

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2024 - 25

Date(s) of completing the EqIAA:	August 2023 – January 2023
Person(s) completing the EqIAA:	EqIAA Lead: Service Director – Finance & Chief Financial Officer (S151 Officer) Equality Officer – Policy & Compliance

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	2 - 8
Section 1 - Introduction	9 - 11
Section 2 – Equality Priority Areas	12 - 22
Key Information in relation to the Equality Priority Areas	13 – 17
What residents have told us over the last 10 years	18 - 20
Section 3 – What residents have told us over the last eleven years	23 - 31
What residents have told us about Council approaches to delivering its savings plan in the longer term	23 – 26
What residents have told us about their satisfaction levels with Council services	27 – 29
What residents have told us about the local area and the Council	30 - 31
Section 4 – Setting the Council Tax	32 - 33
Section 5 – Cost reduction and income	34 - 56
Cost reduction proposal – Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTR)	35 – 42
Income proposal – Paid for on and off street parking	43 - 45
Income proposal – Blue Badge Administration Fee	46 - 49
Income proposal - Cemeteries, Exclusive Rights of Burial Charges	50 – 51
Income proposal - Garden Waste (Green Bin) Service Charges	52 – 54
Income proposal – Local Land Charges	55 - 56
Section 6 – Cumulative Impacts	57 - 62
Part 1 - Cumulative analysis of impacts in respect of the package of proposals	57
Part 2 - Cumulative Impact of savings over time	58 - 62
Section 7 – EqIAA Outcome	63
Section 8 – EqIAA Sources of Information	64
Appendix 1 - Previous Consultation Feedback	65 - 105
The next 5-10 years	66 – 78
The local area and the council	79 - 87
Satisfaction with services	88 - 104
Characteristics of consultation respondents	105
Appendix 2 - Cumulative impacts of the savings programme since 22/23	106 - 122
Appendix 3 - South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice consultation feedback	122 - 125

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This EqIAA presents the following 5 ‘sets’ of information:

1. Equality Priority Areas

The identified Priority Areas, where the most significant inequalities exist across South Gloucestershire, were presented as part of the consultation and residents responded in respect of where they would like to see the Council place the bulk of its focus.

‘Health and Wellbeing’, ‘Education’ and ‘Poverty & Financial Hardship’ were the 3 areas most stated by residents responding to the consultation.

- Health and Wellbeing was the most highly prioritised Area regardless of Protected Characteristic.
- Education was prioritised in the top 3 by all Protected Characteristic groups except for Disabled People who prioritised Housing, Adult Social Care and Poverty & Financial Hardship more highly.
- Poverty & Financial Hardship was the third highest priority, closely followed by Housing.
- Hate crime was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to experience it i.e. people from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and LGBTQ+ communities.
- Adult Social Care was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to be in contact with the adult social care system i.e. disabled people, people aged 65+ and carers.
- Housing was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to be in housing need i.e. disabled people, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and the Armed Forces community.

In respect of Council Budget setting, the following is noted in regard to the 10 Equality Priority Areas:

Priority Area	Investments and Key Resourcing Points
Health and Wellbeing	Reducing health inequalities is the priority of the Public Health and Wellbeing Division - all work is aligned to delivering improved health and wellbeing outcomes and reducing inequalities in outcomes between different groups in our communities. Partners are also supported to do the same. Resource for this work continues.
Educational attainment & experience	Phase 2 of the Recovery Curriculum programme will continue, and this includes continuing to build on the successes delivered via the Equality in Education work. Providing additional support to young people is resourced, particularly around their emotional and mental wellbeing through expanding the Youth Activities Offer (YAO), including expanding the Education Inclusion Project (EIP).
Poverty and financial hardship	Through the Welfare Benefit & Debt Advice consortium, additional investment to provide complex advice services to 50% more people in 2024/25 - this is anticipated to secure an additional £2.5m in financial outcomes for local residents. Warm and Well - additional funding to continue council's work to tackle fuel poverty. Continuing Community Welcome Spaces and support for food banks/pantries. Provision of Warm Packs and energy efficiency measures. Continuation of Financial Security Officer post into 2025/26 to provide resource and strategic capacity for work on cost of living crisis.

	<p>Capacity to continue communications and preventative work enabling people to help themselves through increased benefit take up campaigns such as Maximising Income / Benefit Take up Campaign and Planned & Sustained campaign, using a range of methods and partners.</p> <p>Provision of Free School Meals Vouchers at £15 per child for one week in Easter and one week in the summer supporting c. 6,500 children and young people.</p>
Housing	<p>Continued implementation of the Council's Housing Strategy.</p> <p>Introduction of a pilot scheme to support landlords to reach current Minimum Energy Efficiency Standard (MEES).</p> <p>Continued enforcement of the energy efficiency (Private Rented Property) (E&W) regulation 2015.</p>
Adult social care	<p>Provision of resource for the introduction of Adult Social Care Quality Assurance work which includes inclusive services and practice for all.</p> <p>Permanent support for Safeguarding Partnership arrangements (children and adults).</p>
Children's social care	<p>Continuation of the Children's Services Improvement Partner and Improvement Officer work - the effectiveness of this work is seen in the improvements that have been made to date.</p> <p>Early Help is vital to enable good support for families at the earliest possible stage, to help prevent more serious issues arising and resource has been identified to deliver the new Early Help Strategy.</p> <p>Bringing forwards additional capacity to manage growing caseloads across Children Services.</p> <p>Providing extra resource in providing placement opportunities for care leavers and the support they need to thrive in those placements.</p> <p>Resourcing work to better shape future housing options to meet the needs for care leavers, delivering improved outcomes for our young people.</p> <p>Permanent support for Safeguarding Partnership arrangements (children and adults).</p>
Employment	<p>We have developed and launched our Workforce Equalities Action Plan and this work continues.</p> <p>Continuation of the Universal Business Support programme which aims to offer South Gloucestershire businesses a range of advice, support and training. This work shows good representation in respect of the spread of Age, Sex, Ethnicity and Disability of business leaders and includes targeted support such as Women in Business and feeds into the South Gloucestershire Business Show including the Major Employers Forum.</p>
Accessibility (digital inclusion, transport, built & natural environment, wider economy)	<p>Resource for creating accessible communications that meets user needs to redesign complex information into plain English.</p> <p>Continuation of the provision of free access to PCs and Wi-Fi in public libraries and One Stop Shops, the Digital Champion Volunteer Scheme providing free one to one digital help and support and work with partners and community organisations to address the digital divide in our communities.</p> <p>Continuation of resource to ensure maintenance of assets in the built environment as a result of growth in the district.</p> <p>Inclusion of permanent funding for street cleansing, highway reactive repairs (potholes), grounds maintenance, tree maintenance as a result of housing growth and linked highway network growth. In addition, work aimed at enhancing access to public areas by reducing clutter, such as street furniture, instances of overhanging vegetation etc. especially ensuring the enhancement of accessibility for disabled and elderly people is ongoing.</p>

	Continuation of works to maintain and improve bus stops and shelters to support access to public transport and enhance accessibility. Continuation of work to improve accessibility on our high streets. Continuation of works to improve mobility facilities at uncontrolled crossing points in priority areas. Continuation of the Handyvan service which offers subsidised rates; the core customer groups in receipt of the service are older and vulnerable residents and contributes to keeping people in their homes and maintaining independence. Continuation of assisted waste collections for disabled and elderly people who are unable to move bins and containers. Continuation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy to deliver a suite of actions aimed at enhancing accessibility to our community spaces.
Tackling inequalities in addressing Climate & Nature Emergency	Continuation of work to ensure that work on climate and nature emergency is strategic in reducing inequalities through targeted projects and ensuring that each individual project closes inequalities gaps and avoids exacerbating existing inequalities.
Hate Crime	Continuation of the delivery of the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Plan which works to reduce the prevalence of hate crime and brings resource to co-ordinate and drive this work with our partners; this includes the commissioning of SARI (Stand Against Racism and Inequality) to support victims of hate crime.

In support of the 10 Equality Priority Areas, South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice are the voice and influence group representing our diverse communities and support the council in developing and delivering actions to tackle inequalities across the district. Funding for a further three years has been identified to continue provision of this support.

The Council will be publishing a new Tackling Inequalities Plan from April 2024, setting out specific and measurable objectives against each of the above 10 Priority Areas. This goes hand-in-hand with the budget setting process which ensures resource is in place to deliver against these objectives moving forwards.

2. Analysis of consultation feedback

The consultation conducted allows for an analysis over an eleven year period to be conducted in respect of:

1. What residents have told us about Council approaches to delivering its savings plan in the longer term.
2. What residents have told us about the local area and the Council.
3. What residents have told us about their satisfaction levels with Council services.

This information has been disaggregated according to Protected Characteristic in order that trends can be considered as part of decision making. Full data is available in [Appendix 1](#).

Feedback has been directly received from South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice and is shown in [Appendix 3](#).

Key points arising include:

- Disabled people and people of older ages are less likely to support digital and online approaches to service delivery;
- People who are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty/financial hardship in South Gloucestershire (Younger adults <45, Women, People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, Disabled people) are less likely to want to see increases in fees and charges or see services scaled back.

- Parks and Open Spaces, Libraries and Waste & Recycling Services continue to be the service areas with which residents are most highly satisfied, although in respect of Parks and Open Spaces there are trends showing lower than average levels of satisfaction amongst disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups.
- Overall satisfaction levels with services are not at high levels (with the exception of Parks and Open Spaces, Libraries and Waste & Recycling Services).
- With the exception of Waste & Recycling Services and Local Bus Services, all service areas have this year received a higher level of satisfaction than the eleven year average satisfaction level.
- 43% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become worse as a place to live over the last two years and this is the highest level over the ten year period that this question has been asked. In particular, LGBTQ+ people and carers were more likely to say the area has become worse.
- In contrast, most respondents (65%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live, however, this is lower than the average satisfaction over the eleven year period of 76%. LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, carers and people aged under 45 reported the lowest levels of satisfaction with the local area this year.
- People from minority ethnic groups have been most likely to have lower levels of satisfaction with the way the Council runs things across the eleven year period.

A summary of this information is shown on pages 23 – 31 and full data tables are shown in [Appendix 1](#).

3. Setting the Council Tax

Just over one-third (34%) of respondents preferred Option 1, which was the option with the largest percentage preference, however:

- Women were slightly more likely to prefer Option 2.
- People from 'White Other' groups were most likely to choose Option 2 and preferred Option 4 over Option 1.
- People aged under 45 showed the same level of preference for Options 1 and 2 and were more likely than average to choose Option 3.
- People from minority ethnic groups were more likely to choose Option 4. Whilst the sample size is small, it is noted that this mirrors the preference of last year of people from minority ethnic groups.
- Disabled people were more likely than average to choose Option 4.

National and local evidence shows that these groups are more likely to be living in financial hardship. In the autumn of 2022 research conducted by the Council found:

- Families with children, younger adults <45, women, those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, those who are renting privately, those who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness have noted greater difficulty or have had to make more changes.
- Minority ethnic respondents are also suffering disproportionately, with 20% experiencing difficulty or great difficulty, compared to 13% of the population overall.
- People with disabilities feel much worse off than a year ago, 33% feel this compared to 21% of non-disabled respondents.

The data shown in this EqIAA shows that Option 1 is likely to impact more greatly for people with lower incomes, however, at the same time, Option 1 mitigates further cuts to services which would likely disproportionately impact residents with lower incomes.

4. Cost reduction and income proposals for 2024/25

The following table shows an overarching summary of the impacts of the cost reduction and income proposals.

Proposal	Female	Male	Children and Young People	Younger adults (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Car Parking	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Blue Badges						✗	✗			✗					✗		
Cemeteries	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Waste service	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Land Charges	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		

Note: The ✗ symbol used shows the 'groups' likely to be proportionately more negatively impacted under each proposal.

Local Council Tax Reduction

Option 2 (only include earnings as an income in the calculation of entitlement to Council Tax Reduction) is proposed and, of the Options presented, this Option would result in the least financial impact on recipients - the median drop in support would be £0.75 per week as opposed to significantly higher drops under Options 1a – 1d. In addition, far fewer households would experience a drop of >£5 per week and far fewer would lose entitlement to any support.

Implementation of the Option would be delayed until April 2025 in order that the new arrangements can be implemented alongside additional Welfare and Debt Advice support in order to provide partial mitigation of the impacts.

Paid for On and Off- Street Parking

The decision to delay implementation of car parking charges until April 2025 results in no negative impacts being identified at this stage. The proposed decision allows time for options to be considered, including implementation of the mitigating actions identified which include investigation into any exemptions for Blue Badge holders and the usage of accessible payment methods. However, this EqlAA makes clear the negative impacts in respect of any implementation of paid for on and off street parking.

Blue Badge Administration Fee

51% of consultation respondents agreed with the introduction of this fee compared to 28% who disagreed. However, it is clearly noted that disabled people were significantly less likely to agree (40% agreement compared to 38% disagreement) than the average across all respondents. Overall, this proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly for those with lower incomes, and our data shows that disabled people overall are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity as well as be facing extra costs (e.g. spending on specialist disability-related products and services that are essential, higher usage of essentials such as having to use more energy or extra accessible transport options etc.). It is noted that a Blue Badge is valid for 3 years and therefore, the fee of £10 would only be incurred once in each 3 year period (i.e. equivalent to £3.33 per annum).

Cemeteries, Exclusive Rights of Burial Charges

This proposal would see the term of the Exclusive Right of Burial extend from 50 years to 60 years (an increase of 20% in the term) and an increase of 20% in the fee charged for the Exclusive Right of Burial by the Council. This proposal is likely to increase the cost of funeral directors' bills paid by residents as funeral directors would need to cover the increase in costs and pass this increase to residents. This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes who are disproportionately more likely to be younger adults <45, women, people from many minority ethnic groups and disabled people. However, this is not a regular (e.g. annual) fee that residents would incur and the term increases in-line with the cost.

Garden Waste (Green Bin) Service Charges

Slightly more residents disagreed (44%) than agreed (38%) with the proposal to increase the Garden Waste charge from £30 to £60 per annum in 2024/25 with annual inflationary increases applied each year thereafter. The 'groups' with the largest disagreement levels were people aged 65+ and disabled people.

Overall, this proposal is likely to result in a negative impact, in particular for those more likely to have lower incomes. Mitigating actions are in place:- 1) a 50% cost reduction for people in receipt of certain benefits and the opportunity for grouping together to share a bin provides partial mitigation, and 2) the availability of single disposable sacks provides a good level of mitigation especially for those with smaller amounts of garden waste which could particularly include people on lower incomes, as there are no price increases proposed for the single disposable sacks aside from annual inflationary increases from 2025/26. Household Waste and Recycling Centres continue to accept garden waste.

Local Land Charges

45% of respondents to the consultation agreed with the proposal to increase local land charges by 21% with annual inflationary increases from 2025/26 onwards compared to 16% disagreeing. This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes who are disproportionately more likely to be younger adults <45, women, people from many minority ethnic groups and disabled people. However, this is not a regular (e.g. annual) fee that residents would incur.

5. Cumulative Impacts of the Savings Programme since 2022/23

The following table provides an overview of the extent of impacts of the Council Savings Programme since 2022/23. The table shows the percentage of projects within the Council Savings Programme which have resulted in positive and negative impacts.

	Female	Male	Children and Young People	Younger adults (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
Positive impacts identified	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	8%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Negative impacts identified	16%	3%	8%	10%	3%	10%	22%	1%	1%	17%	9%	1%	3%	1%	17%	1%	0%

The information shows that in particular, disabled people, people from minority ethnic groups, people on lower incomes and females have been negatively impacted by the Savings Programme to date.

In response to this, the Local Council Tax Reduction proposals and the on and off street parking proposals have been delayed until 2025 in order that they can be aligned with mitigating actions, including actions to support people facing financial hardship. In addition, this information allows for informed considerations as integral to future work of the Savings Programme.

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

The financial challenge we face

Like councils up and down the country, over recent years, our finances have been stretched by rising costs, reduced funding and inflation, which gives us less freedom to prioritise spending as we – and you – might like us to. Our draft budget does not propose to make new savings at this time but provides further details of savings and additional income that were approved in the budget in February 2023. The delivery of these savings and the generation of new income is assumed as the starting point for the draft budget.

Our updated financial position for the coming year

Each year, we update our Medium-Term Financial Plan, which considers our financial position for the coming years. Since February 2023, when this year's budget was agreed, through factors outside the council's direct control, our overall financial position for the years ahead has worsened. Based on delivery of the proposed savings programme and service level options we forecast we will be able to balance the budget for the forthcoming three years with a retained core budget shortfall of around £9m to close by 2027/28.

Looking ahead

All councils are facing financial challenges. Our forward planning has left us in a comparatively robust position in the short term, but we need to deliver significant savings over the coming years to enable us to continue to balance the books.

We've made assumptions about how prices and wages might rise in the coming years and on that basis, we estimate we'll need to identify a further £9m of savings by 2027/28. These savings will be in addition to the £40m of savings that were announced in the February 2023 budget. We'll continue to identify ways to save or raise additional funds and consult on these as appropriate over the coming months and years.

This Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA) document

The key purpose of this EqIAA is to provide clear and robust information relating to equalities issues and considerations which influence decisions in respect of budget setting including proposals for reducing costs and generating additional income.

The EqIAA shows information in respect of:

- i. Identified Equality Priority Areas with an analysis of resident feedback, and information relating to investments and continuing resourcing of work to tackle inequalities across the 10 Equality Priority Areas;
- ii. An analysis of consultation feedback (the analysis spans the last eleven year period);
- iii. An analysis in respect of Council Tax options for 24/25;
- iv. An analysis of the two packages of proposals for savings targets for reducing the cost of the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme by £400k from 2024/25 and generating £1m of additional income from September 2024 rising to £2m in 2025/26.
- v. An analysis of the cumulative impacts of the Savings Programme since 2022/23.

This EqIAA also serves to remind the Council of its statutory duty, in the exercise of its functions, to have due regard to the need to:-

- 1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010;**
- 2. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; this means:-**
 - removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.
 - taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it.
 - encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- 3. Foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; this means:-**
 - tackling prejudice.
 - promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are:

- age;
 - disability;
 - gender reassignment;
 - marriage and civil partnership;
 - pregnancy and maternity;
 - race;
 - religion or belief;
 - sex;
 - sexual orientation.
-
- In addition, the council's EqIAA approach includes 'socio-economic groups' and the 'Armed Forces Community'.

There are several issues to be raised within this introduction as follows:

- The council has a well-established approach in place in regard to Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA). In relation to the budget setting process, potential equalities impacts have been identified from the outset of option development. This has been delivered through the specific identification and consideration of equalities issues as an integral part of the council's Resource Planning process. This approach has allowed for potential equalities impacts to be identified and considered as an integral part the budget setting process from the outset.
- The approach taken by the council's Resource Planning process ensures that a robust approach to EqIAA is in place from the outset which identifies: potential equalities impacts; mitigating actions in respect of any identified negative equalities impacts and opportunities to bring about greater equality. Section 5 of this EqIAA analyses the overall equalities impacts of the proposals identified via the council's Resource Planning process.

- Extensive consultation has been conducted and this allows for information to be explicitly gathered and analysed with respect to 'Protected Characteristic' groups as defined by The Equality Act 2010. Feedback directly from South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice is shown in [Appendix 3](#). It is important to note that this EqlAA provides information not only concerning the consultation results collected between October 2023 and December 2023, but also analyses trends year-on-year since 2013/14 (as set out in [Appendix 1](#)). This allows for a comprehensive EqlAA, and together with information shown in [Appendix 2](#) regarding impacts of the Council Savings Programme, includes information regarding cumulative impacts and allows for issues arising to form a robust part of decision-making.
- A diverse cross section of residents have been engaged in consultation activity. Taking this approach, which involves large numbers, provides a robust level of feedback from diverse communities.
- This EqlAA should be read in conjunction with the Council's [Annual Equalities Reports](#), the [South Gloucestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment](#) and the specific [EqlAAs](#) that are conducted as part of the delivery of all Council 'functions'. In addition, this EqlAA should be read in conjunction with the Equality and Human Rights Commission's most recent report '[Is Britain Fairer? 2018](#)' and the Budget 2024/25 Consultation Output Report.

SECTION 2 – EQUALITY PRIORITY AREAS

Equality Priority Areas

As a result of the Council's ongoing EqIAA activity, an 11-year analysis which triangulates national data, local data and community feedback has been conducted. As a result of this work, 10 'Equality Priority Areas' have been established.

These Priority Areas are (in no particular order):

Equality Priority Areas
1. Educational attainment and experience.
2. Hate Crime.
3. Employment.
4. Poverty and financial hardship.
5. Housing.
6. Accessibility, especially in terms of digital inclusion, transport, the built and natural environment and access to the wider economy.
7. Health and Wellbeing.
8. Adult Social Care.
9. Children's Social Care.
10. Tackling inequalities as part of work to address the Climate and Nature Emergency.

