 years, and 65-74 was higher than these age groups' proportion of the population in Bristol. Survey responses from children (under 18) and young people aged 18-24 were under-represented. Responses from people aged 25-44 years and over 75 closely matched these age groups' proportion of the population in Bristol.

46% of responses were from women and 46% were from men. (8% preferred not to say.)

Disabled respondents (11%) were under-represented compared to the proportion of disabled people living in Bristol<sup>11</sup>.

Respondents included a higher proportion of White British respondents than the Bristol population. Black/Black British and Asian/Asian British citizens were under-represented. Response rates for Other White, Mixed / Dual Heritage and Other Ethnic Group were similar to these citizens' proportion of the population in Bristol.

People with no religion were over-represented and Christians, Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims were under-represented.

A full breakdown of respondent characteristics is found in Table 2 and Figure 2.

### **3.3.2 Differences in respondent characteristics for self completion and interview responses**

Part of the rationale for undertaking face-to-face interviews was to seek responses from people with as diverse a range of backgrounds as possible, including citizens who do not commonly self-complete online surveys.

Respondent characteristics were compared for the 181 people who responded to the survey in face-to-face interviews and the 515 people who self-completed the survey online or using paper copies. Key differences for self-completion and interview responses are summarised below and in Figure 3. (Percentages exclude respondents who 'prefer not to say'.)

Compared to self-completion respondents, the interviewees included a lower proportion of people aged 25-44 and 45-64, but a higher response rate from people in all other age categories.

Compared to the proportion of each age group living in Bristol, the interviewed response rate was a better match for children (under 18) and citizens aged 18-24 and 45-64 but under-represented respondents aged 25-44 and over-represented ages 65-74 and over 75.

Interview responses included more women (56%) than men (44%), whereas self-completed responses comprised slightly more men (52%) than women (48%).

The interview responses included a higher proportion (18%) of disabled citizens and were a good match to the proportion of disabled citizens in Bristol.

Interview responses included more representative response rates for the following ethnicities:

- White British respondents (lower response rates than self-completion responses);
- Black/Black British (higher response rates than self-completion responses); and
- Asian / Asian British (higher response rates than self-completion responses).

Response rates for Other White, Mixed/Dual Heritage and Other Ethnic Group were very similar for interviewed and self-completion responses and closely matched the proportion of these groups in Bristol.

Interviewed respondents more closely matched the proportions in Bristol who are Christians, Muslims, Jewish, identify as 'Other Religion or Belief' or have no religion, than self-completion respondents. People who identified themselves as Buddhist, Hindu, or Sikh responded in similar proportions for interview and self-completion methods.

---


<sup>11</sup> Data on disability rates in the Bristol population are based on people who identified in the 2011 Census that their day-to-day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months.


**Table 2: respondent characteristics - all responses to the survey**

|                    | <b>Respondent characteristic</b>       | <b>Number of responses to CS&amp;B survey</b> | <b>% responses to equalities question</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Age                | Under 18                               | 15                                            | 2%                                        |
|                    | 18 – 24                                | 37                                            | 6%                                        |
|                    | 25-44                                  | 194                                           | 29%                                       |
|                    | 45-64                                  | 230                                           | 34%                                       |
|                    | 65-74                                  | 115                                           | 17%                                       |
|                    | Over 75                                | 43                                            | 6%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 33                                            | 5%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 29                                            | -                                         |
| Gender             | Female                                 | 308                                           | 46%                                       |
|                    | Male                                   | 305                                           | 46%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 54                                            | 8%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 29                                            | -                                         |
| Transgender        | Yes                                    | 1                                             | <1%                                       |
|                    | No                                     | 577                                           | 89%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 69                                            | 11%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 49                                            | -                                         |
| Ethnicity          | White British                          | 516                                           | 78%                                       |
|                    | Other White                            | 32                                            | 5%                                        |
|                    | Mixed / Dual Heritage                  | 20                                            | 3%                                        |
|                    | Black / Black British                  | 20                                            | 3%                                        |
|                    | Asian / Asian British                  | 11                                            | 2%                                        |
|                    | Other ethnic group                     | 4                                             | 1%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 60                                            | 9%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 33                                            | -                                         |
| Disability         | Yes                                    | 74                                            | 11%                                       |
|                    | No                                     | 525                                           | 79%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 64                                            | 10%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 33                                            | -                                         |
| Religion           | No religion                            | 301                                           | 46%                                       |
|                    | Christian                              | 242                                           | 37%                                       |
|                    | Buddhist                               | 7                                             | 1%                                        |
|                    | Hindu                                  | 0                                             | 0%                                        |
|                    | Jewish                                 | 4                                             | 1%                                        |
|                    | Muslim                                 | 16                                            | 2%                                        |
|                    | Sikh                                   | 0                                             | 0%                                        |
|                    | Any other religion or belief           | 19                                            | 3%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 72                                            | 11%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 35                                            | -                                         |
| Sexual orientation | Heterosexual (straight)                | 523                                           | 79%                                       |
|                    | Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual               | 38                                            | 6%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 99                                            | 15%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 36                                            | -                                         |

Note 1: Respondents who selected 'Prefer not to say' from the list of options;

Note 2: Respondents to the CS&amp;B survey who declined to answer the equalities question.

**Figure 2: respondent characteristics - all responses to the survey**

**Figure 3: Characteristics of self completion and interviewed respondents**

## 4 Survey responses on the budget proposals

### 4.1 Council Tax 2018/19

#### 4.1.1 All respondents

Respondents were asked to state which of four options they would prefer for the level of Council Tax increase in 2018/19.

Of the 696 people who responded to the CS&B consultation, 670 (96%) expressed a preference for the level of Council Tax increase. Figure 4 shows the numbers who supported each option. 26 people did not answer this question.


373 (56%) preferred the proposed increase of 1.99%. This is the maximum increase permitted without requiring a referendum.

The option with the second highest level of support - 121 respondents (18%) - was 'no increase to Council Tax' in 2018/19

109 (16%) would prefer a Council Tax increase of more than 1.99%, which would require a referendum.

67 (10%) respondents wanted Council Tax to increase by less than 1.99%


**Figure 4: Preferred level of Council Tax increase in 2018/19**



#### 4.1.2 Differences between self-completion and interview responses

There were differences between the preferences of the 491 people who self-completed the question and the 179 people who gave their views in an interview survey (Figure 5).

For both groups of respondents, the preferred option was the proposed increase of 1.99% (supported by 56% of self-completing respondents and 54% of interviewed respondents). Compared to respondents who self-completed the survey, the interviewed respondents expressed significantly less support for a Council Tax increase above 1.99% and more support for no increase or an increase of less than 1.99%.

**Figure 5: Views on Council Tax for self-completion and interviewed respondents**

## 4.2 Social Care Precept 2018/19


### 4.2.1 All respondents

Respondents were asked if they would support a proposed additional charge of 3% on top of Council Tax to help pay for adult social care.

669 (96%) of the 696 respondents to the CS&B consultation expressed a view. Of these:

- 478 (71%) would support the proposed annual 3% social care levy on Council Tax;
- 191 (29%) disagreed with the proposed annual 3% social care levy.

27 people did not answer the question.


**Figure 6: Views on the proposed 3% social care levy in 2018/19**

## 4.2.2 Differences between self-completion and interview responses

There was a higher level of support (80%) for the proposed additional 3% social care levy among the 172 people who expressed a view in interview surveys compared to the 497 people who answered the question in self-completed surveys (69% support) - Figure 7.

This greater willingness by interviewees to pay the additional social care levy contrasted with their lower preference to pay Council Tax at 1.99% or more.

**Figure 7: Views on social care levy for self-completion and interviewed respondents**



## 4.3 Budget savings proposals 2018-2023

The survey also asked respondents for their views on the savings proposals 2018-2023 which were described in the appendix to the Corporate Strategy and Budget Consultation Information Booklet.

There were 290 free text responses to this question (42% of the 696 CS&B respondents), which are categorised below<sup>12</sup> and in Figure 8.

### Scale of budget savings

There were 30 (10%) comments about the scale of budget savings. Of these:

- 12 (4%) recognised that balancing the budget is difficult;
- 11 (4%) stated that services have already been heavily cut and that cuts will increase deprivation;
- 3 (1%) said that we should cut deeper and/or make the cuts soon to avoid building up more debt;
- 2 (1%) claimed that 'people are sick of cuts';
- 1 (0.3%) was sceptical that the budget savings will actually will be made;
- 1 (0.3%) said the council should have managed the budget better in the past

<sup>12</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 290 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are expressed as % of the 290 responses.

## **Support for proposals**

There were 7 (2%) comments in support of the proposals:

- 3 (1%) supported the Culture Services proposals;
- 1 (0.3%) supported the Neighbourhood Action proposals;
- 1 (0.3%) supported the Financial Assessment of Care Services proposals;
- 1 (0.3%) supported the Parks and Green Spaces proposals;
- 1 (0.3%) offered general support for the proposals.

## **Against proposals**

There were 2 (1%) comments against the proposals:

- 1 (0.3%) was opposed to the housing proposals;
- 1 (0.3%) was opposed to the Neighbourhood Action proposals;

## **Alternative proposals**

There were 6 (2%) comments offering alternative proposals:

- 3 (1%) provided alternative proposals for Neighbourhood Action;
- 2 (1%) provided alternative proposals for Culture Services;
- 1 (0.3%) provided alternative proposals for libraries.

## **Concern about impacts of savings proposals on services**

There were 28 (10%) comments concerned about the impact of savings proposals on services. Of these:

- 5 (2%) were concerned about the impact on maintenance of pavements/roads/bridges;
- 4 (1%) were concerned about the impact on parks;
- 3 (1%) were concerned about the impact on street trees;
- 2 (1%) were concerned about the impact on libraries;
- 2 (1%) were concerned about the long term impacts of cuts generally;
- 2 (1%) said the cuts would negatively impact neighbourhoods;
- 2 (1%) were concerned about the impact on advice services, which was viewed as having a disproportionate effect on vulnerable people;
- 2 (1%) were concerned about the impact on Children's Services;
- 1 (0.3%) was concerned about the impact on the Housing Options service;
- 1 (0.3%) was concerned about the impact they thought the cuts would have on crime in Bristol;
- 1 (0.3%) believed that the cuts would have an impact on the ability of BCC to be fair and inclusive;
- 1 (0.3%) said the cuts would negatively impact schools;
- 1 (0.3%) said the cuts would negatively impact toilet provision;
- 1 (0.3%) said the cuts would negatively impact older people.

## Services to prioritise

There were 66 (23%) comments on which services the council should prioritise. The numbers of comments in favour of prioritising each service was as follows:

- 20 (7%) - social care for the young, old and vulnerable;
- 9 (3%) - libraries;
- 6 (2%) - parks;
- 5 (2%) - housing;
- 4 (1%) - education;
- 3 (1%) – ‘spending on people who need it and who cannot help themselves’;
- 3 (1%) - improving public transport;
- 2 (1%) - reducing carbon emissions;
- 2 (1%) - improving cycling and walking provision;
- 2 (1%) - young families on low incomes;
- 2 (1%) - the environment;
- 1 (0.3%) - street trees;
- 1 (0.3%) – toilets;
- 1 (0.3%) – parking;
- 1 (0.3%) - local community projects / Community Interest Companies;
- 1 (0.3%) - emergency services;
- 1 (0.3%) - School Crossing Patrols;
- 1 (0.3%) – health;
- 1 (0.3%) said we need an adequate amount of face-to-face advice.

## Problems that need solving

There were 12 (4%) comments about problems that need solving:

- 4 (1%) stated we needed to reduce congestion and pollution;
- 4 (1%) said we needed to solve problems caused by immigration;
- 4 (1%) said that we needed to reduce the number of homeless people in Bristol.

## Views on Council Tax

There were 127 (44%) comments with views on Council Tax as follows:

- 25 (9%) said that we should introduce a means tested Council Tax;
- 20 (7%) said that people cannot afford higher Council Tax;
- 34 (12%) said we should increase Council Tax, of which:
  - 19 (7%) said that we should increase Council Tax by an unspecified amount;
  - 11 (4%) said we should increase Council Tax by more than 2%;
  - 4 (1%) supported a Council Tax increase if the money is exclusively used for essential services;

- 10 (3%) said that more people should have to pay Council Tax, e.g. students;
- 7 (2%) said the survey should have more options for the percentage increase in Social Care Precept;
- 6 (2%) said they supported the Social Care Precept;
- 2 (1%) supported an increase in Social Care Precept only if a long term social care solution is implemented;
- 5 (2%) said they do not support an increase in Council Tax;
- 5 (2%) said that we should review Council Tax discounts and enforce collection more;
- 3 (1%) said we should charge more Council Tax for more expensive properties;
- 3 (1%) disagreed with the Social Care Precept;
- 2 (1%) felt that the Council Tax reduction scheme is too generous;
- 2 (1%) said that we should increase Businesses Rates;
- 1 (0.3%) said we need to be careful with proposing Social Care Precept;
- 1 (0.3%) said the council should revise Council Tax bandings;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should only increase Council Tax if the money goes to police or NHS.

