

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Date(s) of completing the EqIAA: August 2020 - onwards
Person(s) completing the EqIAA: EqIAA Lead: Head of Financial Services

Please Note:-

This document describes an initial assessment of equalities impacts.

The council has a statutory duty to consider the impact of its actions in relation to the following protected characteristic groups:-

1. Age
2. Disability
3. Gender Reassignment
4. Marriage and Civil Partnership
5. Pregnancy and Maternity
6. Race
7. Religion or Belief
8. Sex
9. Sexual Orientation

Therefore, the council wishes to hear and proactively consider any comments in relation to how any aspect of its budget may impact on any sections of the community as listed above. Any feedback in relation to equalities will inform a full Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis.

- You can find out more and tell us your views by completing our survey online at www.southglos.gov.uk/budget, or sending your comments to:
Freepost Plus RTX-L-YHGY-GSYS
South Gloucestershire Council
Corporate Consultation Team
Council Offices
Badminton Road
Yate
BRISTOL
BS37 5AF
- Email: consultation@southglos.gov.uk
- Phone: 01454 868550
- Copies of the consultation can be requested from your local library or one stop shop.

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of the Council's budget setting process is to set the Council's annual revenue budget, its capital programme and the council tax. The overall success of this process is measured through the delivery of the council's priorities within a balanced budget.

In respect of this, the key purpose of this EqlAA is to provide all parties with clear and robust information relating to equalities issues and considerations which influence decisions in respect of budget setting.

This EqlAA 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.

There are several issues worth raising within this introduction as follows:

- Extensive consultation continues to be undertaken and is currently being conducted (this EqlAA forms part of the current consultation). This allows for information to be explicitly gathered and analysed with respect to 'Protected Characteristic' groups as defined by The Equality Act 2010.
- This Initial EqlAA sets out an analysis of equalities issues as elicited through prior consultation and provides a wealth of information regarding the priorities and satisfaction levels of residents as disaggregated according to 'protected characteristic group'. The current consultation results, once available, will be added in to this document in order to update it and establish any trends and issues emerging. The updated EqlAA will then form part of decision-making processes.
- Equalities monitoring is carried out by services on an on-going basis which allows for equalities impact to be specifically researched and assessed with ongoing development activities designed and implemented. Full details of this can be found in the Council's Annual Equalities Reports here: <http://www.southglos.gov.uk/community-and-living/equality-and-diversity/monitoring-equalities-information-and-reports/> .

SECTION 2 – CONSULTATION & RESEARCH IN RELATION TO THE EqIAA

The extent of the council's consultation activity and the analysis of feedback information in respect of 'protected characteristic' groups allows Councillors to consider equalities impacts in a robust way and fully consider the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty throughout the budget setting process.

The following pages of this Initial EqIAA provide information concerning the equalities issues emerging as a result of consultation previously conducted and where possible, provides a comparison against historical consultation results in order that any trends can be highlighted. Further information will be inserted post consultation in order to update the information shown.

This EqIAA also covers important information concerning the differential impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on protected characteristic groups. It is noted that between publication of this Initial EqIAA and completion of the Final EqIAA a wide range of further information and evidence will have been forthcoming at national, regional and local levels; as such, this EqIAA will be updated in this regard post consultation.

Covid-19 Impacts

As previously noted, the main purpose of the council's budget setting process is to set the Council's annual revenue budget, its capital programme, and the council tax. The Covid-19 pandemic has resulted in many impacts across society and so it is important that within the context of the council's budget setting process these impacts are considered.

This Initial EqIAA focuses upon the differential impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic experienced by protected characteristic groups. It is clear that direct health impacts have been experienced by all groups, and that some have experienced proportionately greater direct health impacts. It is also clearly noted that Covid-19 is affecting life in South Gloucestershire in a wide range of ways including, but not limited to, physical and mental health, personal relationships, social interactions, jobs, finance and the natural environment and these issues are also being experienced differentially by protected characteristic groups.

Health impacts relating to Covid-19

The Public Health England, *Disparities in the risk and outcomes from Covid-19* report provides the following information specifically in terms of protected characteristics and Covid-19 diagnosis rates and mortality:

- Covid-19 diagnosis rates increased with age for both males and females. When compared to all-cause mortality in previous years, deaths from Covid-19 have a slightly older age distribution, particularly for males.
- The Public Health England Disparities report found that working age males diagnosed with Covid-19 were twice as likely to die as females.
- An analysis of survival among people with confirmed Covid-19 by sex, age group, ethnicity, deprivation and region, shows that, compared with people under 40, the probability of death was about three times higher among those aged 40 to 49, nine times higher among those aged 50 to 59, twenty-seven times higher among those aged 60 to 69, fifty times higher among those aged 70 to 79 and seventy times higher among those aged 80 and over.
- The most common comorbidities associated with Covid-19 are cardiac disease, non-asthmatic pulmonary disease, kidney disease, liver disease, malignancy, obesity, and dementia.
- Deprivation and socio-economic status directly impact the risk of death from Covid-19. People who live in deprived areas have higher diagnosis rates and death rates than those living in less deprived areas. The mortality rates from Covid-19 in the most deprived areas were more than double the least deprived areas, for both males and females. This is greater than the inequality seen in mortality rates in previous years, indicating greater inequality in death rates from Covid-19.
- There are worse health outcomes for people from BAME backgrounds diagnosed with Covid-19 compared to white British people. Covid-19 has replicated existing health inequalities, and in some cases, increased them. The Public Health England Disparities report found that people from black ethnic groups were most likely to be diagnosed. Death rates from Covid-19 were highest among people from black and Asian ethnic groups. People of Bangladeshi ethnicity had around twice the risk of death than people of white British ethnicity. From the evidence available at the time of the Disparities report, people of Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, other Asian, Caribbean and other black ethnicity had between 10 and 50% higher risk of death when compared to white British.
- It is important to note that there is not a suggestion that there is a casual link between ethnicity and risk of death from Covid-19 - wider factors which impact on people's lives have a real and measurable impact on the risk of death. There are significantly worse outcomes for people from BAME backgrounds in all major areas of life compared to white British people. These factors contribute vastly to worse health outcomes in relation to Covid-19 for people from BAME backgrounds. There is no one, single factor alone which can explain the disproportionate impacts of Covid-19 on people from BAME backgrounds. Factors contributing to the disproportionate

impact on people from BAME backgrounds include, in no particular order: poverty and financial hardship, where people live, overcrowded housing, types of job, racism and discrimination, other illnesses and access to health services.

Wider impacts relating to Covid-19

Poverty and financial hardship are clearly identified as factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups. In respect of these:

- Disabled people are three times more likely, dependent upon impairment type, to be living in poverty and have extra living costs of £570 per month on average, with one in five facing additional living costs of more than £1,000 per month.
- People from BAME backgrounds who, depending on ethnic group, are twice as likely to be living in poverty (20% of adults regardless of ethnicity are living in relative poverty and 30% of children are living in households in poverty in the UK). People from the following ethnic groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty: people from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Black African, Mixed ethnicity, Other ethnicity and Chinese backgrounds.
- People from BAME backgrounds are more likely to be in poorer standard housing and in overcrowded conditions. New research by the Human City Institute (HCI) stresses the impacts of low quality, overcrowded and fuel poor housing on communities – especially BAME communities. Together with socio-economic deprivation, sub-standard housing adversely affects the physical and mental health of household members, the educational attainment of children, the development of cohesive communities, social mobility and life chances. HCI's report reveals that more than 6% of the white British population is overcrowded, but this rises to between 15% and 30% for BAME households depending on ethnic group (Black Africans and Bangladeshis most often live in overcrowded conditions). Almost 70% of the BAME population lives in the 25% most overcrowded neighbourhoods in England. Some 15% of BAME households live in homes with at least one Category 1 Housing Health and Safety Rating System hazard (this system focuses on health outcomes of a variety of physiological and psychological hazards). This climbs to 18% in the private rented sector. Clearly we know that Covid-19 will be more likely to pass to others in overcrowded conditions. Poor housing conditions often means greater likelihood of co-morbidities associated with worse outcomes from Coronavirus e.g. Asthma.
- Analysis of those currently in receipt of housing related support in South Gloucestershire identifies the following: the majority of those receiving support are single men who make up 54%, with women making up 46%, of whom 8% were identified as pregnant or with dependent children. Relating to ethnicity, 81% were white (lower than the proportion in the South Gloucestershire population), 6% identified as from a BAME group (higher than the proportion in the South Gloucestershire population); those with a declared disability or health issue comprised 33% of those receiving a service (higher than the proportion in the South Gloucestershire population), of whom half identified mental health. The largest age group receiving support is those aged 31-49 at 49%, with younger people at 26%, those aged 50-64 at 18% and those over 65 at 6%.
- Across Britain, women are more likely to live in poverty than men, and are also more likely than men to experience severe material deprivation.
- Across Britain, people aged 16–24 are proportionately more likely to be living in poverty.

Types of job are clearly identified as factors contributing to the ongoing disproportionate impact on protected characteristic groups. In respect of these:

- Those employed in insecure work (defined as temporary employment or in agency work or in low-paid self-employment, identified by self-employment in caring, leisure and other service occupations, process, plant and machine operative occupations, or elementary occupations, such as cleaners or kitchen and catering assistants) are proportionately more greatly impacted. Some groups are more likely to be in insecure employment than others; these tend to be young people, Disabled people, people in certain ethnic groups and those from Muslim communities. Refugee and Asylum-Seeking communities are also more severely disadvantaged in the workplace – some are already not allowed to work and others much more likely to be in lower paid, poorer conditions. Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities are more likely to be running small businesses or be self-employed or working for the most impacted business areas e.g. Taxi Drivers, working in take-aways or restaurants, hotels etc.