These are identified as broad Priority Areas because they are the areas where national and local research, and our engagement and consultation activity with organisations, groups and individual residents all combine to evidence the largest and most significant inequalities, which ultimately negatively impact upon individual residents and their families, and our area as a whole.

The following section provides key information to show some of the most significant inequalities in respect of each Priority Area.

Key inequalities in relation to the Priority Areas

All of the research, engagement and consultation conducted (as shown throughout the Council's EqIAA activity throughout the last 11 years) has been analysed and combines to provide evidence of the largest and most significant inequalities. Key inequalities are summarised below against each of the 10 Equality Priority Areas:

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
<p>1. Educational attainment and experience</p>	<p>Persistent inequalities exist in relation to Pupil Attainment. In particular, pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM), pupils from many minority ethnic groups and pupils from lower socio-economic groups are disproportionately impacted. Pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND), specifically those on 'SEN Support', do less well in South Glos than in other Authority areas.</p> <p>The proportion of South Glos pupils who are eligible for Free School Meals has nearly doubled over the last 6 years and pupils with disabilities and pupils from most minority ethnic groups are disproportionately overrepresented.</p> <p>We know that there has been a decline in pupil wellbeing (mental health, confidence, self-esteem, anxiety etc.) across the school population and pupils from minority ethnic groups and LGBTQ+ pupils have disproportionately lower levels of wellbeing.</p> <p>We also know that pupils from minority ethnic groups are disproportionately over-represented in exclusion data.</p>
<p>2. Hate Crime</p>	<p>The level of hate crime in South Gloucestershire continues to grow, mirroring the growth rates seen across England and Wales.</p> <p>In South Gloucestershire, there has been a 46% increase in hate crimes reported to the police over the last 4 years, and some 'types' of hate crime are rising at an alarming rate, for example, over the last 4 years, there has been a 250% rise in transphobic hate crime.</p>
<p>3. Employment</p>	<p>In South Gloucestershire, the Census 2021 tells us that, depending upon ethnicity, people from minority ethnic groups are between 1.5 times and 3.5 times more likely than average to be unemployed and are significantly over-represented in lower paid work in South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>The proportion of disabled people with no qualifications is nearly three times that of non-disabled people, and disabled people are nearly 2 times less likely to be economically active than non-disabled people.</p> <p>Adult education data for the West of England shows a disproportionately lower likelihood of gaining employment or going on to a positive destination after the achievement of adult education qualifications, particularly for Younger People,</p>

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	<p>Women, Disabled People and People from some Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds.</p> <p>The under-representation of girls in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subjects has been recognised as a problem needing urgent attention with high-profile reviews calling for increased participation in STEM by women and girls, and people from under-represented minority ethnic groups. STEM careers are central to the South Gloucestershire economy, and it is vital that these inequalities are tackled for the benefit of our area.</p>
<p>4. Poverty and financial hardship</p>	<p>Experience of poverty is growing in South Gloucestershire. In the autumn of 2022, research conducted by the Council found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Families with children, younger adults <45, women, those from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, those who are renting privately, those who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness have greater experience of poverty and financial hardship. – Minority ethnic respondents are also suffering disproportionately, with 20% experiencing difficulty or great difficulty, compared to 13% of the population overall. – People with disabilities feel much worse off than a year ago, 33% feel this compared to 21% of non-disabled respondents. <p>Citizen’s Advice South Gloucestershire have seen a 10-fold increase in foodbank referrals – up from 6 clients a month on average pre-covid to now over 60 a month.</p> <p>People aged between 22 and 50, disabled people, households with children, people from ‘Black/Black British’ heritage , and people stating ‘other ethnicities’ are over-represented in applying to the South Gloucestershire Household Support Fund.</p> <p>The proportion of children eligible for Free School Meals in South Gloucestershire has nearly doubled over the last 6 years with disabled children and young people and children from nearly every minority ethnic group being disproportionately over-represented in this eligibility data.</p> <p>Children and adults in low-income households are more likely to have poorer educational outcomes and have lower paid work as an adult than their peers; have a shorter life expectancy and healthy life expectancy; live in areas more impacted by poor air quality; live in poor quality housing; be an unhealthy weight; develop preventable long term health conditions.</p>
<p>5. Housing</p>	<p>Affordability of housing is an essential issue to tackle for all and especially considering the over representation of many groups experiencing poverty and financial hardship as set out above.</p>

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	<p>South Gloucestershire data shows that the following groups are disproportionately over-represented in the housing need data: Females, Disabled People, People aged 25 – 44, People from many minority ethnic groups, LGBTQ+ communities.</p> <p>The majority of those seeking housing and homelessness advice and assistance are women with dependent children, young people, disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups. 50% of homeless young people are LGBTQ+.</p> <p>There is a significant and growing need for accessible and adaptable housing to meet the needs of disabled residents and our ageing population.</p>
<p>6. Accessibility, especially in terms of digital inclusion, transport, the built and natural environment and access to the wider economy</p>	<p>Disabled people, older people and people with lower incomes are significantly less likely than average to be digitally active and with more services continuing to become offered in a digital format, this is a significant inequality to be tackled.</p> <p>Disabled People and older people are consistently less satisfied than average with bus services and bus stops/shelters.</p> <p>The built and natural environment should be accessible for all – this is not only morally and legally right, it is economically right. Disabled People in the UK (circa 60% of whom are older people) have a spending power of £274bn per year to UK businesses. However, we know that, for example, high street shops in the UK lose out on £267m per month due to inaccessibility.</p> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic shone a light on disproportionalities in terms of having local access to open spaces with some communities having significantly less opportunities than others.</p> <p>Women -led and minority ethnic led companies represent over 25% of all businesses. We know that there are often differing issues which are prioritised by women and minority ethnic led businesses; for example, accessing investment and the services available which nurture and support business growth. In order to positively impact our economy, it is important that these businesses which form such a significant part of our economy are supported in ways which meet both demand and need and which enables them to flourish, ultimately growing our local economy.</p>
<p>7. Health and Wellbeing</p>	<p>One in six adults experienced some form of depression in summer in Britain, compared with one in ten before the pandemic. Personal wellbeing measures all remain worse than their pre-pandemic levels. Groups consistently evidence to be most impacted by poor mental health (depression/anxiety) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – People from most minority ethnic groups, – People living with physical disabilities – People living with learning disabilities

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People with sensory impairment - People with alcohol and/or drug dependence - The prison population, offenders and victims of crime - People who are LGBTQ+ - Carers - People who are homeless - Refugees, asylum seekers and stateless persons - Armed Forces veterans <p>In respect of the clearly disproportionately negative levels of poor mental health and wellbeing, it is important that tailored and expert support is available to target services where they are needed most.</p> <p>There are significant and, in some cases, widening inequalities between people living in the most and least deprived areas in South Gloucestershire as well as among Protected Characteristic and vulnerable groups. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inequalities exist in risk factors for infant mortality including late booking, smoking and maternal obesity by maternal age, ethnicity, area deprivation and geography. - Smoking prevalence in adults is highest amongst people with severe mental illness, LGBTQ+ communities, people in routine and manual occupations and armed forces veterans. - There is strong evidence of a persistent difference in oral health between most and least deprived quintiles in both 0-5 and 6-10 year olds. - There are notably higher and increasing rates of excess weight among those living in the most deprived 10% of areas in South Gloucestershire. For children, boys are more likely to be above a healthy weight as are children living in poverty - the most significant gaps are experienced by children from 'Black' and 'Asian' ethnic groups. - People at higher risk of alcohol or drugs related harms are: People on a low income, Men, Older people, Adults with learning disabilities, People from the 'White British' ethnic group, People identifying as LGBTQ+, Armed Forces Veterans.
8. Adult Social Care	<p>Satisfaction with Adult Social Care services in South Gloucestershire is lower than the South West mean and the All England average. Looking in further detail, Council data indicates that residents from minority ethnic groups and younger adults are least satisfied with adult social care services. The data also indicates that residents from minority ethnic groups are proportionally more likely to be subject of a mental health act assessment and/or be detained under the Mental Health Act. There are also developments to be made in regard to the extent to which care for older adults is positively experienced by people from LGBTQ+ communities.</p>
9. Children's Social Care	<p>There is a significant over-representation of children and young people from minority ethnic groups in contact with Children's Social Care, and who are subject to Section 47</p>

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	enquiries and Child Protection Plans. We also know that in terms of children leaving care, children from minority ethnic groups are significantly more likely to be 'Not in Education Employment or Training (NEET).
10. Tackling inequalities as part of work to address the Climate and Nature Emergency	<p>Those likely to be disproportionately impacted by the local impacts of a changing climate, are the elderly and young children (under 5), those with pre-existing health conditions, those in poor housing, in dense urban areas and areas of poor air quality.</p> <p>People in lower socio-economic groups (see poverty and financial hardship section above) are less able to undertake the housing adaptations required to mitigate the impacts of a changing climate.</p>

We know that tackling these issues is not a short term 'fix', it is about persistently and consistently taking action to address these inequalities and ensuring that actions taken genuinely work for people on the ground.

The Council is currently developing a new Tackling Inequalities Plan. The Plan focuses on the above 10 Priority Areas and specific, measurable objectives will be published against each Priority Area.

As part of the Budget consultation, residents were asked to feed back up to 3 Priority Areas they would like to see the Council particularly focus upon in its work. The results of this feedback are shown in the tables below.

Equality Priority Areas - Consultation Results

The consultation survey asked which of the 10 areas residents would like to see the Council particularly focus upon in its work. The consultation results are as follows:

Note:

Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.

Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

Priority Area	Total (All Respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
Health (including mental health)	54%	60%	49%	54%	55%	52%	64%	53%	54%	56%	64%	54%	55%	60%	54%	48%	55%
Educational attainment & experience	40%	37%	42%	48%	41%	37%	33%	46%	40%	48%	36%	38%	43%	41%	44%	40%	43%
Poverty and financial hardship	33%	36%	30%	35%	33%	31%	34%	34%	32%	40%	31%	50%	35%	34%	34%	28%	34%
Housing	32%	30%	33%	32%	30%	34%	46%	27%	32%	24%	33%	29%	30%	34%	29%	40%	29%
Adult social care	32%	32%	32%	16%	33%	38%	40%	31%	33%	13%	15%	8%	32%	42%	30%	36%	32%
Children's social care	32%	30%	31%	35%	32%	30%	25%	32%	31%	30%	31%	21%	32%	32%	31%	32%	31%
Employment	23%	19%	26%	26%	24%	22%	12%	22%	23%	19%	31%	29%	21%	18%	22%	20%	22%
Accessibility (digital inclusion, transport, built & natural environment, wider economy)	22%	24%	21%	18%	20%	25%	17%	20%	22%	19%	28%	21%	20%	18%	21%	16%	20%
Tackling inequalities in addressing Climate & Nature Emergency	16%	18%	14%	17%	17%	13%	12%	15%	16%	21%	10%	17%	15%	9%	16%	20%	16%
Hate Crime	11%	10%	12%	11%	11%	11%	10%	11%	11%	13%	26%	25%	10%	9%	11%	12%	10%

The following table shows how each 'group' of residents prioritised the 10 areas:

Priority	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Armed forces
1	Health	Health	Health	Health)	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health
2	Education	Education	Education	Education	Adult social care	Housing	Education	Education	Education	Education	Poverty & financial hardship	Education	Adult social care	Education
3	Poverty & financial hardship	Housing	Poverty & financial hardship	Poverty & financial hardship	Education	Adult social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Adult social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Housing	Education	Poverty & financial hardship	Education	Housing
4	Housing	Adult social care	Housing	Adult social care	Housing	Poverty and financial hardship	Children's social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Children's social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Housing	Housing	Poverty & financial hardship	Adult social care
5	Adult social care	Children's social care	Children's social care	Children's social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Education	Adult social care	Housing	Housing	Children's social care	Employment	Adult social care	Housing	Children's social care
6	Children's social care	Poverty & financial hardship	Employment	Housing	Children's social care	Children's social care	Housing	Children's social care	Climate & Nature Emergency	Employment	Hate Crime	Children's social care	Children's social care	Poverty & financial hardship
7	Accessibility	Employment	Accessibility	Employment	Accessibility	Accessibility	Employment	Employment	Employment	Accessibility	Accessibility	Employment	Employment	Employment
8	Employment	Accessibility	Climate & Nature Emergency	Accessibility	Employment	Employment	Accessibility	Accessibility	Accessibility	Hate Crime	Children's social care	Accessibility	Accessibility	Climate & Nature Emergency
9	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Adult social care	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Adult social care	Adult social care	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Climate & Nature Emergency	Accessibility
10	Hate Crime	Hate Crime	Hate Crime	Hate Crime	Climate & Nature Emergency	Adult social care	Hate Crime	Hate Crime	Hate Crime					

It is noted that:

- Health (including mental health) was the most highly prioritised Area regardless of Protected Characteristic.
- Education was prioritised in the top 3 by all Protected Characteristic groups except for Disabled People who prioritised Housing, Adult Social Care and Poverty & Financial Hardship more highly.
- Poverty & Financial Hardship was the third highest priority, closely followed by Housing.
- Hate crime was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to experience it i.e. people from Minority Ethnic groups and LGBTQ+ communities.
- Adult Social Care was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to be in contact with the adult social care system i.e. disabled people, people aged 65+ and carers.
- Housing was prioritised more highly by those who are more likely to be in housing need i.e. disabled people, Minority Ethnic groups and the Armed Forces community.

In respect of budget setting, the following is noted in terms of investments and the continuation of resource for works which will positively impact the reduction of inequalities:

Priority Area	Investments and Key Resourcing Points
Health and Wellbeing	Reducing health inequalities is the priority of the Public Health and Wellbeing Division - all work is aligned to delivering improved health and wellbeing outcomes and reducing inequalities in outcomes between different groups in our communities. Partners are also supported to do the same. Resource for this work continues.
Educational attainment & experience	Phase 2 of the Recovery Curriculum programme will continue, and this includes continuing to build on the successes delivered via the Equality in Education work. Providing additional support to young people is resourced, particularly around their emotional and mental wellbeing through Expanding the Youth Activities Offer (YAO), including expanding the Education Inclusion Project (EIP).
Poverty and financial hardship	Through the Welfare Benefit & Debt Advice consortium, additional investment to provide complex advice services to 50% more people in 2024/25 - this is anticipated to secure an additional £2.5m in financial outcomes for local residents. Warm and Well - additional funding to continue council's work to tackle fuel poverty. Continuing Community Welcome Spaces and support for food banks/pantries. Provision of Warm Packs and energy efficiency measures. Continuation of Financial Security Officer post into 2025/26 to provide resource and strategic capacity for work on cost of living crisis. Capacity to continue communications and preventative work enabling people to help themselves through increased benefit take up campaigns such as Maximising Income / Benefit Take up Campaign and Planned & Sustained campaign, using a range of methods and partners.

	Provision of Free School Meals Vouchers at £15 per child for one week in Easter and one week in the summer supporting c. 6,500 children and young people.
Housing	Continued implementation of the Council's Housing Strategy. Introduction of a pilot scheme to support landlords to reach current Minimum Energy Efficiency Standard (MEES). Continued enforcement of the energy efficiency (Private Rented Property) (E&W) regulation 2015.
Adult social care	Provision of resource for the introduction of Adult Social Care Quality Assurance work which includes inclusive services and practice for all. Permanent support for Safeguarding Partnership arrangements (children and adults).
Children's social care	Continuation of the Children's Services Improvement Partner and Improvement Officer work - the effectiveness of this work is seen in the improvements that have been made to date. Early Help is vital to enable good support for families at the earliest possible stage, to help prevent more serious issues arising and resource has been identified to deliver the new Early Help Strategy. Bringing forwards additional capacity to manage growing caseloads across Children Services. Providing extra resource in providing placement opportunities for care leavers and the support they need to thrive in those placements. Resourcing work to better shape future housing options to meet the needs for care leavers, delivering improved outcomes for our young people. Permanent support for Safeguarding Partnership arrangements (children and adults).
Employment	We have developed and launched our Workforce Equalities Action Plan and this work continues. Continuation of the Universal Business Support programme which aims to offer South Gloucestershire businesses a range of advice, support and training. This work shows good representation in respect of the spread of Age, Sex, Ethnicity and Disability of business leaders and includes targeted support such as Women in Business and feeds into the South Gloucestershire Business Show including the Major Employers Forum.
Accessibility (digital inclusion, transport, built & natural environment, wider economy)	Resource for creating accessible communications that meets user needs to redesign complex information into plain English. Continuation of the provision of free access to PCs and Wi-Fi in public libraries and One Stop Shops, the Digital Champion Volunteer Scheme providing free one to one digital help and support and work with partners and community organisations to address the digital divide in our communities. Continuation of resource to ensure maintenance of assets in the built environment as a result of growth in the district. Inclusion of permanent funding for street cleansing, highway reactive repairs (potholes), grounds maintenance, tree maintenance as a result of housing growth and linked highway network growth. In addition, work aimed at enhancing access to public areas by reducing clutter, such as street furniture, instances of overhanging vegetation etc. especially ensuring the enhancement of accessibility for disabled and elderly people is ongoing. Continuation of works to maintain and improve bus stops and shelters to support access to public transport and enhance accessibility. Continuation of work to improve accessibility on our high streets. Continuation of works to improve mobility facilities at uncontrolled crossing points in priority areas. Continuation of the Handyvan service which offers subsidised rates; the core customer groups in receipt of the service are older and vulnerable residents and

	contributes to keeping people in their homes and maintaining independence. Continuation of assisted waste collections for disabled and elderly people who are unable to move bins and containers. Continuation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy to deliver a suite of actions aimed at enhancing accessibility to our community spaces.
Tackling inequalities in addressing Climate & Nature Emergency	Continuation of work to ensure that work on climate and nature emergency is strategic in reducing inequalities through targeted projects and ensuring that each individual project closes inequalities gaps and avoids exacerbating existing inequalities.
Hate Crime	Continuation of the delivery of the Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Plan which works to reduce the prevalence of hate crime and brings resource to co-ordinate and drive this work with our partners; this includes the commissioning of SARI (Stand Against Racism and Inequality) to support victims of hate crime.

In support of the 10 Equality Priority Areas, South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice are the voice and influence group representing our diverse communities and support the council in developing and delivering actions to tackle inequalities across the district. Funding for a further three years has been identified to continue provision of this support.

The Council will be publishing a new Tackling Inequalities Plan from April 2024, setting out specific and measurable objectives against each of the above 10 Priority Areas. This goes hand-in-hand with the budget setting process which ensures resource is in place to deliver against the Tackling Inequalities Plan objectives.

SECTION 3 - WHAT RESIDENTS HAVE TOLD US OVER THE LAST 11 YEARS

The following information summarises the key trends emerging as a result of South Gloucestershire Council budget setting consultations conducted since 2013. Full data tables are shown in [Appendix 1](#) of this EqlAA document and should be read in conjunction with the following summary information.

This approach is significant as for the majority of areas and issues consulted upon, the Council now has eleven years of data which this EqlAA investigates. In turn, this allows for an understanding of both trends and cumulative impacts in respect of Protected Characteristic groups to continue to mature and influence decisions and actions.

What residents have told us about Council approaches to delivering its savings plan in the longer term.

The table below shows the percentage of residents supporting the range of approaches that could be taken to make services more affordable to run. The approaches are listed in order of most highly supported to least supported according to the 2024/24 Budget consultation results.

The table also shows the average support level over the eleven-year period. It is noted that this eleven-year analysis places the approaches in in order of most highly supported to least supported order according to the 2024/24 Budget consultation results, except that '*Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need*' gains slightly more support over the period than '*Making more services available online*', however the difference in levels of support is small.