### **Ideas for saving money**

There were 154 (53%) comments giving suggestions for saving money, as follows:

- 33 (11%) said that we should reduce spending on BCC staff, of which:
  - o 12 (4%) said we should cut senior staff pay;
  - o 8 (3%) said we should cut the amount of senior management;
  - o 4 (1%) said that we should reduce the number of office staff;
  - o 4 (1%) said we should increase the amount of volunteers we use to deliver services;
  - o 2 (1%) said we should cut staff pay;
  - o 2 (1%) said we should scrap final salary pensions;
  - o 1 (0.3%) said we should allow Voluntary Redundancy for all BCC staff.
- 25 (9%) said we should change the way we deliver services to save money, of which:
  - o 4 (1%) said that we should stop/reduce non-statutory services;
  - o 3 (1%) said that we should use Income Support claimants / offenders / prisoners to deliver public services;
  - o 2 (1%) said that we should reduce the number of libraries;
  - o 2 (1%) said that we should review the waste service;
  - o 2 (1%) said that we should reduce street lighting;
  - o 2 (1%) said that we should share services;
  - o 1 (0.3%) said that we should save money by having other organisations take-over services;
  - o 1 (0.3%) said that we should stop [unspecified] services;
  - o 1 (0.3%) said we should remove School Crossing Patrols;
  - o 1 (0.3%) said we should stop funding Learning City & The Works;

- o 1 (0.3%) said we should cap social care spending;
- o 1 (0.3%) said we should bring home care services back into the council;
- o 1 (0.3%) said we should close the international office;
- o 1 (0.3%) said we should reduce spending on traffic calming;
- o 1 (0.3%) said that we should improve the management of council houses;
- o 1 (0.3%) said that we should move from delivering services to supporting;
- 25 (9%) said we should improve council efficiency/control of budgets;
- 21 (7%) said we should reduce the spending on politicians, of which:
  - o 13 (4%) said we should reduce number of mayors/councillors;
  - o 5 (2%) said we should reduce/ remove pay/allowances for councillors;
  - o 3 (1%) suggested that the Mayor should have a pay cut;
- 17 (6%) said we should reduce the money we spend on projects, of which:
  - o 9 (3%) said we should stop spending money on 'controversial major projects' (MetroBus, Arena, Temple Gate);
  - o 8 (3%) said we should stop spending on 'unnecessary smaller projects';
- 4 (1%) said that we should stop using consultants;
- 3 (1%) said that we need more transparency over spending;
- 3 (1%) suggested cost saving measures to keep libraries open;
- 3 (1%) said we should stop spending money on diversity/making Bristol "politically correct";
- 3 (1%) said we should learn best practice from businesses;
- 2 (1%) said we should spend less on promoting the city abroad;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should link outcomes to costs;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should merge with neighbouring authorities;
- 1 (0.3%) said that we should reduce costs by stopping immigration;
- 1 (0.3%) said that we should promote cashless payments;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should stop spending money on refurbishing offices;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should remove Residents' Parking;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should stop funding cheap rents;
- 1 (0.3%) were unspecified savings;
- 1 (0.3%) said we would save money by not applying for European City of Culture;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should introduce a bartering system;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should distribute food vouchers rather than pay-outs;
- 1 (0.3%) said we could save money through partnership working;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should redistribute the money currently being spent on the military;
- 1 (0.3%) said that pensions should be used to cover social care;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should offer discount on Council Tax for paperless billing.

## Generating income

There were 62 (21%) comments on generating income, as follows:

- 18 (6%) said we should oppose austerity and force the government to increase local authority funding;
- 6 (2%) said we should increase business rates;
- 6 (2%) said we should increase income (method unspecified);
- There were 5 (2%) suggestions about generating income through car parks:
  - o 2 (1%) said we should increase car parking charges;
  - o 1 (0.3%) suggested increasing the number of car parks;
  - o 1 (0.3%) suggested charging for residential off-street parking;
  - o 1 (0.3%) suggested charging Councillors for parking;
- 5 (2%) said we should increase fines/charges;
- 4 (1%) said we should increase national taxation;
- 2 (1%) said we should involve the community in running services;
- 2 (1%) said we should use council assets to raise money;
- 2 (1%) said we should reduce the business rates discount for Universities;
- 2 (1%) said we should charge for council services (unspecified);
- 2 (1%) said we should introduce a congestion charge/pollution levy;
- 2 (1%) said we should spend the council's reserves;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested applying business rates to Landlords who rent accommodation to students;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested charging rates to people living in caravans/trailers;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested charging for public toilets;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should publish the amount of fines and what gets done with money;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should bring money into region;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested making income through energy generation.

## Council

There were 10 (3%) comments on the Council:

- 3 (1%) said that the council needs leaders with courage to take difficult decisions and 'not try to please everyone';
- 3 (1%) do not support reducing core infrastructure services to support social care;
- 1 (0.3%) said that party politics should not be part of local government;
- 1 (0.3%) said that we should have less red tape;
- 1 (0.3%) people in charge of council cuts are not competent;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested that the Council identify priorities with good data analysis.

## Areas of Deprivation

There were 3 (1%) comments on areas of deprivation:

- 2 (1%) said we should focus resources on deprived areas/people;
- 1 (0.3%) said that people who are struggling also live in less deprived areas, so we should not focus resources on deprived areas.

## Housing

There were 7 (2%) comments about Housing:

- 1 (0.3%) recommended using brownfield sites for housing;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should regularly check housing stock to ensure property is in a fit state;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should be more proactive in releasing the latent value of real estate assets;
- 1 (0.3%) said housing priority should not be given to incomers;
- 1 (0.3%) suggested that by providing more housing to get people off the street we would reduce the care bill;
- 1 (0.3%) disagreed with the areas selected for house building;
- 1 (0.3%) complained that student housing excludes local people from centre;

## Arena

There were 2 (1%) comments about the arena (in addition to those referred to in the “Ideas for saving money” section above):

- 1 (0.3%) said we should relocate the arena;
- 1 (0.3%) said we should finish building the arena.

## Budget simulator

There were 9 (3%) comments on the budget simulator:

- 6 (2%) were negative about the budget simulator;
- 3 (1%) were positive about the budget simulator.


## Survey


There were 13 (4%) comments on the survey:


- 5 (2%) said they need more information;
- 3 (1%) were positive about the survey;
- 3 (1%) were negative about the survey;
- 2 (1%) said the information was too complicated.


## Other


- 6 (2%) said that some people will never help themselves, and we shouldn't penalise people who help themselves;
- 1 (0.3%) praised the Legible City initiative.


**Figure 8.1: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (1 of 7)**


**Figure 8.2: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (2 of 7)**

**Figure 8.3: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (3 of 7)**

**Figure 8.4: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (4 of 7)**

**Figure 8.5: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (5 of 7)**

**Figure 8.6: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (6 of 7)**

**Figure 8.7: Other comments on the savings proposals 2018-2023 (7 of 7)**

## 5 Survey responses on Corporate Strategy 2018-2023

### 5.1 Overall views on key commitments


Respondents were asked to provide their views on the key commitments as a whole using a five point scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'.

491 (71%) of the CS&B respondents provided their views (Figure 9). Of these:

- 286 (58%) respondents agree or strongly agree with the key commitments overall.
- 146 (30%) respondents neither agree nor disagree with the key commitments overall.
- 59 (12%) respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the key commitments.

205 people did not answer the question<sup>13</sup>.

**Figure 9: Views on Corporate Strategy key commitments overall**




### 5.2 Other key commitments the council should make

Respondents were asked if they think there are other key commitments the council should make. 465 (67%) of CS&B respondents answered the question (Figure 10), of whom:

- 164 (35%) thought other key commitments are needed;
- 151 (32%) thought there are no additional commitments needed; and
- 150 (32%) did not know.

<sup>13</sup> Response rates to the Corporate Strategy questions were lower than for the questions on Council Tax and Social Care Precept because only three of the 181 people who answered interview surveys went on to respond to the section on the Corporate Strategy.

**Figure 10: Views on the need for other key commitments**

190 (27%) of the CS&B respondents specified additional key commitments they thought the council should make. (This is more than the 164 respondents who stated that other key commitments were needed).

These free text suggestions are categorised below<sup>14</sup> and in Figure 11 under the five Corporate Strategy themes (Empowering and Caring, Fair and Inclusive, Well Connected, Wellbeing, Belonging) plus five other categories (the role of the council, Council Tax and Business Rates, ways to save money, other comments about the 23 proposed key commitments, and comments about the CS&B survey).

### Theme 1: Empowering and Caring

There were 42 (22%) comments related to Theme 1: Empowering and Caring. Of these:

- 13 (7%) stated the council should prioritise social care and support the most vulnerable people in Bristol. Of these, four were critical that past and proposed savings have taken funds from vulnerable people and one stated that there is a need to stimulate the social care provider market to prevent dependence on fewer providers;
- 11 (6%) thought that the council's activities should promote independence by individuals and communities, rather than creating dependency. These ranged from recommending the council intervenes less to requesting more support for people to help them achieve independence. Two of the 11 emphasised the need for excellent information and advice to enable people to independently access services provided by the council, NHS and VCS providers;
- 7 (4%) stated that tackling growing homelessness in Bristol is a priority. One of these identified the importance of mental health services to prevent homelessness;
- 4 (2%) highlighted the need to support and safeguard children, with one of these requesting the council to reconsider plans to reduce youth clubs and services;

<sup>14</sup> The number of categorised suggestions is more than the 190 free text responses because some responses included suggestions in more than one category. Percentages are % of the 190 free text responses.

- 3 (2%) called on the council to maintain an active presence in all wards and communities and retain funding for community action. One of these was very critical that the council is transferring its responsibilities to communities and another strongly objected to the proposed withdrawal of £257 in grants for small community projects;
- 2 (1%) supported encouraging volunteering;
- 1 (1%) stated that the local element of Community Infrastructure Levy should be devolved to smaller local areas than is proposed.
- 1 (1%) called for commitment to older people, including age diversity in city leadership.

## **Theme 2: Fair and Inclusive**

There were 62 (33) comments related to Theme 2: Fair and Inclusive. Of these:

- 14 (7%) wanted commitments to address housing. Of these:
  - o 9 (5%) wanted the council to deliver on its commitment to deliver socially affordable housing;
  - o 3 (2%) called on the council to commit to tackle problem landlords, by inspecting properties or capping private rents;
  - o 1 (1%) advised that the council should not build thousands of houses without supporting infrastructure;
  - o 1 (1%) wanted the council to clamp down on the practice of sub-letting council properties.
- 13 (7%) thought the council should prioritise education, including early literacy intervention, support for people with Special Educational Needs and access courses for colleges. A further 2 (1%) wanted the council to do more to support young people, including disabled citizens, into employment;
- 9 (5%) thought the commitments should include addressing social justice and tackling social inequality. Four of these identified that the council should target its resources more fairly across the city. In contrast, one (1%) thought that it is not the role of the council to compensate for inequity in society;
- 8 (4%) want the council to 'grow the city' as a regional centre and to encourage/support business, in order to generate funds to pay for services. In contrast, 1 (1%) suggested reducing demand for services by reducing housing capacity in the city;
- 4 (2%) want the council to oppose austerity;
- 2 (1%) thought the council should ensure all citizens have access to basic needs (healthy food and water, heat and shelter, clean air and safety from violence);
- 2 (1%) wanted the council to protect low-income families;
- 2 (1%) submitted comments opposing inclusivity, citing anti-immigration views;
- 1 (1%) wanted the council to work more with Bristol-based suppliers in order to retain wealth in the city;
- 1 (1%) called for more creative ideas for generating income in order to reduce the need for cuts;
- 1 (1%) favoured promoting more tourism;
- 1 (1%) was concerned about the number of students in the city.

### Theme 3: Well Connected

There were 30 (16%) comments related to Theme 3: Well Connected. Of these:

- 27 (14%) wanted improvements to transport of which:
  - o 19 (10%) want to reduce cars in the city and to promote public transport and healthy travel. One of these wanted a commitment to a congestion charge;
  - o 3 (2%) wanted funds to maintain existing roads and footways;
  - o 2 (1%) argued for measures to making driving more convenient in the city;
  - o 1 (1%) highlighted a need to help people with physical and mental disabilities access transport.
  - o 1 (1%) suggested ways to optimise safety and capacity in Residents' Parking Schemes;
- 3 (2%) wanted a commitment to tackle crime.

