

# Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.10]



Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment of proposed budget savings 2023/24 – 2027/28	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Crosscutting	Lead Officer name: Denise Murray
Service Area: All	Lead Officer role: Service Director - Finance

## Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) early for advice and feedback.

### 1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use [plain English](#), avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

#### Budget context

Every year, the council must agree an annual budget which balances the money we spend with the money we are expecting to receive. Councils across the country are facing extreme financial challenges and based on our current forecasts, we face a funding gap over the next five years (to 2027/28) of £20.3 million in 2023/24 rising to £40 million by 2027/28. The worst case scenario by 2027/28 identifies this could be as much as £124.7 million dependent on the severity of factors such as rising costs of fuel, energy and inflation as well as uncertainty over funding in the latter years. This is in addition to the £34.3 million of savings and efficiencies proposals for 2022-2027 outlined in the 2022/23 budget.

The Council has defined statutory responsibilities, but deliver against a far broader agenda, providing universal services benefiting the whole community, and targeted services aimed at individuals, communities with particular needs, and businesses – administered by our workforce, city partners, stakeholder organisations and commissioned services.

To address these challenges we must look again across all of our services to find where we can do things differently to reduce costs, be more efficient in how we do things and, in some cases, stop doing some things entirely.

The [Medium Term Financial Plan](#) underpins the Council's financial planning process and outlines the approach we will take to meet the challenges presented by focusing primarily on delivering efficiencies, service re-design programmes which cut across directorate boundaries, and increasing external income and Invest to Save revenue.

#### The Budget Equality Impact and Cumulative Impact Assessment process

Bristol City Council anticipates the potential impact for different communities of our budget proposals by carrying out an equality impact assessment process on each of the proposed savings. Even when we plan to consult in more detail on specific service delivery proposals at a later time, we must make sure that

any proposals that are likely to affect future services are informed by sufficient consultation and proper analysis, this is how we pay due regard to any decisions made. This is so that decision makers can have due regard to any likely disproportionate or negative impact for citizens, service users or employees on the basis of their protected and other relevant characteristics at the time the budget is approved and on an ongoing basis as propositions are further developed.

This Cumulative assessment looks at the potential collective equality impacts of all the proposed savings and key budget decisions taken together as a whole to identify any particular compound issues or disparities, and what we can do to mitigate them.

**Decision making**

The recommendations regarding the budget proposals are made by the Mayor in Cabinet and then taken to Full Council, where the budget is set. During the development of budget proposals, officers and Cabinet members have been mindful of the potential impacts that any changes could have on key communities and on the city as a whole, and for several savings proposals there has already been a comprehensive equality impact assessment developed throughout existing projects which has been updated.

**Our Approach**

A key part of our purpose as a local authority is to support those at risk or in need, and the majority of our revenue budgets are spent on services for people. Therefore any change to the costs of delivering our services or our funding, has potential for impact and we have taken into consideration the issue of both direct and indirect impacts on individuals and groups of people when working to deliver a set of proposed budget reductions. It is also important to recognise that although the proposed level of reduction is significant, we will still be spending or directing the spend of significant sums across the city to achieve our priorities.

Our Corporate Strategy sets out how we work with other service providers and organisations and how we are planning to meet the challenges of a growing and ageing population, increased demand for care services and make sure people have the services they need, regardless of background. [Corporate Strategy - bristol.gov.uk](http://bristol.gov.uk/corporate-strategy)

Our Equality and Inclusion Policy sets our vision: recognising the contributions that people from different backgrounds make, actively tackling inequality and fostering good relationships across our communities. As well as our firm commitment to the Public Sector Equality Duty our aspirations go further to include people in care, refugees and migrants, people with caring responsibilities and the inequality resulting from socio-economic disadvantage. [Equalities policy - bristol.gov.uk](http://bristol.gov.uk/equality-policy)

Our aim is to minimise direct and indirect impacts on our communities in this budget, specifically our communities from equalities groups, people living in deprivation and those with other characteristics, and where impacts are probable or likely, that we mitigate against these how and where we can. In building our approach to these budget reductions, we have at all times sought to find the required savings in areas which have the minimum direct impact on people and been clear how we will reshape the ongoing investment to pick up key areas of work. In this context we have also looked at wider measures which have enabled us to maintain many of our services targeted to those more vulnerable in our city.

**1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

**1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?**

**Yes**       **No**      [please select]

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If 'No' explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If 'Yes' complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

## Step 2: What information do we have?

### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: [How we measure equality and diversity \(bristol.gov.uk\)](http://bristol.gov.uk)

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](http://sharepoint.com). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](#); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](#); [Ward Statistical Profiles](#).

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](http://sharepoint.com) which shows the diversity profile of council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment Form](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
<u>Census 2011 and Census 2021</u>  <u>2011 Census Key Statistics About Equalities Communities</u>	The Census details the demographic profile of Bristol. We have had initial data on the population of Bristol by age, ethnic group, national identity, language, and religion, but are still awaiting more detailed results and multivariate data, so demographic data is still largely informed by 2011 census and other population related documents (listed below)
<u>The population of Bristol</u>  <u>Bristol Key Facts 2022</u>	Updated annually. The report brings together statistics on the current estimated population of Bristol, recent trends in population, future projections and looks at the key characteristics of the people living in Bristol.
<u>Ward profile data (bristol.gov.uk)</u>	The Ward Profiles provide a range of data-sets, including population, life expectancy, health and education disparities etc. for each of Bristol's electoral wards.
<u>Bristol Quality of Life Survey 2021-22</u>	The Quality of Life (QoL) survey is an annual randomised sample survey of the Bristol population, mailed to 33,000 households (with online & paper options), and some additional targeting to boost numbers from low responding groups. In brief, the most recent QoL survey indicated that inequality and deprivation

continue to affect people's experience in almost every element measured by the survey.

The [Quality of Life 2021/22 data dashboard](#) highlights those indicators, wards and equality and demographic groups which are better or worse than the Bristol average.

