

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.12]



Title: Cumulative Equality Impact Assessment of proposed budget savings 2024/25 – 2028/29	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Crosscutting	Lead Officer name: Denise Murray
Service Area: All	Lead Officer role: Director of Finance (Chief Finance Officer & S151 Officer)

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, Bristol City 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 continuing to face financial challenges, reflecting the economic context, including the significant inflationary environment, combined with continuing demand pressures and limitations on government funding. Based on our current forecasts, we face a funding gap over the next five years (to 2028/29) of £32.2 million. This is in addition to the £17.7 million of savings and efficiencies proposals for 2024-2028 outlined in the 2023/24 budget and assumed delivery of 2023/24 savings in the current year.

The council is funded via different streams including council tax (24%), business rates (15%), income from service users (19%), grants (38%), contributions from other organisations (3%) and investment income (less than 1%). 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. By far the largest share of the council's budget is spent on social care services, with over 70 per cent of our core service spending on providing support to those who need additional help and the most vulnerable in our city. We are seeing an increase in demand for all of our services which is likely due to a cost-of-living crisis, a rise of inflation nationally and a growth in population.

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. As part of this and reflecting the breadth of savings already within the previous budget, during 2023/24 we have identified four transformation programmes designed to make significant changes to the way we work: Our Families (children and education), Adult Social Care, temporary accommodation and property.

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 and service re-design programmes.

The Budget Equality Impact and Cumulative Impact Assessment process

Each of the proposed savings has an associated equalities impact assessment that analyses the impact of the proposal on different protected characteristics and community groups and identifies any potential mitigations. Assessing the impact of savings proposals on different groups allows decision makers to 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. This relates to the time at which the budget is approved and on an ongoing basis as propositions are further developed. 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 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 compound issues or disparities, and what we can do to mitigate them.

Decision making

The recommendations regarding the budget proposals are made by the Cabinet to Full Council, where the budget is then approved. 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 now 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.

Our [Equity and Inclusion strategic framework](#) 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.

Our aim is to minimise direct and indirect impacts on our communities in this budget, specifically communities with protected characteristics and multiple characteristics, people living in deprivation, and those with other characteristics such as being care experienced. Where impacts are probable or likely, our aim is to mitigate against these where we can.

In building our approach to these budget reductions, we have first prioritised savings in areas which have the minimum direct impact on people and been clear how we will reshape the ongoing investment to address 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 towards those who may be 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?

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[please select]
---	-----------------------------	-----------------

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 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/equality-diversity)

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 : [Statistics and census information \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/statistics), [Bristol Key Facts November 2023](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/bristol-key-facts); [Quality of life in Bristol](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/quality-of-life); [Census 2021 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/census-2021); [Ward profile data \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/ward-profile); [Open Data Bristol](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/open-data), ; [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/jsna);

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 \(sharepoint.com\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/hr-analytics) 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](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Census Data 2021	<p>Key headlines from 2021 census data on Bristol were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 49.6% of the overall population were men and 50.4% were women. • 18.8% of usual residents were born outside of the UK • 17.2% reported a Health issue or disability. The average across England and Wales is 17.5%. • There were 287+ ethnic groups recorded with Somali's being the largest ethnic minority with a population of almost 9,200 (1.9%) • There were 3,220 people identified as trans • 51.4% reported no religion, 32.2% reported Christian and 6.7% reported that they were Muslim
<p>Population of Bristol</p> <p>Population Profile: Disabled population</p> <p>Population Profile: Somali population</p> <p>Population Profile: Religion</p> <p>Population Profile: Ethnic group</p>	<p>The population of Bristol was estimated to be 479,000 people at the end of June 2022. Bristol is one of the 11 UK Core Cities, the largest city in the Southwest and the 8th largest city in England and Wales outside of London. Bristol was the second fastest growing of all the Core Cities in England and Wales over the last 10 years (2012 to 2022).</p> <p><u>Disabled population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 81,000 (17.2%) people in Bristol have long-term physical or mental health conditions or illnesses whose day-to-day activities were limited • More than a quarter (27%) of the 'White Gypsy or Irish Traveller' population said they had a long-term physical or mental health issue or disability that affected their daily lives - 10 percentage points more than the Bristol average (17%) • Of all the carers in Bristol, almost a third (30%) were disabled themselves - this compares to just 17% of the population who do not provide unpaid carer to others <p><u>Somali population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2021 more than half (52%) of Somalis living in Bristol were aged under 20 (Bristol total population 23% aged under 20) • More than half of the Somali population live in Barton Hill (23%), Upper Easton (11%), St Pauls (10%) or Temple Meads (10%) <p><u>Religion population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than a third (36%) of all Jewish people of working age were economically inactive students compared to just 12% in the population as a whole

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hindus have the highest levels of qualification - 62% with a degree or higher • Half of all Muslims (50%) live in socially rented accommodation - 31 percentage points higher than the overall population (19%) <p><u>Ethnic group population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are now more than 287 different ethnic groups in the city, more than 185 countries of birth represented, at least 45 religions and more than 90 languages spoken by people living in Bristol. • The proportion of the population who are not 'White British' has increased over the last two decades from 12% in 2001 to 28% in 2021. 																
<p>Ward profile data</p>	<p>The ward profiles provide a range of datasets including population, life expectancy, Quality of Life, Equalities characteristics, health and education disparities for each of Bristol's electoral wards.</p>																
<p>Deprivation in Bristol</p>	<p>Bristol has 41 Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOA's) in the most deprived 10% in England for Multiple Deprivation (one less than in 2015), including 3 LSOAs in the most deprived 1% in England (3 less than in 2015).</p> <p>The 10 most deprived neighbourhoods in Bristol are all in the South Bristol areas of Hartcliffe, Whitchurch Park and Knowle West. At ward level, the greatest levels of deprivation in Bristol are in the wards of Hartcliffe & Withywood, Lawrence Hill and Filwood, the same as identified in 2015.</p>																
<p>Bristol Quality of Life survey 2022-23</p>	<p>The Bristol Quality of Life survey is an annual, residents survey that measures against 190 indicators on topics such as health, lifestyles, community, local services and living in Bristol. The survey is a randomised sample that is mailed to 33,000 Bristol households. The 2022-23 survey compromised a total of 3,905 responses.</p> <p>The below shows the percentage by demographic in response to the indicator:</p> <p>'% who find it difficult to manage financially'</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="523 1581 1214 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th>Characteristic</th> <th>% Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bristol Average</td> <td>10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Most Deprived 10%</td> <td>17.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 to 24 years</td> <td>18.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 years and older</td> <td>7.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65 years and older</td> <td>5.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>10.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>10.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Characteristic	% Percentage	Bristol Average	10.2%	Most Deprived 10%	17.5%	16 to 24 years	18.5%	50 years and older	7.8%	65 years and older	5.4%	Female	10.0%	Male	10.3%
Characteristic	% Percentage																
Bristol Average	10.2%																
Most Deprived 10%	17.5%																
16 to 24 years	18.5%																
50 years and older	7.8%																
65 years and older	5.4%																
Female	10.0%																
Male	10.3%																