### Theme 4: Wellbeing

There were 73 (38%) comments related to Theme 4: Wellbeing. Of these:

- 33 (17%) requested commitments to maintain existing assets which contribute to wellbeing, including:
  - o 17 (9%) asked for a commitment to parks and green spaces;
  - o 8 (4%) wanted to maintain libraries;
  - o 4 (2%) wanted to keep public toilets open;
  - o 4 (2%) asked for budgets to invest in and maintain street trees;
- 24 (13%) called for commitments to make Bristol sustainable. These included:
  - o 8 (4%) requested commitments to reduce waste, improve household waste and recycling, and cleaner streets with action on litter and fly-tipping;
  - o 6 (3%) called for a commitment to measures to deliver clean air;
  - o 4 (2%) wanted stronger commitments to tackle climate change (again with an emphasis on sustainable transport) and promoting green energy and home efficiency measures;
  - o 2 (1%) wanted a commitment to food and clean water security, including local food production;
  - o 3 (2%) others called for unspecified measures to make Bristol sustainable and to protect the environment;
- 10 (5%) wanted more emphasis on public health and wellbeing;
- 3 (2%) wanted changes to the planning system to site landmark infrastructure and public buildings in the city centre (not at the edges of the city), to protect green belt and to simplify the planning process;
- 2 (1%) wanted to tackle fuel poverty;
- 1 (1%) respondent called for reductions on outside advertising because it impacts on wellbeing, air quality and a diverse local economy.

## **Theme 5: Belonging**

There were 14 (7%) comments related to Theme 5: Belonging. Of these:

- 6 (3%) wanted the council to commit to build the arena;
- 3 (2%) want to maintain museums and art and culture;
- 2 (1%) wanted the council to commit to transparency and honesty (one of whom accused the council of 'cronyism');
- 1 (1%) wanted funding for sports clubs;
- 1 (1%) asked for the council to introduce qualifications for buskers;
- 1 (1%) said the council should bring some fun into Bristol.

## **Role of the council**

There were 18 (9%) comments about the role of the Council. Of these:

- 12 (6%) stated that the council should focus on practical actions, maintaining assets and completing existing priorities before embarking on new visions;
- 3 (2%) said that the council should only commit to delivering its statutory services;
- 1 (1%) stated the council has a key role in civic leadership, and should play a leading role in the life of the city: community, business, social well-being and public life;
- 1 (1%) thought the council should provide some social care service in-house to maintain good quality;
- 1 (1%) thought the council should not fund activities which the private sector could pay for, such as harbour festival, the arena and Bristol's Biggest Bike Ride.

## **Council Tax and Business Rates**

There were 12 (6%) comments related to Council Tax and Business Rates. Of these:

- 4 (2%) wanted to freeze or reduce Council Tax and 1 (1%) wants to reduce Council Tax for the elderly;
- 3 (2%) supported increasing Council Tax and 1 (1%) favours taxing families with children more;
- 2 (1%) oppose increasing business rates;
- 1 (1%) favours increasing business rates.

## **Ways to save money**

There were 30 (16%) suggestions for ways for the council to save money. Of these:

- 12 (6%) Improve council efficiency / control of budgets;
- 5 (3%) recommended cutting salaries for senior staff and another 1 (1%) wanted to review all council staffing;
- 4 (2%) wanted to cut funding for the City Office and running the Mayor's activities;
- 2 (1%) wanted to remove the elected Mayoral system;
- 2 (1%) called for more cross-departmental collaboration in the council;
- 2 (1%) called for cutting benefits for people who make lifestyle choices they cannot afford;
- 1 called for commissioning services externally, which they anticipate would be more efficient;
- 1 (1%) recommended cutting the pay of consultants.

## **Comments about the 23 proposed key commitments**


There were 17 (9%) comments about the 23 key commitments. Of these:

- 8 (4%) highlighted the need to target budgets at areas which deliver the key commitments;
- 6 (3%) were sceptical that the key commitments are platitudes and that policy details and actions were what would count;
- 1 (1%) thought there are too many commitments;
- 1 (1%) expressed positive support for the commitments;
- 1 (1%) criticised the tone of the Corporate Strategy, concluding 'the running of the city is not a business, but a democratically accountable institution'.


## **Comments about the CS&B survey**

There were 2 (1%) comments about the CS&B survey. Of these:

- 1 (1%) stated that the survey was too complicated;
- 1 (1%) questioned the value of consultations and instead wanted the council to talk to service users and let users decide the future services.

**Figure 11.1: Other commitments suggested by respondents (1 of 3)**

**Figure 11.2: Other commitments suggested by respondents (2 of 3)**

**Figure 11.3: Other commitments suggested by respondents (3 of 3)**

### 5.3 Key commitments which respondents think should not be priorities

The survey asked respondents to identify any key commitments which they think should NOT be among the council's highest priorities.


282 (41%) of the CS&B respondents identified one or more of the key commitments which they thought should not be corporate commitments (Figure 12). This is more than half (57%) of the 497 people who answered one or more of the Corporate Strategy questions. Of these, 53 (11%) identified ten or more key commitments which they did not support.

The key commitments which have least support (i.e. those that the highest numbers of respondents thought should NOT be corporate priorities) are as follows. The percentages are the percentage of the 497 people who answered one or more of the Corporate Strategy questions (not the percentage of all CS&B respondents):

- **Commitment 11.** Make progress towards being the UK's best digitally connected city – identified by 104 (21%) of the respondents to the Corporate Strategy questions;
- **Commitment 6.** Make sure that 2,000 new homes – 800 affordable – are built in Bristol each year by 2020. 103 (21%) respondents identified that this should NOT be a priority;
- **Commitment 20.** Bring race, class, sexuality, gender and disability diversity to city leadership – identified by 99 (20%) respondents.
- **Commitment 19.** Develop political connectivity locally, nationally and globally to benefit Bristol, involving people and influencing decisions which affect us - identified by 94 (19%) respondents;
- **Commitment 4.** Prioritise community development and enable people to support their community – identified by 93 (19%) respondents;
- **Commitment 9.** We will make quality work experience and apprenticeships available to every young person – identified by 83 (17%) respondents;

The key commitments which have greatest support (i.e. those which fewest people think should NOT be corporate priorities) are:

- **Commitment 7.** Improve educational equality and attainment, also ensuring there are enough school places to meet demand and a transparent admissions process - 40 (8%) respondents identified that this should NOT be a priority;
- **Commitment 5.** Protect children's centre services and develop their role in communities – identified by 52 (10%) respondents;
- **Commitment 1.** Be great corporate parents and safeguard children and vulnerable adults, protecting them from exploitation or harm– identified by 55 (11%) respondents;
- **Commitment 14.** Improve physical & mental health and wellbeing, reduce inequalities in health and consider health in all our policies – identified by 62 (12%) respondents;
- **Commitment 12.** Deliver high standards of physical accessibility, becoming a city that is safe and open for everyone – identified by 64 (13%) respondents;
- **Commitment 3.** Provide 'help to help yourself' and 'help when you need it' through a sustainable, safe and diverse system of adult and children's social care provision – identified by 64 (13%) respondents;
- **Commitment 15.** Take action to improve air quality and minimise our environmental impact – identified by 65 (13%) respondents;
- **Commitment 13.** Reduce social isolation and help connect individuals and communities socially – identified by 67 (13%) respondents.

**Figure 12: Key commitments which respondents think should NOT be priorities**

## 5.4 Reasons why respondents did not support specific commitments

Respondents were asked to explain why they thought the key commitments they had identified should not be corporate priorities.

178 (26%) respondents provided free text comments explaining why they thought the key commitments they had identified should not be corporate priorities. These comments are categorised below<sup>15</sup> and in Figure 13 for each commitment.

### **Commitment 1 Be great corporate parents and safeguard children and vulnerable adults, protecting them from exploitation or harm**

2 comments (1%):

- 1 (1%) said that being corporate parents should not be BCC's responsibility;
- 1 (1%) said that we should increase the police force instead.

### **Commitment 2 Prevent people becoming homeless and reduce the overall level of homelessness, with no-one needing to spend a 'second night out'**

3 comments (2%):

- 1 (1%) said that BCC is mismanaging homeless provision by paying landlords too much;
- 1 (1%) said that based on cost/benefit this was not a priority;
- 1 (1%) said that we should reduce tax in order to enable the private sector to create jobs for homeless people.

### **Commitment 3 Provide 'help to help yourself' and 'help when you need it' through a sustainable, safe and diverse system of adult and children's social care provision**

8 comments (4%):

- 4 (2%) said that commitment 3 seems to be putting the onus onto vulnerable service users;
- 1 (1%) said that commitment 3 could be combined with commitment 1;
- 1 (1%) said that this should already be in place;
- 1 (1%) said that this could be tackled by increasing jobs in the private sector;
- 1 (1%) said that this would need inclusive and effective council communications.

### **Commitment 4 Prioritise community development and enable people to support their community**

15 comments (8%):

- 10 (6%) said that this should not be a council priority;
- 2 (1%) said that the council had taken actions to destroy communities up to this point;
- 1 (1%) was concerned that the council was loading increasing amounts of public services onto volunteers.

---

<sup>15</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 178 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are expressed as % of the 178 responses.

### **Commitment 5 Protect Children’s Centre services and develop their role in communities**

3 (2%) comments:

- All comments said that BCC did not need to provide this service.

### **Commitment 6 Make sure that 2,000 new homes – 800 affordable – are built in Bristol each year by 2020**

25 (14%) comments:

- 10 (6%) said that there should be a larger quantity of affordable houses built;
- 7 (4%) said that the council should not be building more homes;
- 2 (1%) said that the council should be using existing properties more effectively;
- 2 (1%) said Bristol is already overcrowded;
- 2 (1%) said that too many “affordable” homes were proposed;
- 1 (1%) said houses wouldn’t go to local people;
- 1 (1%) suggested changing town planning regulations.

### **Commitment 7 Improve educational equality and attainment, also ensuring there are enough school places to meet demand and a transparent admissions process**

2 (1%) comments:

- 1 (1%) said that this was ‘pointless within the academy system’;
- 1 (1%) said this would not work due to the unfair way BCC allocates funds to schools.

### **Commitment 8 Develop a diverse economy that offers opportunity to all, valuing small local businesses and traditional trades alongside the city’s high-tech and creative sectors**

4 comments (2%):

- 3 (2%) said that businesses should do this themselves;
- 1 (1%) said that large businesses requiring skilled workers should be included.

### **Commitment 9 We will make quality work experience and apprenticeships available to every young person**

17 comments (10%):

- 14 (8%) said that this was not a priority for BCC;
- 3 (2%) said that there were issues with the approach described in the commitment, of which:
  - o 1 (1%) said that this was ‘undermined by BCC reducing its workforce’;
  - o 1 (1%) said that it would be impossible if colleges do not support the skills businesses need;
  - o 1 (1%) said that 100% coverage would dilute the quality of work experience offered, resulting in people being forced to do roles they don’t want.

### **Commitment 10 Improve physical and geographical connectivity; tackling congestion and progressing towards a mass transit system**

11 comments (6%):

- 6 (3%) were concerned with the disruption and cost of setting up mass transit systems;
- 1 (1%) said that we should work with the current traffic system;
- 1 (1%) said that we should be prioritising infrastructure for walking and cycling;
- 1 (1%) said that we seem to be making transport worse.

### **Commitment 11 Make progress towards being the UK's best digitally connected city**

26 comments (15%):

- All comments said that digital connectivity was not a high priority.

### **Commitment 12 Deliver high standards of physical accessibility, becoming a city that is safe and open for everyone**

10 comments (6%):

- 7 (4%) said that this was not a priority for BCC;
- 1 (1%) said that this commitment was hypocritical after we closed down all public facing council offices outside of the city centre;
- 1 (1%) said that they didn't think we could afford or control it;
- 1 (1%) said that the law already requires reasonable adjustment and disabled access.

### **Commitment 13 Reduce social isolation and help connect individuals and communities socially**

8 comments (5%):

- All comments said that this should not be the council's responsibility.

### **Commitment 14 Improve physical & mental health and wellbeing, reduce inequalities in health and consider health in all our policies**

2 comments (1%):

- 1 (1%) said that we should be addressing inequities in health rather than inequalities;
- 1 (1%) said that the council's actions were in opposition to this commitment.