The West of England Combined Authority (WECA) have reported the following information specifically in terms of Covid-19 business and workforce impacts:

- 30% of the West of England workforce has been furloughed at some point.
- 11% of the UK workforce are estimated to remain on furlough leave through the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS), as at between the 10 to 23 August.
- For the entire South West, recorded furlough levels are highest among the accommodation and food sector (78% of the eligible workforce); arts, entertainment and recreation (72%); and construction (63%). This information is not yet available at a local authority level.
- As of 31 July 2020, 44,100 claims have been made on the Self-Employment Income Support Scheme (SEISS) by West of England residents, amounting to £132.7 million. This represents 76% of people in the region eligible for the support and is in line with the national average. Across the South West, the take up rate for self-employment support was highest amongst service activities (86%); construction (83%); and education (80%). This information is not yet available at a local authority level.
- The below table shows the number of people claiming out of work benefits. 5.3% of the region's workforce claimed out of work benefits in August 2020 (38,800 residents). This is similar to the 5.2% reported for July 2020. All four unitary authorities in the West of England saw a spike in the number of claimants in April and May 2020. This appears relatively stable in August 2020, however, there are now 23,920 more claimants in the West of England than there were in February 2020, before the effects of the pandemic hit.

	July 2020		August 2020	
	Number	% workforce	Number	% workforce
Bath and North East Somerset	5,220	4.2	5,410	4.4
Bristol City	20,470	6.4	20,835	6.6
North Somerset	6,180	5.0	6,180	5.0
South Gloucestershire	6,930	3.9	7,265	4.1
West of England Total	38,800	5.2	39,695	5.3

- There were 11,238 jobs advertised in the West of England in August 2020, up 23% from July 2020 suggesting some level of recovery in terms of available jobs. However, the level of availability is 18% lower than the level of jobs advertised in August 2019.
- Those with lower average annual earnings may be most impacted – 78% of the accommodation and food services workforce, and 72% of the arts, entertainment and recreation workforce have been furloughed. In the South West, average annual earnings for these workers in these workers is £15,300 and £17,900 respectively, compared to an average salary of £26,700 across all industries.

Wider and Linked Information

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) report '*Is Britain Fairer? 2018*' is the latest EHRC state-of-the-nation report on equality and human rights. This was published in 2019 prior to the advent of the Covid-19 pandemic, however is highly relevant when linked to the evidence of Covid-19 affecting life in South Gloucestershire in a wide range of ways including, but not limited to, physical and mental health, personal relationships, social interactions, jobs, finance and the natural environment. (Further details and links are shown in Appendix 2 of this EqIAA).

Work

Overall employment has risen and unemployment fallen, while the rate of insecure employment has risen both overall and for many groups.

Young people, disabled people, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people, and Muslims have consistently lower employment and higher unemployment rates and are more likely to be in insecure employment than other groups.

- Disabled people's employment rate is well below that of non-disabled people and they are more likely to be unemployed, in insecure employment, or economically inactive than non-disabled people.
- Employment rates vary considerably by type of impairment; the lowest rates are for those with learning difficulties, a speech condition or mental health conditions.
- Pakistani and Bangladeshi people have both particularly low employment rates and high unemployment rates, although their unemployment rates have fallen. They are also more likely than many other ethnic groups to be in insecure employment. The unemployment rates for the Mixed/Multiple and Black groups have fallen, but remain high.
- Among religion or belief groups, Muslims have the lowest rate of employment and the highest rate of unemployment and insecure employment.
- People aged 16–24 have much higher unemployment rates than those in all age groups up to the age 65–74.

Three-quarters of mothers have had a negative or possibly discriminatory experience during pregnancy, maternity leave or on their return to work from maternity leave.

There continues to be a pay gap between groups who share protected characteristics.

- Disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be in low-pay occupations.
- Women are much more likely to be in low-pay occupations than men, however the proportion of women in high-pay occupations has risen.

Living Standards

Homelessness disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, lone parents, young care leavers, young offenders, LGBT young people, transgender people, people with mental health conditions, women at risk of domestic abuse, ex-services personnel, and those living in material deprivation.

In England, people from ethnic minorities are still much more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation compared with White people.

Refugees and asylum seekers continue to be affected by poor housing. A more hostile housing policy environment towards Gypsies and Travellers in England has been linked to an increase in unauthorised encampments.

Responses to the Council budget and savings programme consultation 2020/21 found that people from BAME backgrounds and disabled people were more likely than average to select the area of 'Housing' as their highest priority area for investment over the next 10 years.

Child poverty has increased. Three in 10 children live in households in poverty, rising to over half of children in Bangladeshi, Black African, Pakistani and Other ethnicity households.

Disabled people, women, and many ethnic minorities are more likely to live in poverty or to experience severe material deprivation.

Food poverty continues to increase across Britain.

The South Gloucestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) reports that there are more than 6,000 children living in poverty in South Gloucestershire. South Gloucestershire has a lower percentage of children living in low income families (10.5%) than the South West (14.2%) or England (18.0%). Children in workless families are three times as likely to live in poverty compared to families where at least one parent works. South Gloucestershire has a lower rate of worklessness than the national average. In South Gloucestershire, the proportion of residents employed in occupations which usually require a low level of education is higher than the national and sub-regional averages. This suggests that there may be a higher proportion of South Gloucestershire residents in low paid jobs than other areas.

UK-wide reforms to social security and taxes since 2010 are having a disproportionately negative impact on the poorest in society and are particularly affecting women, disabled people, ethnic minorities and lone parents.

Benefit sanctions are applied inconsistently and may disproportionately impact disabled people, younger people, men and ethnic minorities.

Access to Healthcare

People with learning disabilities and disabled people more broadly, homeless people, refugees and asylum seekers and Gypsies, Roma and Travellers continue to experience the most significant barriers to accessing healthcare services.

Rules governing eligibility to NHS healthcare in England are inconsistently and incorrectly applied by healthcare providers resulting in refugees and asylum seekers being wrongly refused access to healthcare.

Men report slightly higher rates of good health than women and, overall, disabled people report much lower rates of good health.

Some groups experience worse physical and mental health outcomes than the rest of the population, particularly homeless people, transgender people, Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers and people with learning disabilities. These are linked with poorer socio-economic outcomes for these groups, which exacerbate poor health.

As more people are living to older age, many of those extra years are being spent in poor health (particularly by women), posing a greater demand on existing health and social care services.

On average, the life expectancy of women and men with a learning disability is 18 years and 14 years shorter than for non-disabled women and men, respectively.

In 2016, infant mortality increased following decades of decreases: In England and Wales, Pakistani and Black African groups had the highest infant mortality rates and the Other White ethnic group had the lowest rate. This pattern has continued since 2009. Infant mortality rates were higher in the most deprived areas compared with the least deprived areas in both England and Wales and increased risk of infant mortality is associated with higher levels of maternal deprivation.

Mental health

Lesbian, gay and bisexual people, and those reporting other sexual orientations were almost twice as likely (27.2%) as heterosexual people (14.3%) to report poor mental health in England.

45% of all looked after children in England have a diagnosable mental health condition (compared with 10% of all children).

In 2016/17, known rates of Mental Health Act 1983 detention in the Black or Black British group were over four times that of the White group, and rates of Community Treatment Order use were almost nine times those of the White group.

Justice and Personal Security

Increases in police recorded hate crime have been observed across all monitored hate crime strands in England and Wales, particularly for disability hate crimes.

Stand Against Racism and Inequality (SARI) work across our region providing support for victims of any type of hate crime. They report a significant rise in race-based hate incidents and crimes during June and July 2020. Avon and Somerset Police report an increase in race-based hate incidents despite a downturn in reporting during lockdown in April and May 2020. In 2018-19 SARI received 38 referrals from South Gloucestershire, compared to 52 referrals in 2019-20; for the first 5 months of 2020, SARI has received more referrals than in the first 5 months of the previous year.

There has been a sharp increase in the number of sexual offences and domestic abuse related offences reported to, and recorded by, the police in England and Wales, including non-recent sexual offences against children.

Those most at risk of sexual or domestic violence are women, LGB people and disabled people, particularly those with mental health conditions or learning disabilities.

South Gloucestershire Trends Analysis

The following information summarises the key trends emerging as a result of South Gloucestershire Council budget and savings programme consultations conducted since 2013. Full data tables are shown in [Appendix 1 of this EqlAA](#) 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 7 years of data which this EqlAA specifically investigates. In turn, this allows for an understanding of both trends and cumulative impacts in respect of protected characteristics to continue to mature and influence decisions and actions.

This information shows where patterns of certain protected characteristic groups reporting higher and lower levels of satisfaction with services has remained the same over successive years. These results are therefore considered a reliable indicator of levels of satisfaction for these groups compared to all respondents.

Satisfaction with Services - Trends

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	<p>Non-disabled people and people aged under 45 are consistently less satisfied than average with care for older people.</p> <p>Older people and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 42% and 49% respectively.</p>
Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties	<p>Non-disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>Disabled people and people aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 48% and 29% respectively.</p>
Children's Social Services	<p>Disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 17%.</p>
Customer services	<p>People from a BAME background are consistently more satisfied than average.</p> <p>People aged 45-64 are consistently less satisfied than average.</p>
Environmental health and trading standards	<p>People from BAME backgrounds are consistently more satisfied than average.</p>
Housing advice services	<p>Disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at 27%.</p>
Highways and Roads	<p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average; however, the satisfaction rates are not high at around 40%.</p>
Libraries	<p>People aged under 45 year are consistently more satisfied than average with a high satisfaction level of 77%. Females continue to be slightly more satisfied than average.</p>
Local Bus Services	<p>People aged over 65 years are consistently more satisfied than average with a high satisfaction level of 67%.</p> <p>People aged under 65 years and disabled people continue to be less satisfied than average with satisfaction levels of around 47% and 56% respectively.</p>

Satisfaction with Services – Trends (continued)

Service Area	Trends
Parks and open spaces	<p>Disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>Younger people are consistently more satisfied than average.</p>
Planning	<p>Disabled people and older people are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>People under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average with planning.</p>
Public Health	<p>There is a low level of satisfaction with people aged 45-64 being less satisfied in most years.</p>
Schools	<p>Older people are consistently less satisfied than average with schools.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average. Females show some consistency in being more satisfied than average.</p>
Sport and leisure facilities	<p>People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average.</p> <p>People aged under 45 years are consistently more satisfied than average.</p>
Waste and recycling services	<p>There are no significant trends in terms of satisfaction with services.</p>
Welfare benefits and council tax reduction for which the council is responsible	<p>People aged 35 – 64 and non disabled people are consistently less satisfied than average with welfare benefits and council tax.</p> <p>People aged over 65 years and disabled people are consistently more satisfied than average although satisfaction levels are not high at 40% and 47% respectively.</p>
Free Car parking	<p>This was the second year for a question surrounding free car parking and no significant trends are yet identified.</p>

The next 5 - 10 years

Again, this information shows the pattern of certain groups preferring a certain approach over successive years. These results are therefore considered a reliable indicator of levels of preference for these groups compared to all respondents.