Importantly, the table provides information regarding trends according to Protected Characteristic and this allows for these trends to be considered as part of decision making.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
1.	Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	90%	86%	The majority of respondents (90%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is also 86%. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the eleven year period.
2.	Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	86%	83%	The majority of respondents (86%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
				Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach (average support over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%).
3.	Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies	81%	80%	<p>The majority of respondents (81%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 80%.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach (average support over the ten year period is 80%).</p>
4.	Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	72%	66%	<p>The majority of respondents (72%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eight year period that this question has been asked is 66%.</p> <p>Trends to note are that people aged under 65 and particularly those aged under 45 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people and people aged 65+ are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average support for this approach being 54% and 55% respectively across the eight year period that this question has been asked. It is also noted that both of these protected characteristic groups have reported an increase in support for this approach over the eight year period, with 46% of people aged 65+ supporting it at the beginning of the eight year period and 61% supporting this year. Similarly, 43% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the eight year period and 67% supported it this year.</p>
5.	Making more services available online	70%	63%	<p>70% of respondents supported this approach this year. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 63%.</p> <p>Trends to note are that people aged under 45 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people and people aged 65+ are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average support for this approach being 50% and 49% respectively across the eleven year period. It is also noted that both of these groups have reported an increase in support for this approach over the eleven year period, with</p>

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
				37% of people aged 65+ supporting at the beginning of the eleven year period and 59% supporting this year. Similarly, 41% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the eleven year period and 65% supported it this year.
6.	Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	64%	66%	The majority of respondents (64%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristic, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last ten years (average support over the eleven year period is 66%)
7.	Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services	54%	53%	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 53%. There are no clear trends over the eleven year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
8.	Increasing fees and charges for some services	54%	45%	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 45%. Trends to note are females, disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups are less likely than average to support this approach across the eleven year period. Linking to this is data demonstrating that people from these same groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty/financial hardship in South Gloucestershire.
9.	Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils	45%	45%	45% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 45%. There are no clear trends over the eleven year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
10.	Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable	35%	36%	35% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 36%. People from minority ethnic groups show a trend for lower than average levels of support for this approach, with 32% supporting this year and an average of 29% supporting over the eleven year period.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
11.	Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	24%	23%	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (24%). Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 23%.</p> <p>Females, disabled people and LGBTQ+ people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average levels of support over the ten year period being 21%, 20% and 23% respectively.</p>
12.	Scaling back or stopping some services	19%	23%	<p>19% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eleven year period is 23%.</p> <p>Females and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with an average of 19% and 18% respectively reporting support for this approach over the eleven year period.</p>
13.	Reducing the quality of services provided	16%	19%	<p>This approach resulted in the lowest level of overall support (16%).</p> <p>Trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, respondents have consistently not supported this approach over the last ten years (average support over the eleven year period is 19%).</p> <p>In particular, females, people aged under 45 and disabled people show a trend of lower support for this approach than average with low support levels this year of 12%, 13% and 14% respectively. It is also noted that people from minority ethnic groups had the lowest level of support for this approach (9%) and Carers and LGBTQ+ people reported lower levels of agreement with this approach (12% and 13% respectively).</p>

What residents have told us about their satisfaction levels with Council services

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	<p>33% of respondents stated satisfaction with care for older people. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 21%.</p> <p>People aged 65+ and disabled people have tended to be more satisfied than average with both groups reporting an average 26% satisfaction level over the eleven year period.</p> <p>Disabled people, carers and people from minority ethnic groups have shown a positive increase in satisfaction levels this year.</p>
Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties	<p>27% of respondents stated satisfaction with care for physically disabled people and people with learning difficulties. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 18%.</p> <p>People aged 65+ and disabled people have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting a 21% and 28% satisfaction level across the eleven year period respectively.</p> <p>Disabled people, carers and people from minority ethnic groups have shown a positive increase in satisfaction levels this year.</p>
Children's Social Services	<p>18% of respondents stated satisfaction with children's social services. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 12%.</p> <p>Younger people have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 19% satisfaction level across the eleven year period.</p> <p>There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the eleven year period.</p>
Customer services	<p>47% of respondents stated satisfaction with customer services. Across the nine year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 35%.</p> <p>There are no groups for whom a particular trend is showing across the nine year period.</p>
Environmental health and trading standards	<p>27% of respondents stated satisfaction with environmental health and trading standards. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 25%.</p> <p>There are no groups for whom a particular trend is showing across the eleven year period.</p>
Housing advice services	<p>16% of respondents stated satisfaction with housing advice services. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 13%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years and disabled people have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 19% and 15% satisfaction level across the eleven year period respectively.</p>

Service Area	Trends
Highways and Roads	<p>18% of respondents stated satisfaction with highways and roads. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 28%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 35% satisfaction level across the eleven year period.</p> <p>Disabled people have tended to be less satisfied across the eleven year period with an average satisfaction level of 23% across the period and a 15% satisfaction level this year.</p>
Free Car parking	<p>83% of respondents stated satisfaction with free car parking. Across the six year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 65%.</p> <p>Disabled people have tended to be less satisfied than average across the period with an average satisfaction level of 58% across the period.</p>
Libraries	<p>76% of respondents stated satisfaction with libraries - the second highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 58%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years have tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than average with libraries with an average satisfaction level of 66% across the period.</p>
Local Bus Services	<p>39% of respondents stated satisfaction with local bus services. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 42%.</p> <p>People aged over 65 years have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 49% satisfaction level across the eleven year period.</p> <p>People aged under 65 years and disabled people (37%) have tended to be less satisfied than average across the eleven year period.</p>
Parks and open spaces	<p>77% of respondents stated satisfaction with parks and open spaces – the highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the ten year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 69%.</p> <p>Disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups have tended to have a slightly lower than average satisfaction level across the period at 59% and 63% respectively.</p>
Planning	<p>21% of respondents stated satisfaction with planning. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 17%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years have tended to be more satisfied than average across the eleven year period.</p>

Service Area	Trends
	<p>Disabled people are less satisfied than average with an average satisfaction level of 13% across the eleven year period.</p>
<p>Public Health</p>	<p>35% of respondents stated satisfaction with planning. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 25%.</p> <p>There appears to be no particular trends in either higher or lower than average levels of satisfaction for any particular groups across the eleven year period.</p>
<p>Schools</p>	<p>47% of respondents stated satisfaction with schools. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 35%.</p> <p>People under the age of 45 and females have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 50% and 47% satisfaction level respectively across the eleven year period.</p> <p>People over 65 and disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average with schools reporting average satisfaction levels across the eleven year period of 27% and 28% respectively.</p>
<p>Sport and leisure facilities</p>	<p>64% of respondents stated satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 51%.</p> <p>Disabled people consistently have the lowest levels of satisfaction with an average satisfaction level of 40% across the period.</p>
<p>Waste and recycling services</p>	<p>67% of respondents stated satisfaction with waste and recycling services – this is the third highest level of satisfaction this year across all services.</p> <p>Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 72%. This is the highest average satisfaction level across the time period for all services.</p>
<p>Welfare benefits and council tax reduction for which the council is responsible</p>	<p>34% of respondents stated satisfaction with welfare benefits and council tax reduction. Across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 24%.</p> <p>Females, people aged over 65 years and disabled people have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average satisfaction level across the eleven year period of 28%, 29% and 33% respectively.</p> <p>People aged under 45 and people from minority ethnic groups tend to be less satisfied than average reporting an average satisfaction level across the eleven year period of 20% and 17% respectively.</p>

What residents have told us about the local area and the Council

Consultation Topic	Feedback
<p>Over the past two years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?</p>	<p>Just 4% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become better as a place to live over the last two years.</p> <p>43% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become worse as a place to live over the last two years and this is the highest level over the ten year period that this question has been asked.</p> <p>In particular, LGBTQ+ people and carers were more likely to say the area has become worse – 48% and 53% respectively.</p> <p>People in the age group 46 – 65 years have shown a greater likelihood to say that the area has become worse over the last ten year period that this question has been asked.</p>
<p>Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live</p>	<p>The majority of respondents (65%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live. Average satisfaction over the eleven year period is 76%.</p> <p>In respect of Protected Characteristics, LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, carers and people aged under 45 reported the lowest levels of satisfaction with the local area this year.</p>
<p>Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things</p>	<p>34% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the council runs things. Average satisfaction over the eleven year period is 56%.</p> <p>The data shows a decline in satisfaction with 60% satisfied at the beginning of the eleven year period and 34% satisfied this year.</p> <p>In respect of Protected Characteristics, people from minority ethnic groups have been most likely to have lower levels of satisfaction with the way the Council runs things; across the eleven year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 38%.</p>
<p>The council keeps me informed about services</p>	<p>64% of respondents agreed that the council keeps them informed about the services it provides. Average agreement over the eleven year period is 50%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 have the lowest level of agreement over the eleven year period with an average agreement level of 44%.</p>
<p>The council keeps me informed about proposals for change</p>	<p>52% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change. Average agreement over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 47%.</p> <p>Over the ten year period disabled people are less likely to agree.</p>
<p>I can influence decisions affecting my local area</p>	<p>Just 14% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area. Average agreement over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 21%.</p> <p>Over the ten year period, disabled people have reported lower levels of agreement with an average agreement level of 19% across the period.</p>

Consultation Topic	Feedback
<p>The council acts on the concerns of local residents</p>	<p>26% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents. Average satisfaction over the eleven year period is 31%.</p> <p>People aged under 45 have reported a lower level of agreement across the eleven year period with an average agreement level of 27%.</p>
<p>The council can be relied on to consistently deliver services</p>	<p>This question has been asked for the past 2 years.</p> <p>30% of respondents felt that the Council can be relied on to consistently deliver services. This is a reduction of 11% over the previous year.</p> <p>People aged under 45, disabled people and LGBTQ+ people have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.</p> <p>People aged 65+ have reported a higher than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.</p>
<p>The council is clear and honest about what it does and why</p>	<p>This question has been asked for the past 2 years.</p> <p>30% of respondents felt that the Council is clear and honest about what it does and why. This is a reduction of 8% over the previous year.</p> <p>All groups reported a lower level of agreement than the previous year.</p>
<p>The council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing</p>	<p>This question has been asked for the past 2 years.</p> <p>30% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 5% over the previous year.</p>
<p>The council has the public's best interests at heart</p>	<p>This question has been asked for the past 2 years.</p> <p>28% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 8% over the previous year.</p> <p>Disabled people, Carers, LGBTQ+ people, people from minority ethnic groups and the armed forces community have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.</p>
<p>The council works collaboratively with other organisations and the public</p>	<p>This question has been asked for the past 2 years.</p> <p>22% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 7% over the previous year.</p> <p>Females have reported a higher than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.</p>

Full data tables are shown in [Appendix 1](#) of this EqIAA document.

SECTION 4 – SETTING THE COUNCIL TAX

The consultation asked residents for their preferences in regard to council tax options for 2024/25 and the table below displays the results.

Note:

Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.

Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

Which of the following options would you prefer?

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
Option 1: To increase council tax in 2024/25 by 4.99% (2.99% general council tax and 2% adult social care precept)	34%	29%	39%	26%	36%	36%	34%	35%	35%	23%	23%	42%	38%	35%	36%	35%	36%
Option 2: To increase council tax in 2024/25 by 2.99% (1.99% general council tax and 1% adult social care precept)	29%	33%	25%	26%	28%	30%	27%	29%	29%	35%	21%	29%	25%	24%	26%	26%	26%
Option 3: To increase council tax in 2024/25 by 1.99% (1.99% general council tax and 0% adult social care precept)	14%	15%	13%	20%	12%	14%	11%	14%	14%	7%	18%	13%	14%	12%	14%	15%	15%
Option 4: To freeze council tax in 2024/25 at the current level	14%	14%	14%	14%	15%	13%	16%	13%	13%	25%	27%	10%	11%	12%	12%	11%	11%
No preference	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Don't know	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	5%	7%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%

Just over one-third (34%) of respondents chose Option 1, which was the option with the largest percentage preference, however:

- Women were slightly more likely to prefer Option 2.
- People from 'White Other' groups were most likely to choose Option 2 and preferred Option 4 over Option 1.
- People aged under 45 showed the same level of preference for Options 1 and 2 and were more likely than average to choose Option 3.
- People from minority ethnic groups were more likely to choose Option 4. Whilst the sample size is small, it is noted that this mirrors the preference of last year of people from minority ethnic groups.
- Disabled people were more likely than average to choose Option 4.

National and local evidence shows that these groups are more likely to be living in financial hardship.

In the autumn of 2022 research conducted by the Council found:

- Families with children, younger adults <45, women, those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, those who are renting privately, those who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness have noted greater difficulty or have had to make more changes.
- Minority ethnic respondents are also suffering disproportionately, with 20% experiencing difficulty or great difficulty, compared to 13% of the population overall.
- People with disabilities feel much worse off than a year ago, 33% feel this compared to 21% of non-disabled respondents.

The data shown in this EqIAA shows that Option 1 would impact more greatly for people with lower incomes, however, at the same time, Option 1 mitigates further cuts to services which would disproportionately impact residents with lower incomes.

SECTION 5 – COST REDUCTION AND INCOME

Two packages of proposals were consulted upon. These cover options for:

1. Reducing the cost of the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme by £400k from 2024/25, and
2. Generating £1m of additional income from September 2024 rising to £2m in 2025/26.

Overall, these two packages result in the following six proposals for 2024 – 2025:

Cost Reduction

1. Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme

Income Generation

2. Paid for on and off-street parking regime
3. Blue Badge Administration Fees
4. Cemeteries, Exclusive Rights of Burial Charges
5. Land Charges
6. Garden Waste (Green Bin) Service Charges

Each one of these six proposals is considered in turn on the following pages of this EqIAA document.

LOCAL COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME

Description

Council Tax Reduction (CTR) is a reduction on a Council Tax bill based on a household's income and capital. There are different rules about how much reduction someone receives depending on whether they are of working age or state pension age. The rules for people of state pension age are based on a nationally defined scheme, whereas since 2013, Local Authorities have been responsible for implementing their own scheme for working age people. **As the state pension age scheme is a national scheme, no changes are proposed for this scheme.**

In South Gloucestershire, we have had an income-banded scheme for working age people since 2014. This means that depending on household income, people can receive a reduction of up to 80% of the council tax bill.

For working age customers, if they have a weekly income of between:

- £0 and £120, they could receive a reduction of 80%
- £120.01 and £150, they could receive a reduction of 50%
- £150.01 and £200, they could receive a reduction of 30%
- £200.01 and £250, they could receive a reduction of 20%
- £250.01 and £300, they could receive a reduction of 10%

If they are in receipt of certain income related benefits – Jobs Seeker's Allowance (income based), Employment and Support Allowance (income related), Income Support or maximum Universal Credit - they will receive the maximum 80% award. This also applies to customers whose income is under £300/week and receive certain disability benefit.

Entitlement to a CTR will be reduced if a customer has an adult living in their home who is not their partner or a dependent child (this is referred to as a non-dependant). A deduction is made for them based on the income that they are receiving.

With regards to Universal Credit, where the customer is not receiving the maximum award, all of this income is currently disregarded. Other incomes are also disregarded in the calculation of weekly income, such as carers allowance and personal independence payments. There is also a maximum capital limit of £6,000 for a working age customer to be eligible for a reduction.

There are currently around 10,038 recipients of CTR in South Gloucestershire. This is broken down between recipients of working age and pension age as below:

	Recipients
Working age	5,609
Pension age	4,429
Total:	10,038

As the state pension age scheme is a national scheme, no changes are proposed for this scheme. The 4,429 state pension age recipients are not affected by the proposed CTR changes; therefore, the below information specifically reflects the caseload for the working age scheme.

Impacts of the proposals

Option 1: Including Universal Credit as an income.

Of the 5,609 working age recipients of CTR, around 1,430 (25%) would see their CTR entitlement reduce should option 1 be implemented. Of these, if Option 1a (including 100% of UC income) is implemented, 94% would see their entitlement drop by more than £5 per week, with 51% losing entitlement to any support. These percentages reduce as the amount of UC income that is taken into account falls in the various options.

What we know about who would be affected is shown in the table below.

	1a-Including 100% of UC income	Percentage of total	1b – including 25% of UC income	Percentage of total	1c -including 50% of UC income	Percentage of total	1d including 25% of UC income	Percentage of total
Households worse off by >£5pw								
Totals	1338	-	386	-	612	-	635	-
Employed	131	10%	98	25%	129	21%	130	20%
On out-of-work- benefits	1207	90%	288	75%	483	79%	505	80%
Single	434	32%	47	12%	56	9%	63	10%
Lone parent	821	61%	296	77%	503	82%	518	82%
Couple without children	18	1%	6	2%	6	1%	7	1%
Couple with children	65	5%	37	10%	47	8%	47	7%
Households losing all support								
Totals	726	-	83	-	133	-	323	-
Employed	95	13%	9	11%	28	21%	63	20%
On out-of-work- benefits	631	87%	74	89%	105	79%	260	80%
Single	91	13%	26	31%	29	22%	33	10%
Lone parent	577	80%	50	60%	94	71%	258	80%
Couple without children	10	1%	1	1%	1	1%	3	1%
Couple with children	48	7%	6	7%	9	7%	29	1%

In terms of the data categories used by the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme, we know the following information in respect of Protected Characteristics:

LCTR Data categories	Characteristics
‘Employment’ and ‘out-of-work benefits’	<p>In South Gloucestershire, the Census 2021 tells us that, depending upon ethnicity, people from minority ethnic groups are between 1.5 times and 3.5 times more likely than average to be unemployed and are significantly over-represented in lower paid work in South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Disabled people are nearly 2 times less likely than average to be economically active than non-disabled people.</p> <p>Adult education data for the West of England shows a disproportionately lower likelihood of gaining employment or going on to a positive destination after the achievement of adult education qualifications, particularly for Younger People, Women, Disabled People and People from some Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds.</p>
‘Single’	30% of all households in the UK are made up of people living alone, with just over half (53%) being women living alone.
‘Lone parent’	Data from the Census 2021 shows that in the UK, 84% of lone-parent families were headed by women.
‘Couple with’ and ‘without children’	Experience of poverty is growing in South Gloucestershire. In the autumn of 2022, research conducted by the Council found that families with children have greater experience of poverty and financial hardship.

The data shows that throughout the proposals set out in option 1, the people most affected by any implementation are clearly people on out-of-work-benefits and lone parents – and the extent of impact grows as a greater percentage of UC income is included. When relating this to Protected Characteristics as described in the above table, this shows that those most impacted by this option are likely to be disproportionately:

- People from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds
- Disabled People
- Women
- Younger People

Option 2: Only include earnings as an income in the calculation of entitlement to CTR

Of the 5,609 working age recipients, around 5,122 (91%) would see their CTR entitlement reduce should option 2 (only include earnings as an income) be implemented. Of these, if Option 2 is implemented, 8% would see their entitlement drop by more than £5 per week, with less than 1% losing entitlement to any support. What we know about who would be affected is shown in the table below.

	Totals	Percentage of total
Households worse off by >£5pw	420	-
Employed	367	87%
On out of work benefits	48	11%
Single	134	32%
Lone parent	203	48%
Couple without children	55	13%
Couple with children	28	7%
Households losing all support	21	
Employed	17	81%
On out of work benefits	4	19%
Single	15	71%
Lone parent	3	14%
Couple without children	2	10%
Couple with children	1	5%

- In relation to Option 2, the data shows that the largest numbers of households that would be worse off by >£5pw would be employed people and lone parents who are disproportionately more likely to be women.
- The largest numbers of households that would lose all support would be employed people and single people.

Disability

The following table shows the numbers of people entitled to disability-related benefits whose entitlement would reduce under each option along with the median drop.

Disability benefit status	Option 1a (UC 100%) Median drop £18.16pw	Option 1b (UC 25%) Median drop £4.18pw	Option 1c (UC 50%) Median drop £4.68pw	Option 1d (UC 75%) Median drop £4.78pw	Option 2 (earnings only) Median drop £0.75pw
DLA/PIP and ESA	0	0	0	0	552
DLA/PIP only	0	0	0	0	562
ESA only	1	2	2	2	123
Not disabled	712	711	712	721	1302

NB.

DLA – Disability Living Allowance

PIP – Personal Independence Payment

ESA - Employment and Support Allowance

More information about these benefits is available on the government website [here](#)

Summary of Key Points Emerging in relation to each option

The following table provides an overview of the numbers of people impacted in respect of the proposed options:

	Option 1a (UC 100%)	Option 1b (UC 25%)	Option 1c (UC 50%)	Option 1d (UC 75%)	Option 2 (earnings only)
Households with lower awards than currently:	1,430 (25.5%)	1409 (25.1%)	1425 (25.4%)	1426 (25.4%)	5122 (91%)
Of those with lower awards:					
Number experiencing a drop of >£5 per week:	1,338 (94%)	386 (27%)	612 (43%)	635 (45%)	420 (8%)
Number losing entitlement to any support:	726 (51%)	83 (6%)	133 (9%)	323 (23%)	21 (<1%)
Median drop in support	£18.16 per week	£4.18 per week	£4.68 per week	£4.78 per week	£0.75 per week

Consultation Results

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
Option 1a: Include 100% of Universal Credit income																	
Highest preference	28%	23%	30%	28%	31%	23%	24%	28%	27%	30%	27%	7%	24%	19%	26%	24%	25%
Lowest preference	30%	33%	29%	37%	31%	28%	35%	30%	31%	26%	27%	52%	35%	31%	35%	35%	35%
Option 1b: Include 75% of Universal Credit income																	
Highest preference	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%	6%	4%	4%	5%	7%	10%	2%	1%	3%	3%	3%
Lowest preference	9%	7%	9%	12%	9%	8%	9%	8%	9%	9%	9%	13%	10%	11%	10%	10%	10%
Option 1c: Include 50% of Universal Credit income																	
Highest preference	8%	9%	8%	7%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%	5%	11%	13%	8%	11%	7%	8%	8%
Lowest preference	8%	7%	9%	10%	8%	8%	9%	8%	8%	5%	9%	10%	10%	11%	9%	9%	10%
Option 1d: Include 25% of Universal Credit income																	
Highest preference	8%	11%	7%	12%	8%	7%	9%	9%	9%	7%	2%	16%	9%	6%	9%	9%	9%
Lowest preference	10%	7%	12%	10%	10%	10%	10%	9%	10%	7%	16%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Option 2: Consider earnings only and not income from benefits																	
Highest preference	25%	25%	25%	26%	27%	22%	33%	25%	26%	25%	27%	39%	28%	28%	27%	28%	29%
Lowest preference	37%	33%	40%	35%	41%	34%	34%	38%	36%	42%	34%	29%	32%	30%	33%	32%	32%

The responses show inconclusive evidence of preference for any option.