### **Commitment 15 Take action to improve air quality and minimise our environmental impact**

4 comments (2%):

- 2 (1%) said that this was not a priority for BCC;
- 1 (1%) said that this should be dealt with by other agencies;
- 1 (1%) said that there also needed to be a commitment to give people access to green spaces.

**Commitment 16 Build resilience, improving our ability to cope with environmental, economic or social ‘shocks and stresses’ while putting Bristol on course to be run entirely on clean energy by 2050**

10 comments (6%):

- 7 (4%) said that this was an impractical luxury;
- 2 (1%) said that this priority was not well articulated;
- 1 (1%) said that this should be dealt with by other agencies.

**Commitment 17 Encourage life-long learning in environments where both academic and emotional development are understood and delivered together**

11 comments (6%):

- 8 (5%) said that this is not a priority for BCC;
- 2 (1%) were not sure what the commitment meant;
- 1 (1%) suggested training young people in trade skills.

**Commitment 18 Tackle food poverty**

13 comments (7%):

- 3 (2%) said that we should instead stimulate economic activity and create jobs to tackle poverty overall;
- 3 (2%) said that this was not a priority for the council;
- 2 (1%) said that we should be educating people to cook cheap meals, grow their own food etc. to reduce food poverty;
- 2 (1%) said that people need to prioritise their benefits etc. to buy food rather than mobile phones etc.;
- 1 (1%) said that we should give families food vouchers;
- 1 (1%) said that this should be tackled by the voluntary sector.

**Commitment 19: Develop political connectivity locally, nationally and globally to benefit Bristol, involving people and influencing decisions which affect us**

17 comments (10%):

- 13 (7%) said that this was not a priority;
- 3 (2%) said that it was unclear what this commitment aimed to achieve;
- 1 (1%) said that this was not a believable commitment as it is the opposite of the council's actions, e.g. stopping funding neighbourhood forums.

### **Commitment 20 Bring race, class, sexuality, gender and disability diversity to city leadership**

29 comments (16%):

- 18 (10%) were against the focus on diversity and stated that we should be focusing on employing the best people for the job;
- 6 (3%) said that it was not a top priority;
- 2 (1%) said that it was not the council's role to do this and we should just follow legal requirements;
- 1 (1%) suggested that this commitment should be achieved through meaningful intervention to ensure equal opportunities, e.g. flexible working or addressing root cause of unequal academic achievement rather than quotas.

### **Commitment 21 Support meaningful city participation, offering more involvement in decision-making and social investment in the community**

12 comments (7%):

- 8 (4%) said that this was not a priority for the council;
- 4 (2%) said that people who were interested in getting involved with the community already would.

### **Commitment 22 Keep Bristol a leading cultural city, helping make culture, sport and play accessible to all**

15 comments (8%):

- 12 (7%) said that this was not a priority for BCC;
- 3 (2%) said that Bristol is not a leading cultural city.

### **Commitment 23 Take a zero-tolerance approach to abuse or crime based on gender, disability, race, religion or sexuality**

13 comments (7%):


- 6 (3%) saw commitment 23 as directing police action towards equalities groups at the expense of everyone else;
- 2 (1%) said that this is the job of the police rather than the council;
- 1 (1%) said that we have allowed grooming gangs and FGM to continue.


## **Not specific to a particular commitment**


46 comments (26%):

- 11 (6%) said that commitments were not priorities (unspecified);
- 6 (3%) said that the commitments were too vague and needed more specific detail;
- 2 (1%) said that some of the priorities should be delivered through private businesses;
- 2 (1%) said that we should not be prioritising minorities;
- 1 (1%) said we should focus on delivery;
- 1 (1%) said people need to take responsibility for themselves;
- 1 (1%) said decisions should be free from politics;
- 1 (1%) said that education should be prioritised;
- 1 (1%) said that the educational cuts go against our commitments;
- 1 (1%) said that we should not prioritise people with children;
- 1 (1%) said that we need a smaller number of key commitments;
- 1 (1%) said that we should make Bristol safe;
- 1 (1%) said that we should stop the Council Tax reduction scheme;
- 1 (1%) said that we should encourage sports and exercise;
- 1 (1%) said that we should cut senior staff;
- 1 (1%) said that we should involve residents in the running of BCC.

6 (3%) of the comments misunderstood the question and commented on commitments they wanted prioritised.

**Figure 13.1: Reasons why respondents do not support specific commitments (1 of 3)**

**Figure 13.2: Reasons why respondents do not support specific commitments (2 of 3)**

**Figure 13.3: Reasons why respondents do not support specific commitments (3 of 3)**

## 5.5 Other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy

158 (23%) of the CS&B consultation respondents provided other free text comments on the draft Corporate Strategy. These comments are categorised below<sup>16</sup> and in Figure 14.

### Positive comments on the Corporate Strategy

There were 16 (10%) positive comments about the Corporate Strategy, of which:

- 12 (8%) were positive comments about the vision;
- 4 (3%) were positive comments about the commitments.

### Negative comments on the Corporate Strategy

There were 31 (20%) negative comments about the Corporate Strategy.

- 26 (16%) said that the Corporate Strategy was too vague / too idealistic / contained too many commitments.
- 2 (1%) stated that the monetary savings were not clear enough.
- 1 (1%) said that the Corporate Strategy needed more emphasis on economic growth.
- 1 (1%) said that BCC was using this consultation as support for cuts.
- 1 (1%) said that BCC needs to better explain the jargon within the strategy.

### Implementation of the Corporate Strategy

- 12 (8%) stated that the value of the vision and commitments is dependent on successful delivery and implementation.

### Priorities

There were 58 (37%) comments giving priorities for the council. These were:

- 8 (5%) - public transport/access;
- 6 (4%) - the environment/reducing air pollution;
- 5 (3%) - improving infrastructure and conditions for pedestrians/cyclists;
- 4 (3%) - improving roads and congestion;
- 4 (3%) - reducing social inequality;
- 3 (2%) - opposing austerity;
- 3 (2%) - health and wellbeing;
- 3 (2%) - social services/care homes/carers;
- 2 (1%) - libraries;
- 2 (1%) - education;
- 2 (1%) - older people;
- 2 (1%) - vulnerable adults;
- 2 (1%) - building more affordable housing;
- 2 (1%) - dealing with the causes of social problems rather than the symptoms;

---

<sup>16</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 158 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are expressed as % of the 158 responses.

- 2 (1%) - parks/green spaces;
- 2 (1%) - fixing roads;
- 1 (1%) - learning disabilities;
- 1 (1%) - supporting local and citywide events;
- 1 (1%) - stopping discrimination;
- 1 (1%) - reducing immigration;
- 1 (1%) - building the arena;
- 1 (1%) - reducing illegal drugs usage in Bristol.

### **Not priorities when budgets are limited**

There were 4 (3%) comments on what areas are not priorities when budgets are limited:

- 1 (1%) said that “digitally connected” was not a priority;
- 1 (1%) said that the commitments in general were not a priority;
- 1 (1%) said that people need to help themselves;
- 1 (1%) said that the council needs to get back to basics.

### **Savings suggestions**

There were 24 (15%) savings suggestions:

- 8 (5%) suggested that the council should control costs;
- 5 (3%) suggested that the council should scrap costly transport schemes;
- 4 (3%) suggested that the council should stop sub-contracting work and using consultants;
- 3 (2%) suggested removing non-productive staff;
- 1 (1%) suggested that we need better coordination of services;
- 1 (1%) suggested better utilising the current housing stock;
- 1 (1%) suggested stopping spending on projects;
- 1 (1%) suggested that being a councillor should become a voluntary service.

### **Income**

There were 9 (6%) comments on income:

- 3 (2%) suggested increasing income (unspecified);
- 2 (1%) suggested that we raise Council Tax;
- 1 (1%) suggested that we keep large events free as they bring in more income through increased tourism;
- 1 (1%) suggested selling off/leasing council owned properties;
- 1 (1%) suggested introducing a tourist tax;
- 1 (1%) suggested using the council reserves to pay for services.

## **Collaboration**

There were 2 (1%) comments on collaboration:

- 2 (1%) suggested that we collaborate with the universities.

## **Comments about the consultation**

There were 5 (3%) comments about the consultation:

- 4 (3%) gave negative comments about the consultation;
- 1 (1%) gave positive comments about the consultation.

## **Negative about council's record**


There were 11 (7%) negative comments about the council's record:


- 3 (2%) commented negatively about the arena;
- 3 (2%) had negative comments about the council's record in general;
- 2 (1%) had negative comments about the council's record on transport;
- 2 (1%) had negative comments about the council's record on schools;
- 1 (1%) said that the commitment to city participation is undermined by savings proposal to reduce community development posts.

## **Suggestions for running of the council**

There were 17 (11%) comments with suggestions for running the council:

- 3 (2%) said we should reduce Council Tax;
- 2 (1%) suggested reducing business rates;
- 2 (1%) said that a happy city will sell itself;
- 2 (1%) said that the One City Plan needs to be assisted by joined-up data/consultation;
- 1 (1%) said the council needs to prove it is committed to saving money and getting best value for money;
- 1 (1%) said we need to stop the building of a nuclear power station;
- 1 (1%) said they were anti-cuts;
- 1 (1%) were concerned that Council Tax is increasing faster than most people's income;
- 1 (1%) asked whether it was a foregone conclusion that the Council will be a smaller organisation;
- 1 (1%) suggested that charging for museums wouldn't raise much money;
- 1 (1%) suggested that the council should leave the free market to sort things out;
- 1 (1%) suggested that we should allow high density residential housing to be built.

**Figure 14.1: Other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy (1 of 2)**

**Figure 14.2: Other comments on the draft Corporate Strategy (2 of 2)**

## **6 Other correspondence on the CS&B consultation**

### **6.1 Overview**

16 letters and emails were received in response to the CS&B consultation, outside of the consultation survey format. These are summarised below and comprised:

- nine responses from members of the public;
- seven responses from other interested parties.

A further 13 emails and letters were received which focused on the Neighbourhood Action consultation and these are described in Appendix C.

### **6.2 Responses from members of the public regarding the consultation**

The nine responses from members of the public included recommendations for council priorities and suggestions for how the council should generate more income and save money. The comments are summarised by theme below.

#### **Council Tax**

There was one suggestion about Council Tax, which stated that people on benefits should contribute to council's budget.

#### **Income/funding**

There were two suggestions for increasing income/funding:

- Libraries should charge for library books;
- The council should oppose austerity and demand money from central government.

#### **Saving money**

There were seven suggestions about saving money:

- The council should cancel MetroBus;
- The council should remove the Mayor;
- The council should sell off the College Green offices;
- The council should stop spending on projects with no chance of completion;
- People need to be held accountable for wasting council money;
- The council should provide larger litter bins so they can be emptied less frequently;
- The council should reduce the BCC pension scheme.

#### **Council priorities**

There were four recommendations about council priorities:

- Maintain free bus passes for older people;
- Maintain park toilets;
- Waste collectors need to stop dropping rubbish;
- Build underground metro system on budget

## 6.3 Responses from other interested parties regarding the consultation

The seven responses from other interested groups came from the following local organisations: Avon and Somerset PCC and Constabulary, Bristol Unison, Golden Key, The Northern Slopes Initiative, South Gloucestershire Council, Woodland Trust, and VOSCUR. These comments are summarised below.

### Corporate Strategy

The Northern Slopes Initiative made the following points on the Corporate Strategy in general:

- The Corporate Strategy needs to be inspirational and set standards for others;
- The council needs to encourage individuals and groups and develop trust between parties;
- The splitting of strategic themes and commitments was viewed as unhelpful, as people need to understand how they interlink and need to be delivered;
- The document needs to be simpler to understand.

### The City

South Gloucestershire Council stated that they:

- Suggest that we collectively assess the implications of Brexit;
- Suggested working collaboratively to promote the region to the Europe and the World;
- Support the concept of the One City Plan.

### Empowering and Caring

Golden Key, with reference to the 'Empowering and Caring' theme, stated that they:

- Support creating a sustainable, empowered city with financial security;
- Council needs to create a city-wide response for vulnerable adults not accommodated in the Care Act;
- Support the council making homelessness a key commitment;
- Were concerned with the impact of a Council Tax rise on vulnerable people;
- Believe the council need to support people leaving care or with a history of care.

### Fair and Inclusive

South Gloucestershire Council, in reference to the 'Fair and Inclusive' theme, stated that they:

- Welcome the scale of ambition for housing delivery;
- Support securing quality work experience for young people;
- Support collaborative working to improve educational attainment in the region.

### Well Connected

South Gloucestershire Council, in reference to the 'Well Connected' theme, stated that they:

- Support collaborative working to improve digital connectivity in the region;
- Support collaborative working to improve transport in the region.