	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Disabled</td><td>25.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black, Asian and minority ethnic</td><td>22.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Asian/Asian British</td><td>19.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black/Black British</td><td>27.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups</td><td>20.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td>7.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>White Minority Ethnic</td><td>14.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>White British</td><td>7.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>Christian</td><td>9.6%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other religion</td><td>48.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>No religion or faith</td><td>19.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Single parent</td><td>23.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Two parents</td><td>9.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>No qualifications</td><td>13.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Owner Occupier</td><td>5.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Rented from housing association</td><td>21.3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Rented from the council</td><td>25.9%</td></tr> <tr><td>Rented from private landlord</td><td>19.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non degree qualifications</td><td>14.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Degree qualifications</td><td>8.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Part-time carer</td><td>13.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Full-time carer</td><td>21.2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Carer (All)</td><td>15.7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Parents (All)</td><td>11.0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual+</td><td>14.4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Trans</td><td>32.5%</td></tr> </table>	Disabled	25.7%	Black, Asian and minority ethnic	22.3%	Asian/Asian British	19.7%	Black/Black British	27.0%	Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	20.0%	White	7.9%	White Minority Ethnic	14.7%	White British	7.9%	Christian	9.6%	Other religion	48.9%	No religion or faith	19.5%	Single parent	23.0%	Two parents	9.4%	No qualifications	13.7%	Owner Occupier	5.5%	Rented from housing association	21.3%	Rented from the council	25.9%	Rented from private landlord	19.2%	Non degree qualifications	14.2%	Degree qualifications	8.2%	Part-time carer	13.5%	Full-time carer	21.2%	Carer (All)	15.7%	Parents (All)	11.0%	Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual+	14.4%	Trans	32.5%
Disabled	25.7%																																																				
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	22.3%																																																				
Asian/Asian British	19.7%																																																				
Black/Black British	27.0%																																																				
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	20.0%																																																				
White	7.9%																																																				
White Minority Ethnic	14.7%																																																				
White British	7.9%																																																				
Christian	9.6%																																																				
Other religion	48.9%																																																				
No religion or faith	19.5%																																																				
Single parent	23.0%																																																				
Two parents	9.4%																																																				
No qualifications	13.7%																																																				
Owner Occupier	5.5%																																																				
Rented from housing association	21.3%																																																				
Rented from the council	25.9%																																																				
Rented from private landlord	19.2%																																																				
Non degree qualifications	14.2%																																																				
Degree qualifications	8.2%																																																				
Part-time carer	13.5%																																																				
Full-time carer	21.2%																																																				
Carer (All)	15.7%																																																				
Parents (All)	11.0%																																																				
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual+	14.4%																																																				
Trans	32.5%																																																				
Bristol One City - Cost of Living Crisis Bristol's One City approach to support citizens and communities – What happened and key learning, November 2023	<p>This report provides a summary of Bristol's response to the national cost of living crisis between October 2022 and March 2023.</p> <p>Key headlines are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In August 22 – February 23 the cost-of-living support webpage reached 20,400 unique views • From November 2022 to March 2023, the free 'We are Bristol' helpline logged 359 phone calls linked to the cost-of-living crisis • An estimated 4,911 people per week visited 'Welcome spaces' (a communal warm space that is free to access) over the winter 2022/23 																																																				
Impact of the cost-of-living crisis on black & minoritized communities in Bristol –	<p>The Black Southwest network launched a survey to investigate the impact of the cost-of-living crisis on Black and minoritized communities in the greater Bristol area. In total, there were 127 responses from</p>																																																				

<p>Black Southwest Network, 2023</p>	<p>Black and minoritized individuals to a survey covering a range of topics related to financial concerns.</p> <p>Key headlines are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% advised that they are now struggling to afford basic items • 79% stated that they were struggling with at least one type of bill • 68% advised that they are struggling to afford essential services (public transport, healthcare or education) • Of those who identified as being a parent or guardian for a child/children, 41% mentioned concern around education related expenses such as school uniform
<p>Nomis - Official Labour Market Statistics (nomisweb.co.uk) 2022-23</p> <p>Business Demography</p>	<p>80.6% of all people in Bristol are economically active which is higher than nationally (78.6) and in the Southwest (80.7%). Of economically active people in Bristol 8.2% are self-employed, compared to 9.3% nationally. Of those who are economically inactive in Bristol, 35.5% are Students, 26.7% are 'long-term sick' and 18.7% are looking after family/home, as well as 7.9% who are retired.</p> <p>The percentage of 'workless households' in Bristol is 11.2%, compared to 13.9% nationally, and the proportion of working aged people who are benefit claimants is 11.2%. Bristol has a higher proportion of people working in 'professional occupations' (35.2) than for the Southwest (25.4%) and nationally (26.8%).</p> <p>In 2020 (most recent data) the Southwest 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>Gender and Early Education and Childcare – Spring budget 2023</p>	<p>National data shows that early education and childcare is increasingly expensive. National data shows that 52% of families were concerned about paying for childcare and for 33% of parents, early education and childcare payments are higher than their mortgage or rent, this rises to 47% of those with Black ethnic background, 42% of those receiving universal credit and 38% of single parents.</p> <p>Parents with a one year old child advised that the cost of nursery provision has grown four times faster than their wages. A nursery place for children under two costs between 45-60% of women's average salaries in England. 94% of parents who changed working patterns after having children cited financial reasons as a factor in their decisions.</p>
<p>Bristol City Council – staff data</p>	
<p>HR Analytics data [internal use only – November 2023]</p>	<p>The Workforce Diversity Report shows Bristol City Council Workforce Diversity statistics for Headcount, Sickness, Starters and Leavers data. It excludes data for Locally Managed Schools/Nurseries, Councillors, Casual, Seasonal and External Agency employees. The report is based</p>

on the sensitive information that staff add to Employee Self Service on iTrent (ESS).