Mitigating the impacts

Overall, there are five options presented and as shown, each option has varying degrees of impact.

Regardless of option taken forward, the impact would be negative.

Option 2 would see more households experiencing lower awards than Option 1a, however, the median drop in support for Option 2 would be £0.75 per week as opposed to £18.16 per week under Option 1a. In addition, far fewer households would experience a drop of >£5 per week and far fewer would lose entitlement to any support.

Those most impacted by Option 1 are likely to be disproportionately:

- People from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds
- Disabled People
- Women
- Younger People

In relation to Option 2, the largest numbers of households that would be worse off by >£5pw would be employed people and lone parents who are disproportionately more likely to be women. The largest numbers of households that would lose all support would be employed people and single people.

Implementation of the Option would be delayed until April 2025 in order that the new arrangements can be implemented alongside a new Welfare and Debt Advice service in order to provide partial mitigation of the impacts.

Outcome

Overall, regardless of option, this proposal is likely to result in a negative impact, particularly for those with lower incomes as these are the persons targeted by the scheme itself. Our data shows that people from minority ethnic backgrounds, disabled people, women and younger people are disproportionately more likely to experience lower incomes and would therefore, be proportionately more impacted by any implementation of the proposals. In relation to Option 2, the largest numbers of households that would be worse off by >£5pw would be employed people and lone parents who are disproportionately more likely to be women. The largest numbers of households that would lose all support would be employed people and single people.

Implementation of the Option would be delayed until April 2025 in order that the new arrangements can be implemented alongside a new Welfare and Debt Advice service in order to provide partial mitigation of the impacts.

PAID FOR ON AND OFF- STREET PARKING

Description

This proposal would see the introduction of a paid parking regime for on and off-street parking to move towards full cost recovery in line with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA 1984).

Should this proposal be taken forward, further work would be required to develop the range of options available including considering long stay / short stay Pay & Display, parking bays and resident permit schemes for example.

A charging policy would enable an effective policy lever to encourage modal shift to lower emissivity travel choices and the improvement of urban air quality. Approximately a third of South Gloucestershire's CO₂e emissions (383,400 Tonnes PA) emanates from 280,000 vehicles with the resultant poorer air quality being within the urban areas. We know that poor air quality has a detrimental impact on people's health. While the move to EVs will remove 'tail pipe' emissions, other challenges remain and therefore encouraging the shift to active travel modes and traveling less, will remain an imperative to address both climate and health objectives.

Impacts

This proposal would clearly see a financial impact for motorists and we know that financial impacts are likely to particularly impact those with lower incomes. Our data shows that the following 'groups' in South Gloucestershire are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity. As such, it is clear then that any implementation of this proposal would therefore, disproportionately impact:

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people)
- Disabled people

Consultation Results

The following information shows the consultation results.

Introducing car parking charges

Respondents	Total (All Respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Non-carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
AGREE	23%	23%	23%	25%	26%	19%	24%	24%	24%	35%	18%	32%	25%	20%	25%	25%	25%
DISAGREE	66%	65%	67%	63%	64%	70%	63%	66%	66%	53%	57%	52%	64%	75%	64%	65%	65%

The data shows that:

- Two-thirds of residents disagreed this this proposal, with carers being the most likely to disagree.
- Least likely to disagree were 'White Other', 'People from Minority Ethnic Groups' and 'LGBTQ+ people', however more than half of respondents in each of the 'groups' disagreed.

In addition, the consultation received comments explaining that the majority of car parks in the district are near to high streets and are used by workers in the retail industry (i.e. people working in the high street shops) which are often lower paid job roles. As such, concern was raised about workers incurring costs to park nearby to their workplaces.

Mitigating Actions

In respect of disabled people, any policy development would bring potential to mitigate impact for some disabled people through implementation of a policy of free or reduced parking charges for blue badge holders. It is noted that a small percentage of disabled people are Blue Badge holders - the latest estimates¹ indicate that 16.0 million people in the UK had a disability in 2021/22 and there were 2.35 million valid Blue Badges held as at 31 March 2021². This equates to 14.7% of disabled people holding a Blue Badge in the UK. In South Gloucestershire, the Census 2021 shows 47,429 persons stating they were 'disabled under the Equality Act' and we know that currently there are 14,711 Blue Badge holders; this equates to 31% of disabled people holding a Blue Badge in South Gloucestershire – over double the national average. This shows that any policy to implement free or reduced parking charges for Blue Badge holders would be likely to result in a partial mitigation of impacts.

In addition, it will be important to consider the practicalities of any payment methods and the use of appropriate payment technology should this proposal be implemented. Our data and information show that this would be particularly relevant to disabled people, people aged 65+ and people from lower socio-economic groups who are less likely to be digitally active. Therefore, any payment methods using digital technology would need to be carefully considered.

Outcome

The decision to delay implementation of car parking charges until April 2025 results in no negative impacts being identified at this stage. The decision allows time for options to be considered, including implementation of the mitigating actions identified which include any exemptions for Blue Badge holders and the usage of accessible payment methods.

However, this EqIAA makes clear the negative impacts in respect of any implementation of paid for on and off street parking.

¹ [Department for Work and Pensions' Family Resources Survey](#)

² [Department for Transport \(DfT\)](#)

BLUE BADGE ADMINISTRATION FEE

Description

The national Blue Badge (Disabled Persons' Parking) Scheme was introduced in 1971. The aim of the Scheme is to help disabled people with severe mobility problems caused by visible and non-visible (hidden) disabilities to access goods and services, by allowing them to park close to their destination. The Scheme is open to eligible people irrespective of whether they are travelling as a driver or as a passenger.

In England, the maximum charge for a Blue Badge application is £10. The Blue Badge will normally last for three years. Most local authorities in England levy this charge to cover the costs of administering the Blue Badge Scheme. South Gloucestershire Council currently remains an outlier in providing this service free of charge.

This proposal would introduce a £10 administration charge for processing Blue Badges (both new applications and renewals).

In South Gloucestershire over the last three years, there have been an average of 1,780 new badge issues each year and 3,851 badges renewed. This gives an average of 5,631 blue badge transactions per annum. We know that in South Gloucestershire, there are currently:

Total No. of badges issued	No. issued to an Organisation	No. issued to an individual
14,772	61	14,711

Age of Blue Badge holders

Age 'grouping'	Total No. of badges issued
Under 18	643
Under 25	875
25-64	3,999
65 and over	9,898

Age and Sex of Blue Badge holders

Sex & Age	Total No. issued	Under 25	25-64	65+
Male	5,918	489	1,397	4,032
Female	8,772	381	2,593	5,798
Not specified	21	5	9	7

It is noted that Blue Badges are renewed 3-yearly, thus, any implementation of the proposed £10 fee would see residents incurring this cost once every 3 years.

Impacts

It is noted that a small percentage of disabled people are Blue Badge holders - the latest estimates³ indicate that 16.0 million people in the UK had a disability in 2021/22 and there were 2.35 million valid Blue Badges held as at 31 March 2021⁴. This equates to 14.7% of disabled people holding a Blue Badge in the UK. In South Gloucestershire, the Census 2021 shows 47,429 persons stating they were 'disabled under the Equality Act' and we know that currently there are 14,711 Blue Badge holders; this equates to 31% of disabled people holding a Blue Badge in South Gloucestershire – over double the national average.

This proposal would clearly see a financial impact, particularly impacting those with lower incomes. Our data shows that the following 'groups' in South Gloucestershire are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity:

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people)
- Disabled people

As such, it is clear then that any implementation of this proposal would therefore, disproportionately impact:

- Families with a disabled child/children/disabled person(s) in the household
- Disabled Younger adults <45
- Disabled Women
- Disabled people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- Disabled people who are renting
- Disabled people who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness
- Disabled people overall

³ [Department for Work and Pensions' Family Resources Survey](#)

⁴ [Department for Transport \(DfT\)](#)

It is important to note that the national charity Scope, has reported the extra cost of disability⁵:

- On average, disabled households (with at least one disabled adult or child) need an additional £975 a month to have the same standard of living as non-disabled households.
- If this figure is updated to account for inflation over the period 2022/2023, these extra costs rise to £1,122 per month.

Consultation Results

Introducing a charge to cover the processing of Blue Badge applications

Respondents	Total (All Respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Non-carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
AGREE	51%	46%	54%	55%	52%	47%	40%	54%	50%	47%	59%	42%	55%	59%	55%	57%	57%
DISAGREE	28%	33%	25%	26%	30%	28%	38%	26%	29%	26%	25%	32%	25%	25%	24%	24%	24%

The data shows that:

- Disabled people were least likely to agree with the introduction of a £10 administration charge and the most likely to disagree.

Mitigating Actions

In terms of mitigating identified impacts relating to any implementation of this proposal, actions that the Council would take include:

- Any payment process would ensure clear provision of a variety of payment options, especially given that our data and information shows lower levels of digital activity amongst disabled people, people aged 65+ and people from lower socio-economic groups.

It is clearly noted that this action would not contribute to mitigation of the financial impacts of introducing an administration fee for new and renewal Blue Badges.

⁵ [Disability Price Tag 2023: the extra cost of disability](#)

Outcome

Overall, this proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly for those with lower incomes, and our data shows that disabled people overall are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity as well as be facing extra costs (e.g. spending on specialist disability-related products and services that are essential, higher usage of essentials such as having to use more energy or extra accessible transport options etc.). It is noted that a Blue Badge is valid for 3 years and therefore, the fee of £10 would only be incurred once in each 3 year period (i.e. equivalent to £3.33 per annum).

CEMETERIES, EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS OF BURIAL CHARGES

Description

A burial plot is an area of land in a cemetery where the grave of a person who has died is located. Burial plots are generally not actually sold but are leased for a set period of time.

'Exclusive Right of Burial' is the name for the lease of a burial plot for a set period of time. Nobody else can be buried in the plot for the duration of the period covered by the lease. The Council currently makes a charge for Exclusive Rights of Burial in its cemeteries. The period of time covered by the Exclusive Right of Burial is 50 years. Other local authorities charge for longer periods.

This proposal would see the term of the Exclusive Right of Burial extend from 50 years to 60 years (an increase of 20% in the term) and an increase of 20% in the fee charged for the Exclusive Right of Burial by the Council. The current cost in South Gloucestershire for 'Exclusive Right of Burial' is: £1380.40 in district, £2760.80 out of district (graves), £690.30 in district, £1380.00 out of district cremated remains and the proposal would see this cost increase by 20% to: £1656.48 in district, £3312.96 out of district (graves), £838.36 in district and £1656.48 out of district cremated remains.

Usually, persons do not purchase the 'Exclusive Right of Burial' directly from a cemetery-owner (i.e. the Council), but arrange it via the funeral directors who add the amount to their total bill for arranging a funeral. As such, this fee is not directly to residents, but would ultimately be covered by residents within a funeral directors' bill.

Impacts

Any increase in costs of services would particularly impact those with lower incomes. Our data shows that the following 'groups' in South Gloucestershire are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity and these 'groups' would therefore be disproportionately impacted by this proposal:

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people)
- Disabled people

Consultation Results

Extending the term for Exclusive Rights to Burial

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Non-carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
AGREE	42%	39%	44%	51%	46%	35%	39%	43%	41%	42%	48%	48%	52%	48%	51%	51%	51%
DISAGREE	9%	9%	7%	10%	9%	8%	10%	7%	8%	9%	14%	16%	7%	6%	9%	8%	8%

The data shows that:

- Significantly more respondents agreed with extending the term for Exclusive Rights to Burial (42% agreement versus 9% disagreement).
- All 'groups' were significantly more likely to agree than disagree.

Mitigations

None identified.

Outcome

This proposal is likely to increase the cost of funeral directors' bills paid by residents as funeral directors would need to cover the increase in costs and pass this increase to residents. This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes who are disproportionately more likely to be younger adults <45, women, people from many minority ethnic groups and disabled people. However, this is not a regular (e.g. annual) fee that residents would incur, and the term increases in-line with the cost.

GARDEN WASTE (GREEN BIN) SERVICE CHARGES

Description

When benchmarked against other local authorities' price and service level, South Gloucestershire Council operates a low price, high quality Green Waste Service, which at present is not covering the costs of delivery of the service. This means that residents without gardens/who do not subscribe to the service are supplementing the cost of the service for those with gardens or who do subscribe to the service. The charge for this service has also not risen with inflation since its introduction.

This proposal would retain the same level of service as currently and increase the Garden Waste charge from £30 to £60 per annum in 2024/25 with annual inflationary increases applied each year thereafter. This level of fee would mirror the average fee for the near and neighbouring councils for this service and will mean that the income for the service would cover the cost going forward.

Impacts

Any increase in costs of services would particularly impact those with lower incomes. This service subscribers are those residents with gardens, who are proportionately more likely to be middle to higher income wage earners. This does not mean that no 'low income' residents will be affected and as such our data shows that the following 'groups' in South Gloucestershire are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity and subscribers within these 'groups' would therefore be disproportionately impacted by this proposal:

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people)
- Disabled people

Consultation Results

Increasing the cost of the green waste subscription service

Respondents	Total (All Respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Non-carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
AGREE	38%	40%	39%	49%	41%	33%	31%	40%	38%	49%	48%	48%	46%	41%	46%	44%	45%
DISAGREE	44%	41%	44%	35%	41%	48%	44%	43%	44%	28%	27%	42%	36%	44%	36%	38%	38%

The data shows that:

- Slightly more residents disagreed than agreed.
- The 'groups' with the largest disagreement levels were People aged 65+ and Disabled People.

Mitigations

In terms of mitigating the impacts relating to any implementation of this proposal, actions that the Council would take should this proposal be implemented are:

- A 50% cost reduction would continue to be applied to these annual charges for those in receipt of certain benefits (Income Support, Pension Credit Guarantee Credit, Income-based Job Seeker's Allowance, Income-based Employment and Support Allowance, Universal Credit and you are not working).
- Residents may choose to purchase single disposable sacks at £2.70 each for use as required. The cost of these sacks would remain at £2.70 and only be subject to annual inflationary increases from 2024/25 onwards. Although there is no specific data concerning garden sizes and associated amounts of garden waste, it is considered that people with lower incomes may be proportionately more likely have smaller garden sizes and therefore, the opportunity for single sacks could contribute to helping to mitigate impacts.
- Communities can group together to pay the cost (e.g. 6 households each paying £10 for collection of a single bin from a single address).
- Household Waste and Recycling Centres will continue to accept garden waste.

Outcome

Overall, this proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, in particular for those more likely to have lower incomes as set out above. Mitigating actions are proposed as set out above, and in relation to these:- 1) the 50% cost reduction for people in receipt of certain benefits and the opportunity for grouping together to share a bin provides partial mitigation as the total cost would still increase and 2) the single disposable sacks option provides a good level of mitigation especially for those with smaller amounts of garden waste which could particularly include people on lower incomes, as there are no price increases proposed aside from annual inflationary increases from 2025/26.

LOCAL LAND CHARGES

Description

When buying a property, it is necessary to carry out a local land charges search to establish any issues that may affect the property. A local search will give details of:

- public rights of way
- adopted roads or footpaths next to the property
- full planning history
- local plan designation
- building regulations
- any tree preservation order or listed buildings or conservation areas
- any enforcement notices

This proposal would see the cost for local land charges increase by 21% with annual inflationary increases from 2025/26 onwards, bringing charges in to line with other local authorities. Current search fees are available at [this link](#) and wider information about local land searches and charges at [this link](#).

Impacts

Any increase in costs of services would particularly impact those with lower incomes. Our data shows that the following 'groups' in South Gloucestershire are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity and these 'groups' would therefore be disproportionately impacted by this proposal:

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups,
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people)
- Disabled people

Consultation Results

Increasing land charges

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Non-carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
AGREE	45%	40%	50%	48%	48%	41%	44%	46%	44%	54%	57%	52%	51%	49%	50%	50%	50%
DISAGREE	16%	18%	14%	23%	17%	14%	19%	16%	15%	19%	14%	32%	17%	14%	17%	17%	17%

The data shows that:

- Respondents were significantly more likely to agree than disagree with increasing local land charges.

Mitigations

None identified.

Outcome

This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes who are disproportionately more likely to be younger adults <45, women, people from many minority ethnic groups and disabled people. However, this is not a regular (e.g. annual) fee that residents would incur.

SECTION 6 – CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Part 1 - Cumulative analysis of impacts in respect of the package of proposals

The following table shows an overarching summary of the cumulative/combined impacts of the proposals.

Key:

✓ = Positive Impact identified	✗ = Negative Impact identified	Blank = Neutral impact identified
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Proposal	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Car Parking	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Blue Badges						✗	✗			✗					✗		
Cemeteries	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Waste service	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		
Land Charges	✗			✗			✗			✗					✗		

Overall, it is clear that a reduction to support provided under the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and the income generation proposals would result in increased costs for residents. In particular, it is noted that our evidence shows the following ‘groups’ are disproportionately more likely to be living in financial hardship: Families with children, Younger adults <45, Women, People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups), People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and disabled people), Disabled people overall. Therefore, these are the groups most likely to be negatively impacted when considering the full package of proposals under consideration.

Part 2 - Cumulative Impact of savings over time

As part of the consultation, residents were asked whether they had personally noticed or experienced the following effects on their household or community - the tables below display the results.

Note:

Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.

Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

In the last 5 years, to what extent - if at all - have you personally noticed or experienced the following potential effects on your household or community?

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
Condition of roads and paths																	
BETTER	9%	10%	8%	12%	6%	9%	7%	9%	9%	11%	20%	10%	10%	7%	10%	9%	9%
The same/no impact	11%	9%	14%	14%	11%	10%	9%	12%	11%	19%	11%	19%	12%	8%	12%	12%	12%
WORSE	78%	79%	76%	68%	83%	78%	81%	76%	78%	68%	61%	65%	75%	82%	75%	76%	76%
Availability or accessibility of council services (e.g. opening hours or services no longer being delivered)																	
BETTER	6%	4%	7%	6%	4%	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	7%	3%	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%
The same/no impact	43%	39%	44%	38%	44%	45%	37%	43%	43%	32%	34%	32%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%
WORSE	19%	22%	16%	22%	18%	16%	27%	17%	18%	16%	21%	32%	19%	23%	18%	20%	20%
Quality of council services (e.g. helpfulness of staff, responsiveness or speed of service, getting a satisfactory outcome)																	
BETTER	13%	10%	15%	11%	9%	16%	11%	13%	13%	11%	21%	6%	12%	12%	11%	11%	11%
The same/no impact	40%	39%	42%	38%	40%	42%	39%	41%	41%	35%	36%	36%	42%	42%	42%	43%	42%
WORSE	19%	19%	17%	19%	21%	16%	28%	16%	18%	21%	11%	32%	19%	22%	19%	20%	20%
How safe I feel in my local area																	
BETTER	11%	11%	12%	15%	8%	13%	13%	11%	12%	7%	14%	19%	12%	10%	11%	10%	11%
The same/no impact	60%	63%	58%	52%	63%	62%	49%	62%	60%	61%	64%	48%	58%	58%	60%	60%	60%
WORSE	24%	23%	26%	25%	27%	21%	32%	23%	25%	26%	16%	29%	25%	28%	24%	25%	25%

Table Continued - In the last 5 years, to what extent - if at all - have you personally noticed or experienced the following potential effects on your household or community?

Respondents	Total (All Residents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	White Other	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a carer	Armed forces	Not armed forces
How clean, tidy and well maintained my local streets and open/communal spaces are																	
BETTER	14%	15%	15%	20%	12%	15%	14%	15%	15%	18%	11%	26%	15%	13%	16%	15%	15%
The same/no impact	39%	40%	38%	36%	41%	38%	30%	39%	39%	35%	46%	29%	37%	28%	39%	36%	37%
WORSE	44%	43%	44%	35%	45%	45%	52%	42%	44%	44%	36%	39%	43%	56%	41%	45%	45%
Higher cost of council services I use																	
BETTER	6%	6%	6%	8%	5%	5%	4%	6%	5%	11%	5%	6%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%
The same/no impact	46%	40%	50%	40%	45%	50%	42%	46%	46%	37%	41%	39%	47%	47%	47%	47%	47%
WORSE	25%	26%	24%	25%	28%	22%	30%	24%	25%	23%	32%	29%	24%	26%	23%	25%	25%
How affordable Council Tax is for my household																	
BETTER	5%	4%	5%	7%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	11%	7%	10%	6%	4%	7%	5%	5%
The same/no impact	46%	46%	48%	33%	46%	52%	46%	47%	48%	37%	36%	32%	46%	48%	46%	46%	46%
WORSE	45%	46%	43%	53%	48%	39%	45%	44%	44%	49%	48%	45%	43%	43%	42%	44%	44%
Availability of social care services or services affecting my or my family's health/ wellbeing																	
BETTER	5%	4%	5%	5%	3%	5%	6%	5%	5%	0%	11%	3%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%
The same/no impact	28%	21%	32%	31%	25%	29%	20%	28%	27%	25%	25%	13%	29%	33%	28%	30%	30%
WORSE	21%	25%	17%	22%	26%	17%	36%	18%	20%	23%	20%	36%	24%	34%	21%	23%	23%
Reduced funding/ less resources affecting other services I use (e.g. schools, charities, community groups)																	
BETTER	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	5%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	5%
The same/no impact	30%	23%	35%	26%	27%	33%	27%	30%	30%	26%	23%	13%	29%	27%	29%	29%	29%
WORSE	26%	31%	21%	41%	29%	19%	31%	24%	25%	23%	32%	36%	30%	35%	27%	30%	29%
Problems with housing, planning or development																	
BETTER	4%	3%	4%	7%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%
The same/no impact	30%	28%	31%	31%	30%	29%	25%	30%	30%	25%	25%	32%	33%	37%	32%	34%	33%
WORSE	25%	24%	25%	30%	25%	24%	37%	22%	24%	25%	32%	23%	24%	27%	23%	23%	23%

Analysis of consultation feedback in relation to cumulative impacts

The following table shows the percentage of residents responding to the consultation who felt that each topic had got better and had got worse over the last 5 years.

