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Background

Cumbria County Council published 35 budget saving propositions on 17 October 2013; this consultation began on this date and ran until 20 January 2014 (13 weeks).

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the responses received via the budget consultation document and other sources as detailed below, and an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data.

This report is based on 1,512 budget survey responses (642 paper and 870 submitted online). In addition over 600 e-mail and postal responses have been received, alongside a number of submissions from organisations, sector representatives and local groups. There has been a variety of consultation activities that have taken place since commencement of the budget consultation - all of which have contributed to the qualitative data in this report. Only data where respondents have opted to indicate to what extent they agree or disagree, in the budget consultation survey document, have been used to generate the quantitative data in this report. It is to be noted that in most cases, when respondents have disagreed with a proposition in the budget consultation survey document, they were more likely to provide additional comments compared to those who agreed with a proposition. In some cases this can lead to the qualitative analysis of a particular proposition appearing to have greater levels of disagreement when compared to the quantitative analysis.

The consultation is not designed to be a statistically representative sample of public opinion in Cumbria but a gauge of the opinions of those people and organisations that have chosen to participate in the process.

This report does not seek to make any recommendations: its purpose is to help inform decision makers of opinion expressed as part of this consultation.

The consultation process conforms to the county council’s consultation obligations.

Main budget consultation activity

- Release of consultation document 17 October. Available as a paper copy placed in all libraries and local links. Available as a pdf download and web version to complete online.
- Dedicated multi web-page area created, with details about each proposition and a page dedicated to how the public could share their views (including main document, e-mail, letter, public drop-ins etc). Over the period of this consultation there has been over 6,000 unique visitors to the website with 28,000 page views.
- Your Cumbria, delivered to every household with signposting to the main budget consultation channels.
- Approximately 23 public drop-in sessions held around the county at various locations including libraries and supermarkets.
- A number of specific engagement meetings with the Third Sector Network
- A mail-out to all schools with a request to contact all Y11 pupils/parents regarding proposition 19
- FE college heads written to separately regarding proposition 19
- An additional bus passenger survey placed on all bus routes affected by proposition 24 (the results from this survey form part of the Equality Impact Assessment on this proposition).
- Online discussion forum created to allow public to discuss proposition online.
- A disability workshop to enable people with disabilities to comment on the consultation.
- A number of staff road-shows around the county led by senior officers.
- A number of news releases were issued over the course of the consultation period to generate awareness and encourage participation.
- Stakeholders were invited to comment on the consultation in October 2013 and again in December 2013. Groups invited to comment included county council supplier/contractors, Trades Unions, the business sector, FE Colleges and secondary schools, NHS organisations and CALC.

Technical note

As a result of rounding, the totals in some tables may add up to 99 per cent or 101 per cent.

In places the report refers to net agreement; which is a quantitative measure to identify if respondents were more likely to agree or disagree with a proposal or particular proposition. In cases where there are significant numbers of people who indicate they are neutral, only reporting the percentage agreement figure can be misleading. For example if for a particular proposition there was 20 per cent agreement, of whom 75 per cent were neutral and five per cent disagreed; exclusively reporting the 20 per cent agreement figure may indicate the proposal was unpopular amongst respondents. However, by calculating the difference between the percentage agreement and disagreement which in this example would be 15 per cent it can be clearly seen more people agreed with the proposal than disagreed. In cases where the percentage disagreement is the higher figure the net agreement score is reported as a minus number.

The net agreement scores were calculated after the rounding of percentage scores for each proposition.
Council Tax 2014/15

Figure 1 shows a clear majority in favour of option B (60% to 40%) which is not to accept the council tax freeze grant and increase council tax in 2014/15 by two per cent.

Figure 1: Percentage agreement with option A/B on Council tax (base=1087)

Comments regarding council tax

There were a large number of comments regarding whether to accept the council tax freeze grant or raise council tax by two per cent.

A number of those comments were in support of raising council tax by two per cent, provided the money was used to protect services; most of those were general but some referred to services in particular including those affected by propositions 24 and 28. Some also indicated that although they would pay the two per increase they would not want to see the additional income used to pay higher salaries to senior managers, fund the use of consultants, or support high redundancy packages. Some also indicated that after a period of tax freeze it was reasonable to increase taxes this year. There was also a comment calling for a referendum to increase council tax by more than two per cent.

There were also a number of comments calling for the council tax to be frozen. Of those, some called for it to be frozen because households were already under pressure with rising energy bills, food costs and wages (which have been frozen or have seen below inflation increases). Some felt that council tax was high in Cumbria compared to other areas; some questioned whether it represented value for money and one comment suggested those in rural areas receive fewer services for their council tax. There was also a call to reduce council tax.

There were some efficiency saving suggestions put forward under this commentary including moving to a single unitary authority and reductions in some areas, including translation services.

There was also some commentary suggesting the freeze grant is a ‘fraud’ as it is not added to the revenue base.
There were a small number of comments regarding raising council tax on second homes and a comment asking for council tax to be spread over 12 months not 10.

A small number of comments were also received relating to wages of senior staff and councillors’ allowances.
Headline Quantitative Data Results
Basic overall agreement/disagreement summary by proposition

The quantitative consultation feedback results are, by definition, self-selecting and are not intended to represent statistically reliable measure of public attitudes. The results are nonetheless designed to provide members with an additional strand of consultation feedback alongside qualitative responses and other factors and measures which members will use in determining budget decisions for 2014/15.

Tables 1-6 show that 1413 budget survey responses have been submitted - the majority of the propositions have either very or reasonably strong net agreement from respondents; with proposition 1 (reducing and streamlining management) recording the highest net agreement at 90%. There are three proposals that have net disagreement: proposition 29 (targeted on-street parking charges) proposition 28 (risk based reform of fire and rescue), and proposition 24 (cessation of bus subsidies) -6%, -8% and -42% respectively.

Table 1: % net agreement/disagreement for propositions in theme 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1 - Reducing and streamlining management</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Proposition 10 – Accelerating the council’s Asset Management Strategy</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2 - Commissioning and procurement</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Proposition 11 – Overview and scrutiny</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3 - Commissioning and procurement (contracts)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Proposition 12 – Member development</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4 – Reshaping internal council business services</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Proposition 13 – Travel review and use of pool cars</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 5 - Reshaping economic development</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Proposition 14 – Street lighting improvements</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 6 – Pooling of business rates</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Proposition 15 – Verge maintenance</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7 – Additional dividend from Cumbria Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Proposition 16 – Bringing together low income support services in one place</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8 – Centralised debt collection</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Proposition 17 – Efficiency savings in Children’s Services</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 9 – Gully waste disposal</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Proposition 18 – Investing in ICT</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: % net agreement/disagreement for propositions in theme 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 19 – Review of transport policies (post-16 transport)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Proposition 22 – Residents’ parking permits</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 20 – Reduction in local committee grants (non-highways)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Proposition 23 – Trading Standards – reducing non-statutory functions</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 21 – Refocusing of young people’s services</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Proposition 24 – Cease to subsidise bus services and instead work with communities to find community transport solutions</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: % net agreement/disagreement for propositions in theme 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 25 – Integrating health and social care and managing demand in key services</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Proposition 27 – Efficiency savings in early years’ provision</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 26 – Putting public health at the heart of communities</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Proposition 28 – Risk-based reform of Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: % net agreement/disagreement for propositions in theme 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 29 – Targeted on-street parking charges</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>Proposition 31 – Investing in roads</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 30 – Winter maintenance</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: % net agreement/disagreement for propositions in future potential savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 32 - Joint Fire Authority</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Proposition 34 - Investing in safe routes to school</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 33 - Grants reduction</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Proposition 35 - Reshaping neighbourhood services</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>% Net Agreement/Disagreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1</td>
<td>Reducing and streamlining management</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 13</td>
<td>Travel review and use of pool cars</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8</td>
<td>Centralised debt collection</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 25</td>
<td>Integrating health and social care and managing demand in key services</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4</td>
<td>Re-shaping internal council business services</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2</td>
<td>Commissioning and procurement</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 26</td>
<td>Putting public health at the heart of communities</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 16</td>
<td>Bringing together low income support services in one place</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 5</td>
<td>Re-shaping economic development</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 6</td>
<td>Pooling of business rates</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 10</td>
<td>Accelerating the council’s Asset Management Strategy</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 14</td>
<td>Street lighting improvements</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 9</td>
<td>Gully waste disposal</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
<td>Commissioning and procurement (contracts) – supplies and services</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7</td>
<td>Additional dividend from Cumbria Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 15</td>
<td>Verge maintenance</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 11</td>
<td>Overview and scrutiny</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 31</td>
<td>Investing in roads</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 17</td>
<td>Efficiency savings in Children’s Services</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 30</td>
<td>Winter maintenance</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 34</td>
<td>Investing in safe routes to school</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 18</td>
<td>Investing in ICT</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 27</td>
<td>Efficiency savings in early year’s provision</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 12</td>
<td>Member development</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 35</td>
<td>Reshaping neighbourhood services</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 21</td>
<td>Re-focusing of young people’s services</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 22</td>
<td>Residents’ parking permits</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 20</td>
<td>Reduction in local committee grants (non-highways)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 33</td>
<td>Grants reduction</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 23</td>
<td>Trading Standards – reducing non-statutory functions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 32</td>
<td>Joint Fire Authority</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 19</td>
<td>Review of transport policies (post-16 transport)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 29</td>
<td>Targeted on-street parking charges</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 28</td>
<td>Risk-based reform of Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 24</td>
<td>Cease to subsidise bus services and instead work with communities to find community transport solutions</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 1 – protecting and modernising