## Wellbeing

Both South Gloucestershire Council and the Woodland Trust commented on the 'Wellbeing' theme, stating that they:

- Support collaborative working on improving air quality in the region;

South Gloucestershire Council also highlighted that they:

- Support collaborative working on the wellbeing agenda;

The Woodland Trust also highlighted that they:

- Would like a stronger commitment to protecting and enhancing Bristol's natural environment, particularly a specific reference to maintaining and enhancing the tree canopy;
- The importance of access to green space to promote physical and mental health and wellbeing;
- The need for strong commitment to the expectations on developers to provide trees as part of a new development or of any regeneration scheme.

## Crime

A joint letter from the Police and Crime Commissioner and Avon and Somerset Constabulary stated that these organisations:

- Welcome references to safeguarding and a zero tolerance approach to hate crime;
- Would like reference to safe communities in the Corporate Strategy;
- Would welcome engagement and collaboration on the Reducing Reoffending agenda;
- Recommends that an impact assessment is carried out on discontinuing the services currently funded by the Police and Crime grant if that money is used to fund PCSOs;
- Propose that the PCC fund the PCSO posts directly to the Constabulary as part of the normal police budget process rather than a commissioning grant for internal police posts.

## Council staff

UNISON made the following comments relating to BCC colleagues:

- BCC staff should be consulted on changes that impact them and Unions should be informed;
- Staff feel as though they are overstretched;
- Staff are offended by constant referral to "efficiency savings";
- Staff feel cuts aren't distributed equally across the council as lower paid staff are seemingly cut at the expense of higher paid;
- They perceive a lack of transparency over processes around interim placements;
- They stated that stress and mental ill health has become the highest cause of sickness amongst BCC workforce;
- They welcome a strong, clear message from the leaders of the council whenever they are making decisions;
- Workforce should be important, valued, and the key to making the council successful in the future.

## **Working with community groups**

VOSCUR provided recommendations for improving how the council works with community groups:

- Community Asset Transfer process should be streamlined and community organisations should be supported through the process;
- The council should develop new ways of working with VCSE organisations and communities to enable them to play key roles in delivering public services;
- The council should work collaboratively to develop co-location options for VCSE organisations;
- They supported collaborative working to further develop and replicate models that bring additional resources to the city and make a difference in priority communities.

## **Alternatives to further cuts**

UNISON suggested alternatives to further cuts:

- The council has a range of powers that can be used to generate income;
- Changes need to be made culturally and organisationally to enable the council to use these powers to generate income;
- There are several potential business opportunity areas that could be explored by the council;
- The council needs to develop sustainable finances to deal with the impact of the ageing population and costs of adult social care;
- The council should procure services in a way that both promotes social cohesion and environmental protection and enables innovation in in-house service delivery.

In addition to the written comments described above, verbal comments were received from business representatives, including from Business West and Destination Bristol, at the Corporate Strategy partner briefing on 22 November 2017. These are described in section 7.2.

## **7 Feedback from meetings**

### **7.1 Public meetings**

The CS&B consultation and the 'Neighbourhood Action' consultation were publicised at the LDub Arts Club Funding Meeting on 15 November, the 'Love St Paul's' (post Partnership transition) meeting on 21 November, a 'Team Southmead' meeting on 28 November and at the Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum on 28 November. Attendees were encouraged to complete the survey online or using paper copies. Direct feedback received at the meetings is described below.

#### **Team Southmead meeting**

The Team Southmead meeting was attended by seven residents and five other attendees who were ward councillors, BCC officers or VCS representatives. Of four comments received:

- Two were critical that they were being asked to respond to a proposal to further reduce the funding for Neighbourhood Action, having very recently provided their views on retaining this fund as part of the Your Neighbourhood consultation;
- One was critical of the six week consultation period for the CS&B consultation, stating that because Team Southmead meets monthly, six weeks did not provide enough time to respond;
- One complained that the computers in their library had not worked during the recent 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation.

#### **Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum, Love St Paul's and LDub Arts Club Funding meetings**

The CS&B consultation and related consultations were publicised and paper copies of the information and survey were handed out. No feedback on the CS&B consultation was provided at the meetings.

Feedback on the Neighbourhood Action consultation proposals is included in Appendix C.

### **7.2 Corporate Strategy partner briefing**

Representatives from Bristol City Council's strategic city partners and the business community attended an informal briefing with the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and the council's director of finance on 22 November 2017.

There was broad agreement that the new corporate strategy and budget outline presented an opportunity to work more closely together to redefine the role of the local authority and how businesses and wider partners can help deliver the city's strategic objectives.

Attendees acknowledged the current economic and political environment in terms of local authority funding, austerity and the imperative to balance the council's budget in order to protect services for the long term.

Representatives of the voluntary sector noted that this was an opportunity for real change and for the sector to actively support the council in empowering individuals and communities and where appropriate developing and delivering services either on the council's behalf or independently but in partnership.

Business representatives, including from Business West and Destination Bristol, noted the direct interest of the business community in the council's economic growth agenda. One delegate offered the support and expertise of business leaders in the city in assisting the council in identifying and developing opportunities to raise revenue from appropriate assets and services. The risk of relying too strongly on revenue from increased business rates was also noted. In addition, it was suggested that a collective effort to raise awareness, discussion and change behaviour in relation to citizens' expectations of local authority services could be taken forward.

## 8 How will this report be used?

This report will be taken into account as final proposals are developed by officers to put to Cabinet to recommend to Full Council. This consultation report will also be considered by Cabinet and Full Council in making its decisions about the Corporate Strategy and the 2018/19 budget at the Full Council meeting on 20 February 2018.

As noted above, Full Council will set the overall amounts each part of the council has to spend over the coming year; it does not approve all of the detail on how the savings will be made. The three consultations on specific savings measures (Financial assessment of Care Services consultation, Culture Services consultation, Neighbourhood Action consultation), which are reported in Appendices A, B and C, address how some of the savings could be made in 2018/19 and in future years. The results of these consultations will be taken into consideration in developing a set of final proposals that will be considered by the Mayor and Cabinet when they take those decisions on 23 January 2018<sup>17</sup>.

Cabinet decisions will be published through normal procedures for Full Council and Cabinet decisions at [democracy.bristol.gov.uk](http://democracy.bristol.gov.uk).

### How can I keep track?

You can always find the latest consultations online at [www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub), where you can also sign up to receive automated email notifications about consultations.

All decisions related to the proposals in this consultation will be made publicly at the Full Council meeting on 20 February 2018 or future Cabinet meetings.

You can find forthcoming meetings and their agenda at [democracy.bristol.gov.uk](http://democracy.bristol.gov.uk).

Any decisions made by Full Council and Cabinet will also be shared at [democracy.bristol.gov.uk](http://democracy.bristol.gov.uk).

---

<sup>17</sup> Decisions on the final proposals for Parks and Green Spaces will be made at a Cabinet meeting in 2018, following consideration of the Parks and Green Spaces consultation results, which will be published in a separate report. The Council's forward plan ([www.bristol.gov.uk/forwardplan](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/forwardplan)) will give 28 days' notice of the Cabinet meeting at which the decisions will be made.

## Appendix A Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation

### A.1 Introduction

#### A.1.1 Existing arrangements

There are several ways in which the council supports children who no longer live with their parents.

The council cares directly for some children (currently more than 650). Approximately a quarter of these children are looked after by the council through a voluntary agreement with their parents.

Around 500 other children are cared for by 'Special Guardians'. A Special Guardianship Order (SGO) is a way in which children can gain the security and support of a permanent home and family when they can no longer live with their parents and would otherwise be in the care of the local authority. Special Guardians are usually a family member for the child or someone who knows the child well and is connected to them in some other way; for example a foster carer may become the Special Guardian for a child they have looked after. The council provides financial support in the form of a weekly allowance to Special Guardians.

Further information is available in 'Caring for a family or friend's child' ([www.bristol.gov.uk/social-care-health/caring-for-family-friends-childrens](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/social-care-health/caring-for-family-friends-childrens)).

#### A.1.2 Proposed savings measures

As part of the savings needed to bridge the gap in the council's finances of £108m over the next five years, Bristol City Council consulted on proposed changes to the funding it offers to parents and carers who need extra help to provide care for their children. This would enable us to reduce the budget for this service by £50k in 2018/19.

The proposal that was consulted on was to introduce a financial assessment of three aspects of its provision to children in care. This was intended to ensure that people pay something towards the care of their children if they can afford to, and full funding is reserved for those who need it most. These three proposals were:

**Proposal 1:** a financial assessment of Special Guardians. The proposal that was consulted on was to reduce or end the payment of the allowance for Special Guardians whose financial situation means they do not need the full allowance for looking after the child(ren). The reduction in allowance for individual Special Guardians would range from no reduction to £243 per week, depending on the age of the child, other benefits and income of the Special Guardian. (The council does not currently undertake any financial assessment of Special Guardians, unlike adoption allowances which are subject to a financial assessment of the family).

**Proposal 2:** The council would provide practical support to carers and children according to assessed need which may range from therapeutic interventions (for which Adoption Support Fund applications may be made on behalf of the family) to practical, play and parenting support, or support to access universal and targeted services.

**Proposal 3:** The proposal that was consulted on was to pilot a financial assessment of parents' income where children are voluntarily accommodated (looked after under Section 20 Children Act 1989) by the local authority. Parents would be required to contribute towards the cost of their child's care where they were assessed as being able to afford it. Individual families would be required to contribute approximately £40 per week towards living expenses and clothing allowance. (Information about Section 20 of the Children Act 1989 is available at: [https://www.cafcass.gov.uk/media/277498/s20\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.cafcass.gov.uk/media/277498/s20_guidance.pdf).)

Further information was provided in the [Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation document](#).

## A.2 Methodology

An online survey for the Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation was available on the city council's Consultation Hub ([www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub)) between 6 November and 17 December 2017. Paper copies of the survey and alternative formats were available on request.

The Financial Assessment of Care Services consultation was publicised as one of four 'related consultations' as part of the publicity and briefings for the CS&B consultation (described in section 2.6 of this report).

## A.3 Results

### A.3.1 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics

#### A.3.1.1 Response rate to Financial Assessment of Care Services survey


50 responses were received to the Financial Assessment of Care Services (FACS) survey. All the respondents completed the survey online.

#### A.3.1.2 Geographic distribution of responses

39 responses (78%) were received from postcodes within the Bristol City Council area, three (6%) were from North Somerset, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) or South Gloucestershire, two (4%) postcodes were from further afield or were unidentifiable, and six (12%) respondents did not provide a postcode.

The geographic distribution of responses from within Bristol is shown in Figure A1.

**Figure A1: geographic distribution of FACS responses in Bristol**



### **A.3.1.3 Characteristics of respondents**

47 (94%) people answered one or more of the equalities monitoring questions.

The most common age of respondents is 45-64 years (57%), followed by 25-44 (21%). The proportion of responses in the age categories 45-64 and 65-74 years is higher than these age groups' proportion of the population in Bristol. Survey responses from children (under 18) and age groups 18-24, 25-44, and over 75 are under-represented.

55% of responses were from women and 36% were from men. (9% preferred not to say.)

Disabled respondents (9%) are under-represented compared to the proportion of disabled people living in Bristol<sup>18</sup>.

There more White British and Other White respondents than these groups' proportion of the Bristol population. Mixed / dual heritage respondents approximately match the proportion of this group in Bristol. No respondents identified as Black/Black British, Asian/Asian British or citizens of other ethnic group. 11% of respondents preferred not to say.

People with no religion are over-represented and Christians and Muslims are under-represented. The small number of respondents does not allow for meaningful comparison of respondents from other less prevalent religions and beliefs.

A full breakdown of respondent characteristics is found in Table A1 and Figure A2.

---


<sup>18</sup> Data on disability rates in the Bristol population are based on people who identified in the 2011 Census that their day-to-day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months.