	BCC headcount % (19 Nov 2023)	Bristol Working Age Population (16-64)
Age 16-29	11.9%	39.0%
Age 30-39	21.9%	24.0%
Age 40-49	25.2%	16.0%
Age 50-64	41.2%	21.0%
Disabled	8.5%	12%
Asian / Asian British	2.9%	5.8%
Black / Black British	5.1%	5.3%
Mixed ethnicity	3.5%	2.9%
Other ethnic groups	1.7%	1.0%
White	77.2%	85.0%
Female	61.3%	49.1%
Male	38.7%	50.9%
Use another gender term	0.2%	-
Christian	25.2%	43.5%
Other religion/belief	18.2%	7.4%
No religion/belief	32.2%	41.5%
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	6.4%	9.1%
Trans	0.2%	-

Additional comments:

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 a change process 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 Thursday 9th November and Thursday 21st December. Alongside asking for views on different options for Council Tax and the Social Care precept for 24/25, 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. Whilst it is a challenge to engage with all our citizens, we know that there are some groups with seldom heard voices with whom we can do a better job at engaging with. Unfortunately, because of the very tight timescales involved in preparing our draft budget proposals, this year we were unable to provide an Easy Read version in time for the launch of the consultation as this takes several days to produce. However, both an Easy Read version and a British Sign Language version was uploaded to the consultation and engagement hub. Paper copies were also distributed with Freepost return. Equalities groups and community groups were contacted, raising awareness of the consultation with a request to circulate to their networks.

As of 3rd January 2024, we received 2,547 responses to the consultation including 168 via Easy Read online and 12 email responses. 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:

- 8% 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. 64 per 10,000 residents in Southville, compared to 18 per 10,000 residents in Hartcliffe and Withywood
- 44% of all survey responses were from women and 56% were from men. This compares to 50% of each sex in the Bristol population. 0.1% of responses were from people who identified as 'other sex'.
- 2% of respondents answered 'yes' to 'do you consider yourself to have a gender identity different from your sex recorded at birth'?
- 13% of respondents were Disabled people
- The highest number of responses were from respondents aged 35-44 years (26%), followed by 25-34 (22%)
- 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 5% (compared to 7% for Bristol)
- Black/Black British 3% (compared to 6% for Bristol)
- Mixed/Multiple ethnic group 3% (compared to 4% for Bristol)
- Other ethnic background 1% (compared to 2% for Bristol)

- Gypsy / Roma / Irish Traveller 0.2% (compared to 0.3% for Bristol)
- People from Christian and some other faith groups including Muslims (2% respondents compared to 7% population) were somewhat underrepresented
- 11% of respondents were carers
- Those identifying as LGB+ were over-represented when comparing with the Bristol population.

Summary of findings

Council tax

The majority (66%) favour an increase in core Council Tax to support general services in 2024/25.

- 1,046 (42%) would prefer a 3% increase in core Council Tax. This is the option with the highest support
- 316 (13%) favour a 2% increase
- 279 (11%) favour a 1% increase
- 844 (34%) respondents would prefer 'no increase to Council Tax' in 2024/25. This is the option with the second highest support
- 62 respondents did not give a view on Council Tax.

Selections varied dependent on decile. For example,

- in the most deprived decile 42% selected no increase to council tax in comparison to decile 10 (least deprived) which was 25%.
- In the most deprived decile 75% selected no social care precept above 2% in comparison to decile 10 (least deprived) which was 61% and mid-range, 58%.
- In the most deprived decile 14% advised that the proposals would have an effect on them because of a protected characteristic in comparison to the least deprived which was 8%.

Social care precept

The majority (60%), favour some Social Care Precept (on top of core Council Tax) to support the delivery of social care in 2024/25.

- 932 (37%) would prefer a 2% Social Care Precept. This is the option with the second highest support
- 566 (23%) favour a 1% Social Care Precept
- 966 (40%) respondents would prefer no Social Care Precept in 2024/25. This is the option with the highest support
- 53 respondents did not give a view on Social Care Precept.

Similarly with Council Tax, selections varied dependent on decile.

- in the most deprived decile 49% selected no increase to council tax in comparison to decile 10 (least deprived) which was 33%.

The option with the highest support (30%) is a 3% increase in core Council Tax and a 2% Social Care Precept. This is the maximum increase permitted under government limits announced on 18 December 2023 in the [Provisional local government finance settlement: England, 2024 to 2025](#)

Comments opposed to increasing council tax and the social care precept largely focused on the fact that people are already struggling financially given the current cost of living crisis, and any increase would place additional pressures on budgets. This could lead to further challenges with paying mortgages, food poverty and heating homes. Comments in favour emphasised on the importance of services such as

social care supporting vulnerable groups. Calls were made for proportional taxation based on income or property value.

Respondents were asked what effect, if any, the proposals would have on them because of their protected characteristics. Of the 2,547 respondents to the survey, 87% answered the question.

- (8%) said the proposals would have a very negative effect
- (12%) said the proposals would have a slightly negative effect
- (77%) said the proposals would have no effect
- (2%) said the proposals would have a slightly positive effect
- (1%) said the proposals would have a very positive effect.

This fluctuated between different deciles, 14% in the most deprived area advised that the proposals would have a very negative effect because of protected characteristics, compared to 6% in the least deprived.