Proposition 1 – reducing and streamlining management

Quantitative data

Figure 2 shows 93% strongly agree/agree with proposition 1; with 3% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 2: % agree/disagree with proposition 1: (base=1022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

A large number of comments were received regarding proposition 1. A number of these called for the streamlining to go further and for those on the higher pay scales to take pay cuts. There were some comments suggesting it would be hard to accept reductions in public services whilst there are ‘highly’ paid council staff.

There were some comments suggesting that there should be mergers between heads of departments or merging with other authorities to save money.

There was one comment urging some caution over how far the streamlining should go in order to ensure the council could still function and support staff effectively.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The CALC Executive queried whether this streamlining could be done sooner.

People First independent Advocacy: General support, concern that skills may be lost and encourage the council to adopt robust succession planning

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal teams response: agreed the principle was appropriate but concerned that important skill sets should not be lost and ‘span of control’ should not be too large.

Main feedback bullet points

- General support for reducing management costs
- Call for more joined up working with other authorities
- Suggestions to merge heads of services either internally or with other authorities
- Sufficient support needs to be in place to support staff and ensure council is effective.

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 2 – commissioning and procurement

Quantitative data

Figure 3 shows 79% strongly agree/agree with proposition 2; with 5% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 3: % agree/disagree with proposition 2: (base=961)

Table 8 % agree/disagree with proposition 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

A small number of comments were received regarding proposition 2. Those comments included the need to consult staff to ensure items can still be purchased easily and consult on which suppliers provide the best value.

There was also a comment suggesting combining with other authorities to reduce back-office costs and deliver better integration with other services. In addition there was a comment that centralising procurement could lead to higher costs.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network commented that by centralising, key skills could be lost - such as the interpretation of legislation, policy and community engagement.

The CALC Executive felt some larger contracts had not been previously well managed.

People First independent Advocacy: support streamlined approach some concern that council needs to maintain different skill sets required

Feedback from public drop in events

Any centralising of commissioning and procurement should ensure key skills in specialist areas are not lost.

Internal staff and Member feedback

From staff road-show: concern raised that procurement is not as effective as it could be.

Internal teams response: felt measure was appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Consult with staff to ensure they can purchase from best value suppliers
- Combine with other public bodies to reduce back office costs
- Call to be more integrated with other public services
- Concern over loss of key/specific skill sets

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 3 – commissioning and procurement (contracts)

Quantitative data

Figure 4 shows 75% strongly agree/agree with proposition 3; with 8% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 4: % agree/disagree with proposition 3: (base=955)

Table 9 % agree/disagree with proposition 3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree 75%

Summary disagree 8%

Net Agreement 67%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Most of the comments regarding this proposal centred on the potential impact on smaller local suppliers. Some concern that large suppliers do not always represent better value for money. There was also a comment that local contracts should include a ‘living wage’ element, especially with care services in order to improve quality. Comment was received suggesting combining with other authorities to increase purchasing power. An issue also raised was that by going for the ‘cheapest’ bid, contracts could be untenable. An issue was raised that by having fewer, larger contractors the council may be more at risk of contractor failure. There was recognition of some contracts where it would be sensible to combine.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network commented that amalgamated contracts and consortia bidding may disadvantage smaller local organisations/groups which in turn would lead to poorer services that are less user focused.

Issues were highlighted between purported inconsistencies in the way contracts are managed between Children’s Services third sector providers receiving quarterly visits, and Adult Social Care third sector providers receiving annual visits.

Federation of Small Business’ are supportive, work should be undertaken to enable more Cumbria based firms to tender for work

Allerdale and Copeland Green Party: concern this may make county over reliant on large contractors

Howgill Family Centre: although countywide contracts might present a threat to Howgill, accept the need to operate simpler contracts onus on us to develop effective partnerships.

People First Independent Advocacy: agree there is scope for streamlining again concern about need to maintain required skill sets

Unison: Quality of services can decrease through lack of provision of minimal standards in contracts. Consider more in-house provision.

Feedback from public drop in events

One organisation queried how it would affect how they tendered for contracts

Internal staff and Member feedback

From staff road-show: questioned whether procurement is as effective as it could be.

Internal teams response: felt the measure was appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Consult with staff to ensure best value suppliers available through e-proc
- May have negative impact on smaller local suppliers
- Larger suppliers do not always lead to better value and quality
- Call for contracts to include living wage element
- Concern from the Third Sector that consortia bidding may be more expensive and disadvantage smaller organisations
- Should consider the tenability of contracts not just look at the cheapest bid
- Need to consider risk of contractor failure
- Agreed that some contracts should be amalgamated

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 4 – re-shaping internal council business services

Quantitative data

Figure 5 shows 81% strongly agree/agree with proposition 4; with 5% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 5: % agree/disagree with proposition 4: (base=961)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 % agree/disagree with proposition 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Those who agreed with this proposal were unlikely to leave additional comments.

There were a small number of comments regarding this proposal. Concern was raised that reductions could lead to a reduction in Legal and HR support, leaving the council at greater risk. Concern that this may lead to less engagement with the public. Some concern that this may lead to more jobs being centralised in Carlisle. Also concern that workloads may become too high leading to stress and reduced quality. Comments also made that this area is also important to managing the council’s reputation strategy and promoting its aims.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Allerdale and Copeland Green Party concern this may reduce the ability of Councillors to represent people.
Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal teams response: Changes should be subject to maintaining core skills and knowledge.

Main feedback bullet points

- Comments about proper support being available to service areas
- Council could be at greater risk with reduced capacity in HR and Legal
- Greater workloads may lead to stress and reduced quality

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 5 – re-shaping economic development

Quantitative data

Figure 6 shows 75% strongly agree/agree with proposition 5; with 4% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 6: % agree/disagree with proposition 5: (base=946)

Table 11: % agree/disagree with proposition 5

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree        75%
Summary disagree     4%
Net Agreement        71%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposal. These included the need for better decision-making on economic development; that reducing jobs in this area could have a detrimental effect on Cumbria’s economy; that this area should be part of continued review; and that council involvement in this area has limited impact.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Eden District Council encourages Cumbria to review expenditure on planning and economic development. There was concern from the Disability Consultation Workshop that CVS had limited influence in economic development. The Third Sector Network queried whether this would have an effect on Social Enterprises.