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Support for targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	<p>The majority of respondents (68%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 65%)</p>
Support for reducing the quality of services provided	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (15%).</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, respondents have consistently not supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 20%)</p>
Support for increasing fees and charges for some services	<p>45% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (37%).</p>
Support for making more services available online	<p>The majority of respondents (60%) supported this approach.</p> <p>People aged under 45 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach (89% of 16 – 34 year olds; 88% of 35 – 44 year olds).</p> <p>People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (46%).</p>
Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	<p>The majority of respondents (62%) supported this approach.</p> <p>People aged under 65 are consistently more likely than average to support this approach (83% of 16 – 34 year olds; 88% of 35 – 44 year olds; 69% of 45 – 64 year olds).</p> <p>People aged over 65 and disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (50% and 49% respectively).</p>
Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	<p>The majority of respondents (87%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 7 years (average support over the 7 year period is 86%).</p>
Support for scaling back or stopping some services	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (17%).</p> <p>Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (13%).</p>

The next 5 - 10 years (continued)

Approach	Feedback and Trends
<p>Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable</p>	<p>Just 36% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>Regardless of protected characteristics, the average support over the 7 year period is 35%)</p>
<p>Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working</p>	<p>The majority of respondents (82%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 6 years (average support over the 6 year period is 83%).</p> <p>In addition, people aged under 45 years show a trend of having more support than average for this approach.</p>
<p>Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies</p>	<p>The majority of respondents (81%) supported this approach.</p> <p>Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last 6 years (average support over the 6 year period is 80%).</p>
<p>Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies</p>	<p>This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (19%).</p> <p>Males are consistently more likely than average to support this approach, however, only at level of 22% this year.</p> <p>Disabled people are consistently less likely than average to support this approach (16%).</p>
<p>Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils</p>	<p>43% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach. However, on the whole, younger people appear to show slightly more support for this approach than average across the 7 year period.</p>
<p>Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services</p>	<p>54% of respondents supported this approach.</p> <p>There are no clear trends relating to protected characteristic groups and this approach. Across the 7 year period, the average level of support for this approach is 54%.</p>

Priorities for investment in the next 10 years

In order of support gained (listed in order from highest to lowest). This information shows the results gained via the 2019-20 Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme consultation.

Priority	Feedback and Trends
Education	<p>25% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged 16 – 34 and people aged 35 – 44 were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (43% and 29% respectively).</p>
Health and wellbeing	<p>23% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged 16 – 34, people aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (28%, 28%, 30%, 28% respectively).</p>
Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults	<p>21% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>Females and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (24% and 30% respectively).</p>
Maintaining safe, strong and clean communities	<p>16% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (31%).</p> <p>People under 44 years were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (10.5%).</p>
Housing	<p>15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged over 65 and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (18% and 19% respectively).</p> <p>People under 44 years were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (8%).</p>

Priorities for investment in the next 10 years (continued)

Priority	Feedback and Trends
Developing infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail, broadband)	<p>15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged over 65 were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority area (19% respectively).</p> <p>People aged 34 - 65 were less likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (10.5%).</p>
Protecting the environment	<p>15% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged 16-34 years were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (19%).</p>
Meeting assessed social care needs for children and adults	<p>14% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>Females and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (16% and 17% respectively).</p>
Public transport	<p>12% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged 16-34, people aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (15%, 15%, 14% and 19% respectively).</p> <p>People aged over 65 years, disabled people and people from BAME backgrounds were also more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority in 2019/20.</p>
Employment	<p>10% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged over 65, were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (13%).</p> <p>People aged over 65 years, were also more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority in 2019/20.</p>
Reducing inequality and deprivation	<p>6% of respondents identified this as their highest priority.</p> <p>People aged 16-34 and disabled people were more likely than average to select this area as their highest priority (9%, and 8% respectively).</p>

The Local Area and the Council

This information shows the results gained via the 2019-20 Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme consultation.

Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live

The majority of respondents (79%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live.

People aged 16-34 were least likely to state satisfaction, however, 67% of 16-34 year olds still reported satisfaction.

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

Just 7% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got better as a place to live over the last two years.

30% of respondents stated that they felt the area had got worse as a place to live over the last two years. People aged 46-55 years were most likely to state the area had got worse (34%) and this group shows a trend over the last 6 year period for feeling that the area has got worse as a place to live.

Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things

65% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the Council runs things with no significant differences regardless of protected characteristics.

The Council providing value for money

46% of respondents felt that the Council provides value for money.

People over the age of 65 years are showing a trend for being more likely than average to agree that the Council provides value for money; however, there is still only 54% agreement amongst the over 65s age grouping.

People aged under 65 years are showing a trend for being more likely than average to disagree that the Council provides value for money; an average of 38% of people amongst the under 65s age groupings agreed that the Council provides value for money.

The council keeps me informed about services

47% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about the services it provides.

This rises to 52% agreement amongst people aged 16 – 34 years and falls to 40% agreement amongst disabled people.

The council keeps me informed about any proposals for change

47% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change.

There are no great differences amongst protected characteristic groups in regard to this question across the year, however it is worth noting that disabled people are more likely to disagree that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change.

I can influence decisions affecting my local area

Just 17% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area.

There are no significant trends to note regardless of protected characteristics.

The council acts on the concerns of local residents?

39% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents.

People aged 46 – 65 years show a trend for a lower level of agreement (33%).

People aged over 65 years show a trend for a lower level of agreement (46%).

CONSULTATION RESPONDENTS

The following table shows the number of respondents to the Budget Consultation process in each of the last 7 years:

	Total	Sex		Age			Disability		Ethnicity		Sexual Orientation					Gender Reassignment		Religion or Belief														
		Female	Male	16 - 34	35 - 44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion					
Number of responses 2014/15	681	315	314			83	357	200	46	576	584	27																				
Number of responses 2015/16	1426	682	716			349	563	491	185	1203	1275	35																				
Number of responses 2016/17	1127	508	568			361	561	170	102	949	931	86																				
Number of responses 2017/18	1270	595	616			188	432	591	171	1039	1051	88																				
Number of responses 2018/19	1045	480	519			138	218	667	107	843	928	52																				
Number of responses 2019/20	1753	841	853			669	559	453	212	1435	1537	84	35	37	10	1352	27	10	1542	3	815	8	3	6	1	17	691					
Number of responses 2020/21	1342	661	647	54	108	162	511	625	200	1068	1187	68	24	11	6	1050	21	2	1165	5	708	9	4	5	0	13	414					

In regard to the protected characteristics of 'Sexual Orientation', 'Gender Reassignment' and 'Religion or Belief', the Council continues to engage closely with community groups representing these areas and as a result, statistical information is supplemented via this proactive approach.

SECTION 3 - EqIAA OUTCOMES

This is an Initial EqIAA and as such there is no outcome at this stage. This section will be completed post consultation.

SECTION 4 – 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 2019-20 Consultation Output Report, January 2019
- South Gloucestershire Council Budget and Council Savings Plan 2019-20 Consultation Output Report, January 2020
- South Gloucestershire Annual Equalities Reports (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014 –15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19)
- [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
- Casey Review, December 2016

APPENDIX 1 – CONSULTATION DATA TABLES

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.

Care for older people

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	7%	11%	0%	7%	0%	11%	13%	0%	0%	0%	18%	4%
2020/21	34%	39%	30%	40%	22%		24%	42%	49%	29%	35%	31%	25%	0%	0%	37%	55%	0%	34%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%		33%	21%

Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	6%	15%	0%	5%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%	
2020/21	25%	30%	21%	40%	19%		21%	29%	48%	18%	26%	19%	25%	0%	33%	28%	38%	0%	27%	0%	34%	0%	33%	0%		0%	20%	

Children's social services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	4%	0%	4%	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%	0%	6%	3%	
2020/21	13%	11%	15%	56%	8%		13%	12%	17%	12%	11%	21%	13%	14%	33%	13%	0%	0%	14%	0%	11%	0%	0%		0%	0%	17%	

Customer Services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	28%	15%	70%	28%	0%	31%	25%	67%	0%	0%	29%	25%
2020/21	54%	56%	52%	67%	58%		46%	59%	52%	54%	55%	50%	56%	57%	50%	57%	62%	0%	56%	0%	62%	50%	50%	0%		33%	51%

Environmental health and trading standards

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
2014/15	53%	50%	56%			58%	55%	48%	29%	58%	55%	69%																
2014/15	29%	31%	30%			13%	38%	20%	27%	31%	31%	40%																
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%	13%	4%	70%	14%	0%	17%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	11%	
2020/21	40%	40%	40%	64%	35%		37%	41%	38%	41%	40%	37%	47%	50%	25%	42%	33%	0%	41%	25%	43%	0%	0%	0%		63%	40%	

Housing advice services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	5%	4%	70%	5%	0%	5%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%
2020/21	17%	17%	18%	20%	20%		16%	17%	27%	13%	17%	29%	10%	14%	33%	16%	29%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%		25%	16%	

Highways and roads

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	23%	25%	23%			35%	24%	19%	10%	25%	23%	27%															
2014/15	16%	15%	18%			17%	16%	18%	16%	17%	16%	28%															
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%	29%	22%	70%	27%	33%	27%	13%	0%	33%	0%	35%	29%
2020/21	33%	38%	29%	43%	40%		32%	32%	31%	35%	34%	35%	27%	36%	33%	36%	24%	0%	35%	20%	33%	29%	50%	60%		54%	36%

Libraries

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	39%	33%	80%	38%	33%	40%	38%	0%	50%	100%	41%	34%
2020/21	68%	73%	63%	77%	77%		62%	69%	68%	68%	68%	71%	60%	29%	75%	71%	75%	0%	69%	40%	71%	40%	67%	100%		43%	71%