Topic	Resident Feedback		Notes regarding feedback - Protected Characteristics
	Worse	Better	
Condition of roads and paths	78%	9%	<p>Disabled people were the most likely to say that the condition of roads and paths had got worse.</p> <p>Analysis of satisfaction with 'Highways and Roads' over the last eleven years shows that disabled people have tended to be less satisfied than average across the period with an average satisfaction level of 56% across the period.</p> <p>'Access...to the built and natural environment...' is one of the 10 identified Equality Priority Areas and we know this is of particular importance for disabled people.</p>
How affordable Council Tax is for my household	45%	5%	<p>Younger people, people from 'White Other' groups, people from minority ethnic groups and women were most likely to say that affordability of council tax has become worse.</p> <p>This matches with our data evidencing that these same groups are more likely than average to be experiencing financial hardship.</p>
How clean, tidy and well maintained my local streets and open/communal spaces are	44%	14%	<p>Disabled people and carers were the most likely to say that cleanliness, tidiness and maintenance of streets and open/communal spaces has got worse.</p> <p>This links to 'Access...to the built and natural environment...' which is one of the 10 identified Equality Priority Areas, and we know this is of particular importance for disabled people.</p>
Reduced funding/ less resources affecting other services I use (e.g. schools, charities, community groups)	26%	3%	<p>Younger people were the most likely to say that reduced funding/less resources affecting other services used has become worse.</p>
Problems with housing, planning or development	25%	4%	<p>Disabled people, followed by people from minority ethnic groups and younger people were the most likely to say that problems with housing, planning or development has got worse.</p> <p>These same groups are disproportionately over-represented in our housing need data.</p>

Topic	Resident Feedback		Notes regarding feedback - Protected Characteristics
	Worse	Better	
Higher cost of council services I use	25%	6%	People from minority ethnic groups and disabled people were the most likely to say that higher costs of council services used has got worse. This matches with our data evidencing that these same groups are more likely than average to be experiencing financial hardship.
How safe I feel in my local area	24%	11%	Disabled people, carers and LGBTQ+ people were most likely to say how safe they feel in the local area has got worse. This links to data evidencing increases in disablist, homophobic and transphobic hate crime in South Gloucestershire.
Availability of social care services or services affecting my or my family's health/ wellbeing	21%	5%	Disabled people, carers and LGBTQ+ people were most likely to say the availability of social care services or services affecting health/wellbeing has got worse.
Quality of council services (e.g. helpfulness of staff, responsiveness or speed of service, getting a satisfactory outcome)	19%	13%	The data does not show any particular disparities according to Protected Characteristic.
Availability or accessibility of council services (e.g. opening hours or services no longer being delivered)	19%	6%	LGBTQ+ people and disabled people were most likely to say that availability or accessibility of council services has got worse.

In addition to the above consultation questions, the following analysis has been conducted: The current Council Savings Programme commenced for the 2022/23 budget year. Since this time, numerous proposals have been identified (with associated EqIAAs), and as a result, numerous proposals have been taken forward and implemented (with associated EqIAAs). Proposals continue to be identified and a package of six proposals have been identified as part of the current 2024/25 budget setting process.

A ‘cumulative analysis’ has been undertaken which assesses all proposals since the 2022/23 budget year (whether proposals have been implemented, are in the process of being implemented, or have not yet been commenced).

The following table shows the results of the cumulative assessment with details shown in [Appendix 2](#):

Table to show the number of positive and negative impacts likely to be experienced across the savings programme according to characteristics.

	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
Positive Impacts Identified	0	0	3	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative Impacts Identified	16	3	8	10	3	10	22	1	1	17	9	1	3	1	17	1	0

The table shows that Disabled People have experienced the most negative impacts in respect of the savings programme. People from minority ethnic groups, people on lower incomes and women have also experienced a significant number of negative impacts. Younger adults, LGBTQ+ people and children & young people, have also experienced a significant number of negative impacts.

This links to the consultation results shown above where disabled people, carers, people from minority ethnic groups and LGBTQ+ people have been more likely to report effects on their household and/or community.

It is important that this information is factored into decision making in respect of the 2024/25 budget setting process and continues to be monitored closely.

SECTION 7 - EqIAA OUTCOMES

The Resource Planning process has been robust in taking account of equalities impacts from the outset. Equalities impacts identified throughout the process have been considered and have influenced decision-making in relation to the proposals taken forward.

The consultation process has been robust, allowing for information to be gathered in respect of the proposals as well as year-on-year and this information has been analysed in respect of 'Protected Characteristics' and used to inform the budget setting process.

The council has a defined set of Equality Priority Areas and the consultation information as well as work conducted throughout the year continues to evidence that these Priority Areas are robust and align to the overarching Council Plan aim of reducing the inequality gap. The proposed budget provides clarity of information in respect of the resourcing of work to tackle inequalities across all 10 of the defined Equality Priority Areas.

In respect of the proposals under consideration, the process undertaken has had clear influence in minimising equalities impacts. Negative impacts have been identified, however, mitigating actions have been identified in respect of these impacts and will be implemented as integral to work moving forwards.

This EqIAA forms part of the Council Revenue and Capital Budget reports in order that Members have sufficient information to discharge the Public Sector Equality Duty. Members have received equalities training which specifically covered details of and responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010 including the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Implementation of savings projects will continue to be monitored in respect of their EqIAA progress.

SECTION 8 – EqIAA EVIDENCE

The evidence which has been used as part of the systematic approach to the consideration of equality impact includes:

- South Gloucestershire Council Budget 2014-15 Consultation Report, January 2014
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2015
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2016
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2017
- South Gloucestershire Council Savings Plan and Budget Report, January 2018
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2019
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2020
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2021
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2022
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2023
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, December 2023
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, December 2024
- [South Gloucestershire Annual Equalities Reports](#) (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014 –15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23)
- [South Gloucestershire Council Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis](#) (EqIAA) documents and [reports](#)
- “*How Fair is Britain?*”, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2010
- “*Is Britain Fairer?*”, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2015
- “*Is Britain Fairer? (2018)*”, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), 2018
- Race Disparity Audit, October 2017
- South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice feedback

APPENDIX 1 – CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Introduction

The following tables show information regarding consultation feedback over the last 11 year period and is disaggregated according to characteristics. Data in respect of Religion or Belief is not provided for 23/24 or 24/25 due to low numbers of respondents, and data in respect of Sexual Orientation and Gender Reassignment has been merged due to low numbers of respondents.

The data shown covers percentages of respondents who stated agreement with each approach to making services more affordable to run.

Note:
Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.
Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

The next 5 – 10 years

Resident responses to the approaches that could be taken to make services more affordable to run.

Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces		
2014/15	51%	54%	48%	54%	54%	47%	50%	51%	52%	59%																					
2015/16	67%	65%	68%	65%	67%	66%	69%	67%	68%	55%																					
2016/17	68%	70%	65%	70%	68%	61%	61%	70%	69%	64%																					
2017/18	64%	68%	61%	60%	68%	63%	65%	64%	65%	58%																					
2018/19	69%	70%	67%	61%	64%	72%	73%	68%	70%	50%																					
2019/20	68%	68%	68%	75%	67%	66%	68%	68%	69%	57%	71%	57%	40%	48%	70%	69%	70%	67%	66%	100%	67%	50%	100%	71%	72%						
2020/21	68%	66%	69%	71%	69%	66%	67%	68%	68%	57%	71%	73%	50%	67%	50%	67%	68%	60%	67%	56%	100%	40%	-	46%	69%						
2021/22	70%	71%	70%	77%	68%	71%	71%	71%	70%	71%	75%			50%	71%	71%	80%	69%	100%	100%	33%	0%	63%	73%							
2022/23	70%	75%	67%	61%	70%	71%	73%	70%	71%	69%	80%			-	72%	72%	100%	73%	-	100%	0%	-	50%	70%							
2023/24	72%	70%	75%	76%	72%	72%	80%	71%	74%	64%	73%						72%											73%	71%	69%	72%
2024/25	64%	65%	65%	61%	69%	61%	69%	65%	66%	50%	74%						67%											66%	68%	67%	67%

Reducing the quality of services provided

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	25%	19%	29%	17%	25%	24%	19%	23%	22%	37%																			
2015/16	20%	21%	18%	19%	20%	20%	20%	20%	19%	23%																			
2016/17	23%	20%	26%	24%	23%	21%	15%	24%	23%	28%																			
2017/18	20%	16%	23%	17%	21%	19%	16%	20%	20%	18%																			
2018/19	23%	25%	23%	25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	24%	21%																			
2019/20	16%	12%	21%	16%	18%	15%	20%	16%	17%	12%	20%	41%	10%	22%	80%	16%	16%	33%	15%	25%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%				
2020/21	15%	16%	13%	11%	17%	13%	14%	15%	14%	10%	21%	36%	0%	14%	0%	15%	15%	0%	15%	11%	25%	0%	-	0%	16%				
2021/22	18%	14%	22%	16%	17%	19%	16%	19%	18%	22%	20%			50%	18%	18%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	16%				
2022/23	14%	12%	16%	7%	17%	16%	11%	15%	13%	24%	15%			-	13%	13%	0%	13%	-	0%	67%	-	21%	15%					
2023/24	19%	13%	25%	13%	19%	24%	15%	20%	20%	16%	15%				19%											15%	20%	24%	18%
2024/25	16%	12%	19%	13%	16%	16%	14%	16%	16%	9%	13%				15%											12%	15%	15%	15%

Increasing fees and charges for some services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	40%	37%	44%	30%	44%	39%	35%	42%	41%	29%																			
2015/16	41%	43%	39%	38%	44%	40%	37%	42%	41%	39%																			
2016/17	46%	45%	47%	44%	48%	41%	38%	47%	47%	42%																			
2017/18	43%	39%	48%	36%	46%	44%	37%	44%	44%	34%																			
2018/19	46%	45%	48%	43%	46%	47%	47%	47%	48%	33%																			
2019/20	43%	41%	47%	45%	45%	40%	36%	45%	43%	62%	40%	62%	30%	33%	80%	43%	44%	33%	40%	50%	33%	67%	0%	41%	48%				
2020/21	45%	44%	47%	51%	48%	41%	37%	47%	45%	37%	46%	55%	17%	48%	0%	45%	46%	0%	44%	44%	75%	0%	-	46%	50%				
2021/22	43%	42%	45%	37%	46%	42%	41%	45%	43%	35%	39%				100%	43%	44%	40%	43%	33%	100%	33%	0%	32%	46%				
2022/23	36%	34%	39%	25%	39%	39%	30%	38%	36%	37%	34%				-	37%	39%	25%	37%	-	100%	33%	-	29%	38%				
2023/24	54%	53%	56%	49%	60%	55%	50%	56%	57%	36%	56%					54%									57%	53%	56%	54%	
2024/25	54%	48%	61%	52%	53%	55%	46%	57%	55%	48%	55%					52%									52%	52%	51%	52%	

Making more services available online

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	61%	60%	64%	89%	69%	37%	41%	63%	61%	74%																				
2015/16	62%	63%	62%	80%	67%	44%	51%	64%	62%	61%																				
2016/17	64%	62%	68%	85%	57%	45%	46%	67%	66%	62%																				
2017/18	56%	53%	60%	81%	66%	42%	42%	58%	55%	64%																				
2018/19	56%	54%	60%	86%	67%	47%	41%	60%	57%	56%																				
2019/20	68%	69%	70%	98%	65%	46%	55%	72%	69%	77%	86%	76%	70%	52%	90%	69%	70%	67%	59%	100%	33%	100%	0%	65%	80%					
2020/21	60%	58%	63%	89%	67%	46%	46%	64%	60%	62%	71%	73%	83%	48%	100%	61%	61%	20%	56%	67%	50%	60%	-	62%	70%					
2021/22	64%	60%	68%	83%	74%	51%	49%	67%	64%	66%	62%				100%	65%	66%	80%	60%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	73%					
2022/23	59%	52%	66%	72%	75%	59%	46%	63%	59%	76%	72%				-	60%	60%	50%	55%	-	0%	100%	-	64%	70%					
2023/24	72%	70%	77%	78%	76%	67%	73%	73%	75%	67%	68%					78%											69%	74%	78%	73%
2024/25	70%	67%	72%	87%	75%	59%	65%	71%	69%	80%	84%					74%											67%	74%	72%	73%

Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces		
2017/18	58%	55%	63%	80%	68%	46%	43%	61%	58%	64%																					
2018/19	57%	54%	62%	87%	64%	49%	44%	61%	57%	60%																					
2019/20	70%	68%	73%	97%	67%	50%	59%	72%	70%	83%	86%	78%	80%	56%	90%	70%	71%	67%	60%	100%	33%	83%	0%	53%	81%						
2020/21	62%	59%	66%	86%	69%	50%	49%	66%	62%	63%	67%	73%	67%	43%	100%	62%	64%	20%	57%	67%	50%	80%	-	77%	72%						
2021/22	67%	63%	71%	84%	76%	55%	50%	70%	67%	67%	64%				50%	68%	69%	60%	61%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	79%						
2022/23	63%	56%	70%	80%	81%	63%	50%	68%	63%	80%	72%				-	64%	65%	50%	59%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	75%						
2023/24	75%	72%	79%	78%	80%	68%	73%	76%	77%	69%	68%						78%											71%	75%	81%	75%
2024/25	72%	68%	76%	86%	76%	61%	67%	74%	71%	82%	77%				76%													72%	76%	75%	75%

Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	84%	82%	86%	91%	86%	75%	85%	84%	84%	82%																				
2015/16	86%	86%	86%	89%	87%	82%	81%	87%	86%	81%																				
2016/17	86%	85%	87%	89%	88%	77%	77%	88%	87%	77%																				
2017/18	85%	86%	86%	87%	90%	82%	80%	86%	86%	91%																				
2018/19	87%	86%	89%	91%	92%	85%	86%	88%	88%	79%																				
2019/20	87%	86%	88%	100%	85%	86%	83%	87%	87%	90%	94%	100%	60%	63%	90%	88%	88%	67%	86%	100%	67%	100%	100%	76%	89%					
2020/21	87%	86%	89%	95%	88%	85%	85%	88%	87%	85%	96%	91%	83%	81%	50%	88%	89%	80%	88%	89%	75%	100%	-	54%	88%					
2021/22	85%	85%	86%	87%	88%	82%	80%	88%	86%	81%	87%			100%	88%	87%	60%	85%	33%	100%	67%	0%	89%	89%						
2022/23	86%	85%	87%	89%	90%	87%	81%	88%	86%	87%	89%			-	86%	87%	75%	86%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	89%						
2023/24	86%	84%	89%	84%	89%	85%	88%	86%	88%	78%	80%					90%											92%	83%	86%	86%
2024/25	90%	90%	92%	87%	91%	91%	90%	92%	91%	93%	94%					90%											90%	89%	89%	90%

Scaling back or stopping some services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	30%	21%	39%	20%	32%	29%	26%	30%	29%	44%																				
2015/16	27%	31%	23%	29%	28%	23%	22%	27%	27%	19%																				
2016/17	28%	24%	33%	31%	29%	21%	22%	29%	28%	28%																				
2017/18	25%	21%	29%	22%	28%	23%	19%	26%	25%	25%																				
2018/19	24%	22%	27%	30%	23%	24%	22%	25%	25%	19%																				
2019/20	19%	14%	23%	17%	21%	17%	13%	19%	19%	14%	37%	46%	0%	15%	80%	18%	18%	0%	20%	13%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%					
2020/21	17%	15%	19%	8%	19%	17%	13%	18%	16%	16%	13%	18%	0%	10%	0%	17%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	40%	-	8%	18%					
2021/22	22%	17%	26%	26%	21%	21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	13%			50%	22%	22%	20%	22%	0%	0%	33%	0%	16%	23%						
2022/23	17%	11%	21%	18%	18%	18%	11%	18%	16%	19%	20%			-	16%	16%	0%	17%	-	0%	0%	-	36%	17%						
2023/24	27%	16%	36%	20%	30%	30%	17%	30%	27%	24%	27%					26%											29%	27%	35%	26%
2024/25	19%	13%	22%	15%	19%	19%	16%	19%	18%	11%	16%					17%											16%	18%	18%	18%

Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	21%	18%	23%	18%	22%	18%	20%	19%	20%	15%																				
2015/16	37%	39%	35%	34%	39%	37%	41%	36%	37%	26%																				
2016/17	36%	31%	40%	33%	38%	36%	31%	37%	36%	34%																				
2017/18	38%	37%	40%	36%	40%	38%	35%	38%	39%	38%																				
2018/19	40%	38%	42%	32%	32%	44%	43%	40%	41%	25%																				
2019/20	38%	34%	43%	35%	39%	44%	40%	38%	39%	26%	43%	30%	50%	33%	80%	39%	40%	33%	38%	25%	100%	33%	100%	47%	40%					
2020/21	36%	36%	37%	23%	35%	41%	32%	38%	36%	34%	42%	9%	17%	43%	0%	37%	37%	0%	37%	56%	50%	20%	-	31%	36%					
2021/22	37%	35%	39%	38%	35%	38%	43%	37%	38%	30%	26%				50%	38%	38%	0%	38%	100%	0%	33%	0%	16%	39%					
2022/23	33%	32%	34%	31%	29%	36%	33%	34%	34%	30%	31%				-	34%	34%	0%	34%	-	100%	0%	-	57%	35%					
2023/24	40%	36%	45%	40%	40%	44%	34%	43%	43%	31%	37%					40%											41%	43%	51%	41%
2024/25	35%	32%	39%	24%	35%	40%	32%	36%	36%	32%	16%					33%											32%	34%	32%	33%

Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2015/16	86%	87%	84%	85%	88%	84%	85%	86%	86%	97%																				
2016/17	85%	84%	86%	91%	85%	73%	72%	88%	87%	70%																				
2017/18	80%	77%	82%	86%	84%	75%	66%	82%	80%	92%																				
2018/19	79%	77%	82%	90%	77%	77%	64%	81%	79%	73%																				
2019/20	84%	83%	86%	100%	82%	78%	75%	86%	84%	89%	97%	78%	70%	63%	90%	85%	86%	67%	81%	88%	100%	100%	0%	94%	88%					
2020/21	82%	80%	83%	91%	83%	79%	74%	85%	82%	84%	79%	82%	67%	67%	100%	83%	84%	60%	81%	89%	75%	60%	-	62%	87%					
2021/22	84%	81%	86%	95%	85%	79%	75%	86%	84%	85%	89%				100%	84%	85%	100%	82%	100%	100%	33%	0%	84%	89%					
2022/23	80%	78%	84%	84%	87%	82%	72%	84%	80%	80%	82%				-	81%	83%	100%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	85%					
2023/24	85%	82%	89%	86%	85%	86%	90%	85%	87%	79%	78%					88%											83%	84%	89%	84%
2024/25	86%	84%	90%	88%	85%	86%	80%	88%	87%	91%	94%					86%											80%	86%	85%	85%

Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2015/16	82%	83%	82%	83%	84%	81%	82%	83%	83%	77%																				
2016/17	82%	81%	83%	84%	84%	69%	66%	84%	84%	72%																				
2017/18	79%	77%	80%	84%	79%	77%	69%	80%	79%	84%																				
2018/19	80%	79%	82%	85%	80%	79%	70%	82%	80%	71%																				
2019/20	79%	80%	79%	93%	77%	77%	77%	80%	80%	64%	89%	78%	60%	67%	90%	80%	82%	33%	78%	88%	67%	100%	0%	82%	83%					
2020/21	81%	79%	84%	84%	81%	81%	76%	83%	81%	85%	88%	91%	50%	81%	100%	81%	82%	80%	81%	89%	75%	40%	-	62%	83%					
2021/22	80%	79%	82%	86%	83%	77%	67%	83%	80%	76%	75%				100%	81%	81%	60%	80%	100%	100%	33%	0%	74%	84%					
2022/23	79%	78%	81%	78%	83%	82%	72%	82%	80%	80%	79%				-	80%	82%	75%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	81%					
2023/24	79%	75%	83%	77%	83%	78%	76%	79%	82%	67%	76%					82%											78%	81%	82%	79%
2024/25	81%	82%	82%	80%	81%	82%	79%	83%	81%	91%	87%					80%											77%	80%	80%	81%