For example there are significant disparities based on people's characteristics and circumstances in the extent to which they find it difficult to manage financially:

Quality of Life Indicator	% who find it difficult to manage financially
16 to 24 years	12.5
50 years and older	6.7
65 years and older	3.2
Female	8.6
Male	8.5
Disabled	21.6
Asian/Asian British	9.9
Black/Black British	19.8
Mixed/Multiple Ethnicity	16.3
White British	7.8
White Minority Ethnic	8.4
Lesbian Gay or Bisexual	12.7
No Religion or Faith	8.0
Christian Religion	8.3
Other Religions	18.2
Carer	10.7
Full Time Carer	14.0
Part Time Carer	9.7
Single Parent	28.6
Two Parent	9.6
Parent (all)	12.0
No Qualifications	10.0
Non-Degree Qualified	12.9
Degree Qualified	6.7
Rented (Council)	20.3
Rented (HA)	20.6
Rented (Private)	14.6
Owner Occupier	4.6
Most Deprived 10%	18.8
<b>Bristol Average</b>	<b>8.7</b>

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment reports on the health and wellbeing needs of the people of Bristol. It brings together detailed information on local health and wellbeing needs and looks ahead at emerging challenges and projected future needs. The JSNA is used to provide a comprehensive picture of the health and wellbeing needs of Bristol (now and in the future); to inform decisions about how we design, commission and deliver services, and also about how the urban environment is planned and managed; to improve and protect health and wellbeing outcomes across the city while reducing health inequalities; and to provide partner organisations with information on the changing health and wellbeing needs of Bristol, at a local level, to support better service delivery.

HR Analytics: Power BI reports (sharepoint.com) [internal link only]

Equality and Inclusion annual progress report 2021-22 (bristol.gov.uk)  
Appendix – Workforce Diversity Data – summary analysis

Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the Employee Staff Survey Report and Stress Risk Assessment Form completed by individuals and teams [internal links only]

The Workforce Diversity Report shows Bristol City Council Workforce Diversity statistics for Headcount, Sickness, Starters and Leavers data. The report is updated once a month with data as at the end of the previous month. It excludes data for locally managed schools/nurseries, councillors, casual, seasonal and external agency employees. The report is based on the sensitive information that staff add to Employee Self Service on iTrent (ESS).

**Summary of Bristol City Council workforce diversity**

	BCC headcount % (31 Oct 2022)	Bristol Working Age Population (16-64)
Age 16-29	12.2%	39.0%
Age 30-39	22.0%	24.0%
Age 40-49	24.4%	16.0%
Age 50-64	41.4%	21.0%
Age 65+	3.4%	-
Disabled	9.0%	12%
Asian / Asian British	2.9%	5.8%
Black / Black British	5.1%	5.3%
Mixed ethnicity	3.6%	2.9%
Other ethnic groups	0.4%	1.0%
White	79.8%	85.0%
Female	60.1%	49.0%
Male	39.3%	51.0%
Use another gender term	0.2%	-
Christian	25.9%	43.5%
Other religion/belief	6.6%	7.3%
No religion/belief	41.9%	41.5%
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	5.9%	9.1%
Trans	0.1%	-

<p><a href="https://nomisweb.co.uk">Nomis - Official Labour Market Statistics (nomisweb.co.uk)</a></p> <p><a href="https://ons.gov.uk">Business demography, UK - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk)</a></p>	<p>84% of all people in Bristol are economically active which is higher than nationally (78.6%) and in the South West (80.7%). Of economically active people in Bristol 6.9% are self-employed, compared to 9.5% nationally. Of those who are economically inactive in Bristol, 33% are Students, 29% are 'long-term sick' and 16% are looking after family/home, as well as 9.2% who are retired. The percentage of 'workless households' in Bristol is 12.1%, compared to 13.6% nationally, and the proportion of working age people who are benefit claimants is 11.2%. Bristol has a higher proportion of people working in 'professional occupations' (36.2) than for the South West (24.4%) and nationally (25.8%).</p> <p>In 2020 (most recent data) the South West continued to have the highest five-year 'survival rate' in the UK of businesses that survived into 2020 (this has been the case since 2012). The largest proportion of these surviving businesses, 22%, was in the professional, scientific and technical industry.</p>
<p><a href="#">Bristol One City: Cost of Living Crisis – Bristol's One City approach to supporting citizens and communities (Oct 2022)</a></p> <p><a href="https://arcgis.com">Cost of Living Risk Index (arcgis.com)</a></p>	<p>The rising cost of living is not impacting on everyone equally. People who are already experiencing inequity and poverty will be disproportionately impacted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>People on the lowest incomes</b> - will have less available income but also pay more for the same services. For example, people unable to pay their bills by Direct Debit and those borrowing money are subject to higher costs and interest rates. This is what anti-poverty campaign group Fair by Design has referred to as a Poverty Premium</li> <li>• <b>Households with pre-payment energy meters</b> - households with pre-payment meters often pay above-average costs for their fuel. They will face a significant rise in their monthly bills in autumn and winter with increased energy usage as they do not benefit from the "smoothing" effect of Direct Debits, which spread usage costs evenly across the year</li> <li>• <b>Parents and young families</b> – parents of young children are more likely to seek credit and alternative support as they are less able, on average, to afford an unexpected expense. Single parents will be disproportionately affected; and one in four single parents find it difficult to manage financially (28.6%).</li> <li>• <b>Disabled people</b> – just under half of all people in poverty in the UK are Disabled people or someone living with a Disabled person. Disabled people have higher living costs, and tend to pay more for their heating, travel, food/diet, prescription payments, and specialist equipment. It is estimated that UK households that include Disabled children pay on average £600 more for their energy bills than an average household</li> <li>• <b>Black and Minoritised people</b> – A higher proportion of Black and minoritised ethnic groups reported finding it difficult to manage financially (14.9%) in 2021. In 2020 the Social Metrics Commission found that almost half of people living in a family in the UK where the head of the household is Black are in</li> </ul>

	<p>poverty. Age UK report that poverty among older Black and minoritised ethnic groups is twice as high as for white pensioners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>People in rented accommodation</b> – it is estimated that 69% of low-income private renters in England will be forced to go without food and heating at least one day per week to meet rising housing and living cost. Almost three in ten homes in Bristol are privately rented</li> <li>• <b>Underserved populations</b> - It is likely that populations that are not typically well represented in data and research are likely to also face increased risk from rising cost of living. For example, refugees and asylum seekers, people experiencing homelessness, and Gypsy/Roma/Traveller groups.</li> <li>• <b>Cost of Living Risk Index</b> (October 2022) identified Lawrence Hill, Hartcliffe &amp; Withywood, Filwood, Lockleaze, Ashley, Southmead, Easton, Avonmouth &amp; Lawrence Weston, Hillfields and Eastville as neighbourhoods in Bristol more at risk of the impact of the cost of living crisis.</li> </ul>
<p><u>An evaluation of the Bristol Race Equality Covid-19 Steering Group</u></p> <p><u>Designing a new social reality - Research on the impact of covid-19 on Bristol’s VCSE sector and what the future should be – Black South West Network 2020</u></p> <p><u>Delivering an inclusive economy post COVID-19</u></p>	<p>Report focusing on how co-production using a One City approach has been used to respond to the disproportionate impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on our marginalized ethnic communities. Local research has highlighted how long-term underinvestment and lack of equity in funding and procurement has eroded the local voluntary and community sector. Our local partners have conducted research into the ongoing impact of COVID-19 for women and have provided recommendations on what service providers can do to reduce impact further impact.</p>