Local bus services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	53%	52%	54%			55%	52%	54%	30%	55%	53%	50%															
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%	33%	41%	70%	34%	67%	38%	25%	33%	17%	0%	35%	30%
2020/21	57%	59%	57%	50%	43%		47%	67%	56%	58%	57%	58%	65%	55%	100%	59%	58%	0%	58%	75%	63%	71%	75%	75%		45%	52%

Parks and open spaces

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	69%	52%	80%	69%	67%	69%	88%	33%	33%	0%	59%	69%	
2020/21	79%	78%	80%	85%	83%		76%	80%	71%	80%	80%	66%	71%	91%	100%	80%	81%	50%	80%	100%	80%	75%	75%	20%		75%	80%	

Planning

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	12%	7%	70%	13%	0%	14%	13%	0%	50%	0%	6%	12%	
2020/21	24%	24%	24%	29%	38%		26%	20%	22%	25%	24%	31%	31%	22%	25%	25%	10%	0%	24%	67%	25%	0%	33%	0%		38%	25%	

Public Health (not including NHS services)

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	14%	15%	70%	13%	0%	17%	25%	0%	17%	0%	12%	11%
2020/21	35%	34%	36%	53%	33%		32%	36%	36%	36%	36%	34%	33%	38%	25%	37%	38%	0%	36%	67%	40%	0%	0%	33%		50%	31%

Schools

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	19%	11%	80%	19%	0%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%	18%	20%
2020/21	46%	50%	42%	74%	67%		43%	38%	47%	47%	46%	48%	40%	14%	33%	49%	56%	0%	48%	50%	47%	40%	0%	0%		29%	49%

Sport and leisure facilities

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	47%	30%	80%	46%	33%	46%	63%	67%	67%	0%	24%	48%
2020/21	68%	67%	68%	89%	72%		68%	64%	58%	71%	69%	63%	62%	43%	60%	70%	67%	0%	69%	75%	68%	67%	67%		50%	71%	

Waste and recycling services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	73%	56%	90%	73%	67%	73%	63%	33%	50%	0%	82%	73%
2020/21	77%	80%	76%	85%	71%		74%	81%	74%	79%	78%	80%	71%	64%	67%	79%	86%	50%	79%	60%	81%	78%	50%	80%		67%	77%

Welfare benefits and council tax reduction

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	12%	26%	70%	13%	0%	17%	25%	0%	0%	0%	35%	10%
2020/21	34%	35%	34%	47%	21%		27%	40%	47%	29%	35%	15%	38%	25%	100%	33%	38%	0%	34%	33%	39%	0%	50%	50%		20%	29%

Free car parking

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2019/20	50%	50%	50%			55%	49%	55%	47%	51%	52%	31%	66%	49%	50%	51%	41%	70%	51%	33%	51%	25%	67%	67%	0%	47%	52%
2020/21	63%	63%	64%	70%	63%		60%	65%	60%	64%	64%	56%	65%	40%	83%	65%	43%	100%	64%	80%	67%	40%	75%	50%		55%	60%

The next 5 – 10 years

In the next 5 - 10 years, the council will continue to find ways to make services more affordable to run. How strongly do you agree or disagree with using the following approaches?

Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	70%	48%	70%	69%	67%	66%	100%	67%	50%	100%	71%	72%	
2020/21	68%	66%	69%	72%	69%		69%	66%	67%	68%	68%	57%	71%	73%	50%	68%	67%	50%	67%	60%	67%	56%	100%	40%		46%	69%	

Support for reducing the quality of services provided

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	16%	22%	80%	16%	33%	15%	25%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%	
2020/21	15%	16%	13%	9%	13%		17%	13%	14%	15%	14%	10%	21%	36%	0%	15%	14%	0%	15%	0%	15%	11%	25%	0%		0%	16%	

Support for increasing fees and charges for some services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	44%	33%	80%	43%	33%	40%	50%	33%	67%	0%	41%	48%	
2020/21	45%	44%	47%	52%	49%		48%	41%	37%	47%	45%	37%	46%	55%	17%	46%	48%	0%	45%	0%	44%	44%	75%	0%		46%	50%	

Support for making more services available online

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	70%	52%	90%	69%	67%	59%	100%	33%	100%	0%	65%	80%
2020/21	60%	58%	63%	89%	88%		67%	46%	46%	64%	60%	62%	71%	73%	83%	61%	48%	100%	61%	20%	56%	67%	50%	60%		62%	70%

Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	71%	56%	90%	70%	67%	60%	100%	33%	83%	0%	53%	81%
2020/21	62%	59%	66%	83%	88%		69%	50%	49%	66%	62%	63%	67%	73%	67%	64%	43%	100%	62%	20%	57%	67%	50%	80%		77%	72%

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	88%	63%	90%	88%	67%	86%	100%	67%	100%	100%	76%	89%	
2020/21	87%	86%	89%	96%	93%		88%	85%	85%	88%	87%	85%	96%	91%	83%	89%	81%	50%	88%	80%	88%	89%	75%	100%		54%	88%	

Support for scaling back or stopping some services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	18%	15%	80%	18%	0%	20%	13%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%	
2020/21	17%	15%	19%	6%	9%		19%	17%	13%	18%	16%	16%	13%	18%	0%	17%	10%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	40%		8%	18%	

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	40%	33%	80%	39%	33%	38%	25%	100%	33%	100%	47%	40%	
2020/21	36%	36%	37%	24%	22%		35%	41%	32%	38%	36%	34%	42%	9%	17%	37%	43%	0%	37%	0%	37%	56%	50%	20%		31%	36%	

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	86%	63%	90%	85%	67%	81%	88%	100%	100%	0%	94%	88%	
2020/21	82%	80%	83%	91%	91%		83%	79%	74%	85%	82%	84%	79%	82%	67%	84%	67%	100%	83%	60%	81%	89%	75%	60%		62%	87%	

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	82%	67%	90%	80%	33%	78%	88%	67%	100%	0%	82%	83%
2020/21	81%	79%	84%	87%	81%		81%	81%	76%	83%	81%	85%	88%	91%	50%	82%	81%	100%	81%	80%	81%	89%	75%	40%		62%	83%

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	20%	19%	80%	20%	0%	19%	13%	0%	67%	0%	35%	21%
2020/21	19%	17%	22%	9%	21%		20%	19%	16%	20%	19%	22%	29%	9%	0%	19%	33%	0%	19%	0%	21%	22%	25%	0%		23%	17%

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	47%	44%	80%	46%	33%	46%	50%	33%	83%	0%	71%	46%
2020/21	43%	42%	44%	54%	36%		43%	43%	41%	44%	44%	44%	67%	36%	0%	44%	62%	50%	44%	40%	44%	67%	25%	40%		54%	43%

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	54%	59%	80%	53%	33%	55%	88%	33%	83%	100%	59%	51%
2020/21	54%	55%	53%	52%	45%		50%	58%	48%	55%	53%	62%	63%	55%	83%	55%	62%	50%	55%	60%	58%	67%	75%	60%		23%	50%

Which of the following areas would you choose as the three highest priorities for investment in the next 10 years?

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Employment																										
Highest Priority	10%	9%	11%	9%	7%	8%	13%	12%	10%	10%	12%	13%	9%	50%	9%	33%	50%	10%	20%	12%	0%	25%	20%		15%	6%
Second Priority	8%	7%	8%	9%	6%	8%	7%	9%	8%	7%	12%	4%	0%	0%	8%	10%	0%	8%	20%	9%	0%	0%	0%		8%	6%
Third Priority	6%	6%	6%	2%	3%	5%	8%	8%	6%	6%	6%	4%	9%	0%	6%	10%	0%	7%	0%	6%	11%	0%	0%		0%	7%
Housing																										
Highest Priority	15%	14%	15%	9%	7%	13%	18%	19%	13%	15%	10%	4%	27%	17%	14%	33%	50%	14%	0%	16%	0%	25%	20%		8%	13%
Second Priority	10%	10%	10%	6%	6%	8%	12%	12%	10%	10%	18%	4%	0%	0%	10%	14%	0%	10%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		8%	8%
Third Priority	7%	7%	7%	9%	5%	7%	7%	9%	6%	7%	4%	4%	0%	17%	7%	0%	0%	7%	40%	8%	11%	0%	0%		15%	6%
Education																										
Highest Priority	25%	23%	27%	43%	29%	20%	27%	23%	24%	24%	24%	25%	18%	0%	24%	38%	50%	25%	20%	26%	0%	25%	60%		8%	23%
Second Priority	12%	11%	13%	17%	12%	11%	12%	10%	12%	12%	21%	17%	9%	17%	12%	10%	0%	12%	20%	12%	44%	0%	0%		15%	12%
Third Priority	9%	8%	10%	9%	12%	10%	8%	12%	8%	9%	9%	8%	9%	0%	9%	5%	0%	9%	0%	9%	11%	25%	0%		23%	7%
Health and wellbeing																										
Highest Priority	23%	23%	22%	28%	16%	18%	28%	30%	21%	22%	28%	21%	36%	50%	20%	76%	50%	22%	20%	24%	44%	0%	20%		23%	17%
Second Priority	12%	13%	12%	11%	5%	12%	14%	10%	12%	0%	0%	13%	0%	17%	13%	5%	0%	12%	40%	13%	0%	25%	20%		23%	10%
Third Priority	6%	5%	7%	2%	7%	6%	6%	6%	7%	6%	3%	8%	0%	33%	7%	5%	0%	7%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%		0%	8%
Maintaining safe, strong and clean communities																										
Highest Priority	16%	17%	16%	7%	14%	14%	18%	16%	16%	15%	31%	4%	9%	0%	16%	38%	50%	17%	0%	19%	33%	0%	20%		8%	12%
Second Priority	13%	11%	14%	7%	11%	12%	14%	10%	13%	13%	7%	8%	18%	33%	13%	19%	0%	12%	20%	12%	0%	25%	40%		15%	14%
Third Priority	10%	11%	9%	11%	12%	13%	8%	8%	11%	10%	10%	17%	9%	17%	10%	5%	0%	11%	20%	9%	22%	25%	0%		8%	12%