**Table A1: respondent characteristics - Financial Assessment of Care Services survey**

|                    | <b>Respondent characteristic</b>       | <b>Number of responses to survey</b> | <b>% responses to equalities question</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Age                | Under 18                               | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | 18 – 24                                | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | 25-44                                  | 10                                   | 21%                                       |
|                    | 45-64                                  | 27                                   | 57%                                       |
|                    | 65-74                                  | 5                                    | 11%                                       |
|                    | Over 75                                | 2                                    | 4%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 3                                    | 6%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 3                                    | -                                         |
| Gender             | Female                                 | 26                                   | 55%                                       |
|                    | Male                                   | 17                                   | 36%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 4                                    | 9%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 3                                    | -                                         |
| Transgender        | Yes                                    | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | No                                     | 43                                   | 91%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 4                                    | 9%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 3                                    | -                                         |
| Ethnicity          | White British                          | 34                                   | 76%                                       |
|                    | Other White                            | 4                                    | 9%                                        |
|                    | Mixed / Dual Heritage                  | 2                                    | 4%                                        |
|                    | Black / Black British                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Asian / Asian British                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Other ethnic group                     | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 5                                    | 11%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 5                                    | -                                         |
| Disability         | Yes                                    | 4                                    | 9%                                        |
|                    | No                                     | 34                                   | 77%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 6                                    | 14%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 6                                    | -                                         |
| Religion           | No religion                            | 25                                   | 53%                                       |
|                    | Christian                              | 12                                   | 26%                                       |
|                    | Buddhist                               | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Hindu                                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Jewish                                 | 1                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | Muslim                                 | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Sikh                                   | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Any other religion or belief           | 2                                    | 4%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 7                                    | 15%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 3                                    | -                                         |
| Sexual orientation | Heterosexual (straight)                | 36                                   | 78%                                       |
|                    | Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual               | 4                                    | 9%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 6                                    | 13%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 4                                    | -                                         |

Note 1: Respondents who selected 'Prefer not to say' from the list of options;

Note 2: Respondents to the FACS survey who declined to answer the equalities question

**Figure A2: Characteristics of respondents**

## A.3.2 Survey results

### A.3.2.1 Views on proposal 1: financial assessment of Special Guardians


Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 1: a financial assessment of Special Guardians.

50 (100%) respondents expressed a view (Figure A3), of whom:

- 31 (62%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 1;
- 4 (8%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and
- 15 (30%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 1.

There are currently 514 children in Bristol living in a permanent family arrangement through Special Guardianship or a similar order and to whom the council pays a weekly allowance. It is anticipated that financial assessment would affect the financial support we pay to 15 (3%) of these families.

**Figure A3: Views on proposal 1: financial assessment of Special Guardians**



### A.3.2.2 Views on proposal 2: practical support according to assessed need

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 2: the council will provide practical support to carers and children according to assessed need.


Of the 49 (98%) respondents who expressed a view (Figure A4):

41 (84%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 2;

3 (6%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and

5 (10%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 2.

**Figure A4: Views on proposal 2: practical support according to assessed need**



### A.3.2.3 Views on proposal 3: financial assessment for voluntarily accommodated children


Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 3: to pilot financial assessment of parents' income where children are voluntarily accommodated by the local authority.

50 (100%) respondents expressed a view (Figure A5), of whom:

- 34 (68%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 3;
- 6 (12%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and
- 10 (20%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 3.

The council cares directly for more than 661 children, of whom 180 (27%) are looked after by the council through a voluntary agreement with their parents. It is anticipated that financial assessment would affect nine (5%) of these families.

**Figure A5: Views on proposal 3: financial assessment for voluntarily accommodated children**



### A.3.2.4 Other comments on the proposals

15 (30%) respondents provided free text feedback on the proposals. These free text comments are categorised below and in Figure A6 <sup>19</sup>.

#### Requests to maintain financial allowances

10 respondents urged the council not to cut these financial allowances, of whom:

- 7 (47%) were concerned about the negative effects this would have on families and children and stated that carers looking after traumatised children need financial support;
- 7 (47%) stated that the proposals would discourage people taking on a Special Guardian role and would push more children into foster care, costing the council more in the long run;
- 1 (7%) thought that the forecast saving of £50k was not sufficient to justify the impacts on families.


#### Other comments

There were 12 other comments on the proposals:

- 2 (13%) thought the council should increase its services to cared-for children, not decrease them;
- 2 (13%) expressed the view that parents have a responsibility to pay for the upkeep of their own children and should not expect others to pay for them;
- 2 (13%) comments identified that there would be additional administrative costs to undertake financial assessments of families and Special Guardians;
- 1 (7%) commented that ongoing assessment would be required on an individual basis to meet families' changing needs;
- 1 (7%) thought the financial assessments should not apply to the parents of previously looked after children now adopted or in SGO placements;
- 1 (7%) commented that the help foster carers receive has been reduced hugely compared to previous years;
- 1 (7%) stated that the welfare of children should be central consideration;
- 1 (7%) suggested that savings could be made by the council claiming child benefit for all children accommodated by the local authority;
- 1 (7%) suggested consulting again when the outcomes from the piloting are known, stating that it is difficult to judge the proposals now without knowing much more about the services, the administration costs of the proposals and the impacts on the families and children.

---

<sup>19</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 15 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are % of the 15 free text responses.

**Figure A6: Other comments on Financial Assessment of Care Services proposals**

### A.3.3 Other correspondence

No letters or emails were received on this proposal.

### A.3.4 Public/stakeholder meetings

There was no feedback from public or stakeholder meetings on this consultation.

## Appendix B Culture Services consultation

### B.1 Introduction

As part of the savings needed to bridge the gap in the council's finances of £108m over the next five years, Bristol City Council consulted on proposals for increasing income and efficiency across its Culture Service beyond those already detailed in the 2017/18 Corporate Strategy consultation. The proposals in the Culture Services consultation included:

- introducing charges at some of our museums;
- increasing sponsorship and changes to how the Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions services work that will make them self-financing.

The consultation proposals defined a target of saving money over each of the next five years so that by 2023 we would operate with a budget reduced by £140k compared to our present budget. The proposed savings in each year are shown below.

**Table B1: Annual savings table:**

| Net saving<br>2018/19<br>(£'000s) | Net saving<br>2019/20<br>(£'000s) | Net saving<br>2020/21<br>(£'000s) | Net saving<br>2021/22<br>(£'000s) | Net saving<br>2022/23<br>(£'000s) | Total<br>(£'000s) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 5,000                             | 60,000                            | 19,000                            | 35,000                            | 21,000                            | 140,000           |

The consultation proposed following three changes to achieve these savings.

- **Proposal 1:** Red Lodge and the Georgian House Museums currently offer free entry. We proposed introducing a small entrance fee for adults, while keeping admission free for children in 2019/20. We forecast that this would generate an additional £45,000 a year although we acknowledged it would be likely to have an impact on visitor numbers. We proposed that the exact charge would be decided following user research and full benchmarking but we expected it to be between £3 and £7.
- **Proposal 2:** The council proposed to work with businesses and organisations to explore the possibility of increasing major event income through sponsorship and additional commerciality for events such as Harbour Festival. This could see us raise an additional £35,000 a year by 2022/23, without changing the fundamental nature of the events.
- **Proposal 3:** The council proposed working towards making the Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions services self-financing. This could be achieved by increasing the number of events, both large and small, held in the city and working with the industry to boost the number of film and TV productions filmed here. Over the five year period 2018/19 to 2022/23 this would mean generating an additional £60,000 to ensure both teams are self-financing.

Further information was provided in the [Culture Services consultation](#).

## B.2 Methodology

An online survey for the Culture Services consultation was available on the city council's Consultation Hub ([www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub)) from 6 November to 17 December 2017. Paper copies of the survey and alternative formats were available on request.

The Financial assessment of care services consultation was publicised as one of four 'related consultations' as part of the publicity and briefings for the CS&B consultation (described in section 2.6 of this report).

In addition, the Culture Service sent details of the consultation to Staff and Friends Groups and requested that they forward the consultation to relevant stakeholders. (These included specialist interest groups; for example archaeology groups). The service also made visitors to Red Lodge and Georgian House aware of the consultation

## B.3 Results

### B.3.1 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics

#### B.3.1.1 Response rate to Culture Services survey


124 responses were received to the Culture Services survey via the online survey.

#### B.3.1.2 Geographic distribution of responses

105 responses (85%) were received from postcodes within the Bristol City Council area, six (5%) were from North Somerset, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) or South Gloucestershire, one (1%) postcode was unidentifiable, and 12 (10%) respondents did not provide a postcode.

The geographic distribution of responses from within Bristol is shown in Figure B1.

**Figure B1: geographic distribution of Culture Services responses in Bristol**



### **B.3.1.3 Characteristics of respondents**

122 (98%) people answered one or more of the equalities monitoring questions.

The most common age of respondents is 45-64 years (44%), followed by 25-44 (28%). The proportion of responses in the age categories 45-64 and 65-74 years is higher than this age group's proportion of the population in Bristol. Survey responses from children (under 18) and young people aged 18-24 are under-represented. Responses from people aged 25-44, and over 75 closely match this age group's proportion of the population in Bristol.

47% of responses were from women and 40% were from men. (13% preferred not to say.)

Disabled respondents (7%) are under-represented compared to the proportion of disabled people living in Bristol<sup>20</sup>.

Response rates from White British, Other White and Mixed/dual heritage respondents are higher than these groups' proportion of the Bristol population. All other ethnic groups are under-represented and no respondents identified as Asian/Asian British or citizens of other ethnic group. 14% of respondents preferred not to say.

People with no religion are over-represented and Christians and Muslims are under-represented. The small number of respondents does not allow for meaningful comparison of respondents from other less prevalent religions and beliefs.

A full breakdown of respondent characteristics is found in Table B2 and Figure B2.

---


<sup>20</sup> Data on disability rates in the Bristol population are based on people who identified in the 2011 Census that their day-to-day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months.

**Table B2: respondent characteristics - Culture Services survey**

|                    | <b>Respondent characteristic</b>       | <b>Number of responses to survey</b> | <b>% responses to equalities question</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Age                | Under 18                               | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | 18 – 24                                | 3                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | 25-44                                  | 34                                   | 28%                                       |
|                    | 45-64                                  | 54                                   | 44%                                       |
|                    | 65-74                                  | 15                                   | 12%                                       |
|                    | Over 75                                | 6                                    | 5%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 10                                   | 8%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 2                                    | -                                         |
| Gender             | Female                                 | 56                                   | 47%                                       |
|                    | Male                                   | 48                                   | 40%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 15                                   | 13%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 5                                    | -                                         |
| Transgender        | Yes                                    | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | No                                     | 99                                   | 85%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 18                                   | 15%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 7                                    | -                                         |
| Ethnicity          | White British                          | 85                                   | 71%                                       |
|                    | Other White                            | 11                                   | 9%                                        |
|                    | Mixed / Dual Heritage                  | 6                                    | 5%                                        |
|                    | Black / Black British                  | 1                                    | 1%                                        |
|                    | Asian / Asian British                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Other ethnic group                     | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 17                                   | 14%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 4                                    | -                                         |
| Disability         | Yes                                    | 8                                    | 7%                                        |
|                    | No                                     | 93                                   | 78%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 19                                   | 16%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 4                                    | -                                         |
| Religion           | No religion                            | 64                                   | 53%                                       |
|                    | Christian                              | 30                                   | 25%                                       |
|                    | Buddhist                               | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Hindu                                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Jewish                                 | 1                                    | 1%                                        |
|                    | Muslim                                 | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Sikh                                   | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Any other religion or belief           | 2                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 23                                   | 19%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 4                                    | -                                         |
| Sexual orientation | Heterosexual (straight)                | 71                                   | 66%                                       |
|                    | Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual               | 7                                    | 7%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 29                                   | 27%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 17                                   | -                                         |

Note 1: Respondents who selected 'Prefer not to say' from the list of options;

Note 2: Respondents to the Culture Services survey who declined to answer the equalities question

**Figure B2: Characteristics of respondents**

## B.3.2 Survey results


### B.3.2.1 Views on proposal 1: charging for adult entry to Red Lodge and The Georgian House

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 1: charging for adult entry to Red Lodge and The Georgian House Museum.

123 (99%) respondents expressed a view (Figure B3), of whom:

- 69 (56%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 1;
- 16 (13%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and
- 38 (31%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 1.

**Figure B3: Views on proposal 1: charging for Red Lodge and The Georgian House**




### B.3.2.2 Views on proposal 2: increasing major event income

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 2: increasing major event (such as Harbour Festival) income through sponsorship and increased commerciality

Of the 124 (100%) respondents who expressed a view (Figure B4):

- 107 (86%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 2;
- 10 (8%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and
- 7 (6%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 2.

**Figure B4: Views on proposal 2: increasing major event income**




### B.3.2.3 Views on proposal 3: making Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions self-financing

Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with proposal 3: making the Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions services self-financing

123 (99%) respondents expressed a view (Figure B5), of whom:

- 102 (83%) agreed or strongly agreed with proposal 3;
- 14 (11%) neither agreed nor disagreed; and
- 7 (6%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with proposal 3.