## 2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation

## 2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

Although our corporate approach is to collect diversity monitoring for all relevant characteristics, there are gaps in the available local diversity data for some characteristics, especially where this has not always historically been included in census and statutory reporting e.g. for sexual orientation. We also know there are some under-reporting gaps in our workforce diversity information - where personal and confidential information is voluntarily requested from staff.

## 2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing change or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

We launched a public consultation on our budget proposals between Friday 11 November and Friday 23 December. Alongside asking for views on different options for Council Tax next year the consultation set out all the savings proposals we had identified to produce a balanced budget in the context of reduced available funding and increasing financial pressures. In carrying out budget saving equality impact assessments we have also incorporated key learning from local equalities communities in response to previous consultations.

Unfortunately, because of the very tight timescales involved in preparing our draft budget proposals, this year we were unable provide an EasyRead version in time for the launch of the consultation as this takes several days to produce. To ensure Easy Read users had a reasonable period to respond, we let people know we would accept Easy Read responses which reached us by email or post by midnight on Sunday 8 January.

As part of the consultation we asked some diversity monitoring questions to help us understand more about the characteristics and circumstances of respondents, as well as to identify differences in their views:

- 6% of responses were from people living in the most deprived areas of the city (by postcode)
- There were significant differences in response rate by Ward e.g. 121 per 10,000 residents in Hotwells and Harbourside, compared to 30 per 10,000 residents in Stockwood
- 46% of respondents were female and 53% were male
- 11% of respondents were Disabled people
- Young people 18-24 were underrepresented (3%) and older age groups, except for age 85+ were overrepresented, compared to the overall Bristol population
- Respondents from some minoritised ethnic backgrounds were underrepresented:
  - Asian/Asian British 4% (compared to 7% for Bristol)
  - Black/Black British 2% (compared to 6% for Bristol)
  - Mixed/Multiple ethnic group 3% (compared to 4% for Bristol)
  - Other ethnic background 0.5% (compared to 2% for Bristol)
  - Gypsy / Roma / Irish Traveller 0.1% (compared to 0.3% for Bristol)
- People from Christian and some other faith groups including Muslims were somewhat underrepresented
- We had good levels of representation from people with LGB+ sexual orientations
- 1% of respondents were pregnant or had given birth in the last 6 months
- 0.2% were refugees or asylum seekers

## 2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?

Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.



All responses to the Budget Consultation have been analysed and will be included in the Council's Budget report that will be published on the Bristol City Council website in early 2023. We will take Budget consultation responses into account when developing this and other final proposals to put to the Cabinet and a meeting of the Full Council for approval. The final decision will be taken by Full Council at its budget setting meeting in February / March 2023.

Following the setting of the overall budget envelope there will be extensive engagement, consultation and co-design with affected communities on particular proposals which will inform future decision making prior to implementation. Our approach to public engagement and consultation will proactively target under-represented respondents to increase the participation of people from equality groups and their local representative organisations. This will help to ensure that our services and actions are informed by the views and needs of all our citizens.

### Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above, and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

#### 3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Consider sub-categories and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.

Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS** (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)

Even when we plan to consult in more detail on specific service delivery proposals at a later time, we must ensure that any budget setting decisions that are likely to affect future services are informed by sufficient consultation and proper analysis. This is so that decision makers can have due regard to any likely disproportionate or negative impact on the basis of their protected and other relevant characteristics at the time the budget is approved – not afterwards.

Decision makers will have the ability to make changes to the individual spending plans following further consultation as appropriate and detailed evaluation of the impact of specific proposals. Within the proposed budget envelope there will be financial mitigation put aside for any non-delivery or amendments to proposals which may occur due to future consideration of equalities issues or other factors.

As well as identifying whether budget changes will have a disproportionate impact on particular groups (e.g., because they are over-represented in a particular cohort), we need to pay particular attention to the risk of indirect discrimination: when an apparently neutral decision puts members of a given group at a particular disadvantage compared with other people because of their different needs and circumstances.

We are also aware of existing structural inequalities and particular considerations, issues, and disparities for people in Bristol based on their characteristics, which we will take into account.

#### **Workforce changes**

Where budget proposals are likely to impact on our workforce we will carry out consultation in line with the Council's Management of Change process and seek advice from HR and the Equality and Inclusion Team to mitigate risks of discrimination. For any savings which are likely to lead to changed job roles for our employees we will: use positive action initiatives as appropriate to address under representation across the workforce; advertise any new job opportunities in a range of ways to ensure a wide pool of applicants; review job paperwork including job descriptions and employee specification to make they are

only for the skills, experiences and qualities needed to do the job and there are no discriminatory statements, requirements; and check tests, assessments and interview processes are accessible and transparent.

It is anticipated that there may be significant changes including a reduction of some services and transfer of some staff to the West of England Combined Authority (WECA), which might affect access levels of representation or participation. We will consider any disproportionate impact of TUPE arrangements, where applicable and any emerging potential negative impacts will be carefully monitored throughout the management of change process.

Proposals which look at reducing the number of buildings we use are also very much focused on making sure they have good quality facilities. We recognise that busier buildings can have an impact on accessibility in terms of increased pressure on physical infrastructure such as lifts, shared equipment, toilets, noise levels etc. Estate rationalisation may also limit our capacity to host in-person meetings with equalities groups and host community events. Where proposals relate to changing work locations or conditions we will also consider the impact on those who may be more reliant on car parking or public transport; and provide and support access to funding for workplace adaptations and aids to enable disabled employees to obtain and retain their employment. We will provide reasonable adjustments whenever they are required and promote flexible working patterns wherever possible to maximise opportunities for people with caring responsibilities and those from faith groups or other relevant requirements.