	Total (all respondents)	Male	Female	16-34	35-44	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
Reducing inequality and deprivation																										
Highest Priority	6%	6%	7%	9%	6%	6%	7%	8%	6%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	6%	19%	0%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%		0%	7%
Second Priority	8%	8%	7%	9%	3%	6%	10%	11%	7%	7%	9%	8%	9%	0%	7%	29%	50%	7%	20%	9%	11%	0%	20%		8%	6%
Third Priority	7%	6%	7%	6%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	7%	1%	17%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	20%	7%	0%	0%	0%		0%	6%
Safeguarding vulnerable children and adults																										
Highest Priority	21%	18%	24%	11%	22%	19%	24%	30%	19%	21%	13%	4%	18%	0%	21%	62%	50%	21%	20%	22%	0%	25%	20%		31%	19%
Second Priority	13%	12%	14%	9%	14%	11%	14%	15%	13%	13%	13%	13%	0%	0%	13%	14%	0%	13%	20%	14%	11%	25%	0%		0%	11%
Third Priority	8%	9%	8%	9%	8%	9%	8%	11%	8%	8%	13%	8%	9%	0%	8%	10%	0%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%	40%		15%	8%
Meeting assessed social care needs for children and adults																										
Highest Priority	14%	12%	16%	9%	8%	15%	15%	17%	13%	14%	6%	4%	18%	0%	13%	48%	50%	14%	0%	16%	0%	25%	0%		0%	12%
Second Priority	12%	11%	11%	6%	6%	11%	13%	15%	10%	11%	9%	8%	18%	0%	12%	5%	0%	12%	40%	12%	11%	0%	20%		31%	10%
Third Priority	9%	8%	10%	4%	15%	8%	9%	11%	9%	9%	13%	8%	0%	0%	10%	10%	0%	9%	0%	10%	22%	0%	0%		8%	7%
Protecting the environment																										
Highest Priority	15%	13%	16%	19%	14%	15%	15%	13%	15%	15%	13%	21%	27%	0%	14%	38%	50%	15%	20%	14%	11%	0%	20%		23%	15%
Second Priority	13%	13%	14%	7%	14%	13%	14%	13%	14%	14%	10%	8%	18%	17%	12%	19%	0%	13%	20%	13%	0%	0%	0%		15%	14%
Third Priority	12%	12%	11%	24%	10%	8%	14%	10%	12%	0%	0%	8%	18%	17%	12%	0%	0%	12%	20%	13%	0%	0%	20%		8%	12%
Public transport																										
Highest Priority	12%	11%	12%	15%	6%	9%	15%	14%	11%	12%	19%	13%	9%	0%	10%	29%	50%	11%	20%	12%	33%	0%	20%		23%	9%
Second Priority	12%	13%	12%	19%	12%	11%	13%	13%	12%	12%	19%	0%	36%	0%	13%	24%	50%	13%	20%	14%	11%	25%	20%		8%	12%
Third Priority	12%	14%	11%	7%	6%	12%	13%	12%	12%	12%	6%	29%	18%	0%	12%	10%	0%	12%	0%	12%	0%	0%	0%		31%	13%
Developing infrastructure (e.g. roads, rail, broadband)																										
Highest Priority	15%	15%	15%	13%	9%	13%	19%	16%	15%	14%	13%	17%	18%	17%	14%	33%	100%	15%	0%	17%	22%	0%	20%		8%	13%
Second Priority	13%	13%	13%	7%	7%	15%	13%	11%	13%	13%	10%	17%	27%	0%	13%	29%	0%	13%	20%	14%	0%	0%	20%		23%	12%
Third Priority	12%	14%	10%	13%	10%	12%	11%	11%	12%	12%	12%	4%	18%	0%	11%	10%	0%	12%	0%	11%	0%	25%	20%		8%	11%

Your 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?

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
better 2015/16	61%	56%	65%			61%	60%	60%	49%	62%	61%	52%															
better 2016/17	11%	9%	12%			9%	12%	11%	9%	11%	11%	16%															
better 2017/18	9%	9%	9%			10%	7%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%															
better 2018/19	8%	8%	8%			7%	7%	8%	11%	7%	8%	10%															
better 2019/20	8%	8%	9%			11%	7%	7%	4%	9%	9%	8%	29%	24%	30%	9%	7%	70%	9%	0%	7%	13%	0%	17%	0%	18%	11%
better 2020/21	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%		6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	10%	8%	18%	17%	7%	14%	0%	7%	0%	8%	22%	25%	0%		8%	6%
worse 2015/16	25%	27%	22%			21%	29%	23%	24%	26%	27%	24%															
worse 2016/17	23%	18%	27%			22%	24%	22%	29%	22%	22%	14%															
worse 2017/18	27%	25%	28%			24%	33%	23%	26%	27%	26%	31%															
worse 2018/19	26%	24%	28%			19%	30%	26%	21%	26%	25%	17%															
worse 2019/20	29%	29%	29%			35%	35%	25%	32%	29%	29%	25%	14%	14%	40%	28%	44%	30%	28%	0%	26%	38%	67%	67%	0%	29%	28%
worse 2020/21	30%	31%	28%	17%	28%		34%	27%	33%	29%	30%	16%	25%	0%	0%	28%	29%	50%	28%	40%	27%	0%	50%	40%		15%	30%

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

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
2014/15	81%	80%	82%			80%	82%	80%	82%	81%	82%	74%																
2015/16	63%	69%	60%			66%	65%	63%	50%	65%	65%	60%																
2016/17	81%	84%	81%			83%	81%	81%	71%	83%	84%	78%																
2017/18	81%	84%	78%			83%	81%	81%	79%	82%	82%	74%																
2018/19	81%	85%	79%			83%	74%	84%	84%	82%	83%	77%																
2019/20	81%	83%	80%			87%	79%	84%	81%	82%	83%	68%	71%	92%	90%	84%	74%	90%	83%	67%	85%	63%	67%	33%	100%	76%	82%	
2020/21	79%	80%	78%	67%	82%		78%	80%	80%	79%	80%	62%	58%	100%	100%	81%	90%	50%	80%	60%	83%	56%	25%	40%		85%	77%	

Satisfaction with the way the council runs things

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	64%	59%	80%	63%	33%	67%	63%	0%	33%	100%	65%	60%	
2020/21	65%	68%	62%	63%	59%		63%	69%	61%	66%	66%	57%	63%	82%	67%	68%	71%	50%	67%	20%	70%	44%	25%	40%		46%	67%	

Agreement that the council provides value for money

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
2014/15	45%	43%	47%			44%	41%	51%	47%	45%	46%	39%															
2015/16	54%	54%	54%			59%	54%	54%	33%	56%	55%	44%															
2016/17	49%	54%	47%			47%	52%	48%	48%	50%	52%	52%															
2017/18	47%	50%	45%			40%	42%	54%	46%	48%	49%	40%															
2018/19	43%	46%	41%			33%	37%	48%	46%	44%	45%	40%															
2019/20	41%	42%	40%			41%	40%	46%	35%	43%	41%	37%	71%	32%	50%	43%	37%	80%	43%	0%	48%	13%	33%	33%	0%	59%	37%
2020/21	46%	49%	43%	33%	42%		40%	54%	46%	46%	47%	37%	58%	45%	50%	49%	67%	0%	48%	40%	53%	33%	25%	40%		38%	43%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about services

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	43%	37%	80%	42%	33%	43%	25%	33%	33%	100%	76%	41%
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	52%	38%		50%	45%	40%	48%	47%	44%	50%	64%	0%	49%	52%	50%	49%	20%	48%	33%	25%	60%		31%	50%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about proposals for change

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	44%	41%	90%	44%	33%	44%	25%	67%	67%	100%	59%	44%	
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	57%	44%		47%	46%	41%	48%	47%	43%	54%	73%	0%	50%	57%	50%	49%	40%	50%	33%	25%	40%		31%	49%	

Ability to influence decisions in the local area

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	
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%	18%	26%	70%	19%	0%	19%	0%	0%	33%	100%	41%	19%	
2020/21	17%	18%	16%	30%	21%		17%	16%	14%	18%	17%	15%	25%	27%	0%	18%	14%	0%	18%	20%	18%	11%	25%	0%		15%	20%	

Agreement that the council acts on the concerns of residents

	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Non White British	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Heterosexual	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion
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%	34%	41%	70%	34%	33%	37%	13%	0%	17%	0%	65%	29%
2020/21	39%	40%	38%	35%	32%		33%	46%	37%	38%	38%	35%	46%	36%	0%	42%	57%	50%	41%	60%	45%	44%	50%	40%	0%	38%	35%

APPENDIX 2 - NATIONAL INFORMATION

The following information shows important findings in relation to national research conducted in respect of equalities and inequalities. The information is shown in order to highlight issues on a national level which are pertinent to the residents of South Gloucestershire.

For ease of reading, the following hyperlinks are included to allow readers of this document to skip directly to information which may be of particular interest:

How Fair is Britain?

In 2010, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) produced its first progress report on equality, entitled “**How Fair is Britain?**”

In October 2015, the EHRC published its follow-up report on both equality and human rights, entitled “**Is Britain Fairer?**”

The latest EHRC report, published in 2019, entitled “**How Fair is Britain? (2018)**” is available [here](#).

Note:	A brief overview of findings is shown on pages 50-56 of this EqIAA.
--------------	--

Race Disparity Audit

The Government’s “**Race Disparity Audit**” report was published in October 2017. An overview of findings is shown under the following headings:-

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Hyperlinks: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full Report• Communities• Poverty and Living Standards• Education• Employment• Housing• Policing• Criminal Justice• Health• The Public Sector Workforce |
|--------------------|--|

The Casey Review

“**The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration**” set out to look at: how well we get on with each other; how well we all do compared to each other. An overview of findings is shown under the following headings:-

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Hyperlinks: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full Report• Social and Economic Exclusion• Equality and Division• Leadership• Recommendations |
|--------------------|--|

HOW FAIR IS BRITAIN 2018 – OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS

EDUCATION

Attainment at school-leaving age has improved for some groups in recent years. However, inequalities persist:

- On average, boys continue to do worse than girls at school.
- Children with educational support needs, poorer children and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children continue to achieve below-average school exam results.
- Gender differences in career aspirations emerge at an early age.
- Boys aged 7–11 are 20 times more likely than girls to aspire to be an engineer or architect.