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	28%	26%	32%	23%	30%	27%	26%	28%	29%	30%																				
2015/16	27%	28%	25%	27%	28%	24%	21%	27%	27%	26%																				
2016/17	27%	22%	32%	28%	28%	21%	23%	28%	28%	22%																				
2017/18	25%	22%	29%	24%	26%	25%	20%	26%	25%	22%																				
2018/19	22%	20%	24%	20%	22%	22%	16%	23%	22%	27%																				
2019/20	21%	19%	23%	25%	22%	17%	17%	22%	21%	23%	34%	22%	10%	19%	80%	20%	20%	0%	19%	13%	0%	67%	0%	35%	21%					
2020/21	19%	17%	22%	15%	20%	19%	16%	20%	19%	22%	29%	9%	0%	33%	0%	19%	19%	0%	21%	22%	25%	0%	-	23%	17%					
2021/22	22%	18%	26%	19%	23%	23%	20%	23%	23%	18%	15%				50%	23%	23%	20%	24%	67%	0%	67%	0%	11%	22%					
2022/23	21%	16%	26%	23%	21%	23%	17%	23%	22%	9%	15%				-	22%	22%	0%	22%	-	100%	33%	-	36%	19%					
2023/24	22%	17%	26%	13%	26%	26%	19%	22%	22%	19%	24%					23%											18%	23%	35%	21%
2024/25	24%	22%	26%	20%	25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	25%	19%					24%											26%	24%	25%	25%

Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	46%	49%	45%	54%	49%	43%	52%	47%	47%	49%																				
2015/16	51%	52%	51%	50%	52%	51%	51%	52%	51%	58%																				
2016/17	49%	50%	49%	56%	47%	44%	39%	51%	51%	37%																				
2017/18	46%	44%	50%	48%	46%	47%	40%	48%	48%	40%																				
2018/19	46%	46%	47%	55%	42%	46%	43%	47%	46%	48%																				
2019/20	45%	44%	47%	52%	45%	40%	49%	45%	45%	54%	49%	51%	30%	44%	80%	46%	47%	33%	46%	50%	33%	83%	0%	71%	46%					
2020/21	43%	42%	44%	30%	43%	43%	41%	44%	44%	44%	67%	36%	0%	62%	50%	44%	44%	40%	44%	67%	25%	40%	-	54%	43%					
2021/22	46%	45%	48%	44%	49%	44%	43%	47%	46%	49%	39%				50%	47%	46%	40%	48%	67%	0%	33%	0%	47%	45%					
2022/23	43%	43%	43%	38%	47%	44%	40%	44%	43%	54%	49%				-	44%	44%	75%	44%	-	100%	67%	-	64%	44%					
2023/24	39%	34%	43%	35%	40%	42%	33%	41%	40%	37%	44%					42%											35%	42%	39%	39%
2024/25	45%	44%	48%	50%	44%	44%	45%	47%	46%	46%	52%					47%											42%	46%	47%	47%

Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	54%	56%	54%	60%	53%	58%	50%	55%	57%	52%																				
2015/16	56%	55%	57%	51%	51%	65%	60%	55%	56%	55%																				
2016/17	53%	52%	54%	48%	55%	57%	49%	53%	55%	45%																				
2017/18	54%	54%	55%	52%	49%	60%	49%	55%	55%	49%																				
2018/19	56%	57%	57%	57%	49%	59%	60%	57%	57%	44%																				
2019/20	53%	54%	52%	58%	48%	57%	50%	54%	53%	63%	51%	54%	80%	59%	80%	53%	54%	33%	55%	88%	33%	83%	100%	59%	51%					
2020/21	54%	55%	53%	49%	50%	58%	48%	55%	53%	62%	63%	55%	83%	62%	50%	55%	55%	60%	58%	67%	75%	60%	-	23%	50%					
2021/22	54%	53%	57%	52%	53%	57%	57%	54%	55%	54%	56%			50%	56%	55%	40%	58%	100%	100%	33%	0%	42%	52%						
2022/23	53%	55%	52%	48%	57%	54%	51%	54%	53%	72%	54%			-	54%	55%	75%	55%	-	100%	100%	-	50%	52%						
2023/24	47%	44%	51%	45%	45%	55%	34%	51%	49%	39%	46%					48%											44%	49%	54%	47%
2024/25	54%	54%	56%	50%	49%	59%	58%	55%	54%	70%	74%					54%											52%	53%	53%	53%

The Local Area and the Council

Over the past 2 years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?

Feedback	Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces		
BETTER	15/16	61%	56%	65%	61%	60%	60%	49%	62%	61%	52%																					
	16/17	11%	9%	12%	9%	12%	11%	9%	11%	11%	16%																					
	17/18	9%	9%	9%	10%	7%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%																					
	18/19	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	8%	11%	7%	8%	10%																					
	19/20	8%	8%	9%	11%	7%	7%	4%	9%	9%	8%	29%	24%	30%	7%	70%	9%	9%	0%	7%	13%	0%	17%	0%	18%	11%						
	20/21	7%	7%	6%	7%	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%	10%	8%	18%	17%	14%	0%	7%	7%	0%	8%	22%	25%	0%		8%	6%					
	21/22	7%	8%	7%	11%	6%	8%	6%	8%	7%	7%	5%	11%				50%	7%	7%	0%	8%	33%	0%	0%	0%	16%	7%					
	22/23	6%	5%	6%	8%	6%	5%	7%	5%	5%	5%	11%	8%				-	6%	6%	0%	6%	-	0%	0%	-	0%	5%					
	23/24	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%	6%	3%	5%	5%	5%	7%	15%					5%											5%	5%	7%	5%
	24/25	4%	3%	4%	7%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	9%	3%					4%											3%	3%	3%	3%
WORSE	15/16	25%	27%	22%	21%	29%	23%	24%	26%	27%	24%																					
	16/17	23%	18%	27%	22%	24%	22%	29%	22%	22%	14%																					
	17/18	27%	25%	28%	24%	33%	23%	26%	27%	26%	31%																					
	18/19	26%	24%	28%	19%	30%	26%	21%	26%	25%	17%																					
	19/20	29%	29%	29%	35%	35%	25%	32%	29%	29%	25%	14%	14%	40%	44%	30%	28%	28%	0%	26%	38%	67%	67%	0%	29%	28%						
	20/21	30%	31%	28%	23%	34%	27%	33%	29%	30%	16%	25%	0%	0%	29%	50%	28%	28%	40%	27%	0%	50%	40%		15%	30%						
	21/22	31%	25%	33%	24%	35%	27%	33%	30%	30%	38%	25%				50%	28%	30%	20%	26%	0%	100%	33%	0%	42%	32%						
	22/23	35%	31%	36%	41%	30%	34%	39%	34%	34%	30%	30%				-	33%	31%	25%	32%	-	0%	0%	-	43%	32%						
	23/24	41%	42%	38%	36%	43%	38%	52%	37%	38%	49%	32%					38%											51%	39%	38%	41%	
	24/25	43%	40%	42%	41%	46%	41%	46%	41%	42%	30%	48%					44%											53%	43%	45%	45%	

Overall, how satisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

Budget year	Total	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
14/15	81%	80%	82%	80%	82%	80%	82%	81%	82%	74%																				
15/16	63%	69%	60%	66%	65%	63%	50%	65%	65%	60%																				
16/17	81%	84%	81%	83%	81%	81%	71%	83%	84%	78%																				
17/18	81%	84%	78%	83%	81%	81%	79%	82%	82%	74%																				
18/19	81%	85%	79%	83%	74%	84%	84%	82%	83%	77%																				
19/20	81%	83%	80%	87%	79%	84%	81%	82%	83%	68%	71%	92%	90%	74%	90%	83%	84%	67%	85%	63%	67%	33%	100%	76%	82%					
20/21	79%	80%	78%	75%	78%	80%	80%	79%	80%	62%	58%	100%	100%	90%	50%	80%	81%	60%	83%	56%	25%	40%		85%	77%					
21/22	79%	83%	79%	85%	77%	81%	80%	80%	80%	68%	84%				50%	81%	80%	100%	82%	100%	100%	100%	0%	74%	80%					
22/23	77%	80%	75%	70%	78%	79%	74%	79%	78%	78%	85%				-	79%	81%	75%	82%	-	100%	33%	-	64%	78%					
23/24	70%	72%	71%	72%	71%	71%	61%	73%	74%	56%	78%					73%											71%	71%	68%	72%
24/25	65%	69%	67%	56%	66%	70%	56%	69%	68%	66%	52%					63%											57%	65%	62%	62%

Satisfaction with the way the council runs things

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	60%	57%	63%	60%	55%	66%	62%	60%	61%	48%																				
2015/16	47%	50%	46%	47%	46%	51%	35%	49%	49%	37%																				
2016/17	62%	68%	58%	59%	64%	64%	56%	63%	64%	66%																				
2017/18	60%	65%	56%	56%	55%	67%	57%	61%	62%	55%																				
2018/19	58%	61%	54%	50%	57%	60%	57%	58%	60%	44%																				
2019/20	61%	63%	60%	60%	59%	68%	56%	62%	62%	60%	80%	57%	70%	59%	80%	63%	64%	33%	67%	63%	0%	33%	100%	65%	60%					
2020/21	65%	68%	62%	61%	63%	69%	61%	66%	66%	57%	63%	82%	67%	71%	50%	67%	68%	20%	70%	44%	25%	40%	-	46%	67%					
2021/22	62%	69%	59%	56%	56%	69%	57%	64%	65%	37%	61%				50%	65%	63%	40%	69%	100%	100%	33%	0%	53%	59%					
2022/23	56%	63%	51%	43%	53%	59%	55%	56%	57%	52%	62%				-	58%	59%	100%	62%	-	0%	33%	-	50%	54%					
2023/24	49%	53%	48%	49%	50%	51%	41%	52%	53%	37%	44%					53%											45%	51%	49%	51%
2024/25	34%	38%	37%	25%	31%	41%	29%	38%	38%	32%	29%					28%											21%	28%	26%	26%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	53%	55%	52%	45%	53%	59%	57%	53%	55%	55%																				
2015/16	45%	46%	43%	38%	43%	51%	44%	45%	45%	42%																				
2016/17	48%	49%	49%	45%	52%	42%	41%	50%	48%	59%																				
2017/18	43%	43%	44%	35%	43%	48%	39%	44%	45%	35%																				
2018/19	43%	43%	44%	38%	39%	46%	37%	44%	44%	44%																				
2019/20	41%	38%	45%	40%	44%	43%	45%	42%	42%	54%	49%	30%	30%	37%	80%	42%	43%	33%	43%	25%	33%	33%	100%	76%	41%					
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	45%	50%	45%	40%	48%	47%	44%	50%	64%	0%	52%	50%	49%	49%	20%	48%	33%	25%	60%	-	31%	50%					
2021/22	59%	63%	58%	58%	63%	58%	54%	61%	61%	47%	52%				50%	60%	60%	60%	60%	100%	100%	67%	0%	58%	63%					
2022/23	50%	49%	51%	40%	52%	52%	48%	51%	51%	50%	49%				-	52%	53%	75%	54%	-	0%	33%	-	36%	51%					
2023/24	64%	66%	64%	69%	64%	63%	62%	64%	67%	60%	59%					66%											58%	66%	74%	65%
2024/25	52%	53%	57%	34%	54%	57%	53%	55%	56%	50%	48%					48%											47%	47%	48%	47%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about proposals for change

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2015/16	46%	47%	47%	47%	46%	46%	22%	49%	45%	52%																				
2016/17	43%	43%	45%	39%	45%	44%	43%	44%	44%	52%																				
2017/18	41%	40%	42%	41%	39%	43%	36%	42%	41%	38%																				
2018/19	41%	43%	39%	39%	38%	43%	33%	42%	42%	40%																				
2019/20	42%	42%	44%	43%	44%	44%	41%	44%	43%	51%	66%	32%	60%	41%	90%	44%	44%	33%	44%	25%	67%	67%	100%	59%	44%					
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	51%	47%	46%	41%	48%	47%	43%	54%	73%	0%	57%	50%	49%	50%	40%	50%	33%	25%	40%	-	31%	49%					
2021/22	53%	56%	52%	54%	56%	53%	41%	56%	54%	46%	46%				100%	55%	54%	20%	55%	100%	100%	67%	0%	26%	56%					
2022/23	49%	51%	49%	38%	51%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	59%				-	51%	52%	75%	52%	-	0%	33%	-	43%	52%					
2023/24	58%	58%	60%	61%	63%	55%	53%	61%	63%	36%	49%					60%											58%	60%	67%	60%
2024/25	52%	52%	57%	38%	54%	56%	53%	56%	56%	57%	58%					48%											50%	47%	49%	48%

I can influence decisions affecting the local area

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	18%	17%	19%	17%	15%	21%	22%	17%	19%	6%																				
2015/16	52%	48%	57%	54%	56%	45%	41%	54%	53%	52%																				
2016/17	21%	23%	20%	21%	21%	21%	22%	21%	21%	28%																				
2017/18	17%	19%	16%	12%	18%	19%	17%	17%	19%	13%																				
2018/19	21%	23%	19%	22%	20%	21%	21%	21%	21%	27%																				
2019/20	18%	18%	19%	23%	17%	16%	16%	19%	18%	37%	49%	3%	20%	26%	70%	19%	18%	0%	19%	0%	0%	33%	100%	41%	19%					
2020/21	17%	18%	16%	26%	17%	16%	14%	18%	17%	15%	25%	27%	0%	14%	0%	18%	18%	20%	18%	11%	25%	0%	-	15%	20%					
2021/22	15%	17%	14%	16%	15%	15%	12%	16%	15%	9%	20%			50%	16%	15%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%	16%					
2022/23	13%	15%	11%	6%	16%	12%	11%	13%	13%	17%	16%			-	14%	15%	0%	14%	-	0%	0%	-	21%	14%						
2023/24	15%	16%	16%	17%	17%	15%	13%	17%	17%	13%	22%					15%											11%	18%	17%	16%
2024/25	14%	16%	14%	10%	15%	14%	12%	16%	16%	16%	10%					13%											8%	14%	13%	13%

Agreement that the council acts on the concerns of residents

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	38%	37%	38%	36%	31%	45%	38%	38%	38%	42%																				
2015/16	18%	22%	17%	26%	18%	17%	19%	19%	18%	26%																				
2016/17	39%	43%	38%	34%	42%	44%	46%	39%	41%	40%																				
2017/18	37%	39%	35%	36%	31%	42%	36%	37%	39%	30%																				
2018/19	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	37%																				
2019/20	33%	31%	35%	31%	30%	42%	29%	34%	33%	40%	57%	43%	50%	41%	70%	34%	34%	33%	37%	13%	0%	17%	0%	65%	29%					
2020/21	39%	40%	38%	34%	33%	46%	37%	38%	38%	35%	46%	36%	0%	57%	50%	41%	42%	60%	45%	44%	50%	40%	0%	38%	35%					
2021/22	41%	43%	41%	33%	37%	48%	36%	43%	42%	30%	44%			0%	44%	42%	0%	47%	100%	0%	33%	0%	47%	39%						
2022/23	36%	40%	34%	22%	35%	37%	36%	37%	37%	33%	48%			-	38%	38%	50%	41%	-	0%	0%	-	43%	34%						
2023/24	31%	31%	33%	26%	34%	37%	26%	33%	33%	30%	27%					37%											31%	31%	29%	32%
2024/25	26%	28%	28%	19%	25%	30%	23%	29%	29%	21%	26%					23%											19%	23%	22%	22%

Further questions

In addition to the above questions, the following questions have now been asked as part of the Council Budget consultation for the 2 years. The following tables displays the results.

Note:
Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.
Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

The council can be relied on to consistently deliver services

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	41%	39%	43%	35%	43%	45%	31%	44%	43%	30%	27%	45%	41%	42%	44%	41%
2024/25	30%	32%	33%	19%	29%	35%	27%	33%	33%	36%	23%	27%	24%	27%	25%	25%

The council is clear and honest about what it does and why

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	38%	39%	40%	41%	38%	40%	33%	41%	41%	34%	37%	40%	32%	42%	40%	40%
2024/25	30%	32%	33%	22%	30%	33%	25%	34%	33%	32%	19%	26%	20%	26%	25%	25%

The council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	35%	36%	35%	35%	38%	36%	28%	38%	38%	29%	44%	39%	38%	35%	33%	36%
2024/25	30%	32%	32%	23%	30%	32%	25%	33%	33%	34%	23%	28%	20%	27%	27%	26%

The council has the public's best interests at heart

Question	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	36%	36%	38%	36%	39%	36%	28%	39%	39%	29%	39%	39%	32%	38%	26%	38%
2024/25	28%	30%	31%	20%	28%	32%	21%	32%	31%	25%	19%	26%	19%	25%	24%	24%

The council works collaboratively with other organisations and the public

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	29%	33%	27%	35%	31%	24%	20%	31%	31%	23%	27%	30%	29%	30%	17%	31%
2024/25	22%	26%	23%	16%	23%	24%	22%	24%	24%	34%	23%	22%	21%	21%	21%	21%

Satisfaction with Services

Note:
 Areas highlighted **GREEN** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.
 Areas highlighted **RED** are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

The following tables show the percentage of respondents stating satisfaction with the service.

Care for older people

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	31%	32%	32%	22%	26%	39%	26%	32%	32%	43%																				
2015/16	9%	11%	8%	5%	7%	15%	19%	8%	9%	14%																				
2016/17	9%	10%	7%	4%	10%	13%	15%	7%	8%	10%																				
2017/18	9%	8%	10%	4%	5%	14%	20%	8%	9%	7%																				
2018/19	12%	11%	11%	7%	9%	14%	22%	10%	12%	10%																				
2019/20	7%	6%	8%	17%	8%	12%	11%	6%	7%	6%	11%	3%	0%	11%	0%	7%	7%	0%	11%	13%	0%	0%	0%	18%	4%					
2020/21	34%	39%	30%	31%	24%	42%	49%	29%	35%	31%	25%	0%	0%	55%	0%	34%	37%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%		33%	21%					
2021/22	35%	36%	36%	13%	32%	42%	37%	34%	37%	18%	55%			0%	36%	35%	100%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%						
2022/23	28%	30%	28%	17%	23%	32%	35%	26%	29%	26%	29%			-	29%	27%	0%	33%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	21%						
2023/24	28%	31%	26%	30%	26%	31%	15%	35%	34%	0%	0%					31%											33%	30%	29%	30%
2024/25	33%	37%	34%	33%	32%	35%	40%	34%	36%	56%	33%					31%											45%	23%	31%	31%

Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	31%	31%	31%	28%	29%	35%	29%	31%	34%	14%																				
2015/16	7%	8%	6%	5%	6%	10%	16%	6%	7%	3%																				
2016/17	6%	7%	5%	3%	7%	5%	18%	4%	5%	9%																				
2017/18	7%	6%	7%	4%	4%	9%	18%	5%	6%	8%																				
2018/19	8%	6%	8%	9%	7%	7%	17%	6%	8%	8%																				
2019/20	6%	5%	6%	18%	5%	7%	16%	4%	6%	5%	3%	0%	0%	15%	0%	5%	6%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%					
2020/21	25%	30%	21%	30%	21%	29%	48%	18%	26%	19%	25%	0%	33%	38%	0%	27%	28%	0%	34%	0%	33%	0%		0%	20%					
2021/22	27%	29%	27%	19%	27%	31%	38%	27%	27%	18%	45%				0%	29%	28%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	22%					
2022/23	22%	20%	21%	21%	17%	24%	35%	17%	21%	14%	18%				-	22%	22%	0%	26%	-	100%	0%	-	0%	18%					
2023/24	27%	20%	35%	24%	28%	37%	28%	30%	34%	13%	40%					31%											37%	26%	21%	29%
2024/25	27%	27%	32%	23%	26%	32%	40%	27%	31%	40%	14%					26%											46%	17%	28%	28%

Children's social services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	31%	37%	22%	32%	28%	34%	15%	34%	33%	33%																				
2015/16	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	9%																				
2016/17	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%																				
2017/18	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	6%	2%	2%	5%																				
2018/19	4%	3%	4%	5%	6%	10%	9%	3%	4%	2%																				
2019/20	5%	5%	5%	19%	3%	4%	11%	4%	4%	15%	3%	0%	0%	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%	0%	6%	3%					
2020/21	13%	11%	15%	32%	13%	12%	17%	12%	11%	21%	13%	14%	33%	0%	0%	14%	13%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		0%	17%					
2021/22	14%	16%	14%	27%	17%	9%	13%	15%	15%	6%	14%				0%	15%	15%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	13%					
2022/23	16%	11%	17%	19%	17%	15%	21%	14%	15%	26%	6%				-	16%	15%	0%	19%	-	100%	100%	-	0%	11%					
2023/24	26%	31%	26%	32%	25%	31%	21%	31%	34%	8%	43%					29%											23%	30%	42%	27%
2024/25	18%	15%	22%	30%	14%	15%	22%	18%	19%	33%	0%					18%											24%	15%	17%	18%