**Figure B5: Views on proposal 3: making Bristol Film Office and Site Permissions services self-financing**



### **B.3.2.4 Other survey comments on the proposals**

49 (40%) of the respondents to the survey provided free text feedback on the proposals. Within this feedback, there were 68 comments about proposal 1, 16 comments about proposal 2, 15 comments relating to proposal 3 and seven comments relating to all three proposals<sup>21</sup>. The comments are categorised below and in Figure B6.

#### **Proposal 1**

##### ***Scale of admission charges***

30 of the comments about proposal 1 addressed the scale of admission charges, of which:

- 6 (12%) said that admission to museums should be free;
- 2 (4%) stated entry fees should be no more than £1 to £2;
- 6 (12%) stated that entry fees should be around £3;
- 2 (4%) proposed entry fees should be £5 or less, one of whom suggested £5 would be a suitable fee to minimise the need for staff to keep change);
- 6 (12%) suggested there should be entry deals, including discounts for entry to more than one museum, free return within a defined period, season tickets, and 'free days');
- 6 (12%) requested free or discounted entry to museums for Bristol Council Tax payers, with charges applied to other visitors;
- 1 (2%) recommended free / discounted entry for people on benefits/low incomes;
- 1 (2%) requested that senior staff in the Culture Service, who will have the marketing expertise and knowledge of museum budgets, should set admission fees to ensure value for money.

##### ***Concerns about admission charges***

22 of the comments on proposal 1 were concerns about the effects of admission charges:

- 13 (27%) were concerned that the proposed admission charges would reduce visitor numbers, with two citing evidence from previous charging initiatives in London and Bristol. Two of these thought that charging could lead to closure of the Georgian House and Red Lodge museums;
- 7 (14%) were concerned that entry fees would exclude people on low income from visiting museums, with educational and cultural impacts that would increase exclusion;
- 1 (2%) was concerned that this proposal was the start of charging for all museums in Bristol;
- 1 (2%) asked how staff would charge schools who visited the Red Lodge and Georgian House.

---

<sup>21</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 49 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are % of the 49 free text responses.

### ***Other ideas for raising income or making savings***

14 comments suggested other ways to generate income or make savings at museums:

- 3 (6%) suggested exhibitions, talks, history days and specialist guides as a way to attract more paying visitors;
- 2 (4%) recommended marketing to raise awareness of the museums;
- 2 (4%) proposed charging for M Shed and Bristol Museum and Art Gallery;
- 2 (4%) suggested asking for visitor donations instead of compulsory entry charges;
- 1 (2%) advocated trialling admission fees;
- 1 (2%) wanted the council to seek all avenues for sponsorship of major events before considering admission charges to museums;
- 1 (2%) recommended selling tickets on-line or from single central location to reduce costs;
- 1 (2%) thought the council should cut staff by 50% to reduce costs, which they asserted would have little or no detriment to the museums opening schedules;
- 1 (2%) suggested Integrating the sites permission team dealing with events in parks into the Parks Service, as a way to make savings.

### **Proposal 2**

#### ***Sponsorship***

11 of the comments on proposal 2 addressed sponsorship, of which:

- 3 (6%) advised that it is important that increased commercialisation / sponsorship does not spoil the visitor experience;
- 2 (4%) were concerned that the council should avoid accepting unethical sponsorship;
- 2 (4%) stated that major festivals are already commercial and raised doubts that additional sponsorship is available;
- 2 (4%) questioned if the council has skilled people in post to identify and pursue opportunities;
- 1 (2%) stated their agreement that the Harbour Festival should get non BCC sponsorship;
- 1 (2%) requested that BCC should encourage sponsorship of small arts organisations, and suggested that the council might offer benefits to local businesses that provided sponsorship.

#### ***Charging event organisers***

Five of the comments stated support for or disagreement with charging festival/event organisers and/or visitors. Of these:

- 1 (2%) supported entry charges for visitors to major festivals;
- 1 (2%) supported charging the organiser of the Harbour Festival;
- 1 (2%) were concerned that increased event charges would discourage attendance, citing the VegFest experience;
- 1 (2%) supported charging the organisers of the Balloon Fiesta and 1 (2%) opposed charging the organisers of the Balloon Fiesta.

### **Accessible events**

1 (2%) respondent stated that major events must be fully accessible to all, with fully accessible toilets, including Changing Places, and fully accessible routes which are publicised.

### **Proposal 3**


The 12 comments on Proposal 3 were:

- 5 (10%) agreed that the Film Office should charge for its services to become self-funding. One of these thought that the introduction of charges should be phased to avoid pricing Bristol out of the market. TV companies and organisers of marathons were mentioned by one respondents are being appropriate for charges;
- 3 (6%) were concerned that extra costs may lead to fewer events and discourage community activity;
- 2 (4%) said it was important to avoid inconvenience to the public and to avoid from an 'unrealistic' amount of event activity on public land;
- 1 (2%) stated that residents need to benefit from / have a say on how income raised from use of their local assets is spent
- 1 (2%) asked if proposal 3 would affect the level of free services currently provided to students and independent filmmakers.

### **All three proposals**

The six comments that addressed all three proposals were:

- 3 (6%) stated that culture services are vital to Bristol in terms of education, wellbeing and economic benefits and requested that service levels are maintained;
- 3 (6%) noted that the Culture Service proposals do not raise much money., and questioned if they were worth the inconvenience (more events) and potential negative impacts on Bristol's attractiveness to TV/Film companies.
- 1 (2%) noted that generating more income would require more staff and questioned if the income generated would more than cover the additional costs.

**Figure B6: Other comments on Culture Services proposals**

### **B.3.3 Other correspondence**

No letters or emails were received about this proposal.

### **B.3.4 Feedback from service-led public/stakeholder meetings**

The following feedback on the proposals was received at four service-led meetings.

#### **Friends of Bristol Art Gallery committee meeting**

The meeting was held on 14 November 2017 at Bristol Museum and Art Gallery and was attended by six committee members and two Bristol culture team staff.

Feedback:

- There was no concern with regards to the proposals for the Film Office, Site permission team or events.
- There was slight concern about charging for Red Lodge and the Georgian House but the attendees understood and believed the offer is worth charging for. There was concern that the pricing needs to be right (not too much so as not to put people off).

#### **Friends of Bristol Museums, Galleries and Archives committee meeting**

The meeting was held on 21 November 2017 at M Shed and was attended by five committee members and two Bristol Culture Team staff.

Feedback:

- The committee accepted that with austerity hitting the council's budgets, charging at the two Houses from 2019 was understandable and acceptable and, compared to the Parks proposals, the situation could have been much worse.
- There were no comments on the other proposals as these were outside the committee's remit.

#### **Bristol Museums Development Trust**

The meeting was held on 6 December 2017 at Bristol Student Union and was attended by eight trustees and five members of staff.

Feedback:

- There was discussion about the marketing of the houses to ensure they can hit the income targets and price point for them to work as chargeable venues.

#### **Culture team staff meeting**

The meeting was held on 6 December 2017 and Bristol Museum and Art Gallery at was attended by 38 members of Bristol Culture Team.

Feedback:

- There was discussion of the proposals and questions about how the council could gain more sponsorship for Harbour Festival.
- There was some discussion about the price point for Red Lodge and Georgian House.

## Appendix C Neighbourhood Action consultation

### C.1 Introduction

#### C.1.1 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation on funding for neighbourhood action

As part of the 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation, which was open between 13 June and 5 September 2017, the council sought the public's views about how we should allocate a budget of £309k per annum to support neighbourhood action and decision making. This was what was left in the Neighbourhood Partnerships budget once the saving of £1.062m was removed. We put forward three proposals, one of which was to allocate £257k as small grants to fund local community projects. These grants were proposed to be available for local councillors and members of the community to decide jointly on projects to fund – for example, sports equipment or community events.

We recognise that in the recent 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation most people supported the proposal to fund local community projects so we know, of those who responded, most people thought it is a good idea. However, we have had to review this proposal in the context of further savings. Further information is available in the 'Your Neighbourhood' Consultation report.

#### C.1.2 Consultation on further reductions to funding for neighbourhood action

As part of savings needed to bridge the gap in the council's finances of £108m over the next five years, Bristol City Council consulted between 6 November and 17 December 2017 on 'Removal of remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action' (referred to as the Neighbourhood Action consultation).

The consultation proposed that the £257k budget for grant funding local community projects be stopped in 2018/19 and future years under the category identified as 'reducing or stopping non-priority services'. The 'Neighbourhood Action' consultation asked if citizens agreed or disagreed with this proposal and if they had any further comments on this proposal.

Further information was provided in the [Neighbourhood Action consultation](#).

### C.2 Methodology

An online survey for the Neighbourhood Action consultation was available on the city council's Consultation Hub ([www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/consultationhub)) between 6 November and 17 December 2017. Paper copies of the survey and alternative formats were available on request.

The Neighbourhood Action consultation was publicised as one of four 'related consultations' as part of the publicity and briefings for the CS&B consultation (described in section 2.6 of this report).

In addition, the Neighbourhood Action consultation was promoted at the following public meetings:

- LDub Arts Club Funding Meeting on 15 November 2017;
- 'Love St Paul's' (a post Partnership transition meeting) on 21 November 2017;
- 'Team Southmead' meeting on 28 November 2017;
- Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum on 28 November 2017.

Views expressed at these meetings are summarised in section C3.4.

Other service-led publicity included the following:

| Date        | Publicity                                                        | Reach |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 08 Nov 2017 | Emails to 3517 contacts and groups                               |       |
| 09 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - south area              | 151   |
| 10 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - north area              | 92    |
| 28 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes video - east and central        | 25    |
| 28 Nov 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes link to budget balancer - south | 108   |
| 06 Dec 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes BSL version – south area        | 85    |
| 09 Dec 2017 | Facebook: Tough Times High Hopes BSL version – east & central    | 23    |
| 10 Dec 2017 | Facebook: one week left link to consultation - Fishponds         | 268   |

## C.3 Results

### C.3.1 Survey response rate and respondent characteristics


#### C.3.1.1 Response rate to Neighbourhood Action Survey

239 responses were received to the Neighbourhood Action survey, via the online and paper-based surveys, including alternative formats. 5 (2%) respondents completed the survey on paper (including large print and easy read formats), and the remaining 234 (98%) completed it online.

#### C.3.1.2 Geographic distribution of responses

213 responses (89%) were received from postcodes within the Bristol City Council area, four (2%) were from North Somerset, Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) or South Gloucestershire, three (1%) postcodes were from further afield or were unidentifiable. 19 (8%) respondents did not provide a postcode.

The geographic distribution of responses from within Bristol is shown in Figure C1.

**Figure C1: geographic distribution of Neighbourhood Action responses in Bristol**

### C.3.1.3 Characteristics of respondents

230 (96%) people answered one or more of the equalities monitoring questions.

The most common age of respondents is 45-64 years (37%), followed by 65-74 (26%) and 25-44 (22%). The proportion of responses in the age categories 45-64 years, 65-74 and over 75 are higher than these age groups' proportion of the population in Bristol. Survey responses from children (under 18), young people aged 18-24 and people aged 25-44 are under-represented.

41% of responses were from women and 48% were from men. (12% preferred not to say.)

Disabled respondents (12%) is less than the proportion of disabled people living in Bristol<sup>22</sup>.

Respondents include more White British respondents than these groups' proportion of the Bristol population. Other White ethnicity and Mixed/Dual Heritage match Bristol's population. Black/back British and Asian/Asian British citizens are under-represented.

People with no religion and people with 'Any other religion or belief' are over-represented. Christians, Muslims Hindus and Sikhs are under-represented.

A full breakdown of respondent characteristics is found in Table C1 and Figure C2.


<sup>22</sup> Data on disability rates in the Bristol population are based on people who identified in the 2011 Census that their day-to-day activities are limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months.