The overall exclusion rate is on the rise in England and Wales. There are major differences in the exclusion rate of different groups:

- Boys are more likely than girls to be excluded from school.
- Children with educational support needs, children from disadvantaged backgrounds and Gypsy and Traveller children have high exclusion rates.
- White children tend to have comparatively high exclusion rates compared with other ethnicities across Britain. But in England, Black and Mixed ethnicity children are more likely to be excluded than their White British peers.

Half of all children report that they are bullied. Certain groups are at greater risk than others:

- Girls are more likely than boys to be bullied; more than a third of young women experience sexist comments online.
- Bullying of lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT) children is highly prevalent and has been linked with mental health conditions and higher risk of suicide.

The overall proportion of young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEET) has declined:

- Disabled people are around twice as likely as non-disabled people to be NEET.

The proportion of people holding degree-level qualifications increased between 2013/14 and 2016/17. Some groups are more likely to go to university, and succeed there, than others:

- Women are more likely than men to pursue higher education. However, women continue to be under-represented in most science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) courses.
- Women perform better than men in higher education, on average.
- In terms of access to higher education, the gap between disadvantaged white men and the average is particularly large.
- Overall, the proportion of higher education students from poor backgrounds is increasing, but remains small.
- White British people are less likely to have a degree than those from ethnic minorities.
- However, white students are much more likely to receive a first or 2:1 than ethnic minority students.

Disabled people continue to be less likely to hold a degree than non-disabled people and are more likely to drop out; they are also less likely to engage in ongoing, lifelong learning.

WORK

Overall employment has risen and unemployment fallen, while the rate of insecure employment has risen both overall and for many groups.

Young people, disabled people, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people, and Muslims have consistently lower employment and higher unemployment rates and are more likely to be in insecure employment than other groups.

- Differences in employment and unemployment rates for some groups have narrowed.
- Disabled people's employment rate is well below that of non-disabled people and they are more likely to be unemployed, in insecure employment, or economically inactive than non-disabled people.
- Employment rates vary considerably by type of impairment; the lowest rates are for those with learning difficulties, a speech condition or mental health conditions.
- Pakistani and Bangladeshi people have both particularly low employment rates and high unemployment rates, although their unemployment rates have fallen. They are also more likely than many other ethnic groups to be in insecure employment. The unemployment rates for the Mixed/Multiple and Black groups have fallen, but remain high.
- Among religion or belief groups, Muslims have the lowest rate of employment and the highest rate of unemployment and insecure employment.
- People aged 16–24 have much higher unemployment rates than those in all age groups up to the age 65–74.

Bullying and sexual harassment remain widespread in the workplace, although a lack of recent large-scale Britain-wide surveys means that it is difficult to quantify their precise extent. There is some evidence that women, particularly young women, ethnic minorities, LGB and transgender people are at greater risk than other groups.

Three-quarters of mothers have had a negative or possibly discriminatory experience during pregnancy, maternity leave or on their return to work from maternity leave.

There continues to be a pay gap between groups who share protected characteristics. The gender pay gap in hourly earnings for full-time employees in Britain has narrowed. It is consistently wider in England than in Scotland or Wales.

- Disabled people have lower average hourly earnings than non-disabled people and the size of the pay gap varies according to the type of impairment.
- The size of the gender pay gap for full-time employees varies considerably between occupations and is particularly wide for those in skilled trades and for process, plant and machine operatives. It also varies considerably between industries and is particularly wide in the finance sector.

There has been a small increase in the proportion of people in high-pay occupations.

- However, against this overall change there was an increase in the proportions of disabled people in low-pay occupations. Disabled people were more likely than non-disabled people to be in low-pay occupations.
- Women are much more likely to be in low-pay occupations than men, however the proportion of women in high-pay occupations has risen.

Although women's share of company board positions has increased considerably in recent years, they remain under-represented on them and are still much more likely to be non-executive directors than executive directors.

Apprenticeships remain strongly segregated by sex and women are still under-represented in the construction and engineering sectors.

LIVING STANDARDS

Homelessness continues to be a serious concern across all nations. Evidence links this to recent UK-wide reforms to social security, as well as a lack of affordable housing and reductions in local authority budgets to tackle homelessness. Recent legislative and policy measures to address homelessness are welcome but it is too early to evaluate their impact.

- Homelessness disproportionately affects ethnic minorities, lone parents, young care leavers, young offenders, LGBT young people, transgender people, people with mental health conditions, women at risk of domestic abuse, ex-services personnel, and those living in material deprivation.

In England, people from ethnic minorities are still much more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation compared with White people. Across Britain, disabled people face a shortage of accessible and adaptable homes and long delays in making existing homes accessible.

Refugees and asylum seekers continue to be affected by poor housing. A more hostile housing policy environment towards Gypsies and Travellers in England has been linked to an increase in unauthorised encampments.

Child poverty has increased. Three in 10 children live in households in poverty, rising to over half of children in Bangladeshi, Black African, Pakistani and Other ethnicity households.

There has been little change overall in the proportion of adults living in poverty and the overall proportion in severe material deprivation has reduced.

Disabled people, women, and many ethnic minorities are more likely to live in poverty or to experience severe material deprivation.

- Food poverty continues to increase across Britain. Fuel poverty has remained stable in England but reduced in Scotland and is estimated to have reduced in Wales.
- UK-wide reforms to social security and taxes since 2010 are having a disproportionately negative impact on the poorest in society and are particularly affecting women, disabled people, ethnic minorities and lone parents.
- Benefit sanctions are applied inconsistently and may disproportionately impact disabled people, younger people, men and ethnic minorities.
- The proportion of social care service users reporting that they were treated with dignity and respect increased in England but declined slightly in Scotland. Older people and those with physical disabilities, frailty and sensory impairments were less likely to report this in England. In Scotland, older people, people with all impairment types, bisexual people and those of 'Other' sexual orientation were less likely to report this.
- Reductions to social care funding in England have led to concerns about their effect on the availability and quality of care provided, and the impact on people's ability to live independently. Scottish and Welsh Governments have protected social care funding although the amount available has reduced in real terms due to rising need for services and no research has yet assessed the potential impact on the quality of care provided.

HEALTH

Access to healthcare

Across Britain, patients are unable to access the quality service and treatment they need in line with referral and waiting time targets set by respective governments:

- Waiting times have increased in all three countries since 2014. In March 2017, nearly one in 10 people (9.7%) in England who were waiting for treatment had waited for more than 18 weeks. In Scotland one in six people (16.8%) who received treatment had waited for more than 18 weeks since referral. In Wales, nearly one in eight people (12.0%) were waiting for health services for more than 26 weeks since referral.
- People with learning disabilities and disabled people more broadly, homeless people, refugees and asylum seekers and Gypsies, Roma and Travellers continue to experience the most significant barriers to accessing healthcare services.
- Transgender people experience considerable barriers to accessing specialist services in England and Wales, and face poor treatment and discrimination when accessing general health services.
- Workforce shortages across the health and social care sector in Britain have had an impact on the quality of and timely access to health services.
- Rules governing eligibility to NHS healthcare in England are inconsistently and incorrectly applied by healthcare providers resulting in refugees and asylum seekers being wrongly refused access to healthcare.

Health outcomes

In 2015, 75.8% of adults in England, 80.6% of adults in Wales and 73.0% of adults in Scotland (in 2016) reported good health:

- Men report slightly higher rates than women and, overall, disabled people report much lower rates of good health.

Some groups experience worse physical and mental health outcomes than the rest of the population, particularly homeless people, transgender people, Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, refugees and asylum seekers and people with learning disabilities. These are linked with poorer socio-economic outcomes for these groups, which exacerbate poor health.

As more people are living to older age, many of those extra years are being spent in poor health (particularly by women), posing a greater demand on existing health and social care services.

On average, the life expectancy of women and men with a learning disability is 18 years and 14 years shorter than for non-disabled women and men, respectively.

In 2016, infant mortality increased following decades of decreases:

- In England and Wales, Pakistani and Black African groups had the highest infant mortality rates and the Other White ethnic group had the lowest rate. This pattern has continued since 2009.
- Infant mortality rates were higher in the most deprived areas compared with the least deprived areas in both England and Wales and increased risk of infant mortality is associated with higher levels of maternal deprivation.

In 2016, men were more likely to die by suicide than women: in Britain and England, three times more likely; in Wales over four times more likely; and in Scotland over two-and-a-half times more likely.

In 2016, the suicide rate for those aged 45–54 was almost double that for those aged 15–24 in Britain. This pattern was repeated across England and Scotland.

Mental health

The lack of ring-fenced funding for mental health in England, Wales and Scotland risks money being diverted away from mental health to fund other services.

Overall, more adults in Wales report poor mental health than in England and Scotland:

- Lesbian, gay and bisexual people, and those reporting other sexual orientations were almost twice as likely (27.2%) as heterosexual people (14.3%) to report poor mental health in England.
- 45% of all looked after children in England have a diagnosable mental health condition (compared with 10% of all children).

Access to specialist perinatal mental health services is extremely poor; 40% of people in the UK have no access at all. This is worse in Wales where 70% of people have no access.

Despite numerous programmes to help children and young people with mental health needs, learning disabilities and/or autism in England, this has not yet resulted in improved access or outcomes for children and young people in need of mental health services.

In 2016/17, known rates of Mental Health Act 1983 detention in the Black or Black British group were over four times that of the White group, and rates of Community Treatment Order use were almost nine times those of the White group.

The use of restrictive interventions on mental health service users is also over three times higher for Black or Black British groups compared with White British.

JUSTICE AND PERSONAL SECURITY

Civil and criminal justice

Overall confidence in the justice systems of Britain remains high, but there is evidence of lower levels of confidence among some groups:

- Just 43% of disabled adults in England and Wales reported that the criminal justice system is effective, compared with an average of 53%.
- Only 54% of Black Caribbean adults in England and Wales reported that the criminal justice system is fair, compared with an average of 68%.

Employment tribunal claims have increased substantially across Britain since the abolition of employment tribunal fees in July 2017, but are still below the levels seen before the fees were introduced.