Customer Services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2016/17	16%	17%	16%	12%	17%	21%	22%	15%	16%	24%																				
2017/18	17%	17%	16%	14%	12%	21%	23%	16%	17%	18%																				
2018/19	18%	19%	16%	16%	13%	19%	28%	17%	18%	21%																				
2019/20	27%	28%	27%	40%	22%	28%	29%	27%	27%	38%	40%	22%	30%	15%	70%	28%	28%	0%	31%	25%	67%	0%	0%	29%	25%					
2020/21	54%	56%	52%	63%	46%	59%	52%	54%	55%	50%	56%	57%	50%	62%	0%	56%	57%	0%	62%	50%	50%	0%		33%	51%					
2021/22	47%	56%	41%	40%	44%	53%	49%	48%	49%	31%	51%				0%	50%	48%	0%	52%	0%	100%	0%	0%	50%	45%					
2022/23	45%	50%	41%	43%	41%	45%	44%	45%	46%	40%	58%				-	47%	47%	33%	49%	-	100%	0%	-	75%	43%					
2023/24	48%	51%	48%	46%	48%	53%	47%	51%	52%	35%	54%					51%											45%	49%	36%	51%
2024/25	47%	46%	49%	45%	48%	47%	46%	48%	47%	69%	38%					44%											37%	46%	43%	43%

Environmental health and trading standards

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	53%	50%	56%	58%	55%	48%	29%	58%	55%	69%																				
2015/16	9%	10%	8%	8%	8%	10%	12%	9%	9%	20%																				
2016/17	8%	7%	8%	5%	9%	11%	12%	7%	7%	13%																				
2017/18	8%	8%	8%	10%	6%	10%	11%	8%	8%	10%																				
2018/19	9%	9%	9%	8%	7%	10%	15%	9%	9%	13%																				
2019/20	14%	15%	14%	28%	10%	15%	18%	14%	14%	20%	51%	27%	20%	4%	70%	14%	13%	0%	17%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	11%					
2020/21	40%	40%	40%	50%	37%	41%	38%	41%	40%	37%	47%	50%	25%	33%	0%	41%	42%	25%	43%	0%	0%	0%	-	63%	40%					
2021/22	37%	41%	36%	29%	32%	44%	45%	39%	38%	25%	46%				0%	40%	39%	0%	40%	100%	0%	0%	-	46%	37%					
2022/23	34%	34%	33%	33%	31%	37%	36%	33%	35%	24%	35%				-	35%	36%	33%	39%	-	100%	33%	-	40%	28%					
2023/24	33%	41%	27%	28%	35%	36%	34%	32%	34%	33%	20%					40%											40%	30%	15%	35%
2024/25	27%	28%	27%	25%	29%	24%	21%	28%	27%	47%	0%					28%											37%	23%	27%	27%

Housing advice services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	33%	34%	31%	38%	31%	28%	18%	34%	33%	50%																			
2015/16	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	4%	8%	3%	4%	3%																			
2016/17	4%	4%	3%	2%	3%	6%	11%	3%	3%	7%																			
2017/18	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	3%																			
2018/19	5%	5%	5%	7%	6%	4%	12%	4%	5%	6%																			
2019/20	5%	6%	4%	18%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	6%	23%	0%	0%	4%	70%	5%	5%	0%	5%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%				
2020/21	17%	17%	18%	20%	16%	17%	27%	13%	17%	29%	10%	14%	33%	29%	0%	17%	16%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	-	25%	16%				
2021/22	15%	19%	14%	17%	17%	14%	15%	17%	16%	13%	35%			100%	16%	16%	0%	18%	100%	0%	0%	-	20%	10%					
2022/23	18%	19%	14%	33%	18%	14%	21%	16%	16%	26%	12%			-	18%	19%	0%	20%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	14%					
2023/24	26%	28%	28%	43%	25%	21%	25%	29%	30%	30%	60%				29%											30%	28%	15%	29%
2024/25	16%	16%	19%	22%	17%	14%	19%	17%	17%	40%	13%				16%											17%	12%	15%	14%

Highways and roads

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	23%	25%	23%	35%	24%	19%	10%	25%	23%	27%																				
2015/16	25%	24%	26%	32%	21%	24%	26%	25%	25%	29%																				
2016/17	31%	33%	30%	36%	29%	28%	18%	33%	31%	40%																				
2017/18	27%	28%	25%	31%	25%	27%	23%	27%	28%	18%																				
2018/19	27%	32%	23%	43%	26%	25%	25%	28%	28%	29%																				
2019/20	27%	32%	23%	35%	23%	25%	29%	27%	28%	31%	46%	8%	20%	22%	70%	27%	29%	33%	27%	13%	0%	33%	0%	35%	29%					
2020/21	33%	38%	29%	42%	32%	32%	31%	35%	34%	35%	27%	36%	33%	24%	0%	35%	36%	20%	33%	29%	50%	60%	-	54%	36%					
2021/22	33%	36%	32%	43%	32%	33%	25%	34%	34%	24%	48%				50%	35%	33%	100%	34%	100%	100%	0%	-	47%	35%					
2022/23	29%	33%	26%	26%	32%	27%	26%	30%	29%	37%	31%				-	30%	31%	67%	31%	-	0%	0%	-	38%	30%					
2023/24	31%	36%	29%	44%	26%	28%	21%	34%	33%	34%	40%					33%											20%	35%	29%	33%
2024/25	18%	21%	16%	21%	17%	16%	15%	19%	18%	20%	22%					20%											15%	21%	18%	18%

Free car parking

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2019/20	50%	50%	50%	55%	49%	55%	47%	51%	52%	31%	66%	49%	50%	41%	70%	51%	51%	33%	51%	25%	67%	67%	0%	47%	52%				
2020/21	63%	63%	64%	67%	60%	65%	60%	64%	64%	56%	65%	40%	83%	43%	100%	64%	65%	80%	67%	40%	75%	50%	-	55%	60%				
2021/22	65%	69%	64%	69%	61%	69%	59%	67%	66%	60%	73%			0%	67%	66%	75%	69%	0%	0%	100%	-	53%	64%					
2022/23	59%	61%	58%	54%	58%	60%	48%	62%	59%	43%	53%			-	60%	61%	75%	62%	-	100%	33%	-	70%	57%					
2023/24	67%	71%	64%	71%	64%	68%	54%	70%	68%	63%	76%				65%														
2024/25	83%	86%	82%	82%	83%	84%	79%	84%	83%	86%	86%				85%														

Libraries

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	78%	79%	77%	82%	76%	80%	76%	80%	78%	86%																				
2015/16	48%	45%	51%	57%	40%	52%	49%	48%	49%	57%																				
2016/17	45%	50%	39%	50%	41%	46%	49%	44%	44%	52%																				
2017/18	41%	46%	36%	53%	34%	43%	38%	42%	43%	31%																				
2018/19	37%	42%	31%	49%	29%	36%	34%	38%	36%	44%																				
2019/20	38%	46%	30%	53%	33%	38%	40%	38%	38%	37%	60%	8%	40%	33%	80%	38%	39%	33%	40%	38%	0%	50%	100%	41%	34%					
2020/21	68%	73%	63%	77%	62%	69%	68%	68%	68%	71%	60%	29%	75%	75%	0%	69%	71%	40%	71%	40%	67%	100%	-	43%	71%					
2021/22	60%	63%	59%	72%	55%	63%	60%	63%	62%	47%	58%				100%	63%	62%	100%	63%	100%	0%	0%	-	40%	64%					
2022/23	66%	69%	63%	69%	63%	66%	67%	66%	67%	51%	65%				-	67%	68%	100%	68%	-	100%	50%	-	29%	68%					
2023/24	79%	82%	76%	81%	79%	77%	69%	81%	82%	47%	80%					80%											82%	78%	77%	79%
2024/25	76%	82%	73%	80%	76%	76%	70%	79%	77%	81%	86%					77%											81%	75%	77%	77%

Local bus services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	52%	52%	56%	50%	47%	65%	41%	54%	55%	39%																				
2015/16	36%	38%	36%	25%	33%	49%	42%	36%	36%	34%																				
2016/17	35%	36%	36%	28%	40%	36%	26%	36%	37%	35%																				
2017/18	36%	37%	35%	25%	25%	47%	38%	36%	37%	30%																				
2018/19	38%	37%	39%	36%	29%	42%	30%	40%	39%	42%																				
2019/20	34%	32%	35%	37%	28%	47%	29%	35%	34%	39%	69%	30%	40%	70%	-	34%	33%	67%	38%	25%	33%	17%	0%	35%	30%					
2020/21	57%	59%	57%	47%	47%	67%	56%	58%	57%	58%	65%	55%	100%	0%	-	58%	59%	75%	63%	71%	75%	75%	-	45%	52%					
2021/22	56%	60%	53%	52%	47%	63%	55%	56%	58%	40%	55%				50%	58%	56%	100%	60%	100%	100%	0%	-	45%	54%					
2022/23	50%	50%	50%	42%	48%	49%	39%	52%	49%	59%	61%				-	51%	51%	75%	56%	-	0%	33%	-	25%	46%					
2023/24	28%	29%	29%	35%	21%	32%	19%	32%	30%	24%	28%					31%											24%	28%	27%	29%
2024/25	39%	38%	43%	33%	37%	42%	28%	43%	41%	33%	23%					37%											36%	35%	36%	37%

Parks and open spaces

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces		
2015/16	59%	59%	60%	69%	57%	56%	51%	61%	60%	66%																					
2016/17	57%	60%	54%	67%	55%	41%	34%	59%	58%	60%																					
2017/18	61%	66%	58%	79%	62%	56%	51%	64%	62%	58%																					
2018/19	57%	60%	53%	70%	56%	54%	41%	60%	57%	58%																					
2019/20	67%	68%	67%	82%	61%	63%	59%	70%	69%	56%	80%	86%	80%	52%	80%	69%	69%	67%	69%	88%	33%	33%	0%	59%	69%						
2020/21	79%	78%	80%	84%	76%	80%	71%	80%	80%	66%	71%	91%	100%	81%	50%	80%	80%	100%	80%	75%	75%	20%	-	75%	80%						
2021/22	79%	82%	77%	75%	76%	84%	73%	80%	81%	64%	78%				100%	80%	79%	100%	82%	100%	0%	33%	-	65%	79%						
2022/23	79%	80%	78%	71%	80%	81%	73%	81%	80%	65%	77%				-	81%	82%	75%	81%	-	0%	0%	-	77%	81%						
2023/24	78%	79%	79%	79%	80%	79%	71%	81%	82%	58%	86%						80%											80%	78%	77%	80%
2024/25	77%	80%	78%	80%	76%	77%	67%	80%	78%	81%	81%						78%											77%	78%	77%	77%

Planning

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	32%	30%	35%	35%	33%	30%	12%	36%	35%	17%																				
2015/16	9%	10%	8%	9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	3%																				
2016/17	9%	8%	11%	11%	9%	9%	7%	9%	9%	6%																				
2017/18	7%	6%	8%	11%	7%	6%	5%	8%	7%	7%																				
2018/19	7%	6%	8%	9%	10%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%																				
2019/20	12%	12%	13%	22%	12%	11%	9%	13%	12%	10%	31%	24%	0%	7%	70%	13%	12%	0%	14%	13%	0%	50%	0%	6%	12%					
2020/21	24%	24%	24%	34%	26%	20%	22%	25%	24%	31%	31%	22%	25%	10%	0%	24%	25%	67%	25%	0%	33%	0%	-	38%	25%					
2021/22	20%	19%	22%	24%	19%	21%	16%	22%	21%	18%	19%				0%	22%	21%	0%	20%	67%	0%	0%	-	18%	24%					
2022/23	18%	17%	18%	24%	23%	17%	14%	19%	18%	21%	10%				-	19%	20%	0%	18%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	21%					
2023/24	27%	33%	24%	38%	24%	23%	24%	29%	29%	19%	40%					27%											32%	25%	24%	28%
2024/25	21%	23%	21%	27%	22%	18%	19%	22%	22%	45%	8%					23%											23%	22%	24%	24%

Public Health (not including NHS services)

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	50%	51%	49%	47%	43%	64%	42%	52%	53%	31%																				
2015/16	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%	11%																				
2016/17	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%																				
2017/18	6%	5%	7%	5%	4%	8%	8%	5%	6%	3%																				
2018/19	6%	6%	7%	8%	5%	6%	8%	6%	7%	8%																				
2019/20	14%	12%	15%	24%	12%	17%	15%	14%	14%	23%	31%	27%	10%	70%	-	13%	14%	0%	17%	25%	0%	17%	0%	12%	11%					
2020/21	35%	34%	36%	43%	32%	36%	36%	36%	36%	34%	33%	38%	25%	0%	-	36%	37%	67%	40%	0%	0%	33%	-	50%	31%					
2021/22	42%	43%	44%	37%	42%	45%	41%	44%	45%	13%	40%				0%	45%	42%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%	-	36%	46%					
2022/23	37%	40%	33%	48%	34%	36%	38%	37%	37%	35%	48%				-	38%	38%	0%	42%	-	100%	50%	-	60%	33%					
2023/24	37%	39%	36%	38%	34%	42%	35%	37%	40%	23%	46%					40%											31%	34%	19%	39%
2024/25	35%	38%	38%	37%	38%	33%	27%	41%	38%	39%	42%					37%											25%	40%	36%	36%

Schools

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	62%	62%	61%	64%	63%	54%	44%	63%	61%	57%																				
2015/16	18%	17%	21%	39%	16%	7%	12%	20%	18%	31%																				
2016/17	16%	19%	15%	35%	7%	9%	8%	17%	17%	19%																				
2017/18	17%	21%	15%	43%	18%	9%	15%	18%	18%	17%																				
2018/19	13%	15%	11%	30%	20%	6%	9%	14%	12%	19%																				
2019/20	19%	21%	17%	35%	18%	12%	21%	19%	19%	32%	46%	0%	20%	11%	80%	19%	19%	0%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%	18%	20%					
2020/21	46%	50%	42%	71%	43%	38%	47%	47%	46%	48%	40%	14%	33%	56%	0%	48%	49%	50%	47%	40%	0%	0%	-	29%	49%					
2021/22	45%	52%	41%	65%	44%	39%	35%	48%	46%	31%	41%				0%	47%	46%	100%	44%	100%	0%	0%	-	71%	49%					
2022/23	44%	48%	42%	56%	52%	36%	37%	45%	44%	61%	40%				-	46%	46%	0%	46%	-	100%	0%	-	60%	46%					
2023/24	57%	53%	63%	63%	60%	43%	42%	63%	66%	27%	55%					59%											65%	60%	29%	59%
2024/25	47%	53%	49%	54%	48%	40%	36%	52%	47%	77%	46%					49%											46%	50%	47%	47%

Sport and leisure facilities

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	68%	72%	64%	81%	69%	59%	42%	71%	69%	67%																				
2015/16	34%	33%	37%	52%	32%	26%	32%	35%	35%	49%																				
2016/17	31%	36%	26%	44%	25%	22%	25%	32%	31%	36%																				
2017/18	34%	38%	29%	60%	35%	24%	22%	35%	34%	31%																				
2018/19	31%	35%	27%	49%	41%	24%	25%	32%	31%	33%																				
2019/20	45%	50%	41%	63%	42%	34%	30%	49%	46%	45%	66%	46%	70%	30%	80%	46%	47%	33%	46%	63%	67%	67%	0%	24%	48%					
2020/21	68%	67%	68%	81%	68%	64%	58%	71%	69%	63%	62%	43%	60%	67%	0%	69%	70%	75%	68%	67%	67%	67%	-	50%	71%					
2021/22	58%	65%	54%	71%	57%	56%	59%	61%	59%	50%	70%				0%	61%	60%	100%	62%	100%	0%	0%	-	63%	59%					
2022/23	59%	62%	56%	63%	60%	57%	54%	59%	59%	50%	52%				-	60%	62%	67%	63%	-	0%	50%	-	67%	57%					
2023/24	65%	66%	63%	63%	67%	65%	47%	70%	70%	34%	82%					71%											76%	61%	61%	66%
2024/25	64%	74%	61%	66%	64%	63%	50%	69%	67%	71%	68%					66%											62%	68%	66%	66%

Waste and recycling services

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	70%	73%	69%	67%	70%	76%	52%	73%	72%	59%																				
2015/16	64%	62%	66%	62%	60%	71%	59%	66%	65%	63%																				
2016/17	69%	72%	67%	63%	72%	72%	68%	69%	71%	66%																				
2017/18	69%	73%	67%	69%	68%	72%	61%	71%	71%	70%																				
2018/19	70%	75%	66%	65%	65%	73%	64%	72%	72%	65%																				
2019/20	71%	74%	69%	76%	67%	79%	70%	72%	72%	63%	83%	73%	90%	56%	90%	73%	73%	67%	73%	63%	33%	50%	0%	82%	73%					
2020/21	77%	80%	76%	78%	74%	81%	74%	79%	78%	80%	71%	64%	67%	86%	50%	79%	79%	60%	81%	78%	50%	80%	-	67%	77%					
2021/22	80%	85%	76%	75%	75%	86%	79%	80%	81%	62%	82%				100%	81%	79%	80%	82%	100%	100%	67%	-	67%	78%					
2022/23	77%	81%	75%	72%	72%	78%	76%	78%	78%	65%	79%				-	78%	79%	100%	80%	-	0%	67%	-	83%	76%					
2023/24	77%	77%	78%	70%	77%	86%	69%	79%	81%	51%	82%					80%											76%	77%	78%	78%
2024/25	67%	70%	67%	49%	66%	75%	63%	69%	69%	60%	55%					65%											69%	63%	63%	63%

Welfare benefits and council tax reduction

Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
2014/15	34%	42%	25%	33%	32%	40%	22%	36%	36%	18%																				
2015/16	12%	11%	13%	9%	10%	16%	23%	10%	12%	17%																				
2016/17	9%	11%	8%	4%	10%	17%	22%	8%	9%	12%																				
2017/18	11%	13%	10%	9%	9%	15%	22%	10%	12%	9%																				
2018/19	15%	18%	12%	9%	10%	17%	34%	12%	15%	17%																				
2019/20	13%	14%	12%	19%	11%	22%	25%	11%	13%	8%	29%	5%	40%	26%	70%	13%	12%	0%	17%	25%	0%	0%	0%	35%	10%					
2020/21	34%	35%	34%	34%	27%	40%	47%	29%	35%	15%	38%	25%	100%	38%	0%	34%	33%	33%	39%	0%	50%	50%	-	20%	29%					
2021/22	35%	43%	30%	34%	30%	40%	50%	32%	35%	24%	41%				0%	36%	34%	0%	41%	100%	0%	50%	-	50%	29%					
2022/23	31%	39%	25%	21%	19%	32%	44%	27%	33%	28%	41%				-	34%	34%	0%	39%	-	100%	0%	-	0%	24%					
2023/24	34%	35%	34%	25%	34%	41%	39%	32%	39%	15%	50%					37%											43%	33%	20%	35%
2024/25	34%	43%	32%	27%	31%	42%	35%	38%	39%	24%	47%					34%											38%	36%	36%	36%

CHARACTERISTICS OF CONSULTATION RESPONDENTS

Consultation Respondents (The following table shows the numbers of respondents to the Budget consultation in each of the last 11 years):

Budget year	Total	Female	Male	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
14/15	681	315	314	83	357	200	46	576	584	27																			
15/16	1426	682	716	349	563	491	185	1203	1275	35																			
16/17	1127	508	568	361	561	170	102	949	931	86																			
17/18	1270	595	616	188	432	591	171	1039	1051	88																			
18/19	1045	480	519	138	218	667	107	843	928	52																			
19/20	1753	841	853	669	559	453	212	1435	1537	84	35	37	#	27	10	1542	1352	#	815	#	#	#	#	17	691				
20/21	1342	661	647	162	511	625	200	1068	1187	68	24	11	#	21	#	1165	1050	#	708	#	#	#	#	13	414				
21/22	1398	586	734	180	466	673	203	1083	1220	108	61			#	1192	1186	#	730	#	#	#	#	19	431					
22/23	1475	612	783	88	361	624	239	1155	1290	54	61			#	1259	1118	#	829	#	#	#	#	14	390					
23/24	1159	462	608	301	448	318	181	897	917	115	41					588	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	157	671	72	1010
24/25	1541	588	731	261	538	657	173	1126	1194	44	31					705	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	145	584	668	694

Note: where numbers are 10 or less, the # symbol is used in order to ensure confidentiality.