As there is evidence showing that lack of equity in funding and procurement has eroded the local voluntary and community sector, we need to consider the extent to which any proposed reductions in budgets for commissioned services, or proposals to increase income (e.g. by reducing business rate relief for charities or other subsidies, passing on increased costs, or charging more commercial rates for premises and services) may have a disproportionate impact and without alternative income generating opportunities for the sector, could undermine the resilience of smaller organisations which are led by and/or support local equalities communities.

A smaller workforce and less recruitment could mean it will take longer to address existing underrepresentation, pay gaps and other disparities particularly on the basis of age, disability, ethnicity and sex. In some service areas shrinking capacity may lead to an increase in workforce stress/pressure and reduced flexibility. [Cuts to equality team / community team – public sector equality duty advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relation etc.]

Reducing office accommodation is likely to have a disproportionate impact on some employees e.g. those who are more reliant on car parking or public transport (Age, Disability, Pregnancy/Maternity). We will provide and support access to funding for workplace adaptations and aids to enable disabled colleagues to obtain and retain their employment; promote flexible working patterns wherever possible to maximise opportunities for people with caring responsibilities; and continue to provide multi-faith spaces at our main working sites.

We are also aware of existing structural inequality and particular considerations, issues and disparities for people in Bristol based on their characteristics, and background which we have taken into account in making this budget proposal.

### **Deprivation and the Cost of Living Crisis**

The rising cost of living is not impacting on everyone equally and people who are already experiencing inequity and poverty not only have less available income but also often pay more for the same services. Our savings proposals are not happening in a 'bubble', and we should be aware of the compounding

impact of external factors such as rising utility bills, accommodation costs and food prices on everyday household budgets.

Whilst there is a clear and direct potential impact on low-income household some of our savings proposals such as those relating to options for Council Tax funding and a Social Care Precept, decision makers should be also be aware of the potential cumulative impact of multiple savings proposals which taken together are likely to amount to significantly increased charges for council services overall, and consider whether there are any specific mitigations which can be put in place to reduce the disproportionate negative of this impact on people living in deprivation.

### **Quality of Life and the wider determinants of health**

There are disparities by demographic group in our annual Quality of Life survey with some groups showing significantly worse than average across all themes (in particular disabled people, council renters, those in the 10% most deprived areas of the city).

There are multiple budget savings proposals which will reduce the overall range and quantity of services that promote quality of life for Bristol citizens, including those relating to community and living which may not have been considered collectively.

The cumulative impact of these proposals may exacerbate existing levels of inequality and we should be aware that there may also be a disproportionate impact on demographic groups who are not recorded in the Quality of Life survey such as asylum seekers, refugees and those with no resource to public funds.

<b>Demographic group</b>	<b>Number of significantly worse indicators</b>
Disabled	112
10% most deprived	86
Renting from the Council	95
Renting from a Housing Association	67
Renting from a Private Landlord	45
Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic groups	32
Christian	42
Other faith groups	21
Young People 16-14	35
Older people 65+	54
No qualifications	77
Full time carers	79
LGBTQ+	45
Single Parents	43

### **Filling the gaps**

There are multiple savings proposals which aim to reduce the need for direct services by enabling other organisations, communities, and individuals to take things on, where possible doing less directly ourselves. Some proposals aim to build resilience and prevent problems in people's lives escalating, by intervening early to support independence and prevent more need for us in the future.

We are aware that stopping, reducing or increasing the threshold of need at which we offer services may have a disproportionate impact on vulnerable citizens including on the basis of their protected characteristics, deprivation and caring responsibilities if suitable alternative support is not in place.

We know that other public bodies including NHS Trusts are also under enormous financial strain, and that long-term underinvestment and lack of equity in funding and procurement has eroded the local voluntary and community sector. Because the underlying reasons for the Council's budget deficit are far reaching and likely to impact other public bodies and providers we should avoid making any assumptions that people's needs will still be met by other / external provision if we reduce or decommission our existing services.

The Quality of Life in Bristol survey and anecdotal reporting from local community and voluntary sector organisations indicates there has been a considerable decline in the extent to which Bristol citizens volunteer or help out in their community, with more people saying money problems are stopping them from doing this. For this reason we cannot assume that when we stop or reduce services this will be fully mitigated by local volunteering and community action.

We will ensure that service redesign is informed by meaningful consultation, comprehensive needs analysis and equality impact assessment that includes consideration of the changing landscape of external specialist provision.

For savings proposals which aim to streamline third party spend by working with a smaller range of providers or a single strategic partner we will ensure that commissioning arrangements promote the delivery of inclusive, accessible and culturally competent services to meet the diverse needs of Bristol's citizens, and that specialist provision is retained where needed.

### **Significant Financial Pressures & Challenge**

Alongside other public bodies we are in a significant period of financial pressure, with significant challenging in being able to meet all our statutory duties within a balanced budget. As a local authority these responsibilities include ensuring, so far as reasonably practicable, sufficient provision of specific services within the area to meet the needs of particular groups such as: our duty of care for adult social care and children's services; education; housing policy and homelessness prevention; health, safety and licensing; and libraries. In setting our budget we prioritised statutory over discretionary services. However some approaches such as the dedicated school grant extension are not sustainable as long-term solutions.

### **Accommodation**

Where savings proposals aim to reduce the costs of providing temporary accommodation by creating new temporary accommodation and repurposing existing properties (including sites not previously being used for accommodation) we need to ensure that homes are safe, accessible/adaptable, culturally appropriate and near support networks, with a sufficient range of properties to meet differing needs including for larger families and for minoritised ethnic communities, single households and younger people who are over-represented in temporary accommodation and homelessness applicants locally. This is also true of proposals to increase in-house Children's Home Provision. We must also ensure that we have sufficient officer capacity to quality assure agreements with third parties helping us achieve this.

### **Transport and mobility**

Where our savings proposals are likely to mean that service users will have to travel further to access our services we should be aware that there are significant disparities in the extent to which inaccessible public transport prevents some people in Bristol from leaving their home when they want to depending on their characteristics and where they live. This inequality is likely to be exacerbated by the cost of living crisis and more limited local bus provision due to lack of drivers. For our proposals which involve reducing or change services relating to transport infrastructure and city design we will aim to minimise any potential reduction in our capacity to promote safe and accessible travel in the city.

## **Income generation**

Where we have savings proposals to charge clients, partners or citizens for goods or services, we may do so at the kind of market rates that you'd expect from a private business and reducing subsidies by other taxpayers. We may seek to secure more grants and external funding for services and activities, and collect debts which are owed to us ethically, but more effectively. Increasing business-to-business charges for goods/services may have a disproportionate impact on small businesses and the local voluntary and community sector in particular for minoritised ethnic led organisations, and for those who support equalities groups. We will consider the impact of particular users on a case-by-case basis, promote initiatives which address lack of equity, and provide discretionary concessions for external equalities-led stakeholder organisations where appropriate.