The volume of legal aid applications granted in England and Wales continues to fall, with evidence suggesting this has had a negative impact on people's access to affordable advice and access to justice generally.

Violence and abuse

Increases in police recorded hate crime have been observed across all monitored hate crime strands in England and Wales, particularly for disability hate crimes. There has been a decrease in the number of racially aggravated charges recorded in Scotland.

Homicide rates in England have reached their highest level since 2010/11, but remain low by historic standards.

There has been a sharp increase in the number of sexual offences and domestic abuse related offences reported to, and recorded by, the police in England and Wales, including non-recent sexual offences against children.

Those most at risk of sexual or domestic violence are women, LGB people and disabled people, particularly those with mental health conditions or learning disabilities.

Conditions of detention

Two-thirds of adult prisons are overcrowded in England and Wales, posing potential risks for prisoner safety.

People from ethnic minorities continue to be over-represented in the adult prison population and within the youth secure estate in England and Wales, despite an overall decrease in the number of young people in custody.

The use of police stations as a place of safety for people detained under the Mental Health Act has decreased considerably in England and Wales.

There has been a considerable increase in self-harm and assault incidents in prisons across Britain and an increase in the rate of non-natural deaths among prisoners in England and Wales.

The number of self-harm incidents requiring medical treatment in immigration detention settings almost trebled between 2011 and 2017.

PARTICIPATION

Political and civic participation and representation

There was an increased voter turnout between the 2015 and 2017 General Elections, but younger people and ethnic minorities are still less likely to take part in political activities, to be on the electoral register, or to vote. In Scotland 16 and 17 year olds now have the vote.

Prisoners released on temporary licence will now be permitted to vote in UK elections.

Women remain under-represented among local election candidates and in public appointments, and in England and Wales there remains a lack of disabled and ethnic minority magistrates.

Access to services

Transport services are at risk of becoming less accessible for disabled and older people, because of reductions in bus services and inconsistency of government public transport policy.

Being older, a disabled person, or living in a rural area remain risk factors for digital exclusion, although personal internet use is improving among those groups. In Wales and Scotland, there continue to be areas of digital exclusion in rural areas.

Fewer older people, disabled people, women and those from lower socio-economic groups access cultural and leisure services.

Privacy and surveillance

Internet use in Britain is increasing while the number of people who do not share information online is few and declining, therefore the potential impact from breaches of privacy online is increasing.

There is uncertainty around the extent to which the UK Government's bulk powers of surveillance, particularly regarding the retention of communications data and its use, are compliant with human rights law.

Social and community cohesion

Feelings of trust and belonging to one's local area tend to be lower among ethnic minorities, younger people, those from lower socio-economic backgrounds or who are economically excluded, and for those living in urban areas.

Recent public discourse and policy-making around social cohesion has focused predominantly on the exclusion of ethnic minorities while evidence suggests other groups are also at risk from isolation including young people, LGBT groups, disabled people and older people. However, there is little evidence on what works to foster social and community cohesion.

RACE DISPARITY AUDIT

The Government's "Race Disparity Audit" report was published in October 2017.

Overall, the audit shows that there are disparities between ethnic groups in all areas of life affected by public organisations. Some are more pronounced than others or have a greater impact on people's life chances and quality of life. In some areas, disparities are reducing, while in others, they are static or increasing.

Key findings include:-

Communities

The UK has become more ethnically diverse. The proportion of people identifying as White British in England and Wales decreased from 87.4% in 2001 to 80.5% in 2011.

The majority, 87%, of the usual resident population of England and Wales in 2011 were born in the UK, and 13% (7.5 million) were born outside the UK.

The majority of people in each ethnic group also felt a sense of belonging to their local neighbourhood. This was similar across ethnic groups, and manifested in a range of positive civic behaviours and attitudes. More than three quarters of people from each ethnic group felt that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together: Black people reported the lowest levels and people from an Asian background reported very high levels. However, Black people – together with White people and people in the Other group – were the most likely to participate in some regular formal volunteering. Black people felt appreciably more able to influence decisions that affect their local area (such as contacting their councillor) than White people.

Poverty and living standards

Asian and Black households and those in the Other ethnic group were more likely to be poor and were the most likely to be in persistent poverty. Around 1 in 4 children in households headed by people from an Asian background or those in the Other ethnic group were in persistent poverty, as were 1 in 5 children in Black households and 1 in 10 White British households. Households of Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black, Mixed and Other backgrounds were more likely to receive income-related benefits and tax credits than those in other ethnic groups. The ethnic minority population is more likely to live in areas of deprivation, especially Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi people.

Education

Pupils in several ethnic groups were achieving and progressing better than White British pupils. Pupils from Chinese and Indian backgrounds showed high attainment and progress throughout their school careers and high rates of entry to university. Pupils from Gypsy and Roma, or Irish Traveller background (which are not included in the White British category), had the lowest attainment and progress, and were least likely to stay in education after the age of 16. Although pupils in the Black ethnic group made more progress overall than the national average, Black Caribbean pupils fell behind. White British pupils and those from a Mixed background also made less progress than average.

Low educational attainment and progress is closely associated with economic disadvantage. There is a sizeable gap in attainment between disadvantaged pupils and those from better off households among White British, White Irish and Mixed pupils. In particular, White British and White Irish pupils who were not eligible for free school meals were around twice as likely to attain A*- C in maths and English GCSEs as those who were eligible. In contrast, attainment for Black Caribbean pupils is very low overall, with a smaller gap between pupils eligible for free school meals and those not. Pupils from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds are achieving almost as well as, and progressing better than, White British pupils, whereas the attainment and progress of Black Caribbean pupils is much lower. White pupils from state schools had the lowest university entry rate of any ethnic group in 2016.

Of all regions in England, the most educational progress and best attainment in state primary and secondary schools was found in London, where more than half of pupils were from ethnic minority groups. Disadvantaged pupils in receipt of free school meals in London made more progress and had higher attainment than their counterparts elsewhere in England.

Employment

Employment rates have increased for all ethnic groups, but substantial differences remain in their participation in the labour market; around 1 in 10 adults from a Black, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Mixed background were unemployed compared with 1 in 25 White British people. Although women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds were the least likely to be employed, the proportion who were in work has increased substantially since 2004.

While employment rates among people from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds have been improving, these populations remain more likely to be in low skilled, low paying occupations than other ethnic groups. They also have higher rates of self-employment. Pakistani or Bangladeshi employees received the lowest average hourly pay, which was £4.39 per hour less in the last three months of 2016 than Indian employees who received the highest average hourly pay.

Housing

Home ownership, access to social housing, affordability and the quality of housing varies very widely between ethnic groups. Home ownership is most common among households of White British, Indian, Pakistani, and Mixed White and Asian origin; it is substantially lower among African, Arab, and Mixed White and Black African households.

The households that are most likely to rent social housing were headed by someone in the African, Caribbean, Other Black, Bangladeshi, Irish and Arab groups, or the Mixed groups other than Mixed White and Asian. As a group, ethnic minority households are also much more likely to rent privately than White British households and to spend a higher proportion of their incomes on rent, regardless of whether they rent from a social or private landlord. Their housing tends to be of lower quality, particularly among households of Pakistani origin, and overcrowding is more common, especially among households of Bangladeshi origin. Overcrowding affects ethnic minority households disproportionately, and London had one of the highest rates of overcrowding of all regions of England.

There has been an increase in the number of ethnic minority households accepted by local authorities as statutorily homeless over the past two decades, even though the number of acceptances overall has fallen substantially.

Policing

There are lower levels of confidence in the police among Black people, and especially among younger Black adults. While there has been a very large reduction in the use of Stop and Search among Black people since 2008/09, the use of these powers remains far higher on this ethnic group than others. Black men are also almost three and a half times more likely to be arrested than White men.

Criminal justice

Of all defendants, including juveniles, who were remanded at Crown Court for indictable offences, the proportion of defendants who were remanded in custody (rather than allowed out on bail) was highest for Black defendants, and particularly for Black males.

Among adults who were tried for indictable offences, the percentage of prosecutions resulting in conviction – known as the conviction ratio – was highest among White defendants at 87% in 2016, and lowest for Asians (81%); for Black defendants it was 82%. Across all ethnic groups the conviction ratio was lower for juveniles than adults. The lowest conviction ratio for juveniles was among Black defendants (69%); the conviction ratio for juveniles from all other ethnic groups ranged between 71% and 73%.

For all offenders (including juveniles), the average custodial sentence length (ACSL) for indictable offences has increased for all ethnic groups since 2009. White offenders consistently received the shortest ACSL. In 2016, the ACSL for White offenders was 18 months whereas Black and Asian offenders received the longest ACSL at 24 and 25 months respectively. These statistics do not take into account any other contextual factors such as the offences dealt with, which may differ by ethnic group.

Health

There are differences between ethnic groups across a range of health-related behaviours and preventable poor outcomes, and each ethnic group exhibits both healthy and unhealthy behaviours. More than half of adults in all ethnic groups other than the Chinese group were overweight (having a Body Mass Index of 25 and over), and this was particularly so among the White and Black ethnic groups, affecting 2 out of 3 White and Black adults. Adults in the Mixed group were the most likely to be physically active but also the most likely to smoke.

Most Asian groups express lower levels of satisfaction and less positive experiences of NHS General Practice services than other ethnic groups and there are differences in the prevalence of mental ill-health, its treatment and outcomes between ethnic groups.

In the general adult population, Black women were the most likely to have experienced a common mental disorder such as anxiety or depression in the last week, and Black men were the most likely to have experienced a psychotic disorder in the past year. However, White British adults were more likely to be receiving treatment for a mental or emotional problem than adults in other ethnic groups. Of those receiving psychological therapies, White adults experienced better outcomes than those in other ethnic groups. Black adults were more likely than adults in other ethnic groups to have been sectioned under the Mental Health Act.

The public sector workforce

The public sector workforce is a major employer, but ethnic minority employees are concentrated in the lower grades or ranks, and among younger employees.