Federation of Small Business’ are supportive and a willing partner on economic development activity
Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
N/C

Main feedback bullet points
- Economic development decisions need to improve
- Council involvement in this area has limited impact
- Downsizing could have detrimental effect on economic development
- CVS should have some influence
- CCC should encourage diversification of industry to reduce reliance on large industries

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 6 – pooling of business rates

Quantitative data

Figure 7 shows 73% strongly agree/agree with proposition 6; with 4% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 7: % agree/disagree with proposition 6: (base=944)

Table 12 % agree/disagree with proposition 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposition. Comment received that savings should be passed on to encourage growth in towns.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network queried if this would impact the relief rate for charities.

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

N/C
Main feedback bullet points

- Call to reduce business rates to promote growth
- Suggestion to pass on savings to businesses

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 7 – additional dividend from Cumbria Holdings Ltd

Quantitative data

Figure 8 shows 69% strongly agree/agree with proposition 7; with 3% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 8: % agreement/disagreement proposition 7 (base=938)

Table 13: % agree/disagree with proposition 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree  69%
Summary disagree 3%
Net Agreement  66%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposition. Belief that ‘in-house’ teams would be more efficient; and commentary that it is unclear how extra dividend will be achieved. The role of Cumbria Holdings as a profit making company was questioned.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C
Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: felt it was appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Suggestion that team remaining in-house would be more efficient
- Queried role of Cumbria Holdings as a profit making company

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 8 – centralised debt collection

Quantitative data

Figure 9 shows 83% strongly agree/agree with proposition 8; with 3% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 9: % agreement/disagreement proposition 8 (base=953)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

A small number of comments were received on this proposal. Comment that centralisation may result in jobs being moved to Carlisle from other parts of the county. Another comment suggesting that centralisation could take place whilst still retaining some local knowledge.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

25
Internal team’s response: felt it was appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Concern that this may mean jobs will move to Carlisle
- Felt that local skills sets could be retained with centralisation

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Proposition 9 – gully waste disposal

Quantitative data

Figure 10 shows 72% strongly agree/agree with proposition 9; with 5% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 10: % agreement/disagreement proposition 9 (base=947)

Table 15 % agree/disagree with proposition 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was limited feedback for this proposal. Belief that high-tech equipment will cost more to operate and maintain. Suggestion that more joined up working with district councils on this type of waste management could be done.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C

Feedback from public drop in events

Concern raised that drains were not being maintained properly. There was a suggestion that communities would support with drainage work if supplied with the right equipment.
Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: felt it was appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Cost of maintaining the equipment
- Work closely with District Councils to manage similar waste
- Communities may support this function if supplied with equipment

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 10 – accelerating the council’s Asset Management Strategy

Quantitative data

Figure 11 shows 74% strongly agree/agree with proposition 10; with 6% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 11: % agreement/disagreement proposition 10 (base=924)

Table 16: % agree/disagree with proposition 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments relating to this proposition. Some comments that relocating staff to Parkhouse could be problematic due to logistics and public transport infrastructure. Comments also that up-front costs may be more than eventual savings. Also a call to ensure council gets market value for assets. Comment that council should consider renewable energy as part of its new builds. Call for council to sell-off land so people can build appropriate housing. Concern was raised that in the current economic climate that it may be difficult to get full value for assets.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network queried whether the council was still committed to providing community groups with asset transfer opportunities.

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

From staff road-shows: issue raised of investing in buildings for long term savings.

Internal team’s response: Felt it was appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Council should ensure they get full asset value
- Will council still consider asset transfer to community groups?
- Need to consider logistics and public transport infrastructure
- Consider what land is used for when selling
- Ensure investment costs are not greater than savings
- Economic climate could make it difficult to realise full value for assets

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 11 – overview and scrutiny

Quantitative data

Figure 12 shows 68% strongly agree/agree with proposition 11 with; 8% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 12: % agreement/disagreement proposition 11 (base=927)

Table 17: % agree/disagree with proposition 11

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposal. Of those, the majority were against reductions to overview and scrutiny with comments indicating they would consider change as being undemocratic. Commentary that scrutiny is an important part of delivering transparency and provides confidence in decision making. Call for better scrutiny to ensure better value. There were however some comments that reductions could be made in this area without affecting service delivery.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Allerdale and Copeland Green party object to this proposal
People First independent Advocacy: Keen for officer support to scrutiny to continue at current level

Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

The Scrutiny Management Board (*hereafter SMB*) do not support this proposal as it would lead to reduced engagement of non-executive councillors and there would be less transparency and scrutiny taking place.

Main feedback bullet points
- Reducing scrutiny would be anti-democratic
- Scrutiny needed to give confidence to decision-making
- Good scrutiny helps ensure good value
- Savings could be made here without affecting services

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 12 – member development

Quantitative data

Figure 13 shows 59% strongly agree/agree with proposition 12; with 15% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 13: % agreement/disagreement proposition 12 (base=933)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was a small amount of commentary on this proposition. The majority of comments supported the contention that Members should be well trained/equipped so they can make good decisions. There were however some comments supporting reductions in this area and some commentary supporting the contention that the number of councillors should be reduced.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Allerdale and Copeland Green party object to this proposal

People First independent Advocacy: Member development important, would support a partnership process on member development with the council
Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: Felt some training or held qualifications should be mandatory such as Health and Safety.

Main feedback bullet points

- Training important to ensure good decision making
- Could be a false economy
- Savings will not affect service delivery

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 13 – travel review and use of pool cars

Quantitative data

Figure 14 shows 87% strongly agree/agree with proposition 13; with 4% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 14: % agreement/disagreement proposition 13 (base=964)

Table 19 % agree/disagree with proposition 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>52%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposal. The majority of comments supported the principle of this proposal, in particular suggesting there should be increased use of video and telephone conferencing. However there were some comments suggesting infrastructure needed to be improved to support this. There was some concern raised that departments implement travel policies in an inconsistent fashion. A comment suggesting that meetings should only take place at venues accessible by public transport to reduce carbon footprint. A community volunteer raised a concern whether reducing access to vehicles might impact on their ability to do their job.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

West Cumbria Bus Users’ Group encourage CCC staff to use video/telephone conferencing, reduce carbon footprint, cite University of Cumbria negotiated a reduced fares with a train company.

Allerdale and Copeland Green party agree

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

From staff road-show: suggestion that people should be encouraged to use new technologies to deliver and access services, with a query would it be possible to use applications such as Skype to communicate with service users.

Internal team’s response: agree with principle and are committed to reducing mileage.

Main feedback bullet points

- General agreement that more video/telephone conferencing should be used
- Need to ensure infrastructure in place to allow it to happen
- Call for meetings to be held at locations that are fully supported by public transport to reduce carbon footprint
- Encourage people to deliver and access services using new technologies

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 14 – street lighting improvements

Quantitative data

Figure 15 shows 77% strongly agree/agree with proposition 14 with 9% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Table 20: % agree/disagree with proposition 14

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a number of comments on this proposition with a fairly even number of those who support reduced street lighting and those who oppose it. Comments from those who support fewer street lights include: less light pollution; would support selected timed switch-off - mainly after midnight; would encourage tourism with dark skies, reduce carbon foot-print, and reduce crime.

For those who had concerns about reduced street lighting comments included concerns about increased crime and anti-social behaviour; pedestrian safety; call for risk assessments to take place; need to be done with full consultation with local communities.

Commentary where lights have already been switched-off claimed there have been concerns about safety.
Other comments included consideration of LED lights with the claim they are more efficient and any approach should be joined-up with what district councils are doing.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies**

Eden District Council acknowledged they were looking at similar proposals.

Borrowdale Parish Council support this proposition

Allerdale and Copeland Green Party agree

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Some commentary claiming that crime would increase; while others feel it would decrease
- Many support time selective switch-off
- Many support switch off in rural areas to promote dark skies
- A number of concerns raised about pedestrian safety
- Work to be done with consultation of local communities
- Join the approach up with district councils
- Risk assessments to be done
- Reduce carbon foot-print

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Proposition 15 – verge maintenance

Quantitative data

Figure 16 shows 72% strongly agree/agree with proposition 15; with 10% who disagree/strongly disagree.