## **Digital transformation**

There are several savings proposals which aim to make more use of digital technology to help remove or reduce costs. Through more use of digital technology, we can be more efficient and effective, whilst improving outcomes by targeting services to those who need them and addressing digital exclusion - those who can't access digital services or find using them difficult or unaffordable. Some groups in Bristol are much less likely to feel comfortable using digital technology, including older people, Disabled people, carers, those living in Council accommodation and in the most deprived areas of the city.

We will continue to invest in making our digital services more accessible and ensure there are always alternatives for those that need them. The council is using innovative ideas to address digital exclusion and the efficiencies gained through prioritising digital services can be used to provide better face to face or alternative services.

## **Information Poverty**

Some citizens and service users in Bristol experience additional inequality because of barriers to accessing and understanding information about the help and resources available to them. As well as the issues identified above with digital information, this can be because of language barriers (including for British Sign Language users), because of learning difficulties and/or neurodivergence, because of poorly developed information infrastructure, or simply because information is not available or well communicated.

Where our savings proposals lead to significant changes to delivery we need to ensure that we communicate information about this in a range of inclusive and accessible formats, making sure that communication is clear, concise and unambiguous; and setting out time-scales to give sufficient advance notice.

## **Council Tax Funding and the Social Care Precept**

We are conscious of the impact of any Council Tax increase on Bristol residents at a time of acute cost of living pressures. At the same time people rely on our key services and we need to make sure we have a solution for how they will be provided during this difficult period. We continue to work to ensure these services remain sustainable, and that the most vulnerable citizens are protected. This provides us with a difficult balancing act between considering Council Tax increases, provision of services, and how we can generate more income.

Design and implement a more targeted Local Council Tax Reduction scheme. This could include the introduction of a flat rate 10% - 20% reduction in support for working age households or the introduction

of a banding scheme with targeted 100% protection to some working age households. Although this is in line with what other local authorities are doing, the approach needs to be considered in the context of the wider cumulative impact of our other budget savings proposals, and how the cost of living crisis is impacting low-income households in Bristol. As this is a £3m saving proposal and current eligibility is low income and receipt of means tested benefits there is likely to be a disproportionately negative impact overall on deprivation – and we need to ensure reductions are targeted in an equitable way.

Bristol is also responsible for providing social care services to our most vulnerable residents and the Social Care Precept allows us to raise additional money for this through Council Tax.

**The Housing Revenue Account** is a separate ring-fenced account covering all activities of Bristol City Council as a landlord and is mostly made up of the rent we collect. This money is used to plan and provide services for people living in council housing, including repairs and improvements. The Housing Revenue Account also has a programme to build new council homes and invest in additional stock. The HRA budget reflects a commitment to increase investment in the existing stock, to be funded through a series of above inflationary increases in rents, with a 7% rent and service charge increase from April 2023 (applicable to general needs accommodation, supported housing, temporary accommodation and garages).

**The Dedicated Schools Grant** comes from UK government and can only be used to pay for schools and education services for children and young people in Bristol. The Early Years Block within this is used to fund free nursery and pre-school hours for three and four-year olds and for two-year-olds from households with low incomes. The High Needs Block is dedicated funding for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) or for those who need alternative provision, such as Pupil Referral. There is an increasing demand for Education, Health and Care Plans and special educational needs provision. The provisional uplift applied to the High Needs Block is 5% but based on the historic deficits and current trends, this will not be sufficient for the funding needs within the High Needs Block. A Mitigation Plan has been developed that includes a range of deficit mitigation measures and identifies further work required to ensure sustainability in education funding.

**The Public Health Budget** is a yearly UK Government grant to promote good mental and physical health in the city and pay for services that help people be healthier and stay healthy. The council has no say in how much money central government gives us to pay for public health work and we are required to spend the money in line with set guidelines known as the ‘Public Health Outcomes Framework’.

**The Capital Budget** is spent on investing in the city by building e.g. schools and houses, introducing new transport options, maintaining and improving existing stock, and supporting infrastructure work such as Bristol Heat Network which should save money in the future.

**General Reserves** In addition to the council’s budgets to pay for investment and day-to-day services, the council also holds money in reserve, which is required to cover one-off unexpected expenditure, reduced income arising in any particular year and emergency events such as natural disasters and other unforeseen urgent needs. Whilst it is possible to top-up with money from reserves, as it can only be used once, this could only be a short-term solution and the full funding gap will still be evident and need to be addressed. Additionally, a reduction in reserves can reduce the Council’s capacity to respond to the emerging needs of equalities communities in relation to accessibility and inclusion etc.

<b>Age: Young People</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	Living in poverty can negatively impact outcomes for children and may mean that families are less able to make healthy lifestyle choices than more affluent families. Poverty is associated with worse cognitive, social-behavioural and health outcomes, including lower birth weight, asthma, obesity and mental health problems, and poorer

	<p>'life chances'. The Resolution Foundation has estimated that levels of absolute child poverty could rise by 5% points in 2022/23.</p> <p>Proposals to review services improve efficiency, align payments and make savings in commissioned services for children and young people may reduce the focus on providing accessible and flexible services unless revised specifications have an explicit equality and inclusion focus.</p> <p>In addition to the direct impact of "Children and Families" savings proposals there may be a disproportionate cumulative impact for children and young people from various budget proposals where there are existing disparities in access and inclusion related to e.g. accommodation, digital services etc.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on younger employees who are more likely to be employed on fixed term contracts and a large proportion of under 35's are leaving after the end of a fixed term contract. The impact of increased working from home can make it harder for younger and newer employees to be fully part of pre-existing teams – this will be mitigated where possible through positive action initiatives and ongoing liaison with the Young Professionals Network staff led group.</p>
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people are often under-represented in engagement and consultation in Bristol and are less satisfied than average with the way the council runs things.</li> <li>• Children and young people in Bristol are considerably more ethnically diverse than the overall population of Bristol.</li> <li>• Children and young people from the most deprived areas of Bristol have the poorest outcomes in health and education in terms of health, education and future employment etc.</li> <li>• Young people in Bristol are more likely to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ have poor emotional health and wellbeing</li> <li>○ find inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to</li> <li>○ 6.8% of 16-17 year olds (2020/21) were "not in education, employment or training" (NEET), worse than the national average (5.5%)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Young adults are most likely to have lost work or seen their income drop because of COVID-19 and the cost of living crisis</li> </ul>
<b>Age: Older People</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	Savings proposals which relate to transport, buildings, parking, parks and green spaces etc. may lead to service changes which have a disproportionate on older citizens unless there is ongoing consideration of their particular needs. The population of older people in Bristol is increasingly diverse and proposals to make savings in commissioned services for older adults may reduce the focus on providing accessible and flexible services unless revised specifications have an explicit equality and inclusion focus. Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on older employees if they are closer to retirement age – see comments above re. mitigating risks of discrimination.
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Older people in Bristol are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ less likely to be comfortable using digital services</li> <li>○ more reliant on public and community transport</li> <li>○ more likely to be an unpaid carer</li> <li>○ more likely to help out or volunteer in their community</li> <li>○ less likely to have formal qualifications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bristol Ageing Better estimated at least 11,000 older people are experiencing isolation in the city.</li> <li>• We must factor aging and the needs of older people into long term budgeting and service design</li> </ul>
<b>Disability</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	Where proposals will explicitly address the needs of Disabled people we should consider whether any savings proposals, which aim to reduce or introduce new charges