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Increasing Local Placement (Children's Residential)	Establish therapeutic foster care pathway to support young children with complex needs	£590,000	£1,010,000	£1,010,000	£1,010,000	£1,010,000																		
Review of Preparing for Adulthood service	We will undertake a review of the Preparing for Adulthood service, which provides a range of support to young people with disabilities, to ensure that it is supporting those with greatest need. From this review we will develop key performance indicators so that we can be sure that the work of the team is not being duplicated elsewhere, supports young people to live independent lives (as opposed to having to utilise residential provision as adults) and aligns with the needs identified within individual EHCPs. This review will determine the future size and scope of the team.	£0	£137,000	£273,000	£410,000	£410,000			✘				✘											
Early Years Income Generation	review charging policy and explore opportunities to generate more income from sector re training subscription services	£25,000	£30,000	£65,000	£80,000	£80,000																		
HtST	Review all remaining elements of non-statutory home to school transport provision. Full review of provision	£0	£0	£200,000	£450,000	£768,000			✘				✘									✘		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
School Improvement Income Generation	reduce level of subsidy for school improvement service & charging in part for some training	£12,000	£27,000	£36,000	£60,000	£60,000																		
SEND	Offer Educational Psychology services to schools outside of South Glos	£0	£0	£27,000	£53,000	£53,000																		
Increasing Resource in the Children's and Young Peoples Commissioning Team	Increase capacity of the CYP Commissioning Team to enable them to build closer relationships with providers to reduce number of children having to be moved away from their local area	£100,000	£100,000	£150,000	£150,000	£150,000			✓															
Alexandra Way Care Home occupancy and charges	Maximise the occupancy of Alexandra Way Care Home and review charges	£0	£0	£96,720	£96,720	£96,720						✓												
Cambrian Green Day Centre repurpose	explore feasibility of repurposing centre to enable support for people with LD and cognitive impairment	£0	£0	£240,000	£240,000	£240,000						✓	✓											
Review of blended day care	Review of blended day care, which would include access to community based day activities alongside building based day care	£0	£24,980	£49,960	£99,920	£100,000							✓											

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Sustaining the impact of Assistive Technology inc AT Provider Pilot	Utilise Technology enabled care	£1,200,000	£2,080,000	£2,080,000	£2,080,000	£2,080,000						✓	✓											
The carers grant	The carers grant is available to carers to help meet their needs in providing care. The proposal is to amend the grant to a one-off fixed payment of £200 per carer per cared-for person, and continues the council's shift from universal provision to person centred support. We will continue to support Carers following an assessment and eligibility decision, either through services directly for the Carer or through services for the person they care for. This saving has been deferred in 2023/24.	£0	£0	£52,000	£52,000	£52,000																		
Transforming outcomes for clients with Learning Difficulties - rephasing of targets	Improve outcomes for service users with LD	£199,000	£617,000	£782,000	£782,000	£782,000							✓											
Fair & Sustainable Price for Care for residential placements	Price of care for all residential care homes in South Gloucestershire and ad-hoc negotiated prices with out of county care homes	£465,000	£1,061,000	£1,199,000	£1,338,000	£1,338,000						✓	✓											
Improved options for supporting people at home (Commissioning)	Options to transform our market offer to make best use of resource	£726,000	£988,000	£988,000	£988,000	£988,000																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Microenterprise and DP Development	Improve availability of cost-effective support and personalisation by developing policy practise process and resources in relation to the use of personal budgets through DPs and Individual Service Funds.	£0	£150,000	£250,000	£350,000	£350,000						✓	✓											
Quality assurance for care homes	Approaches to quality assurance for care homes will be considered, to maximise efficiency and outcomes.	£0	£0	£45,000	£46,000	£47,000																		
Reablement	review of the reablement service, domiciliary care, Home to Decide (temporary funded internal team) and the development of an improved model of reablement.	£1,027,000	£2,883,000	£2,883,000	£2,883,000	£2,883,000						✓	✓											
Reshape housing advice and Homelessness service	Review existing Housing Related Support services and over 18 "mentoring" schemes, and identify opportunities to extend/ develop the offer using that budget envelope. Release post	£0	£0	£36,620	£37,360	£38,100	✗			✗			✗			✗	✗					✗		
Review of Extra Care Housing	To make the most effective use of our current ECH schemes and ensure they are viable, fit for purpose and sustainable; to understand the issues ECH are facing and identify an action plan to resolve identified issues,	£0	£80,000	£300,000	£400,000	£400,000						✓	✓											

		2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
Project	Brief Description	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	working with partners to achieve this.																							
Review of Housing Related Support services commissioned (Enabling Services)	Develop "Enabling" service/s for people who may not yet have the right skills to live independently, or may have lost skills or confidence due to cognitive or emotional challenges	£0	£100,000	£100,000	£150,000	£150,000						✓	✓											
Review of South Glos Homes	South Glos Homes is the in-house social lettings agency designed to forge links with the private rented sector to bring on properties for temporary accommodation and for homelessness prevention and relief. We will review this service to reduce its cost either through reduced use of temporary accommodation or a reduction in resource.	£0	£0	£40,000	£41,000	£42,000	✗			✗			✗			✗	✗					✗		
Software and technology upgrades	Engage technology to optimise staff process & customer interactions	£0	£0	£101,000	£101,000	£101,000																		
Adult Social Care contribution to VCSE	We will review the contribution made by Adult Social Care to the VCSE and our staff resourcing for	£0	£0	£138,000	£241,000	£241,000	✗			✗	✗	✗	✗			✗	✗					✗		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	commissioning and engagement activities, working across the authority in partnership with the VCSE to agree priorities for the remaining funds working to develop and address sustainability across the sector.																							
Support for voluntary organisations on applying for funds	Voluntary and community sector organisations in need of financial support would be able to get support from CVS South Gloucestershire on how to apply to other funding bodies and we would like more organisations to develop fundraising capacities so that that they do not rely on Member Award Funding and Area Wide Grants with £1k per member funding retained for 2024/25. This saving has been deferred until 2024/25.	£0	£0	£192,000	£253,000	£253,000	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Bending the Curve	Reduction over time to capture wider benefit of method and service level investments on future price & demand	£0	£804,000	£1,942,000	£3,354,000	£3,354,000																		
Public Health Savings Programme		£380,000	£630,000	£880,000	£1,130,000	£1,130,000																		
Public Health contributions for vulnerable adults and carers	Reduction in public health contribution to funding for services delivered through the voluntary sector for vulnerable adults and carers. Officers will work across the authority in partnership with our valued	£0	£0	£62,000	£62,000	£62,000	x					x	x			x	x					x		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	VCSE to identify impact on specific funding streams, contracts and grants. Together we will seek to agree priorities for remaining funds, and work to develop and address sustainability across the sector.																							
Review of the Integrated healthy lifestyle and wellbeing service (SLO 11)	We will undertake a full review and options analysis of commissioning of the wellbeing element of integrated healthy lifestyles and wellbeing services and related Council led community engagement work to promote healthy lifestyles and improve mental health and wellbeing.	£0	£0	£296,000	£296,000	£296,000	x	x					x			x	x					x		
Review of school admission fees	Review of admission fees for academy and maintained schools	£0	£40,000	£70,000	£70,000	£70,000																		
Reduce Project Budget - Young Ambassadors	Work with a smaller group of YA to provide more targeted support for children in care and care leavers	£0	£39,210	£62,220	£63,110	£64,210			x															
Different ways of working	Review of non-staffing budgets and move to a more efficient use of resources.	£0	£55,000	£55,000	£55,000	£55,000																		
Children's Agency Social Work	Reduce turnover rate to the England average improving retention	£100,000	£203,000	£203,000	£203,000	£203,000																		
Implementation of the Mockingbird programme	Support delivery of sustainable foster care	£0	£0	£0	£20,000	£20,000			✓															
Review of management for adult, community and learning services	Review arrangements for management & leadership of	£0	£11,410	£19,560	£19,560	£19,560																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	adult and community learning services																							
Review of management for Early Years	Review arrangements for management & leadership of early years services	£0	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000																		
Budget Reduction (Public Health)		£0	£131,000	£273,000	£412,000	£412,000																		
Cessation of GP support contract for specialist advice		£0	£24,000	£24,000	£24,000	£24,000																		
Reduction of council funding for Partnership Boards		£0	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000																		
Release of Public Health Vacant post		£0	£20,820	£21,450	£21,870	£22,310																		
Business Support Budgets	Budget reduction	£0	£18,000	£18,000	£18,000	£18,000																		
Convert vacant H10 Posts	Covert posts to apprenticeships	£0	£51,000	£51,000	£51,000	£51,000																		
Non-staffing costs - Business Support People	Non staff cost budget reduction	£0	£7,240	£7,240	£7,240	£7,240																		
Care Leavers	Delivery of Woodleaze care leavers accommodation , range of 1 bed flats reducing the spend on out of area placements	£150,000	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000	£250,000			✓															
Children's Pooled Budget	Increase funding from CCG allowing SGC to reduce their contribution	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000																		
Childrens Social Care - Change of post	Change post to social work assistant	£0	£4,390	£4,390	£4,390	£4,390																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Children's Social Work University review	These options included working with the Social Work Dept of a local University so they can review and assess our work against good practice guidance/new models of working and a programme supporting fathers to take an active role in caring for their children. It covers a range of areas and is proven to make a difference to both fathers and their children. We believe these are important aspects to our work and we will explore whether we might be able to progress these without resource.	£0	£90,000	£0	£185,000	£185,000		✘	✘															
Recovery Curriculum programme	Phase 1 of the Recovery Curriculum programme, representing investment into education recovery post-Covid, has been very successful, with strong collaborative working and good educational outcomes. Strong leadership in our schools means that we can begin Phase 2 earlier than originally planned, embedding the work within mainstream school activity.	£0	£130,000	£280,000	£450,000	£580,000																		
External Floating Support	A review of contracts and specifications is needed to determine the requirement for the services and their contribution to homelessness prevention and relief.	£144,000	£144,000	£144,000	£144,000	£144,000																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Housing Prevention Grant	Charge staffing costs against the housing prevention grant	£0	£74,040	£74,040	£74,040	£74,040																		
Release of Housing Services Investment		£0	£100,000	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000																		
Review HRS/floating support arrangements	Review contracts and specifications	£0	£80,000	£80,000	£80,000	£80,000																		
Review of the Homelessness Reserve commitments	Budget review	£455,000	£0	£0	£0	£0																		
Reduce Cleaning service	Reduce Cleaning service across the estate - toilets every day, general clean 1 per week, staff responsible for desks	£0	£50,000	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000																		
Reduce total R&M Spend	Reduce corporate estate repairs and maintenance costs informed by refreshed stock condition surveys.	0	0	0	£100,000	£200,000																		
BMR Rental	BMR rental - TBC: subject to commercial deliberations and assessment of confidence levels	0	£170,000	£170,000	£170,000	£170,000																		
Rationalisation of assets used in community to generate additional capital receipts and reduce ongoing running costs linked with the forthcoming Asset Management Plan	Rationalisation of assets used in community to generate additional capital receipts and reduce ongoing running costs linked with the forthcoming Asset Management Plan	0	0	0	£500,000	£500,000																		
Reduce mail van collection	Reduce mail van run collection to once a week.	0	0	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000																		
Property Management System	Efficiencies identified from increasing self service	0	0	0	£52,000	£53,000																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	following implementation of property management system.																							
Review of Property Services administration support through use of system automations and streamlining processes	Review of Property Services administration support through use of system automations and streamlining processes	£21,000	£41,000	£41,000	£41,000	£41,000																		
Identify savings for mail and print facility attributed to move to digitisation of leaflets and reduction of printed materials	Identify savings for mail and print facility attributed to move to digitisation of leaflets and reduction of printed materials																							
Currently paying to firms to manage our asset with proper property management system this could be undertaken in house and considerable less cost. Should a property management system be established we can sell the service to schools and occupiers.	Currently paying to firms to manage our asset with proper property management system this could be undertaken in house and considerable less cost. Should a property management system be established we can sell the service to schools and occupiers.	0.00	£20,000	£40,000	£172,000	£202,000																		
To review the current usage of meeting rooms and proactively manage lettings in line with BBSP approach.	To review the current usage of meeting rooms and proactively manage lettings in line with BBSP approach.	£0	£12,000	£12,000	£12,000	£12,000																		
Amalgamate OT delivery (People), handymen (Property Services) and Handy Van (Place) services, reducing admin tasks and increase potential income streams.	Amalgamate OT delivery (People), handymen (Property Services) and Handy Van (Place) services, reducing admin tasks and increase potential income streams.	£0	£0	£20,000	£30,000	£30,000																		

		2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
Project	Brief Description	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
Borrow to install solar panels across the estate to offset anticipated future costs and potential savings (links to cross cutting method change)	Borrow to install solar panels across the estate to offset anticipated future costs and potential savings (links to cross cutting method change)	£0	£100,000	£0	£0	£0																		
Review of Council buildings usage and offer space to let to individuals / organisations.	Review of Council buildings usage and offer space to let to individuals / organisations.	£0	£0	£25,000	£25,000	£25,000																		
Increasing the Bristol & Bath Science Park (BBSP) service charge to recover full cost of services.	Increasing the BBSP service charge to recover full cost of services.	£0	£38,000	£181,000	£181,000	£181,000																		
Introduction of a standard turnover target across council alongside permanent wellbeing and recruitment support for staff and managers	Introduction of a standard turnover target across council alongside permanent wellbeing and recruitment support for staff and managers	£269,000	£269,000	£269,000	£269,000	£269,000																		
Reduce insurance premiums by increasing "self insurance"	Reduce insurance premiums by increasing "self insurance"	£16,300	£16,300	£16,300	£16,300	£16,300																		
Review of council-wide travel & mileage budgets following changes in behaviour following pandemic and through New Ways of Working in longer term	Review of council-wide travel & mileage budgets following changes in behaviour following pandemic and through New Ways of Working in longer term	£44,000	£44,000	£44,000	£44,000	£44,000																		
Reduction over time to capture wider benefit of method and service level investments on future price & demand	Reduction over time to capture wider benefit of method and service level investments on future price & demand	£0	£393,000	£963,000	£1,785,000	£1,785,000																		
Change to budgeting approach - all budgets will	Change to budgeting approach - all budgets will be presented	£0	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000	£20,000																		

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																				
							Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces				
	providing support, guidance and signposting to residents.																										
Heritage funding	Explore opportunities for funding through alternative sources		£43,000	£44,000	£44,000	£44,000																					
Victim support unit	No longer fund the specialist victim support service		£33,000	£33,000	£33,000	£33,000	✗																				
Review of CC & OSS opening hours	Opening hours to be reviewed to meet times of peak customer demand		£76,000	£77,000	£79,000	£79,000																					
Library opening hrs & use of technology	review opening hrs, maximise use of open access technology whilst protecting access to services such as the summer reading challenge		£337,000	£461,000	£473,000	£473,000	✗		✗																		
Street Lighting	reduction of street lighting by 25% after 11pm & LED replacement programme		£627,000	£627,000	£627,000	£627,000																					
Cycle Safety Training	charge small fee for cycle safety training so service covers its costs		£164,000	£169,000	£174,000	£174,000	✗		✗																		
Council Tax Reduction Scheme	Review scheme and develop options for reducing overall spend			£400,000	£400,000	£400,000	✗			✗																	

Project	Brief Description	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Characteristics																	
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces	
	enforcement to be carried out in all intended locations																							
Introduction of Car Parking charges	Paid for on and off street parking	0	0	£1,500,000	1,600,000	£1,700,000	✗			✗		✗			✗						✗			
Blue Badges administration fee	Blue badge administration fee	0	0	£23,000	£46,000	£46,000					✗	✗			✗						✗			
Cemeteries charges	Exclusive rights of burial fees	0	0	£35,000	£35,000	£35,000	✗			✗		✗			✗						✗			
Waste service charges	Waste (Green Bin) charges	0	0	£900,000			✗			✗		✗			✗						✗			
Land Charges	Land search fees	0	0	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000	✗			✗		✗			✗						✗			

Positive impacts	0	0	3	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative impacts	16	3	8	10	3	10	22	1	1	17	9	1	3	1	17	1	0

APPENDIX 3 – SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE EQUALITIES VOICE CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

8th December 2023

Dear South Gloucestershire Council

In response to the current Council Budget 24/25 consultation, please find below the collective response of South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice.

South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice is led by CVS South Gloucestershire and includes:

- Age UK South Gloucestershire - <https://www.ageuk.org.uk/southgloucestershire/>
- The Diversity Trust CIC - <https://www.diversitytrust.org.uk/>
- South Gloucestershire Disability Equality Network - <https://www.sgden.org.uk/>
- South Gloucestershire Over 50's Forum - <https://www.southgloover50sforum.org.uk/>
- South Gloucestershire Race Equality Network - <https://www.facebook.com/southglosraceequalitynetwork/>
- Southern Brooks Community Partnerships - <https://southernbrooks.org.uk/>
- SARI (Stand Against Racism and Inequality) - <https://saricharity.org.uk/>

Firstly, the consultation asks: which of the following ten areas should the Council prioritise in its work to tackle inequalities? We recognise that these ten areas have been identified as a result of significant research and we agree that these are 10 areas which should **all** be tackled proactively.

1. Educational attainment and experience
2. Hate Crime
3. Employment
4. Poverty and financial hardship
5. Housing
6. Accessibility, especially in terms of: digital inclusion, transport, the built and natural environment, and access to the wider economy
7. Mental health
8. Health
9. Adult and Children's Social Care
10. Tackling inequalities as part of work to address the Climate and Nature Emergency

In terms of prioritising actions, consideration should be given to issues that are within the control of SGC and those where most of the influence is external e.g. poverty is largely a result of UK Government policies on minimum wage, taxation and welfare benefits. We applaud the efforts of the Council towards increasing both number and percentage of affordable and social-rent properties in the area but would ask if more could be done in

terms of affordable, comfortable homes and communities to live in, for older and disabled citizens and also the LGBTQ+ community who are now also facing a rapid rise in hate crimes and increased risks of homelessness. We also ask that more is done to support our rapidly increasing Black and Minority Ethnic population with all its diversity in terms of faith, culture and needs. Hate Crime towards these communities is also on the increase in South Gloucestershire. This combined with the fact that South Gloucestershire is one of the fastest growing areas in terms of new housing means that significant effort and resources must be put into ensuring community cohesion and to ensure newly arriving residents are welcomed and know where to turn if they are targeted. Continuing to support your commitment to race equality, ensuring all South Gloucestershire Members and Staff are trained appropriately; continuing to fund hate crime services (please do read the recent Hate Crime Needs Assessment you commissioned); continuing to fund the South Gloucestershire Racial Equality Network and also Black and Minority Ethnic led projects and to do all we can to tackle offenders to minimise the levels and impact of hate is crucial.

In terms of the specific consultation question asked, we believe that significant positive impacts can be achieved in the areas of 'Education' and 'Poverty and Financial Hardship'. However, we are also clear that the other 8 areas are critical to the advancement of equality and tackling of inequalities across communities.

The consultation presents six specific proposals and it is clear that they all seek to introduce fees and charges. As such, they are disproportionately detrimental to those with lower abilities to pay and we know that certain groups are disproportionately affected by this as clearly and correctly stated within the associated EqIAA document:

- Families with children
- Younger adults, age <45
- Women
- People from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups
- People who are renting (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups)
- People who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness (disproportionately more likely to be people from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups and Disabled people)
- Disabled people
- LGBTQ+ people, who experience disproportionate levels of unemployment, housing challenges, and low income, particularly if they are disadvantaged further by having intersectional characteristics and experiences e.g., a black trans woman with a disability

Mitigating actions are critical to protect and support the most vulnerable in our society.

Specifically in relation to the introduction of fees for Blue Badges, the Disability Equality Network states that introducing a charge for blue badges will be introducing a disadvantage to disabled individuals and disabled people already face unfair extra costs. By introducing a charge, Disabled people will be yet again financially impacted if they use blue badges to get out and about. If blue badges are no longer affordable for some, this will likely isolate an already isolated community of people and put further strain on transport companies to cater to the needs of Disabled individuals. If these blue badges aren't affordable, the independence of Disabled people in South Gloucestershire will also be impacted. Such a fee would only impact the Disabled community, and the South Gloucestershire Disability Equality Network feels very strongly that this is an unnecessary

option as it relies on an already financially drained and challenged community of people and it appears from the calculations in the consultation, that it would not raise a significant sum of money as a result of being implemented.

Across the proposals, it is the people who are less able to bear the brunt of these impacts who clearly stand out as those who are impacted the most. We would wish to encourage the council to distribute impacts more fairly so that those with greater ability to stand the impacts support the council savings programme more (e.g. increasing council tax for the most affluent or larger properties, reviewing business rates etc.).

We believe that it will be important for the council to carefully consider the stated ten areas within its budget setting for 24/25 in order that both equalities and inequalities are addressed as integral to what the council does and the way in which it works.

We hope that this letter is helpful, and we look forward to discussing these ten areas with the council in January.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Berkeley Wilde', written in a cursive style.

Berkeley Wilde
On behalf of South Gloucestershire Equalities Voice