Reasons why the proposals would have an effect because of protected characteristics were cited as:

- Financial struggles and the impact of rising costs (30% who responded in the free text box to this question cited this reason). Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Additional council tax rises will be particularly challenging for retired individuals who have limited income, especially due to fixed pension rates
 - difficulty in affording housing, and saving for the future were highlighted, particularly for younger individuals
- Impact on specific demographics (18% who responded in the free text box to this question cited this reason). Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Specific concerns raised by single parents, disabled individuals, and those on fixed pensions about their vulnerability to cost increases.
 - Criticisms related to gender disparities, especially concerning pay gaps and the differential treatment of households based on marital or partnership status.
 - Challenges highlighted for single parents, carers, single occupants, those on maternity leave, and those on limited benefits facing financial difficulties, indicating potential impacts of increased taxes on their budgets.
 - Mention of specific groups, including LGBT+ individuals, foreign nationals, and women, highlighting concerns about negative effects of increased taxes on their lives and livelihoods.
- Concerns on the disproportionate impact on vulnerable and minority groups (17% who responded in the free text box to this question cited this reason). Examples include but are not limited to:
 - Concerns raised by disabled individuals and carers regarding increased living expenses, financial strain, and limitations in accessing support services.
 - Challenges highlighted include difficulties in managing everyday costs, transportation expenses, and energy needs due to disabilities. Struggles in accessing specialised support, private school costs, and disparities in societal assistance despite paying taxes also raised as issues.
 - Calls for increased funding and improvements in provisions for Special Educational Needs (SEN) and social care for disabled individuals and families.

Other reasons were summarised as:

- Concerns around council governance, decisions and the consultation (12%)
- Concerns about the impact on the community and public services (9%)
- Issues regarding accessibility, equality and fairness (6%)
- Concerns around the impact on health and wellbeing (3%)

A full detailed breakdown of the responses will be available on the [consultation and engagement](#) hub Monday 15th January 2024.

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 from Monday 15th January 2024. We will take Budget consultation responses into account when developing the final proposals to put to the Cabinet, which is scheduled for 23rd January 2024 and a meeting of the Full Council for approval, 20th February 2024 where final decision will be taken.

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)

Overview

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 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.

Alongside other public bodies we are in an unprecedented period of financial pressure, with significant challenges 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. 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.

Savings proposals

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 sure 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.

The operating model re-design of the Children and Education directorate is in line with the current activities within the transformation programmes (Our Families), previously agreed by cabinet and is anticipated to enable us to deliver our work more effectively. The 'Our Families' programme board provide programme governance and alignment with wider changes in children's services, embedding equality and inclusion into operating model activities will help ensure effective outcomes and ensure no discrimination occurs throughout the process. 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. 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. Reviews of management structure should consider the impact on diversifying the workforce, and representation at leadership levels.

Reducing the council's discretionary learning and development budget is likely to impact the council's overall knowledge and skills in relation to best practice of Equality and Inclusion. The council will continue to deliver statutory and mandatory learning and will continue to prioritise funding for Equality and Inclusion where possible, however, learning and development training on other topics may be

reduced, widening knowledge gaps. The impact of this will be monitored through the diversity dashboard and responses to the staff survey. Having two application windows for the annual leave top up scheme is in line with previous years, but the cumulative impact on staff on lower paygrades whom this may feel inaccessible to should be continually monitored. Promoting the scheme in an accessible way to all employees and increasing awareness around the councils flexible working policies should be maximised to support those with other responsibilities such as caring responsibilities.

Community engagement

The Community Development team currently work with priority neighbourhoods, some of which are in the most deprived areas of the city ([Deprivation, 2019](#)). The team works in partnership with a wide range of organisations to promote community cohesion. The current programme of work will continue to be delivered; however, no new operational work will be delivered which may impact the council's ability to further advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations to a greater extent. Although priorities have not been set yet, and this is not committed spend, the need to invest in community development and support equalities across the city is growing.

Health, care and wellbeing

Bristol Quality of Life results showed that results for health and wellbeing indicators in 2022-23 were generally worse than 2021-22 and there are large health deprivation gaps within the city. There are multiple savings related to health care and wellbeing designed to make us work more efficiently. Where we are planning on increasing the number of reviews at shortened stages, the council must ensure that the provision and quality of care people receive is not impacted. Although there are likely to be some service users identified as being able to be discharged from care earlier, there will be some who still require access to care, and this should be sustained to ensure we do not exacerbate existing inequalities and support our duties outlined in the Care Act (2014). Older people and Disabled people are likely to be over-represented in cohorts receiving support, and so reviews should be carefully tailored to support these groups and any changes to care communicated sensitively and appropriately. The ageing population is increasingly diverse, and so ensuring changes to care are person-led, considerate of protected and other characteristics, based on an understanding of health equity and communicated in an accessible way is increasingly important. Staff completing reviews should have a good understanding of disability and race equality. Additionally, any reliance on social or community networks may further burden other groups such as carers.

Proposals that are related to increasing independence to alleviate pressures on other services should factor in equality and inclusion into service design and ensure assessing independence accounts for protected characteristics. Although this approach is anticipated to improve our effectiveness, we also know that other public bodies including NHS Trusts are also under enormous financial strain. The underlying reasons for the Council's budget deficit are far reaching and likely to impact other public bodies and providers and we should avoid making any assumptions that people's needs will still be met by other external provision if we change our existing services.

The [consultation for the Fair and Affordable Care policy](#) is due to close towards the end of January 2024. The policy sets out the council's future approach to Care Act Assessments, identifying how we will meet individual needs whilst ensuring best value for money under current financial pressures. The Policy describes the ways in which we will arrange care in a manner that reflects the choice and preferences of individuals but balances the need for us to arrange care that is sufficient to meet eligible needs whilst always looking to make best value of the finite resources available to us. The policy is likely to have disproportionate impacts on Disabled people and carers as there may be occasions where the support offered will not be the individual's preference or first choice of care. Responses to the consultation will need to be carefully considered and care should be person-centred, promote independence where

possible and ensure adherence to the Human Rights Act. Disabled people's groups should be consulted with where appropriate and internal equalities working groups collaborated with to ensure effective delivery and transparency.