	<p>for services particularly benefiting disabled people, might reduce our public sector equality duty to advance equality of opportunity.</p> <p>Where there are proposals to make general savings and efficiencies to services and better use of technology we must ensure that our capacity to make anticipatory and responsive reasonable adjustments for disabled people is not reduced. We will ensure that those who require resources in alternative formats or who need phone or face-to-face support can still access it. We will involve disabled users in testing new technology to make sure accessibility features are effective.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on disabled colleagues unless emerging accessibility issues are adequately mitigated through ongoing equality impact assessment and liaison with e.g. the Disabled Colleagues Network prior to implementation.</p>
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 17% of Bristol’s population are Disabled. There are more Disabled women than men living in Bristol.</li> <li>• One in five Disabled adults faces extra costs of over £1,000 a month even after they have received welfare payments designed to meet those costs<sup>1</sup>.</li> <li>• In 2021, the disability pay gap was 13.8% with Disabled employees earning a median of £12.10 per hour and non-Disabled employees a median of £14.03 per hour.</li> <li>• Disabled people are less likely to be employed in a managerial or professional occupation</li> <li>• the national disability employment rate was 52.7% in Q2 2021, compared to 81.0% for non-disabled people.</li> <li>• Disabled workers move out of work at nearly twice the rate (8.8%) of non-disabled workers (4.9%). Workless Disabled people move into work at nearly one-third of the rate (11.0%) of workless non-Disabled people (26.9%)</li> <li>• Disability increases with age: 4.1% of all children, for the working age population it increases to 12.3% and for people aged 65 and over it increases to 55.9%.</li> <li>• Disabled people on average have lower qualification levels than the population as a whole.</li> <li>• A higher proportion of Disabled people rent from a social provider (local authority or housing association)</li> <li>• Disabled people have lower car ownership levels</li> <li>• Disabled people experience higher rates of hate crime and domestic abuse compared to the general population</li> <li>• Disabled people should be empowered to make independent living choices and a have a say in access to service provision.</li> <li>• Budget setting needs to provide sufficient resource and flexibility to meet our legal duty to make anticipatory and responsive reasonable adjustments for disabled people including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ changing the way things are done e.g. opening / working times;</li> <li>○ changes to overcome barriers created by the physical features of premises.</li> <li>○ providing auxiliary aids e.g. extra equipment or a different or additional service.</li> <li>○ is ‘anticipatory’ so we must think in advance and ongoing about what disabled people might reasonably need.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disabled people must not be charged for their reasonable adjustments, accessible formats or other adaptations. It is a legal requirement under the Equalities Act to ensure information is accessible to Disabled employees and service users.</li> </ul>
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> [Disability Price Tag](#) | [Disability charity Scope UK](#)