In 2016, 18% of the non-medical NHS workforce (all staff excluding doctors and dentists) were from an ethnic minority group (excluding White minorities). Only 7% of very senior managers and 11% of senior managers were from an ethnic minority group. Also, the executive boards of many NHS trusts do not reflect the diversity of the NHS workforce: 93% of NHS board members in England are White (which includes White ethnic minority backgrounds). Court judges are disproportionately White, though the imbalance is less marked among tribunal judges (though the judiciary are independent office holders).

Some parts of the public sector workforce are more ethnically diverse than others. For example, the vast majority of police officers are from the White group and this has not changed over the past decade. The volunteer, part-time Special Constabulary was the most ethnically diverse part of the police workforce, followed by Police Community Support Officers. The Army is far more diverse than the Air Force.

THE CASEY REVIEW

“The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration” was published in December 2016. The review set out to look at:

1. how well we get on with each other;
2. how well we all do compared to each other.

Key findings include:

- “Discrimination and disadvantage feeding a sense of grievance and unfairness, isolating communities from modern British society”. Examples include: “black boys still not getting jobs, white working class children on free school meals still doing badly in our education system, Muslim girls getting good grades at school but no decent employment opportunities...”
- “...high levels of social and economic isolation in some places and cultural and religious practices in communities that are not only holding some of our citizens back but run contrary to British values and sometimes our laws. The report often found that “...it was women and children who were the targets of these regressive practices. And too often, leaders and institutions were not doing enough to stand up against them and protect those who were vulnerable.”

The report establishes that these remain absolutely vital problems to tackle and get right to improve our society – “The less integrated we are as a nation, the greater the economic and social costs we face – estimated as approximately £6 billion each year in one study. We know that where communities live separately, with fewer interactions between people from different backgrounds, mistrust, anxiety and prejudice grow. Conversely, social mixing and interactions between people from a wider range of backgrounds can have positive impacts; not just in reducing anxiety and prejudice, but also in enabling people to get on better in employment and social mobility.”

The report raises a wide range of issues and some of these are reproduced below (please view the full report for full details of all the issues raised):

Our population today

As a nation, we are getting older, more secular and more open about our sexuality, while the growing ethnic minority population is younger and more likely to identify as religious (particularly among Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups).

Immigration

Britain is an increasingly diverse nation with a long history of immigration but it has changed dramatically in recent years. By 2011, 13% of us were foreign born and nearly 20% of us identified ourselves as belonging to ethnic minorities (compared with 9% and 12% respectively a decade earlier).

In the year ending December 2015, the ‘net’ immigration figure was 333,000 – but emigration does not really ‘cancel out’ immigration; it is the total churn in population that can alter the characteristics of a neighbourhood and the net figure of 333,000 reflected almost a million people in total arriving in or leaving the country over 12 months. Additionally, the placement of asylum seekers across the country – often in poorer communities – and the presence of an unknown number of illegal immigrants, adds to the level of change being experienced.

Higher birth rates among foreign born parents are also contributing to the growing diversity of the UK - while foreign born residents made up 13% of the population in 2011, 27% of births in 2014 were to mothers born outside the UK (predominantly to Polish, Pakistani and Indian mothers).

Settlement and segregation

Minority ethnic groups have tended to settle more in urban and industrial areas, often reflecting labour market gaps which immigrant communities came to fill in the 20th Century. As the diversity of the nation has increased another dynamic is also clear – people from minority groups have become both more dispersed and in some cases more concentrated and segregated:

- 50% of the British population lives in areas with relatively high migration flows.
- Half of all minority ethnic citizens in Britain live in London, Birmingham and Manchester.
- Similar patterns of urban concentration of ethnic minorities exist in Scotland and Wales.

Taken together, high ethnic minority concentration in residential areas and in schools increases the likelihood of children growing up without meeting or better understanding people from different backgrounds.

Research examined during the review suggests that concentrations of ethnic communities can have both positive and negative effects, and that outcomes do not appear to be uniform for all groups. Ethnic concentration can improve bonding between people from similar backgrounds, particularly when they are new to an area, but it can also:

- limit labour market opportunities, notably for Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups – although it appears to improve employment opportunities for Indian ethnic groups;
- reduce opportunities for social ties between minority and White British communities; and
- lead to lower identification with Britain and lower levels of trust between ethnic groups, compared to minorities living in more diverse areas.

Youth programmes that engage young people in altruistic activities seem to be having some success in enabling teenagers from different backgrounds to mix, leading to greater understanding and tolerance, and reduced prejudice and anxiety.

How do people feel about these changes?

The impact of these changes and the challenges they present all of us are complex. Generally, measures of national sentiment show a strong sense of community cohesion and belonging. In 2015-16, 89% of people thought their community was cohesive and a similar proportion felt a sense of belonging to Britain. However, other research reflects a different position, suggesting that the much more significant scale of immigration since the 1990s had affected public attitudes by 2011, with negative judgments about the cultural and economic impact of migration growing and 60% rating the settlement of migrants overall as negative.

Poorer groups felt even more negatively. But unease about immigration is not limited to traditional White British communities.

While there has been a range of polling that suggests British Muslims feel positive about Britishness and life in Britain, polls also highlight differences in attitudes, with some Muslims and some other minority faith groups or indeed other minority sections of society expressing less progressive views, for example towards women's equality, sexuality and freedom of speech.

Social and economic exclusion

Some minority groups have fared better over time than others. Those (particularly of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnicity) with higher levels of residential and school segregation appear to be disadvantaged across a wider range of socio-economic factors. At the same time, some White British communities – particularly in areas of industrial decline – experience significant disadvantage and are increasingly being left behind. And Gypsies and Irish Travellers, while small in number relative to other ethnic groups (at 58,000 people or 0.1% of the population in the 2011 Census) also face persistent socio-economic disadvantage.

There are 13.2 million people across the UK living on relative low income. People living in households headed by someone from an ethnic minority background are more likely than their White counterparts to live on a 'relative low income', with 41% to 51% of households of Black, Pakistani, Chinese and Bangladeshi ethnicity on relative low income compared with 19% of White households.

While children from many ethnic minorities are increasingly matching or out-performing White British pupils in education, there is growing evidence of poorer White British boys, in particular, falling behind. White British pupils on Free School Meals are less than half as likely to achieve five or more good GCSEs as pupils who are not eligible for Free School Meals.

People from Black, Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups are three times more likely than White British people to be unemployed. And there are more concerning aspects of disadvantage relating to gender and age in particular groups:

- For young Black men, aged 16-24, the unemployment rate is 35%, compared with 15% for young White men.
- Where they are in work, men of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnicity tend to be in low status employment – one in four Pakistani men are employed as taxi-drivers and two in five Bangladeshi men work in restaurants (although a number of these will be in family-owned businesses).
- Economic inactivity levels remain unusually high among women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic groups – 57.2% are inactive in the labour market compared with 25.2% of White women and 38.5% of all ethnic minority women.

The range of socio-economic exclusion suffered by some groups must be given greater attention. The persistent disadvantage experienced by young Black men in employment, the falling behind of poorer White British communities in some areas needs to be addressed if we are to prevent cracks and divisions in society from growing.

But in relation to social and economic integration in particular, there is a strong correlation of increased segregation among Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic households in more deprived areas, with poorer English language and poorer labour market outcomes, suggesting a negative cycle that will not improve without a more concerted and targeted effort.

Equality and division

Equality is another important factor of successful integration. Britain has developed some of the strongest equalities legislation in the world, and provided greater freedoms to be different; but there is more still to be done.

This review has highlighted worrying levels of segregation and socio-economic exclusion in different communities across the country and a number of inequalities between groups; one of the most striking of which is the inequality of women.

A similar picture is seen for lesbian, gay and bisexual groups – who suffer discrimination in mainstream society, but are affected twice over when they also belong to a community that can be culturally intolerant of non-heterosexual identification.

Incidents of hate crime are also on the rise. In 2015-16, there were 62,518 hate crimes (based on race, sexual orientation, religion, disability and transgender) recorded by the police – up 19% on the previous year. The Crime Survey for England and Wales suggests that the actual level of hate crime experienced – including anti-Semitic and Islamophobic attacks – is more than four times the number of recorded incidents.

We all have a responsibility to counteract hate in any form, and to undermine those seeking to divide us, whoever they are and however uncomfortable it may be.

Leadership

For the last fifteen years Governments have commissioned many reviews of community cohesion and developed strategies to improve it. But these cohesion or integration plans have not been implemented with enough force or consistency, they have been allowed to be diluted and muddled, they have not been sufficiently linked to socio-economic inclusion, and communities have not been engaged adequately.

We need leaders at all levels – in Government, in public sector and faith institutions, and in communities – to stand up and be more robust on this.

Recommendations

The report identified some initial recommendations, which are summarised below summarised below, and are designed to:

Build local communities' resilience in the towns and cities where the greatest challenges exist, by:

(1) Providing additional funding for area-based plans and projects that will address the key priorities identified in this review, including the promotion of English language skills, empowering marginalised women, promoting more social mixing, particularly among young people, and tackling barriers to employment for the most socially isolated groups.

(2) Developing a set of local indicators of integration and requiring regular collection of the data supporting these indicators.

(3) Identifying and promoting successful approaches to integration.

Improve the integration of communities in Britain and establish a set of values around which people from all different backgrounds can unite, by:

(4) Attaching more weight to British values, laws and history in our schools.

(5) Considering what additional support or advice should be provided to immigrants to help them get off to the best start in understanding their rights and obligations and our expectations for integration.

(6) Reviewing the route to British citizenship and considering the introduction of an integration oath on arrival for immigrants intending to settle in Britain.

Reduce economic exclusion, inequality and segregation in our most isolated and deprived communities and schools, by:

(7) Working with schools providers and local communities to promote more integrated schools and opportunities for pupils to mix with others from different backgrounds.

(8) Developing approaches to help overcome cultural barriers to employment.

(9) Improving English language provision through funding for community-based classes and appropriate prioritisation of adult skills budgets.

(10) Improving our understanding of how housing and regeneration policies could improve integration or reduce segregation.

(11) Introducing stronger safeguards for children who are not in mainstream education, including those being home schooled.

Increase standards of leadership and integrity in public office, by:

(12) Ensuring that British values such as respect for the rule of law, equality and tolerance are enshrined in the principles of public life and developing a new oath for holders of public office.