Support for parents and children

A management plan has been developed to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of the Dedicated Schools Grant. The plan brings together the transformation programme, activities around Delivering Better Value (DBV) and Bristol's Special Educational Needs (SEND) activities. Any changes to the Dedicated schools grant will have multiple, intersecting equality impacts that require careful consideration. External expertise should be consulted with where appropriate to ensure accountability and that changes are meeting objectives related to creating more inclusive spaces for children. Co-production activities should be embedded into workstreams including with a wide range of stakeholders, parents and children from diverse backgrounds to capture different lived experiences. Programme boards should consistently pay due regard to equalities issues when decision making, to ensure effective governance, compliance with equality processes and to ensure we are achieving the best outcomes. Robust monitoring and adapting of deliverables will help ensure the needs of children, including complex needs are supported. Developing a culture of inclusion should continue to be prioritised and engagement with other sectors would be beneficial, to ensure a holistic approach to support. Activities will be subject to their own equalities assessment to ensure any risks and supporting mitigations are identified. Actions developed from the equality assessment process should be carefully monitored and implemented.

Like every local authority in England, Bristol has seen significant rising levels of Disabled Children diagnosed with SEND in schools in recent years, and budgets have not increased sufficiently to meet the current demand. There are 13,500 pupils in Bristol who have been diagnosed with SEND, this has increased 43% since 2016. Supporting children who require more support than what is ordinarily available has been a priority issue for the council, but the process has now become unsustainable. The [consultation for Bristol's Special Educational Needs \(SEND\)](#) funding closed on 13th December 2023. The purpose of the consultation was to gather views on how we provide non-statutory, discretionary top-up funding for children who have SEND but not an education, health and care plan (EHCP). Those receiving funding currently are more likely to be eligible for free school meals and pupils with SEND attendance at school is consistently lower. Black African children are 27% more likely to be in receipt of non-statutory top-up at mainstream schools, 60% more likely to be at a special school than the average child in Bristol and 41.6% of pupils with SEND support live in a deprived area. The budget is finite and a continuation of the current process puts the school system in Bristol at risk, so we must now review how the money is spent. There is likely to be a disproportionate negative impact on Disabled children who currently receive funding. Responses to the consultation will be carefully reviewed and the council will work with schools, parents and children to minimise impacts on equality of opportunity, especially where children have combined characteristics, so as to not widen existing educational gaps.

Transport and connectivity

The council will use net proceeds from the Clean Air Zone charges to support local transport schemes and change the way we pay for things. Investing into highways maintenance and highways network is likely to have a positive impact by ensuring roads and pavements are maintained in better conditions and are more accessible. Accessibility when carrying out any works should be continued to be prioritised. Any restructures or changes to services should use this as an opportunity to diversify the workforce.

Accommodation

There will be a rent and service charge increase in rents from April 2024, this is applicable to general needs accommodation, supported housing, temporary accommodation and garages and is to relieve pressures on the Housing Revenue Account. The maximum increase is determined by the government using a rent formula, a cap was introduced for the previous year which has now been lifted. Bristol quality of life data shows that, already, those renting from the council have several indicators significantly worse in relation to financial stability:

Indicator	% Bristol average	Rented from the council
% who find it difficult to manage financially	10.2%	25.9%
% extremely worried about keeping their home warm this winter	20.9%	47.5%
% households that used a food bank during the last 12 months	1.9%	6.8%
% households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity	8.1%	26.4%

Decision makers should consider the impact increases will have on tenants. Lettings officers will work with tenants on an individual basis and, where appropriate, put support plans in place and signpost to other financial resources to help minimise the impact on tenants. There are a high proportion of Disabled tenants in council-rented accommodation in comparison to the Bristol average, therefore specific financial and other support tailored to the needs of Disabled people should be shared where possible. Communications around increases in rent and service charges will be available in multiple languages and via accessible means. A fund has been made available specifically for residents struggling to pay rent, in addition to a crisis fund.

Almost three in ten homes in Bristol are privately rented. Private rental prices continue to grow annually, research from Bristol determined 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 ([Bristol One City, 2022](#)). Young people are often over-represented in privately rented homes. Decision makers should consider the likelihood of a knock-on effect for tenants when introducing costing licensing schemes for landlords. There is a small risk that landlords will transfer the additional costs down to tenants to avoid absorbing costs which could disproportionately impact those from lower socio-economic households. The impact of the scheme will be reviewed for its effectiveness, and local rent prices will need to be reviewed carefully. Overall, it is designed to have a positive equalities impact by improving living standards for tenants of rented, private accommodation which is greatly needed. Other proposals focused on accommodation; increasing direct lets with private landlords and developing two new solo homes for foster children will consider the suitability of accommodation based on the needs of service users based on Disability status, cultural needs and other characteristics when designing and placing people in accommodation to advance equality of opportunity. Physical accessibility needs should be prioritised, and BCC utilise this as an opportunity to work with landlords to raise awareness on accessible accommodation.

Income generation and contract management

Whilst we take a corporate approach to inflation, which includes on fees and charges, we have some savings linked to fees and charges to clients, partners or citizens for goods or services, where we are proposing increases above that inflationary rate. This is reflective of the markets and conditions in those specific areas as well as to ensure that we are able to recover costs of providing services. This ensures we are not cross subsidising chargeable areas through other income sources. 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 organisations who are led by those who are racially minoritised 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.

Contract negotiation and better contract management forms a core part of the budget proposals. Although this is designed to improve efficiencies, this should be carefully monitored to ensure it does not impact the quality of goods and services that subsequently may impact service-users. Robust monitoring of contracts should continue to take place with quality checks and equality and inclusion embedded into review processes.

Low-income households

Deprivation and cost of living crisis

Although the annual inflation rate is down on the previous year (October 2023), energy prices remain extremely high. Gas prices nationally in October 2023 were 60% higher than the previous two years and electricity was 40% higher than the previous two years ([Census, 2023](#)). Census data also showed that around two thirds of adults nationally are spending less on non-essentials because of cost-of-living increases.