<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	<p>The cumulative impact of proposed savings may have a disproportionate impact on women because of existing economic and structural inequalities which mean that they are more dependent on existing services. Service redesign should take into consideration the differing needs of female and male service users.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes will have a disproportionate impact on women as c.60% of employees, however there is wide variance in the proportion of female and male employees between teams. Female employees are much more likely to work part time which is likely to be because of unpaid caring responsibilities for children and older adults. This can be partly mitigated through the Council's Flexible Working Policy, and we are committed to helping all employees achieve a balance between their working life and other priorities such as parental and caring responsibilities etc.</p>
<b>Existing issues / considerations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The average UK pay gap is 15.4% in favour of men. The South West average is 16.6% with women paid 83p for every £1 earned by male counterparts.</li> <li>• Women still bear the majority of caring responsibilities for both children and older relatives.</li> <li>• Women are more likely to be excluded from conversations which affect decision making due to lack of representation in boards / organisational leadership.</li> <li>• Services and workplace requirements may not take into consideration the impact of women's reproductive life course including menstruation, avoiding pregnancy, pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding, and menopause.</li> <li>• Young women between the ages of 16 and 24 have higher risk of common mental health problems and higher rates of self-harm and post-traumatic stress disorder etc.</li> <li>• Bristol female preventable mortality rates are significantly higher than the England rates</li> <li>• Nationally 27% of women experience domestic abuse in their lifetimes. The rate of recorded domestic abuse incidents in Bristol has shown a significant rise over the last two years and 74% of victims were female.</li> <li>• Men and boy's health is in general poorer than that of women and girl's</li> <li>• Male life expectancy at birth in Bristol is around four years less than for females.</li> <li>• On average men in Bristol live 18 years in poor health, women live 22 years in poor health</li> <li>• A higher proportion of boys have physical impairments and more boys than girls have diagnosed mental health disorders and learning difficulties.</li> <li>• Men in Bristol are more likely than women to have unhealthy lifestyle behaviours including being overweight and obese, smoking, alcohol and substance misuse</li> <li>• There are differences between men and women in health practices and the way they use health services</li> <li>• Men are three times more likely than women to take their own lives.</li> </ul>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<p>Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	<p>Proposals to make savings in externally commissioned services may reduce the focus on providing LGBTQ+ friendly services unless revised specifications have an explicit equality and inclusion focus.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on sexual orientation if relocated lesbian, gay and bisexual staff have concerns about discrimination in their new setting. The Council is committed to promoting an inclusive working environment and challenging discriminatory behaviour.</p>
<b>Existing issues / considerations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesbian, gay and bisexual people are statistically more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse</li> <li>• 1 in 5 Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans (LGBT) staff have been the target of negative comments or conduct from work colleagues in the last year because they're LGBT.</li> <li>• More than a third of LGBT staff have hidden or disguised that they're LGBT at work in the last year because they were afraid of discrimination.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 in 10 Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic LGBT staff have similarly been physically attacked because of their sexual orientation and /or gender identity, compared to 3% of White LGBT staff</li> <li>• One in four lesbian and bisexual women have experienced domestic abuse in a relationship, one third of them were abused by a man. Almost half of all gay and bisexual men have experienced at least one incident of domestic abuse from either a family member or a partner since the age of 16.</li> <li>• Research shows LGBT people face widespread discrimination in healthcare settings and one in seven LGBT people avoid seeking healthcare for fear of discrimination from staff</li> <li>• The Stonewall <u>LGBT in Britain - Health Report</u> shows LGBT people are at greater risk of marginalisation during health crises, and those with multiple marginalised identities can struggle even more. In communications we should signpost and refer where possible to mutual aid and community support networks?</li> <li>• Research has shown that LGBT people are more likely to be living with long-term health conditions, are more likely to smoke, and have higher rates of drug and alcohol use.</li> <li>• Half of LGBT people experienced depression in the last year</li> <li>• 14% of LGBT people have avoided treatment for fear of discrimination because they are LGBT.</li> </ul>
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	Savings proposals which relate to transport, buildings, parking, parks and green spaces etc. may lead to service changes which have a disproportionate on pregnancy and maternity unless there is ongoing consideration of particular access and support needs. Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on pregnancy employees. We need to ensure equal access to recruitment, personal development, promotion and retention for employees who are pregnant or on maternity leave - including briefing and updates for any workforce changes.
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Equality Act 2010 applies to those who are pregnant or have given birth in the past 26 weeks, as well as making provisions to protect the rights of breastfeeding mothers.</li> <li>• Around 80% of women will give birth and many women will also experience termination, miscarriage and stillbirth</li> <li>• In the workplace we need to ensure equal access to recruitment, personal development, promotion and retention for employees who are pregnant or on maternity leave (including briefing and updates for any workforce changes)</li> <li>• Ensure there is equality of opportunity for services in relation to pregnancy and maternity. This includes e.g. providing physical access when using prams and pushchairs, and availability of toilets and baby-changing facilities etc. , and flexible working patterns and service times for childcare arrangements Women from minoritised ethnic backgrounds are more likely to experience complications at birth</li> </ul>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	Proposals to make savings in externally commissioned services may reduce the focus on providing trans inclusive services unless revised specifications have an explicit equality and inclusion focus. Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on relocated trans employees if they have concerns about discrimination in their new setting. The Council is committed to promoting an inclusive working environment and challenging discriminatory behaviour.
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As sexual orientation above trans people are statistically more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse. Trans people regularly face prejudice and discrimination because of the way in which they transgress many of the norms of our culture and society.</li> </ul>

	1 in 8 trans people (12%) in the workplace have been physically attacked by customers or colleagues in the last year because they were trans
<b>Race</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	<p>Without an explicit focus on addressing race inequality in service redesign the cumulative impact of proposed savings may have a disproportionate for Black and racially minoritised communities because of existing structural inequality and disparities in terms of health, housing, education, employment etc. All service change proposals will be subject to equality impact assessment, and we continue to work with our strategic partners to meet the needs of Bristol’s diverse population.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on Black, Asian and minority ethnic employees who proportionally under-represented on higher salary bands, and statistically more likely to raise formal grievances and be subject to disciplinaries. This should be mitigated through a range of positive action initiatives and specific race equality actions.</p>
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research from The Runnymede Trust shows that Black and minority ethnic households in the UK are more likely to be in deep poverty and currently experience much higher levels of food insecurity, material deprivation and fuel poverty<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• Minoritised ethnic communities in Bristol experience greater disadvantage than in England and Wales as a whole in education and employment and this is particularly so for Black African people<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• In the last census (2011) 16% of the population belonged to a Black, Asian or minority ethnic group and this is likely to be higher now.</li> <li>• The top three countries of birth outside UK for Bristol residents are Poland, Somalia and India.</li> <li>• Although the race or ethnicity pay gap has narrowed in recent years there are still wide pay differences between particular ethnic groups and most minority ethnic groups earn less on average than White British people.</li> <li>• Bangladeshi, Pakistani, and Black ethnic groups are more likely to live in deprived neighbourhoods; and the same groups and Chinese ethnicities are about twice as likely to live on a low income and experience child poverty compared to White groups</li> <li>• Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic households are less likely to own their home and more likely to living in overcrowded housing and intergenerational households. Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups are more likely to live in multi-family households.</li> <li>• Black people in the UK are less likely to hold a driving licence and more likely to rely on public transport.</li> <li>• Black, Asian and minority ethnic groups in Bristol are more likely to find inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to</li> <li>• Black African young people are disadvantaged in education compared to their White peers<sup>8</sup>. A disproportionately high percentage of Bristol school pupils from Black, Asian and minority ethnic backgrounds are excluded from school and In Bristol pupils with the lowest ‘Attainment 8’ scores are from Black ethnic background (highest from Chinese ethnic background.)</li> <li>• Organisations may lack cultural competence because minoritised ethnic staff are under- represented.</li> <li>• People from Black African, Other, and Black Caribbean groups have persistently high levels of unemployment and almost all ethnic minority groups in Bristol experience employment inequality when compared to White British people.</li> <li>• Black Asian and other minoritised ethnic groups are more likely to be self-employed than the Bristol average and over-represented in low income self-employment including taxis, takeaway restaurants</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> The Runnymede Trust (2022), [Falling faster amidst a cost of living crisis](#)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People from minoritised ethnic backgrounds are underrepresented in political and civic leadership.</li> <li>• People who do not speak English as a main language may require information in plain English and community language translations or videos etc.</li> </ul>
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	<p>Whilst the overall budget setting proposals have prioritised essential services there is a risk that the cumulative impact of savings in non-essential areas may have a disproportionate impact on people from non-Christian faith groups who are less likely to be satisfied with the range and quality of outdoor and cultural events, parks and green spaces and other amenities in the city. We will work with faith-led organisations in the city to understand the emerging needs of faith groups as part of ongoing service design.</p> <p>Council workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on some faith groups as the category "Other religion or belief" is disproportionately represented at the lowest salary bracket of Council employees. The main City Hall and Temple St work sites have a multi-faith room, and we will continue to promote flexible working patterns wherever possible to accommodate faith holidays and prayer requirements etc.</p>
Existing issues / considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are at least 45 religions represented in Bristol. The most recent Census data shows that 6.7% of people in Bristol are Muslim, and Islam is the second religion in Bristol after Christianity.</li> <li>• Budget proposals should take into account differing needs because of people's religion and belief (for example different requirements around diet, life events, and holidays).</li> <li>• Having a designated multi-faith room can make environments such as workplaces and shopping centres is more accessible and friendly for people from faith groups where regular prayer is required.</li> </ul>
<b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Cumulative impact and mitigations</b>	None identified
<b>OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	
	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