**Table C1: respondent characteristics for Neighbourhood Action consultation**

|                    | <b>Respondent characteristic</b>       | <b>Number of responses to survey</b> | <b>% responses to equalities question</b> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Age                | Under 18                               | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | 18 – 24                                | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | 25-44                                  | 51                                   | 22%                                       |
|                    | 45-64                                  | 85                                   | 37%                                       |
|                    | 65-74                                  | 59                                   | 26%                                       |
|                    | Over 75                                | 20                                   | 9%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 14                                   | 6%                                        |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 10                                   | -                                         |
| Gender             | Female                                 | 93                                   | 41%                                       |
|                    | Male                                   | 109                                  | 48%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 27                                   | 12%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 10                                   | -                                         |
| Transgender        | Yes                                    | 1                                    | <1%                                       |
|                    | No                                     | 191                                  | 85%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 34                                   | 15%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 13                                   | -                                         |
| Ethnicity          | White British                          | 169                                  | 76%                                       |
|                    | Other White                            | 13                                   | 6%                                        |
|                    | Mixed / Dual Heritage                  | 5                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | Black / Black British                  | 1                                    | <1%                                       |
|                    | Asian / Asian British                  | 2                                    | 1%                                        |
|                    | Other ethnic group                     | 4                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 29                                   | 13%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 16                                   | -                                         |
| Disability         | Yes                                    | 27                                   | 12%                                       |
|                    | No                                     | 167                                  | 75%                                       |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 30                                   | 13%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 15                                   | -                                         |
| Religion           | No religion                            | 101                                  | 45%                                       |
|                    | Christian                              | 70                                   | 31%                                       |
|                    | Buddhist                               | 4                                    | 2%                                        |
|                    | Hindu                                  | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Jewish                                 | 2                                    | 1%                                        |
|                    | Muslim                                 | 2                                    | 1%                                        |
|                    | Sikh                                   | 0                                    | 0%                                        |
|                    | Any other religion or belief           | 10                                   | 4%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 37                                   | 16%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 13                                   | -                                         |
| Sexual orientation | Heterosexual (straight)                | 174                                  | 77%                                       |
|                    | Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual               | 12                                   | 5%                                        |
|                    | Prefer not to say <sup>(1)</sup>       | 40                                   | 18%                                       |
|                    | No response to question <sup>(2)</sup> | 13                                   | -                                         |

Note 1: Respondents who selected 'Prefer not to say' from the list of options;

Note 2: Respondents to the Neighbourhood Action survey who declined to answer the equalities question.

**Figure C2: Characteristics of respondents for Neighbourhood Action consultation**

## C.3.2 Survey results


### C.3.2.1 Support for the proposal to remove grant funding for neighbourhood action

Respondents were asked if they agree with the proposal to stop grant funding for local community projects in 2018/19. This would save £257k per annum in 2018/19 and subsequent years under the category 'reducing or stopping non-priority services'.

Of 236 (99%) respondents who provided their view (Figure C3):

- 149 (63%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal;
- Less than half this number - 70 respondents (30%) – agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal;
- 17 (7%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

**Figure C3: Support for removing grant funding for neighbourhood action**



### C.3.2.2 Other comments on the proposal

145 (61%) respondents provided free text comments on the proposal. These comments are categorised below<sup>23</sup> and in Figure C4.

#### Views on the proposed withdrawal of Neighbourhood Action grant funding

- 87 (60%) stated their opposition to the proposal to withdraw the Neighbourhood Action funds;
- 5 (3%) suggested retaining at least part of the £257k budget or phasing the reduction to enable community groups to seek new funding;
- 14 (10%) respondents supported the proposals, albeit reluctantly acknowledging there were other higher priorities for diminishing council funds.

<sup>23</sup> The number of categorised comments is more than the 145 free text responses because some responses included comments in more than one category. Percentages are expressed as percentages of the 145 free text responses.

## Reasons to retain the Neighbourhood Action fund

There were 162 comments describing why the Neighbourhood Action grants should be retained, with several reasons given by some respondents. Of these:

- 37 (26%) stated that volunteers need some funding to deliver community action. Respondents clarified that this could pay for materials while volunteers would provide their time for free, and that council funding enabled new community groups to build up a track record, without which they could not bid for CIL or S106 funds. A recurrent theme was that community (volunteer) action could mitigate the effects of reduced council interventions, but not without some seed funding from the council;
- 28 (19%) were concerned about the damage to communities in terms of quality of life, mental and physical wellbeing, loss of social interaction and loss of volunteer networks. Of these;
  - 6 (4%) predicted disproportionate negative impacts on deprived areas;
  - 5 (3%) anticipated negative impacts on equalities groups;
  - 3 (2%) stated that antisocial behaviour had already increased, or anticipated that reduced community action would cause it to increase;
- 24 (17%) stated that community grants were very good value for money, which leverage other funds. They stated that withdrawing community grants would cost the council more in future through reduced community support leading to escalating local problems;
- 14 (10%) stated that withdrawal of Neighbourhood Action funds is counter to the One City Plan ambition for a collaborative and integrated approach to deliver for the city and the draft Corporate Strategy expectation that people living and working in Bristol must be part of the solution and that communities and individuals will need to take control of their own change. Respondents stated that the withdrawal of Neighbourhood Action funds would be a disincentive to community involvement;
- 13 (9%) observed that the community-led activities funded by Neighbourhood Action grants help to build community cohesion;
- 10 (7%) stated that funding was needed to delegate local decision making and respondents made the point that strengthening local democracy at a neighbourhood level is directly analogous to Bristol's requests to central Government for more local autonomy;
- 10 (7%) comments provided examples of successful projects which had been funded by Neighbourhood Action grants or new projects which could be delivered by Neighbourhood Action grants if the budget were retained;
- 9 (6%) made the case that the proposal to withdraw the £257 Neighbourhood Action budget disregards the feedback to the recent Your Neighbourhood consultation, describing the proposal as a 'a betrayal', 'deception' and a 'broken promise';
- 6 (4%) stated that the proposal weakens practical links and trust between council and communities;
- 7 (5%) stated that the saving is small compared to the scale of negative impacts if the Neighbourhood Action grants are withdrawn.

### **Reasons to cut the Neighbourhood Action fund**

There were 20 comments describing why the respondents accepted withdrawing Neighbourhood Action grants. Of these:

- 13 (9%) accepted the proposal to withdraw the Neighbourhood Action fund in order to balance the council's budget, of which four did so reluctantly. 6 (4%) explicitly stated there are higher priorities and 2 (1%) requested as mitigation that the council provides advice on how community groups can get external funding;
- 4 (3%) supported the proposal citing criticism of some of the former Neighbourhood Partnerships or how grants were distributed;
- 1 (1%) stated that only a minority of Bristol's citizens benefitted from Neighbourhood Action grants;
- 1 (1%) thought that distribution and monitoring Neighbourhood Action grants would not be feasible now that Neighbourhood Partnerships have been discontinued;
- 1 (1%) noted that there could be additional savings due to the reduced costs of administering the Neighbourhood Action grants.

### **Alternative income sources to avoid cutting the Neighbourhood Action grants**

There were 28 comments suggesting alternative ways to raise income to continue to fund Neighbourhood Action funds:

- 15 (10%) respondents advocated increasing Council Tax, of which 10 specified an increase of more than 1.99% with a referendum;
- 4 (3%) recommended using council reserves, with the expectation that austerity will be lifted in future years;
- 3 (2%) recommended stopping tax avoidance by businesses and individuals;
- 2 (1%) wanted the council to charge students Council Tax or for the universities to pay an equivalent amount to the council for their students;
- 1 (1%) urged the council to seek corporate and philanthropic sponsorship;
- 3 (2%) suggested the council should raise more income, without specifying how this should be done.

### **Alternative savings to avoid cutting the Neighbourhood Action funds**

There were 13 comments suggesting alternative savings to preserve the Neighbourhood Action budget:

- 5 (3%) recommended cutting senior or middle management numbers and/or pay;
- 3 (2%) thought that the council could not justify spending money on a Parliament of Mayors conference at the same time as cutting community funding;
- 2 (1%) advocated reducing the Mayor's and councillors' remuneration / allowances;
- 1 (1%) suggested performance-related pay or pay cuts for council staff;
- 1 (1%) recommended cutting highways spending to minimum safety interventions;
- 1 (1%) advocated not spending money on a new bridge at Cumberland Basin.

## **Alternative uses for the Neighbourhood Action funds**


16 comments identified other priorities that the Neighbourhood Action grants should be spent on:

- 4 (3%) said that funds should be maintained for neighbourhood meetings, even if the grants for local projects are withdrawn;
- 4 (3%) wanted the funds to be available for parks;
- 3 (2%) advocated using the funds for libraries or to provide a community space if the local library is closed;
- 2 (1%) recommended funding the Clean Street Programme or litter picking;
- 1 (1%) wanted funding for public toilets;
- 1 (1%) requested more funding for young people;
- 1 (1%) thought the money should be used to restore O Shed and M Shed as a community space and heritage trail hub and to provide theatre space and sound studios.

## **Other comments**

27 comments addressed other issues, as follows:

- 11 (8%) recommended that the council opposes austerity, 3 of which called for stronger city leadership to oppose austerity and safeguard local budgets;
- 4 (3%) expressed frustration at the council's financial management;
- 3 (2%) were frustrated at Council Tax increases while services are cut;
- 3 (2%) criticised aspects of the consultation or expressed scepticism that feedback would be properly considered;
- 2 (1%) stated that the Neighbourhood Partnerships were successful and should not have been abolished;
- 2 (1%) expressed CIL-related concerns, one stating that the new CIL committees are not sufficiently local and one raising concerns that a specific proposal is not listed in the schemes which have funding for the Clifton, Central and Harbourside Partnership.
- 1 (1%) stated that if Neighbourhood Action funds are retained, there would need to be funding guidance on grant funding criteria and who makes decisions;
- 1 (1%) stated that they are not aware what Neighbourhood Action did for their area.

**Figure C4: Other comments on the Neighbourhood Action Proposals**

### **C.3.3 Other correspondence on the Neighbourhood Action consultation**

Ten emails were received in response to the consultation but outside of the consultation survey format. Four of these were from community organisations and six were from members of the public.

#### **Responses from members of the public regarding the consultation**

Two agreed with the saving proposal to remove funding for Neighbourhood Action and felt there were greater benefits to spending on other higher priority areas, e.g. toilets, trees, parks and libraries.

One was concerned with how they would implement community initiatives without the funding, especially in low income areas. They believed that money should be retained to facilitate these initiatives.

One said we should directly engage with disabled people on what would help them and how funding should be spent.

One said that the council should oppose austerity and not participate in the cuts.

One said that they believed the survey was a propaganda exercise.

#### **Responses from other interested parties regarding the consultation**

The four responses from other interested groups came from the following local organisations: Action Greater Bedminster, Bishopston, Cotham and Redland Community Partnership, St George in Bloom, and Meadow Vale Community Association.

Three said that they opposed the proposed reduction in funding.

One said that the removal of funding is a blow to local community action and empowerment and removes the final link to council engagement. They said that the funding provided by the council was key to unlocking many hours of voluntary work from community groups and volunteers.

One asked whether it would it now be morally fair, just, and transparent for community groups to receive any money in the future from these remaining funds given the need for the council to rapidly balance its financial affairs.

### **C.3.4 Feedback from public/stakeholder meetings**

The CS&B consultation and the 'Neighbourhood Action' consultation were publicised at the LDub Arts Club Funding Meeting on 15 November, the 'Love St Paul's' (post Partnership transition) meeting on 21 November, a 'Team Southmead' meeting on 28 November and at the Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum on 28 November. Attendees were encouraged to complete the survey online or using paper copies. Direct feedback received at the meetings is described below.

### **LDub Arts Club Funding meeting**

Four people attended the LDub Arts Club Funding meeting on 15 November 2017. The following feedback was received on the savings proposal to remove remaining funding supporting neighbourhood action:

- Lots of community projects rely on small grant funding; it is the only way they survive.
- BCC has made false promises. [The group thought the money had already been committed];
- In a time where less money is available for big projects (such as renovating housing stock), these small groups are a lifeline for people to get out of their home, feel less isolated and do something that lifts their mood. This has a big impact on mental wellbeing. The benefits are not just to the members of a group but to their wider family, network and community as a whole.
- It boosts community moral, in times of austerity, to give the community small pots of money that they can use how they wish; it can provide a welcome respite from other aspects of life.
- A little bit of money (£257k across Bristol) will be a catalyst for other things and will go a long way if we use what's on our doorstep too.

### **Love St Paul's meeting**

47 people, including 32 residents, attended the Love St Pauls meeting on 21 November. Information was provided in written form and was announced by a local Councillor. The response was muted and one of acceptance. The group was quite motivated and several people signed up to work collectively to develop local work.

### **Team Southmead meeting**

The Team Southmead meeting was attended by seven residents and five other attendees who were ward councillors, BCC officers or VCS representatives. Of four comments received:

- Two were critical that they were being asked to respond to a proposal to further reduce the funding for Neighbourhood Action, having very recently provided their views on retaining this fund as part of the Your Neighbourhood consultation;
- One was critical of the six week consultation period for the CS&B consultation, stating that because Team Southmead meets monthly, six weeks did not provide enough time to respond;
- One complained that the computers in their library had not worked during the recent 'Your Neighbourhood' consultation.

### **Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum**

Approximately 50 people attended the Stoke Bishop & Sea Mills Forum on 28 November. The CS&B consultation and Neighbourhood Action consultation were publicised and paper copies of the information and surveys were handed out. No feedback on the CS&B consultation was provided at the meeting.