![Figure 16: % agreement/disagreement proposition 15 (base=950)](image)

Table 21: % agree/disagree with proposition 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was some commentary on this proposition with a fairly even number of those supporting a reduction in verge cutting/maintenance and those opposed to any reduction. Those who supported cited reasons such as supporting wildlife, reduced carbon footprint and those who support bringing the function back in-house.

Those who voiced concerns raised issues such as road safety, with junctions and signs becoming obscure and some who feel verge maintenance already is left too long, citing in some cases that residents are undertaking some of the work in their area.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The CALC Executive suggests that parish councils could support with verge maintenance more effectively.
Eden District Council felt this may have a negative impact on rural areas, market towns and villages.

Copeland Borough Council some concern regarding highway safety

Allerdale and Copeland Green party agree

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Some support reduced activity as they see as positive for wildlife
- Safety concerns raised over road junctions and signs becoming obscure
- Support for reduction in carbon footprint
- Some feel there should be an increase from present activity
- Mixed views whether bringing in-house would be more efficient

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Proposition 16 – bringing together low income support services in one place

Quantitative data

Figure 17 shows 78% strongly agree/agree with proposition 16; with 7% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 17: % agreement/disagreement proposition 16 (base=945)

Table 22: % agree/disagree with proposition 16

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree 78%
Summary disagree 7%
Net Agreement 71%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was some limited commentary to this proposal. The main concern was that centralisation may lead to reduced access to services locally which would make it difficult for people who use these services. Also commentary that services could not be online/telephone alone as some people need face to face contact. A comment was made that centralisation would move jobs from around the county to Carlisle. There was also a comment that this service should not be considered a council priority.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network queried whether this would lead to a reduction in services and whether it would have an impact on the Third Sector.

Allerdale and Copeland Green party agree
People First Independent Advocacy: can see that a single point of access would have some advantages but may lead to staff with skill sets which are too generic

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Concern about local access of service
- Concern jobs will be moved to Carlisle
- Users might need more than online/telephone contact

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Proposition 17 – efficiency savings in Children’s Services

Quantitative data

Figure 18 shows 67% strongly agree/agree with proposition 17; with 11% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 18: % agreement/disagreement proposition 17 (base=948)

Table 23 % agree/disagree with proposition 17

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposition. Issue raised that Children’s Services have already undergone efficiencies and further changes may impact on the service’s ability to improve on recent Ofsted inspection reports.

Suggested that charges for safety services to schools are significantly lower compared to other authorities - Cumbria County Council should examine and cost on full recovery basis.

Some commentary that this proposition would mean less money for schools. Further commentary that back-office jobs should be protected as they have already been reduced and any further reductions would reduce the ability of frontline staff to do their jobs.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C
Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points
- Cost for services fully
- Concern about further reductions to Children’s Services
- Back office functions help frontline staff do their jobs

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 18 – investing in ICT

Quantitative data

Figure 19 shows 61% strongly agree/agree with proposition 18 with 11% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 19: % agreement/disagreement proposition 18 (base=951)

| strongly agree | 26% |
| agree | 35% |
| neutral | 27% |
| disagree | 7% |
| strongly disagree | 4% |

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposition. There was a comment that ICT experts are not leading the decision-making on ICT programmes which may end up costing the council more money. Commentary that savings are often not realised in this area. A comment that updated IT equipment is not necessary.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C
Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Concern it would be difficult to realise savings in this area
- Contended that programmes should be led by ICT team
- Are ICT upgrades required?
- If proper guidance/support is given new technologies could help CCC become more efficient

Any known third party activity

N/C
Theme 2 – stopping doing some things and doing other things differently

Proposition 19 – review of transport policies (post-16 transport)

Quantitative data

Figure 20 shows 46% strongly agree/agree with proposition 19; with 40% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 20: % agreement/disagreement proposition 19 (base=1092)

Table 25: % agree/disagree with proposition 19

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Respondents to the budget consultation survey document also had the opportunity to provide additional feedback. Those who indicated they agreed with the survey were far less likely to provide additional feedback compared to those who disagreed.

In addition, a large number of letters and e-mails have been received voicing concern regarding this proposition.

Overall, although there were a small number of comments in agreement with the proposition, the majority were in opposition to the proposal. There were a small number of comments suggesting support should be means tested and/or those from rural communities should receive additional support. The main issues raised have been bullet-
pointed below. One comment suggested that everyone should pay for travel to school but capped to a maximum of a three mile rate. The majority of comments referred to financial impact, impact on rural communities, limiting opportunities for young people and impact on FE colleges.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies/**

A number of schools and FE colleges voiced strong opposition to the proposal: disadvantage students from poorer backgrounds/rural areas, impact on take up of post-16 education, counter to council priorities, longer term economic impact on Cumbria will far outweigh immediate savings, threat to sustainability to some FE colleges and schools, restrict choice of young people and financial impact on families.

Eden District Council objected to this proposal and raised concerns that Eden is a rural area; concerned how children will get to school/college. Also acknowledged that children will be required to stay in education/training until age 18.

Copeland Borough Council voiced concern it would make it difficult for some parents to allow their children to continue further education. Further concern of economic impact on area and the future sustainability of schools and colleges.

The Third Sector Network and the disability workshop felt this may unfairly impact on children living in rural areas and children with disabilities. And have consequences for road safety.

A number of town and parish councils raised concerns including: disincentive for children to stay in education; could affect opportunities for young people in rural areas that could deter families from living in rural areas - which in turn could affect rural schools. Suggestion that those living more than three miles away should receive free travel whilst those living closer should make a contribution.

Rory Stewart MP (Penrith and the Border) raised concerns as to how this would financially impact on those who live in rural communities and noted the requirement for children to stay in education until age 18.

John Woodcock MP (Barrow-in-Furness): concerned could have disproportionate effect on low income families.

People First independent Advocacy: not sure to what extent hardship fund will mitigate impact on low income families, disproportional impact on rural locations

Youth engagement workshop: most participants felt they would have found a way to access further education without post-16 transport support, although acknowledged it would be more difficult for those from rural areas. There was one person felt this may have prevented their opportunity to access further education. Most felt that schools and colleges should help with arrangements and assist with transport costs.

Bus/coach companies opposition to proposition 19: argue that surplus seating contracts generate revenue for the council and not a cost. Encourage working with schools and FE colleges to reduce costs of post-16 transport.
Federation of Small Business’: understand logic but would like to see research into impact. Call for need to up-skill workforce. Embracing new technology to allow distance learning could save money

The Social Responsibility Forum of Churches Together in Cumbria raise issues of: raising aspiration of young people, impact on young people living in rural areas, hardship fund may not meet the need of all poorer families, support lobbying of central government to increase funding to support transport costs, encourage CCC to work in partnership with other providers to find an alternative to have in place.

Allerdale and Copeland Green party strongly disagree

Feedback from public drop in events

General call to protect post 16 transport

Internal staff and Member feedback

Eden Local Committee raised concerns that this could pose a challenge for families living in rural areas with a significant financial impact, and potentially limiting young peoples’ career development.

The Scrutiny Management Board felt this would impact on the most vulnerable. Noted that some organisations have some provision in supporting educational travel costs and suggested the council should adopt a signposting role.

Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Negative impact on rural community
- Effect on life chances/future job opportunities for young people
- Children from poorer backgrounds will have reduced access to education
- Hardship funding doesn’t support low income working families
- Issue that children are expected to stay in education until age 18
- Increased traffic on roads and near colleges
- Will generally restrict access to education
- Issue raised that some rural schools have been closed so now children have to travel further
- Difficult for families of children whose schools do not have a sixth-form
- Financial strain on families
- Limited number of safe walking/cycling routes
- Not all young people should get subsidised transport it should be means tested
- Council should only provide subsidies when statutorily required to do so
- Young peoples’ education important to the future of Cumbria
- If increases have to be made consider less than the full amount
- Potential impact on roll numbers in FE colleges in Cumbria
- Alternative options should be found before cuts are made
- Query if savings will be made/has it been costed properly
- Limited public transport options in some areas
- Safety issues due to increase car usage generally and more young drivers
Concerns about impact of children needing to wait at end of day
Present major logistical challenge for parents
Financial impact magnified for those families with more than one child at further education
May affect under 16’s who use spare places on public services buses that have been pre booked under post-16 transport to access schools out of catchment
Potentially restrict parents’ choice in selecting a school for their children
Potentially impact on sustainability of school not just FE institutions
Consider using technology to allow for distance learning

Any known third party activity

A letter signed by 20 pupils from Kirkby Stephen Grammar School was received voicing objection to proposition 19, concerned about financial costs and impact on rural communities.
Proposition 20 – reduction in local committee grants (non-highways)

Quantitative data

Figure 21 shows 51% strongly agree/agree with proposition 20; with 23% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 21: % agreement/disagreement proposition 20 (base=1011)

Table 26: % agree/disagree with proposition 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

A small number of comments were received regarding this proposal. Comments included: scrapping all local committees; reducing committees and giving local people a role on them; grants from committees are vital to local voluntary groups and reducing the grants could damage these organisations and also comment that local groups are already facing reduced resources in the current climate; grants are too small to make a difference so should scrapped. It was also commented that this proposal conflicted with Theme 4 – thinking local first.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Eden District Council raised concerns that this reduction could impact on some of the voluntary and other bodies that operate within the Eden area.
The Third Sector Network queried whether grants will still be focused around the council and area plans.

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Eden Local Committee raised the concern that this could significantly impact on communities as they will be less likely to use this funding to access match funding from other sources.

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Concern for impact on local and voluntary groups
- Impact could be greater due to match funding
- Extent of impact grants have queried
- Some felt grants should scrapped or reduced further

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
**Proposition 21 – re-focusing of young people’s service**

**Quantitative data**

Figure 22 shows 53% strongly agree/agree with proposition 21; with 18% who disagree/strongly disagree.

**Figure 22: % agreement/disagreement proposition 21 (base=1003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 27: % agree/disagree with proposition 21**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Agreement</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels**

A small number of comments were received for this proposition. Comments included: third sector already hit hard with reductions in this area and further reductions may see some services stop, this proposition may put vulnerable youngsters at risk, youth services need to adapt as they struggle for identity and fail to connect with young people. For a variety of reasons the majority of those commenting objected to this proposition and made the case that children should be invested in because it saves money in the long run; currently the employment climate is difficult; young people’s services already reduced. Calls also to focus services in deprived areas and some concern those in rural areas would not have access to services.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies**

N/C
Feedback from public drop in events

Concern that this would mean services targeted in urban areas leaving the young in rural areas without access to services.

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Services for this group already limited
- Current young peoples’ services need to be more visible
- Need to invest in young people, to save long term costs
- Young need support with employment in current difficult climate

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 22 – residents’ parking permits

Quantitative data

Figure 23 shows 58% strongly agree/agree with proposition 22; with 26% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 23: % agreement/disagreement proposition 22 (base=1052)

Table 28 % agree/disagree with proposition 22

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Those who indicated their agreement with this proposal in the budget survey were less likely to comment than those who disagreed.

There has been a large number of comments/correspondence received regarding this proposition. Although the majority were in disagreement with the proposal there were a significant minority in support. Several people felt resident parking should be scrapped altogether. Issues raised have been bullet pointed below.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Eden District Council suggested that it might be preferable for the charge to be increased in rural areas to support post-16 transport.

Embleton and District Parish Council objected to this proposal
Federation of Small Business’ do not support this proposal

John Woodcock MP (Barrow-in-Furness): may be difficult for people to accept if they can see no additional benefit.

Allerdale and Copeland Green party agree

**Feedback from public drop in events**

Concern over possible variability in residential parking charges.

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Eden Local Committee raised concern that residents who pay for a permit may not receive a space near their home as it could be taken by a person using free-parking under the disc scheme.

Internal team’s response: divided opinion but a majority were in agreement.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- People should be charged for second vehicle/visitor permits
- Some felt £25 charge reasonable
- Residents restricted areas should be for residents only and not disc parking
- Inequitable tax as those in affected areas are lower income households
- Equality assessment should be done
- Cost of enforcement could be higher than revenue
- Need to evidence this is not revenue generating scheme
- Should already be covered by basic council tax
- Better parking in town centres away from residential areas
- Pensioners to be exempt
- Residents should pay or service removed
- Cap costs for time period to avoid price creep
- If paying would want space outside home
- Could move problem to areas just outside of parking restricted areas
- If paying then other users should not have free parking access to spaces
- General costs of running a car already high this would put further pressure on car users

**Any known third party activity**

There was an online e-petition using the county council website in opposition to resident parking charges which concluded with 32 signatures.
Proposition 23 – trading standards – reducing non-statutory functions

Quantitative data

Figure 24 shows 50% strongly agree/agree with proposition 23; with 27% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 24: % agreement/disagreement proposition 23 (base=1018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

A number of comments were received regarding proposition 23. Most disagreed though there were a few in conditional agreement and one comment that argued all non-statutory services in all areas of the council should be stopped. The main thread of comments highlighted concerns that trading standards provide support for vulnerable people and this proposal could have a negative impact on these groups in the community. Other comments that trading standards provide good advice such as on credit unions, testing blankets, customer awareness, stopping people getting scammed and if prevention work is cut it may lead to higher costs later. Suggestion that advice can be sourced from elsewhere.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Preston Patrick and Lower Holker Parish Councils indicated their opposition to this proposal, highlighting functions such as testing electric blankets, dealing with loan sharks and supporting the elderly and vulnerable and no cold calling zones.

The Third Sector Network queried whether they could pick up some of these functions through targeted grant giving.

Federation of Small Business’ do not support this proposal

Tobacco Free Futures pleased to note that CCC intends to continue its programme of age restricted test purchasing. However concerned that the council intends to stop all prevention work including awareness raising.

Unison: Opposed to cuts, risk to vulnerable individuals and puts legitimate business at risk.

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

From staff road-show: could stop preventative work and lead to fire-fighting.

Internal team’s response: felt the preventative non-statutory work was an important function. Intelligence from Community Support officers often helps Enforcement Officers. Internal teams include suggestions such as give advice to only the most vulnerable consumers, maintain links with other organisations, generally refocus a number of non-statutory roles, and create a ‘hybrid’ community and enforcement role.

Main feedback bullet points

- Concern this will impact on elderly and vulnerable
- Stopping preventative work could lead to higher costs later
- Can any work be picked up by third sector

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 24 – Cease to subsidise bus services and instead work with communities to find community transport solutions

Quantitative data

Figure 25 shows 25% strongly agree/agree with proposition 24; with 67% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 25: % agreement/disagreement proposition 24 (base=1201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Agreement/Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: % agree/disagree with proposition 24

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Respondents to the budget consultation survey also had the opportunity to provide additional feedback. Those who indicated they agreed with the survey were far less likely to provide additional feedback compared to those who disagreed.

In addition a large number of letters and e-mails were received voicing concern regarding this proposition.

Although there were some comments supporting the proposition, (with comments questioning why tax payers’ money should pay for peoples’ travel), the majority of comments were opposed to the proposition. There were a number of comments where people accepted there needs to be reductions but suggested there should remain a reduced number of subsidised services that are carefully targeted. Suggestions included removing...
all subsidies for evening and weekend buses. There were a large number of comments that expressed concern about losing specific bus routes that respondents saw as essential to their communities. The main issues raised have been bullet-pointed below.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies**

A large number of district, borough, town and parish councils have voiced their objection to this proposal: often detailing the impact specific bus service reductions would have on their communities - citing rural isolation, impact on elderly, young, those on low incomes, those without cars, removing access to job opportunities and services. Loss of links to other public transport such as train services have also been detailed along with a potential impact on tourism. Potential migration out of villages with potential damaging impacts were also mentioned. Some parishes suggested money saving solutions by altering bus routes and/or their frequency. Comments were also received over the adequacy of community transport solutions. A call to taper subsidies whilst supporting communities during the transition period and further impact studies to assess effect on communities. Consider increasing fares to a more commercial level. Look to improve usage of bus services.