The cost-of-living crisis disproportionately impacts those from lower-income households due to additional financial strain on essential spending. Bristol Quality of life data showed that 61.9% of people in the 10% most deprived areas were extremely or moderately worried about keeping their home warm in winter, the Bristol average was 48.0%. The cost-of-living crisis has wider-reaching, intersecting impacts on issues such as health-as people may be in poorer living-conditions, there are increases in poor mental health due to stress and increases in food insecurity leading to poor health. Decision makers should be aware of the potential cumulative impact of multiple savings proposals which taken together are likely to amount to 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 impact of this on people living in deprivation. Protecting vulnerable households remains a priority for the council and we will continue to use our discretionary funds to provide support to those most in need in 2024/25 and help low-income households with poverty.

Council tax reduction scheme

The council currently provides a Council Tax Reduction Scheme, which was introduced in 2013 and helps people on a low income with up to 100% of their council tax costs. The scheme has continued despite the reduction in government funding and Bristol has been among only a small number of authorities to retain a fully funded scheme for those that need financial support. In February 2023 it was agreed by full council that the scheme would be reviewed as part of the budget setting process. A public consultation launched in October-November 2023 with ten options being proposed. 6,533 surveys were completed, in total 40% wanted no change to the scheme and 60% wanted some change to the current scheme. Monitoring of responses showed that a high proportion of Disabled people responded to the

consultation. The decision went to [cabinet](#) on 5th December 2023 and it was agreed that there would be no change to Bristol's 2024/25 Council tax reduction scheme. The scheme remains unchanged, which will ease pressures on those from low-income households who are reliant on the scheme, this has been reflected in the proposed budget with the related saving being outlined as a proposed write-off as now undeliverable in the 2024-25 budget.

Council funding

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.

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 7.7% rent and service charge increase from April 2024 (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 eligible children up to 4 years. 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 high needs service provision in the coming financial years.

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 amount of funding allocated for public health is dictated by central government 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, supporting infrastructure work and supporting invest to save measures such as those included in the budget for children's homes sufficiency and fostering placements which should save money in the future.

Some activities that have an equalities impact will be dependent on expected income. If we do not receive as much income as expected, then we will ensure equality impact assessments are completed for any activities affected. At this stage, it is not possible to provide an assessment.

Protected characteristics	
Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bristol has a younger age profile in comparison to the national average (This is partly due to the large number of students living in Bristol during term time who are counted as part of the usually resident population). • 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. • Children and young people in Bristol are considerably more ethnically diverse than the overall population of Bristol. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In 2021 more than half (52%) of Somalis living in Bristol were aged under 20 (Bristol total population 23% aged under 20) • 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. • Young people in Bristol are more likely to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ has poor emotional health and wellbeing ○ find inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to ○ 6.8% of 16–17-year-olds (2020/21) were “not in education, employment or training” (NEET), worse than the national average (5.5%) • Young adults are most likely to have lost work or seen their income drop because of COVID-19 and the cost-of-living crisis • There are 91,900 children under 18 living in Bristol (Census 2021) • 21.8% (17,955) of children under 16 live in relative low-income families (Census 2021) • Across Bristol, there were 694 children in care as at the end of March 2022 (Figure 1). This has increased from previous years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Boys are over-represented in the cohort and two-thirds of children in care are of white ethnicity (JSNA). ○ 68% of children in care were from the most deprived 30% of the population. • Young people are more likely to be over-represented in rented accommodation • Young people (16-29) are under-represented in Bristol City Council’s workforce (11.9%) in comparison to those aged 50-64 (41.2%). • Children in the most deprived areas are over five times (5.25) more likely to be injured in motor traffic collisions than those in the least deprived areas
Mitigations:	When considering proposals, consideration should be taken over existing disparities within young people such as educational gaps between Black, Asian and minority ethnic pupils and white pupils, or pupils from low-income households. Consideration should be taken on intersecting characteristics, such as being young and Disabled, and the impact budget proposals taken together may have on combined characteristics. Mitigations will centre around communicating effectively with children, parents and educational settings, signposting to support where possible and working with young people on an individual basis to support their needs. We will continue to monitor outcomes via demographic breakdowns and protected characteristics.

	<p>Proposals related to children in care are anticipated to have a positive impact on young people through increasing the council’s capacity to support children appropriately. Mitigations to support these approaches are ensuring a child-led process for the design and development of the homes based on service-user need and a proactive and targeted recruitment approach will be adopted to widen the pool of foster carers better able to support a wider variety of needs. 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.</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>
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a higher prevalence of Disability in older age groups • Older people in Bristol are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ less likely to be comfortable using digital services (17.5% of people aged 65 years and older advised they lack the skills or confidence to use the internet, the Bristol average is 4.4%) ○ more reliant on public and community transport ○ more likely to be an unpaid carer ○ more likely to help out or volunteer in their community ○ less likely to have formal qualifications • Bristol Ageing Better estimated at least 11,000 older people are experiencing isolation in the city. • We must factor aging and the needs of older people into long term budgeting and service design
Mitigations:	<p>Changes to Health, Care and Wellbeing is likely to disproportionately impact older people due to them being over-represented as service-users. Changes to care need to be communicated clearly and consistently with a wide range of accessible communications for older people. The population of older people in Bristol is increasingly diverse and proposals to make changes 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. Open dialogue with older people and engagement with older people advocacy groups will help to ensure care is appropriate and effective in supporting their needs.</p> <p>Workforce efficiencies and changes may have a disproportionate impact on older employees if they are closer to retirement age. Tailored communications, considerate of the needs and perspectives of older people will help ensure they receive sufficient information, and line managers should communicate with individuals around any support needs.</p>
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 81,000 (17.2%) people in Bristol have long-term physical or mental health conditions or illnesses whose day-to-day activities were limited