**Socio-Economic  
(deprivation)**

- Our assessment at this budget setting stage (prior to further detailed development and implementation of savings proposals) is that there is an overall risk of disproportionate negative impacts on low-income households and people living in poverty from our savings proposals unless this is adequately mitigated.
- We have addressed this risk as far as possible by protecting frontline services and prioritising services for those most in need, and through specific proposals such as allocating of a proportion of the discretionary Local Crisis Prevent Fund to support qualifying new and existing council tenants with emergency living expenses and household goods, maximising income from Council Tax Social Care Precept, and the continuation of a more focused Council Tax Reduction Scheme discount.
- Compared to consultation respondents overall, people living in the 10% most deprived areas of the city were more likely to agree with no increase to Council Tax (36% compared to 23%), and less likely to agree with a 3% increase (29% compared to 41%). They were also more likely to agree with no additional social care precept (35% compared to 28%), and less likely to agree with an additional 3% social care precept (22% compared to 32%).
- The local crisis prevention fund provides discretionary emergency payments for essentials and household goods for people in financial hardship. Any reduction to the authority's contribution to local crisis prevention fund will restrict the effectiveness of this mitigation.
- The Housing Revenue Account budget proposes that Council tenants' rents and service charges increase by 7%. For tenants who are in rent arrears this proposal will influence their current debt situation. We will be mindful that support should be put in place for those who have been identified as having existing arrears and help from appropriate services will be forthcoming. We will also reinvest rents in housing so there are benefits in terms of helping to fund housing supply and make other improvements for tenants.
- Bristol has 41 areas in the most deprived 10% in England, including 3 in the most deprived 1%. The greatest levels of deprivation are in Hartcliffe & Withywood, Filwood and Lawrence Hill.
- In Bristol 15% of residents - 70,800 people - live in the 10% most deprived areas in England, including 19,000 children and 7,800 older people.
- There are an estimated 29,045 households living in fuel poverty in Bristol, 14.4% of all households (BEIS, 2022)
- 4.6% of households have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity, rising to 11.2% in the most deprived areas of the city (QoL 2021-22)
- 34.6% of people in Bristol are dissatisfied with the way the Council runs things, but this is 47.5% for people living in the most deprived areas of the city (QoL 2021-22).
- The inequalities gap in life expectancy between the most and least deprived areas in Bristol is 9.9 years for men and 6.7 years for women.

<b>Carers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the increasing move towards hybrid working is beneficial for some employees with caring responsibilities, proposed workforce efficiencies and changes can have a disproportionate impact if there are significant alterations made to travel requirements or working patterns. We will promote flexible working patterns and consider the needs of those who may be more dependent on vehicle use as part of any Management of Change Process.</li> <li>• Being a carer can be a huge barrier to accessing services and maintaining employment</li> <li>• We need to consider the timing/availability of services, events etc. to allow flexibility for carers.</li> <li>• As with Disability and Pregnancy and Maternity – policies which aim to restrict driving or parking can have a disproportionate impact on people who are reliant on having their own transport.</li> <li>• Studies show around 65% of adults have provided unpaid care for a loved one.</li> <li>• Women have a 50% likelihood of being an unpaid carer by the age of 46 (by age 57 for men)</li> <li>• Young carers are often hidden and may not recognise themselves as carers_</li> </ul>
<b>Homelessness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minoritised ethnic communities are overrepresented in homelessness applicants locally and nationally, especially Black/Black British people</li> <li>• Single households and younger people overrepresented (linked to mortality rates) Higher levels of women (18-20%) and non-EU nationals represented in the Bristol rough sleeping population</li> <li>• Diversity monitoring gaps e.g. for ethnicity, sexual orientation and low self-recognition of disability for people with complex health needs may mean there is less insight into future demand by characteristic</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't

The scale of the potential gap in our core funding means that there is very limited opportunity to bring genuine additional benefit to equalities groups in the circumstances. However we have considered as far as possible the need to: eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups; and foster good relations between people from different groups.

Our budget savings proposals are aligned to our Corporate Strategy and although we have limited resources our future focus will be on achieving those priorities we have identified, including tackling poverty and intergenerational inequality.

## Step 4: Impact

### 4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

<b>Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:</b>
The cumulative impact of our saving proposals are likely to have a disproportionate impact on people living in poverty / low-income families, and equalities groups particularly on the basis of Age and Disability. We will aim to mitigate this disproportionate impact as possible by prioritising and retaining statutory and targeted services which most benefit vulnerable groups. Any reduction in Council roles and office locations is likely to have a disproportionate impact for employees on the basis of their age, disability, sex and race unless mitigated through thorough staff consultation and ongoing consideration of specific equality impacts prior to implementation.
<b>Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:</b>
No significant positive impacts have been identified. This analysis has concluded that overall the proposed savings are proportionate and can be justified on the basis the Council must set a balanced annual budget despite a significant potential gap in the funding required.

## 4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
All relevant EqlAs will be published on the Council's website <a href="https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/council-budgets">https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/council-budgets</a> and continue to be updated as appropriate.		

## 4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured?

How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.

Our Equality and Inclusion Annual Progress Reports show what we have done to achieve the aims of our Equality and Inclusion policy and strategy, and the progress we have made including reporting on all relevant KPIs and workforce diversity <a href="https://www.bristol.gov.uk/equalities-policy">Equalities policy - bristol.gov.uk</a>
---

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqlA. EqlAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) before requesting sign off from your Director<sup>3</sup>.

<b>Equality and Inclusion Team Review:</b> <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	<b>Director Sign-Off:</b> Denise Murray
Date: 11/1/2023	16/01/2023

<sup>3</sup> Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.