Other groups/persons indicated their concern, citing similar issues to those described above include: Cumbria Tourism, the Third Sector Network, the Upper Eden Medical Practice, a number of transport user groups, Brampton Economic Partnership, Allerdale and Copeland Green Party, The Social Responsibility Forum of Churches Together in Cumbria, People First Independent Advocacy, a number of WI groups and Rory Stewart MP (Penrith and the Border) and John Woodcock MP (Barrow-in-Furness).

Bus/coach companies query the difference between the net and gross savings in the proposal. Cite buses are important for accessing work, support the economy giving access to town shops and leisure facilities. Also important for access to education and training opportunities and impact on socio-economic mobility. Young people particularly affected by bus services. Rural buses vital for social exclusion, tourism and reducing rural traffic, suggestion that supporting some routes on a commercial basis would be difficult.

Federation of Small Business’ fully supportive of this proposal

**Feedback from public drop in events**

Most comments at these events related to this proposition. Comments included: discriminatory against people with health conditions, poor, disabled and rural communities. Concerns about social isolation, unable to access services such as medical appointments, shopping, getting to work and collecting pensions. Query whether this would affect planning permissions where new developments need transport links to be considered. There was some support for means tested bus passes. Some support for concessionary users to pay a nominal fee.

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

Eden Local Committee commented that this could have a huge impact on rural communities and thought this worked against the council’s priorities of supporting older and vulnerable people to live independent and healthy lives, supporting economic growth and job creation and enabling communities to live safely and shape services locally. Also raised concerns that alternative options may not be adequate.
The Scrutiny Management Board (SMB) raised concerns about the viability of alternative options and issue of rural isolation. It suggests the exploration of possible alternative funding options and working with private providers to protect routes by developing/changing them to make them more viable. Concern also raised if not providing subsidy becomes council policy then if a provider withdraws from providing a service then a temporary subsidy may not be used to facilitate an alternative provider.

SMB requests that if proposal goes ahead then the council should work closely with communities to help develop alternative transport options.

Internal team’s response: divided opinion but majority felt it was appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Negative/discriminatory impact on rural communities
- Rural isolation
- People in rural communities not able to access services, health, shopping
- Reduced access to jobs, economically damage rural areas
- Discriminatory against old, young, disability and lower income households
- Works against the council plan objectives
- Must have alternatives in place first
- Alternatives unlikely to be adequate
- Impact on tourism, visitors will not be able to get about
- People will be forced to move out of rural areas further damaging smaller communities
- Concern about environmental impact
- Increased congestion on roads
- Impact on health and well-being of residents
- A number indicated charging a nominal fee for concessionary travellers or an annual administration fee to obtain a concessionary pass
- Negative impact on those who do not have access to private transport
- Impact on organisations/services that provide for groups that disproportionality use bus services, as their numbers may fall.
- Consider making changes to service routes/timings to make them more commercially viable
- Encourage use of buses to make them more economically viable
- Community transport options can be expensive compared to buses

**Any known third party activity**

Save Bampton bus service 111 petition: approximately 350 signatures

Save Bus service 836 petition: approximately 110 signatures

Save bus services 34,35 and 36 petition: approximately 100 signatures

Save Irthington bus route petition: 185 signatures

Save Eden’s Buses petition: 1732 signatures

Save Millom’s Buses petition: 531 signatures
Theme 3 – prevention before cure

Proposition 25 – integrating health and social care and managing demand in key services

Quantitative data

Figure 26 shows 83% strongly agree/agree with proposition 25; with 5% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 26: % agreement/disagreement proposition 25 (base=980)

Table 31 % agree/disagree with proposition 25

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposition. Commentary was diverse with several connecting themes. There were a number of comments welcoming greater integration whilst others felt the two services did not belong together. One comment indicated that although working more closely was positive, people work best using their professional skill-set rather than trying to do a bit of everything. There was a call for a clear strategic approach before savings are made. Some concern that savings could lead to a decline in service and commentary that these are ambitious savings and need to be monitored closely. There was some criticism that this was using a partner’s budget rather than a saving. Comments of support included that this integration made sense as people
often had health and social care needs so having them in one place would be better for the service user.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies**

Eden District Council commented on the ambitious savings attached to this proposal and would like consideration to consequences of non-delivery.

Scaleby Parish Council: important that duplication and overlap are avoided

People First Independent Advocacy: support intent of proposal. Focus on improved streamlined patient journey. Needs to be clarity about accountability and governance

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

From staff road-show: concern that IT systems may be a barrier to integrating health and social care.

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Closely monitor integration and savings
- Ensure people are using their skill sets effectively
- Develop clear strategic approach

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Proposition 26 – putting public health at the heart of communities

Quantitative data

Figure 27 shows 77% strongly agree/agree with proposition 26; with 5% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 27: % agreement/disagreement proposition 26 (base=993)

Table 32: % agree/disagree with proposition 26

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was been a small amount of commentary on this proposal: the majority of which agreed with proposition 26. Some commentary that health messages/promotions are costly and ineffective. Comment also on the need to remove bureaucracy from this area. A call to support low income groups and young people to have subsidies to access leisure centres and concern that savings may see a decline in service.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Embleton and District Parish Council objected if funding was being removed from public health funding.

People First Independent Advocacy: strongly support any activity that empowers people and communities to develop a better understanding of the determinants of health.
Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Consider cost effectiveness of Public Health messages
- Consider who support is aimed at
- Look at levels of bureaucracy

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 27 – efficiency savings in early year’s provision

Quantitative data

Figure 27 shows 62% strongly agree/agree with proposition 27; with 13% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 28: % agreement/disagreement proposition 27 (base=977)

Table 33: % agree/disagree with proposition 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was a small amount of commentary on this proposal. Some comments detailed the importance of early intervention to prevent future problems and costs. This provides essential support for people from disadvantaged backgrounds. Concern that some Children’s Centres are already part-time and this could further erode opening hours. Suggestion that non-essential management be removed from this area first. Although the majority of comments supported spending money on services in this area there was one comment which suggested too much can be done for the needy.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

John Woodcock MP (Barrow-in-Furness) would be concerned if there was reduced access to children’s centres for those who need them.
Howgill Family Centre: biggest challenge comes in this proposition, efficiencies can help absorb impact but as other services are reduced more is being asked of the service.

Feedback from public drop in events

N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal team’s response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Early intervention critical for good future outcomes
- Essential support for disadvantaged people
- Concern over opening hours of centres

Any known third party activity

N/C
Proposition 28 – risk based reform of Fire & Rescue

Quantitative data

Figure 29 shows 34% strongly agree/agree with proposition 28; with 49% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 29: % agreement/disagreement proposition 28 (base=1173)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: % agree/disagree with proposition 28

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Respondents to the budget consultation survey had the opportunity to provide additional feedback. Those who indicated they agreed with the proposition were far less likely to provide additional feedback compared to those who disagreed.

In addition a large number of letters and e-mails were received voicing concern regarding this proposition.

This proposition attracted some of the most complex and detailed responses in the budget consultation.