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 13,500 pupils in Bristol been diagnosed with special educational needs (SEN) • Disabled people are twice as likely to live in social rented accommodation than people not Disabled - 32% live in social rented housing compared to 16% of people not Disabled • Disability prevalence increases with age in Bristol: children 6.1% disabled, working age 16.0% disabled, older people 65+ 38.5% disabled • More than a quarter (27%) of the ‘White Gypsy or Irish Traveller’ population said they had a long-term physical or mental health issue or disability that affected their daily lives - 10 percentage points more than the Bristol average (17%) • Disability rates higher than the city average (17%) are found in the ‘Black or Black British Caribbean’ population (23%), the ‘White Irish’ population (21%) and the ‘White British’ population (19%) • Just 18% of Disabled people aged 16+ whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot have a degree or higher – 27 percentage points lower than people not disabled at 45% • Almost 2 in 5 (39%) Disabled people whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot do not have access to a car or van compared to just 17% of people not disabled • Over a quarter of Disabled people (26.4%) report suffering from Disability discrimination or harassment in the last year • Over an eighth (13.0%) have experienced severe food insecurity, over three and a half times the city average • Local data shows 21% of Bristol residents have “below average mental wellbeing”, rising to 34.2% in the most deprived areas. • Disabled people are the least satisfied with life (32.5%), significantly lower than the Bristol average (62.4%) • Disabled people should be empowered to make independent living choices and have a say in access to service provision. • 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"> ○ changing the way things are done e.g., opening / working times. ○ changes to overcome barriers created by the physical features of premises. ○ providing auxiliary aids e.g., extra equipment or a different or additional service. ○ is ‘anticipatory’ so we must think in advance and ongoing about what disabled people might reasonably need. • 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. • Disabled staff are under-represented in the workforce (8.5%).
Mitigations:	Changes in non-statutory, discretionary funding will impact on Disabled young people, some with intersecting and complex needs. A smaller, more targeted approach is required in order for it to be sustainable, however, changes cannot guarantee that all those that require funding will continue to receive it.

	<p>Communicating changes with children, parents and educational settings effectively will be essential and, where possible, signposting to other resources. Proposals related to reviews of care need to carefully consider the intersecting and specific needs of Disabled people when promoting independence and increasing reviews. This may have a positive impact through increased contact time to ensure needs are met appropriately but needs to be sensitively applied dependent on individual circumstances, ensuring continued high-quality care for people that need it. Ensuring staff completing reviews are trained in disability equality and have developed knowledge beyond medical models of Disability, will help to ensure independence is supported effectively. Where we are proposing supporting people with technology and equipment, we need to ensure Disabled people feel confident in using equipment to support their needs independently. Accommodation, including children’s accommodation and temporary accommodation should ensure high-quality, accessible options for Disabled people and that we maximise on the opportunity to engage with landlords around Disability awareness. If we are changing the way we work, we should ensure that we are communicating to service-users in accessible formats. Engaging with Disabled-led groups locally, and internal equality groups around changes will help to minimise impact. Responses to any relevant consultation should be carefully considered to ensure changes are informed by those who may be impacted.</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> <p>Overall, there is likely to be a disproportionate, negative impact on Disabled people due to the number of proposals related to health, care and wellbeing, the consultation on the Fair and Affordable Care Policy and the consultation on Bristol’s SEND funding, that could further existing inequality gaps.</p>
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Men are under-represented in the workforce (38.7%) • The average UK pay gap is 14.8% in favour of men (ONS, 2023) • Women still bear the majority of caring responsibilities for both children and older relatives. • Women are more likely to be excluded from conversations which affect decision making due to lack of representation in boards / organisational leadership. • 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. • 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. • In Bristol, females over the age of 16 are 2.5 times more likely to be a victim of a domestic abuse related crime than males (JSNA, 2023) • Women in Bristol live an average of 21.2 years in poor health. This is higher than England average for women and over 2.5 years worse than the Bristol average for men.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men in Bristol live on average 18.7 years in poor health – which is also higher than the England average for men (JSNA, 2023) A higher proportion of boys have physical impairments and more boys than girls 62% of pupils with Special Educational Needs are boys have diagnosed mental health disorders and learning difficulties. Men are three times more likely than women to take their own lives.
Mitigations:	<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. Any changes to services 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 over 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>
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Census date (2021) showed that 6.1% of Bristol’s population identify as LGB+ LGB people are under-represented in the workforce (6.4%). Lesbian, gay and bisexual people are statistically more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse 55.5% thought that sexual harassment is an issue in Bristol, higher than the Bristol average (34.6%) 35.9% said that their mental/emotional health prevents them from leaving the house, significantly higher than the Bristol average (15.6%) 49.7% reported they were satisfied with life; this is lower than the Bristol average (62.4%) 52.6% reduced spending on essentials due to concerns about energy prices, this is higher than the Bristol average (41.6%) 71.7% reported they felt satisfied that they can stay in their home for as long as they choose to, this is lower than the Bristol average of 81.9% 14.4% of households have experienced moderate, to severe food insecurity, this is higher than the Bristol average 8.1% One in ten black, Asian and minority ethnic LGBT staff (10 per cent) have similarly been physically attacked because of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity, compared to three per cent of white LGBT staff Almost one in five LGBT staff (18 per cent) have been the target of negative comments or conduct from work colleagues in the last year because they're LGBT
Mitigations:	Proposals to make changes in services may reduce the focus on providing LGBTQ+ friendly services unless revised specifications have an explicit equality and inclusion focus.

	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.
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Around 80% of women will give birth and many women will also experience termination, miscarriage and stillbirth • 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) • 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
Mitigations:	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.
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 in 10 (59.8%) suffered from discrimination and harassment in the past year, and almost 1 in 3 (32.2%) feel unsafe from sexual harassment using public transport. • Almost a third experience food insecurity (32.7%) and a third (32.5%; not necessarily the same people) find it difficult to manage financially. • Over half (53.7%) are sometimes prevented from leaving home due to their mental / emotional health. • 40.3% of Trans people said they feel safe outdoors after dark compared to the Bristol average of 57.5% • 37% of trans people and 33% of non-binary people had avoided healthcare through fear of discrimination • 25% of trans people had been homeless at some point in their lives • Trans people are under-represented in the workforce (0.2%)
Mitigations:	Proposals to make savings in 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.

Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the UK in 2022 black employees had the biggest pay gap of 5.6% in comparison to white employees • Black, Asian and minority ethnic people are less likely to be satisfied overall with their current accommodation (74.2%) in comparison to the Bristol average (84.2%) • 57.7% of Black, Asian and minority ethnic people extremely or moderately worried about keeping their home warm this winter in comparison to the Bristol average at 48.0%. • 17.2% of Black, Asian and minority ethnic households have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity in comparison to the Bristol average at 8.1% • Just over a quarter of people of Black ethnicity report below average mental wellbeing, higher than the city average • The majority (85%) of the Somali population live in socially rented accommodation – a level four times higher than the Bristol average (19%) • Overcrowding is most common for people who identified as ‘Black or Black British African’, with nearly half of people (47%) living in overcrowded homes compared with 10% of the overall population • 36% of children belong to a minority ethnic group • People who do not speak English as a main language may require information in plain English and community language translations or videos or visual communications
Mitigations:	The cumulative impact of proposed savings may have a disproportionate impact on the protected characteristic of race because of existing economic and structural inequalities, especially health inequalities may mean that they already may have less access to services. Proposals which have an element of communications such as reducing spend on the Bristol Legible City and communicating licensing fees should consider the impact on those that do not read/speak English. Alternative provisions or access to translation services should be considered. Proposals related to community engagement will largely impact minoritised groups as they are the main beneficiaries of this service. 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.
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 45 religions represented in Bristol • More than half (51%) of people state they have no religion - the third highest proportion of all local authorities in England • The second highest proportion is Christian (32.2%), and the third highest is Muslim (6.7%) • Half of all Muslims (50%) live in socially rented accommodation - 31 percentage points higher than the overall population (19%)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than a third (36%) of all Jewish people of working age were economically inactive students compared to just 12% in the population as a whole • In council staff, 25.2% are Christian, 18.2% have another religion and 32.2% had no religion
Mitigations:	<p>Budget proposals related health, care and wellbeing, such as increasing reviews or supporting people with reablement in their homes should take into account differing needs because of people’s religion and belief (for example different requirements around diet, life events, and holidays). This should be factored into service-design. We will continue to work with faith-led organisations in the city to understand the emerging needs of faith groups.</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>
Marriage & civil partnership	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Existing issues and considerations	No impact identified at this stage.
Mitigations:	No impact identified at this stage.
OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	
Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Socio-Economic (deprivation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the nature of the activity, there is a risk that budget proposals will have a disproportionate, negative impact on those from low-income households and those living in poverty • Bristol has 41 Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the most deprived 10% in England for Multiple Deprivation, including 3 LSOAs in the most deprived 1% in England (Deprivation, 2019) • The results from Bristol’s Quality of Life survey show that people from the most deprived areas in Bristol are less satisfied across a range of indicators (including, Health & Wellbeing, Crime & Safety, Education & Skills, Sustainability & Environment) compared with the cities average. Data showed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the % households which have experienced severe food insecurity increased from 1.8% in 21-22 to 3.7% in 2022-23 ○ Those who experienced moderate to severe food insecurity rose from 4.6% (21-22) to 8.1% (22-23). ○ The % satisfied with the cost of heating their home was (down from 34.7% (21-22) to 21.6% (22-23). ○ People from the most deprived areas of Bristol are significantly less satisfied with their local areas as a place to live, compared to the cities average. ○ Rates of people whose day-to-day life is affected by fear of crime is nearly double in the most deprived areas of the city, compared to the cities average 32.4% / 17.4%.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ People from the most deprived areas of Bristol are 27.4% less satisfied with their local area, compared to the cities average (47.8% / 75.2%). ○ 15.1% less people from the most deprived areas of Bristol feel they belong to their neighbourhood, compared to the cities average of 65.1%. ○ 26.3% of people from the most deprived areas of Bristol have low life satisfaction, compared to the cities average of 13.8%. A difference of 12.5%. ● Around 1 in 4 (24%) of adults who reported difficult in paying their energy bills in 2022 experienced moderate to severe depressive symptoms, which is nearly three times higher than those who found it easy to pay their energy bills (9% - ONS) ● In Bristol 15% of residents (72,300 people) live in the 10% most deprived 12 areas in England, including 17,900 children and 7,600 older people
Carers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Of all the carers in Bristol, almost a third (30%) were disabled themselves - this compares to just 17% of the population who do not provide unpaid carer to others ● In 2021 there were almost 34,000 people providing unpaid care in Bristol. This accounts for 7.6% of all people aged 5 years and over ● About 4 in 9 (45.3%) say caring responsibilities prevent them from leaving their home when they want to. ● Almost 1 in 7 (14.3%) are prevented from getting involved in their community due to accessibility issues. ● Nearly 1 in 11 (8.6%) are stopped from leaving home because of a lack of support and assistance and about 2 in 9 (23.0%) suggested they would visit venues and events more often if the venues were more accessible ● Almost 2 in 9 (21.7%) were victims of disability discrimination or harassment in last year.
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for any other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. asylum seekers and refugees; care experienced; homelessness; armed forces personnel and veterans]	
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

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

There is the potential for a positive equality impact with proposals related to children and education by increasing local specialist education provision, increasing the number of foster carers and having two new children's homes that are designed to support specific needs based on Disability status, supporting equality of opportunity. In addition, proposals related to using funding to support highways

maintenance should improve the quality road roads and footpaths, increasing safety for services users. 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.

Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:

The cumulative impact of our saving proposals is 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 much as possible by prioritising and retaining statutory and targeted services which most benefit vulnerable groups.

Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- Foster carer recruitment and retention
- Supporting Bristol's children's homes (this will help reduce the number of children placed in more expensive placements outside the city, and make sure children can stay close to local connections such as school, friends and family)
- Use Clean Air Zone funds to improve the highways network

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 EqIAs will be published on the Council's website and continue to be updated as appropriate.	Grace Biddulph	March 2024

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 Key Performance Indicators and workforce diversity - Equalities policy - bristol.gov.uk

Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs 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 Director¹.

Equality and Inclusion Team Review: <i>Reviewed by the Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	Director Sign-Off: Denise Murray
Date: 11/01/2023	Date: 16/01/2024

¹ 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.