There were some comments in support of the proposition; on the condition that the suggested reforms are in line with proper risk assessment. In addition there were a number of comments which accepted savings are required but argued this should be achieved in different ways (unspecified) to deliver best value/outcomes for the public.
In terms of comments made relating to this proposition, these broadly focused on what respondents regarded to be an unacceptable reduction in resilience and a potential increase in risk. More specifically comments includes:

- The increase in response time of the second pump in those station areas where removal is proposed, with a number of comments arguing this would be outside specified IRMP response time targets.
- A number of arguments for the importance of the ‘weight’ of the response and without sufficient resources arriving promptly fires will become more developed.
- Concerns raised about reduced resilience and some commentary suggesting the service would struggle to cope with multiple incidents.
- A number cited the strategic locations of pumps that are proposed to be removed such as, M6, other trunk roads, Sellafield, a number of industries, rivers, and other concerns such as issues of flooding. Concern about whether risk assessments included non-fire incidents such as Road Traffic Collisions (RTC), water rescues etc. There were also calls for risk assessments to be more locally based.
- That the retained crews allow for the ‘safe’ deployment of the whole-time crew for incidents such as swift water rescue and otherwise may have to wait for an appliance from further away.
- General comments about increased risk to public and fire crew safety.
- Concern over potential loss of specialist training.
- Questions whether additional cost of fire stations supporting out of area incidents more frequently had been factored in.
- Concern that four-person crewing combined with reduced number of appliances could lead to difficulties.

**Summary of suggested alternatives**

There have been several campaigns led by fire and rescue personnel supporting the retention of existing arrangements which have also suggested a number of alternatives which could be facilitate this approach.

- Change retained/whole-time crewing cover at stations. So more cover provided by retained crews
- Stop full-time crewing at weekends and use resulting saving to allow retention of at-risk pumps
- Incorporate CFRS HR into Cumbria County Council HR with acknowledgement some essential skills would have to be retained
- Introduction of phased alerting (and suggestion this could save between £50,000 to £100,000 )
- Car pooling
- Commercial sponsorship
- Review of contracts, and external contracts for things such as laundry
- Amalgamation or deletion of senior officer posts
- Closure of stations/removal of pumps with low availability (for example Lazonby). Related to this it was also argued that those stations that have a good record of being able to recruit retained fire fighters should retain their second pump.
- Use revenue from council tax increase to protect fire services
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Retained Fire Fighters Union: opposed to removal of second pumps, flawed consultation process, support ALP change, argue in favour of increased on-call provision, rather than regular – better VFM and reflects reduction in incidents, suggestions to improve recruitment and retention of on-call staff, suggestions for changes to duty systems and collaboration with other FRS.

Barrow Branch FBU: negative impact on response times, fires will become more developed, concern about loss of skill sets, under proposals unlikely to meet IRMP response time targets in locality, highlight importance of ‘weight’ of attack, contend full attendance could take much longer and loss of resources would leave community vulnerable.

Rory Stewart MP (Penrith and the Border) supports the consideration of the Penrith retained firefighters alternative proposals.

John Woodock MP (Barrow-in-Furness): concerned about the frontline impact these cuts would have and reduction in quality of service.

A number of district/borough/town and parish councils have voiced their objections to proposition 28. Concerns include: capacity to deal with serious or multiple incidents, response times of second pump, increased safety risk to public and fire-fighters.

Penrith Chamber of Trade and Commerce: opposed to removal of second pump from Penrith. Concerned about risk assessment for the Penrith area and whether response times of the second pump would be adequate. Concerned about increased costs due to potential increase in casualties and damage to property.

Federation of Small Business’ agree changes should be risk based but against removal of fire engines in Workington, Whitehaven, Maryport, Penrith and Kendal.

Feedback from public drop in events

Penrith event attended by eight retained and one full time fire-fighters who raised concerns and outlined alternatives which are included in the above summary. Members of the public wanting to further understand the proposal.

General call countywide to protect fire services with concern reductions would leave communities vulnerable.

Internal staff and Member feedback

SMB concerned that savings proposed in this proposition could impact on the long term viability and approach to setting up a joint fire authority.

Eden Local Committee would like cabinet to explore alternative ways to save the required money rather then remove the second pump from Penrith. Raised the issue of availability of some of the other pumps in the Eden district.
From staff road-show: Retained fire fighters concern on four-person crewing and delay on second pump attendance.

**Main feedback bullet points**

- Reduced ability for Cumbria to deal with major incident such as incident on M6 or nuclear incident
- General concern lives may be put at risk
- Crew safety may be put at risk
- Increased response times/especially arrival of second pump
- Possible loss of specialist training
- Loss of ability to deal with floods, water rescue and height rescue
- Impact on early stages of incident crucial
- Belief that four-person crews cannot enter a building before a second crew arrives, resulting in increased risk to public
- The availability of some pumps operated by retained crews being poor
- Concern rural areas will be at increased risk due to increased response times
- Staggered call-out/pager system so only crews required are called out.
- Additional costs to neighbouring stations to which pumps have been removed
- Additional costs due to potential increase of harm to property
- Delayed response times leading to fires becoming more developed
- Risk assessment to be more local
- Concern that CFRS resilience/capacity reduced beyond what is safe
- Consider amalgamating senior posts and wage reductions
- Consider merger with other fire authorities

**Any known third party activity**

Dalton ‘Save Dalton Fire Station’ petition: 2,286 signatures

Kendal FBU ‘Save Kendal fire engine’ petition: 723 signatures

Penrith ‘Keep Penrith a 2nd pump station’ petition: 9,000 signatures

‘Save Penrith’s second pump’: 1,146 signatures

The Herald ‘register your protest’ signed paper cut out: 1,285 signatures

Single page cut out from consultation document with tick to disagree with proposition, 1,598.

25 letters received from pupils from North Lakes School asking for the retention of the second pump at Penrith. Citing safety issues as their principle concern.

Workington and Whitehaven Petition: 2987 signatures

‘Save Workington fire engine’ - Direct.gov website: 100 signatures

Maryport: 112 standard letters signed by residents stating their concerns about alterations to the fire service in the area, indicating the cover would be inadequate for the area have been collated and submitted by Maryport Town Council.
Theme 4 – thinking local first

Proposition 29 – targeted on-street parking charges

Quantitative data

Figure 30 shows 39% strongly agree/agree with proposition 29; with 45% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 30: % agreement/disagreement proposition 29 (base=1060)

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses to Proposition 29](image)

Table 35: % agree/disagree with proposition 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree 39%

Summary disagree 45%

Net Agreement -6%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

Those who agreed with this proposition in the budget consultation survey were far less likely to leave additional commentary compared to those who disagreed.

There have been a large number of separate letters and emails received in opposition to this proposition.

There have been a small number of comments offering conditional support for the proposal. However the majority of comments were against the proposition with the majority of those indicating they believe this may severely damage local town centres and cause the closure of a number of smaller shops/businesses.
Also, commentary suggesting it may unfairly discriminate against small business as large out-of-town stores can offer free parking. Main issues raised have been bullet-pointed below. Although comments have been received from all parts of the county there has been a notable, significant commentary from the Cockermouth community.

**Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies**

Cumbria Tourism argues that it could be damaging to local towns and the infrastructure (pay machines) would be a blight.

Keswick Tourism Association: negatively impact on Keswick and its traders. Concern for guest houses situated in residential areas

Carlisle City Council concerned this could damage high street businesses

Eden District Council contend it will have a negative impact on the economy of rural market towns.

Cockermouth Town Council strongly object as it would negatively impact on trade in the town.

Kendal Town Council: has it been costed properly and has impact on South Lakeland DC car parks been considered?

Cockermouth Civic Trust argue there is no issue with congestion, present parking disc system works well, would damage small businesses.

Copeland Borough Council asks for a more consistent approach to parking enforcement and remains to be convinced about congestion issues.

A number of parish councils concerned it would impact on privately run shops and small businesses.

Penrith Chamber of Trade and Commerce concerned about potential economic impact, town businesses already struggling with competition from out of town stores with free parking and internet sales. Raised issue of capital start-up costs.

Cumbria Chamber of Commerce feel proposed charges would add to the challenges faced by businesses in the high street resulting in closures and job loses further impacting on the economy.

Federation of Small Business’ opposed to this proposal

Allerdale and Copeland Green party strongly agree

People First Independent Advocacy: Members raised concerns such as does this relate to disabled badge holders, would like to see more consultation.

**Feedback from public drop in events**

N/C
Internal staff and Member feedback

Eden Local Committee also raised concerns this proposition could have on market towns in their district.

SMB suggests if this were to move forward it should be done with local engagement producing local solutions rather than a one size fits all approach.

From staff road-shows – On street parking could have negative impact on local shops, concern whether it would generate revenue.

Internal teams response: Divided opinion with a majority concerned about the proposition.

Main bullet points

- Damage to local town centres
- Town centres will close raising unemployment and reducing tax revenue
- Need to look at planning permissions for out of town shops with free parking
- People will shop online or at stores with free parking
- Argue that other authorities are reversing street parking decisions because of damage to town centres
- Poor evidence of congestion
- Congestion can be managed with disc parking
- Charging could be seen as an illegal revenue raiser
- Concern of capital start up and enforcement costs
- Will cause parking problems outside of charging areas
- Should be at peak times only
- Negative impact on tourism
- Could impact on revenue of off-street car parking
- Impact on those who rely on town centre shops if they close down

Any known third party activity

Cockermouth and District Chamber of Trade petition against on street parking: 3,000 signatures.
Proposition 30 – winter maintenance

Quantitative data

Figure 31 shows 67% strongly agree/agree with proposition 30; with 15% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 31: % agreement/disagreement proposition 30 (base=991)

Table 36: % agree/disagree with proposition 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a number of responses to this proposal. The majority of responses indicated they do not feel there should be reductions in this area while some suggest how savings could be made. Main points are bulleted below.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Eden District Council suggest this could have a major impact on rural areas.

Federation of Small Business’ supportive if does not result in untreated roads.
Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
Internal team’s response: felt appropriate with risk assessment in place.

Main feedback bullet-points
- Winter maintenance is seen as essential for safety reasons
- Would like to see more gritting
- Involve local resources more, including, farmers, parish councils and local contractors
- Make equipment/supplies available for local communities to use
- Important communities and people do not become isolated during winter
- Health and safety risk for single manned gritters

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 31 – investing in roads

Quantitative data

Figure 32 shows 69% strongly agree/agree with proposition 31; with 12% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 32: % agreement/disagreement proposition 31 (base=998)

Table 37: % agree/disagree with proposition 31

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were been a number of comments on this proposition. A number of comments suggesting that pot-hole fixing is currently poor and leads to longer term higher costs. Some commentary that respondents would like to see more capital investment in roads as vital infrastructure and would like to see investment in safer cycle routes. Comment claiming damage to vehicles due to poor quality of roads and that investment in roads is essential for safety reasons. Concern savings now may lead to higher costs later.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Borrowdale Parish Council support this proposition
Feedback from public drop in events

Would like to see Lengthsmen supporting maintenance of roads. Feel current pot-hole fixing is piecemeal and costs more in the long run.

Internal staff and Member feedback

Internal teams response: felt appropriate.

Main feedback bullet points

- Roads seen as an essential part of Cumbrian infrastructure
- Investment in cycle routes
- Maintenance important for safety reasons
- Need improved pot-hole and general road maintenance to avoid later higher costs
- Increase use of surface dressing techniques

Any known third party activity

N/C
Theme – future potential savings

Proposition 32 – joint fire authority

Quantitative data

Figure 33 shows 49% strongly agree/agree with proposition 32; with 30% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 33: % agreement/disagreement proposition 32 (base=1069)

Table 38: % agree/disagree with proposition 32

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a number of responses regarding this proposal. Although there were some comments in favour, indicating they felt this would be a good cost saving, reducing back office functions is preferable to reducing front-line staff and the council should look at joint working in other areas; there were a significant number of comments that did disagree with the proposal; with the main concern being the loss of local geographical knowledge which could lead to mistakes and increased response times. There were some comments suggesting the merger should be done now before any cuts to the service are made.
Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies
N/C

Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
N/C

Main feedback bullet points
- Concern loss of local knowledge will lead to increased response times
- Do merger before cuts to service are made
- Concern that merging with a metropolitan based service would leave Cumbria with a poorer service

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 33 – grants reduction

Quantitative data

Figure 34 shows 48% strongly agree/agree with proposition 33; with 22% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 34: % agreement/disagreement proposition 33 (base=959)

Table 39: % agree/disagree with proposition 33

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary agree</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Agreement</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There have been a few comments regarding this proposal. Some concern this will have a negative impact on community and voluntary organisations. Commentaries that grant decisions to be made locally is a positive step.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

The Third Sector Network queried whether this would affect Local Committee grants.

Eden District Council felt this could have further negative impact upon the local voluntary sector.

Allerdale and Copeland Green party have concerns that this proposition coupled with proposition 20 might result in loss of funds to very valuable community organisations which would render them no longer viable.
Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
N/C

Main feedback bullet points
- Decisions being made locally positive
- Concern that local groups will be adversely affected

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 34 – investing in safe routes to school

Quantitative data

Figure 35 shows 65% strongly agree/agree with proposition 34; with 14% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 35: % agreement/disagreement proposition 34 (base=987)

Table 40: % agree/disagree with proposition 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary agree 65%
Summary disagree 14%
Net Agreement 51%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There was some commentary on this proposition. Overall there was general agreement with this proposal with respondents indicating it will be positive for health and well-being of children. Some would like the investment to include improved cycle ways. However there was some concern raised about safety of walking routes in rural areas especially during winter months and a question whether some roads were suitable for such upgrades in particular narrow lanes. Concern whether people could be persuaded to use walking routes.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

N/C
Feedback from public drop in events
N/C

Internal staff and Member feedback
N/C

Main feedback bullet points
- Seen as a positive for health and well-being
- Concern whether people can be persuaded to use them
- Safety concerns in rural areas
- Call to include cycleways

Any known third party activity
N/C
Proposition 35 – reshaping neighbourhood services

Quantitative data

Figure 36 shows 53% strongly agree/agree with proposition 35; with 13% who disagree/strongly disagree.

Figure 36: % agreement/disagreement proposition 35 (base=954)

Table 41: % agree/disagree with proposition 35

| Strongly agree | 17% |
| Agree          | 36% |
| Neutral        | 34% |
| Disagree       | 9%  |
| Strongly Disagree | 4% |

Summary agree 53%
Summary disagree 13%
Net Agreement 40%

Summary of feedback through principle consultation channels

There were a small number of comments on this proposal. There have been mixed comments, some in support and seeing as a good area to save money, better use of assets and positive there will be a local focus on services. However concerns were raised that it may lead to centralised services negatively impacting on rural areas and possible library closures.

Feedback from organisations/groups/public bodies

Scaleby Parish Council difficult to reconcile the centralisation of services to major centres and the rural nature of the county
Allerdale andCopeland Green Party suggest that if the council is serious about working with communities, allowing representation from parish councils (either singly or in clusters) and/or community based organisations on area committees would help to achieve this.

**Feedback from public drop in events**

Call to cut back on library opening hours.

**Internal staff and Member feedback**

N/C

**Main feedback bullet points**

- This may lead to library closures
- Rural/small town services may be moved to central locations
- Increase rural isolation
- With proposition 24 access to centralised services not possible for some
- Good that there is local focus on services
- Better use of assets
- Call to protect libraries and archive centres as part of neighbourhood services
- Suggestion for libraries to increase revenue opportunities such as opening cafes

**Any known third party activity**

N/C
Respondent Profile

Age

Figure 37: Percent of respondents by age

Table 42 demonstrates that the under 16 age group are under represented and the 65 plus age group are over represented in the consultation survey.

Table 42: Respondent profile age v Cumbria profile age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by age</th>
<th>% of Cumbria population</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-64 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen from table 43 that Barrow and Copeland are significantly under represented whereas Eden is significantly over represented.
Table 43: Respondent District profile v Cumbria District profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses by district</th>
<th>% of Cumbria population</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allerdale</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability

Figure 40: Percent of respondents who consider themselves disabled
Employment Status

Figure 41: Percent of respondents by employment status