

Equality Impact Assessment – Budget Proposals 2012/13

Introduction

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is required to ensure that equality is placed at the centre of policy development and review, as well as service delivery. The purpose of this EIA is to systematically analyse the likely impact of the Budget proposals on different community groups, and how the needs of such groups have been taken into account in developing those proposals.

The EIA can anticipate and recommend ways to avoid any discriminatory or negative consequences for a particular group, on the grounds of any protected characteristic. It provides the opportunity to demonstrate the potential benefits for equality target groups arising from a proposed policy or project.

The need for an EIA stems from the general duty placed on public authorities to eliminate unlawful discrimination in carrying out functions, and promote equality of opportunity. This is outlined in the Equality Act 2010, with specific public sector duties in place from April 2011.

1. Name of Policy or Service / Existing or Proposed

Budget Proposals 2012/13

2. Responsible Manager

Susan Guinness, Head of Shared Financial Services

3. Date EIA Completed

The EIA was completed on 20 February 2012.

4. Description and Aims of Policy / Service (including relevance to equalities)

Budget proposals for 2012/13, when approved, will determine how Council monies are spent, and where necessary savings will come from. There is potential impact for every resident, as all services provided by the Council, and all income received, are included in the [full budget report](#)

5. Who are the stakeholders?

Key stakeholders in the formulation and delivery of these proposals are Council Officers and Members. In terms of impact however, there is potential for every resident, organisation and visitor to be affected.

6. What outcomes do we want to achieve?

The Cabinet Report presented on 21 February 2012 contains targets of £643,600 in income generating / budget saving proposals for 2012/2013. These are detailed in Appendix Three of the report. In addition to the £643,600 a further £126,000 of savings were proposed as part of the previous years medium term financial strategy, bringing the total additional savings that will impact the 2012/2013 budget to £769,600. The table below lists these policies and identifies the outcomes that the successful application of these proposals will bring.

Efficiency Proposal	Expected outcomes
1 – Neighbourhoods	
Staffing Review	£63,405 savings from reviewing staffing in Neighbourhoods
Review of vehicle fleet	£89,000 savings from reviewing the vehicle fleet
Waste management contract	£15,000 savings from the waste management contact with Enterprise plc
Trade waste income	£15,000 income from trade waste service from customers
Partnership income	£15,000 income from the waste partnership
2 – Shared Financial Services	
Review of budget	£50,000 savings from reviewing the budget
Base budget review	£122,000 saving from carrying out a review of base budgets
3 – Regeneration & Health Communities	
Review of catering services	£49,920 savings from the catering services
3 – Shared Assurance Services	
Insurance policy re-negotiation	£10,000 savings from the re-negotiation of the insurance policy
Staffing re-structure	£3,175 savings from re-structuring in the shared assurance service
4 – Business Transformation	
Desktop replacement	£20,000 savings from deferring the replacement of computer desktops
Consultancy budget	£10,000 savings from the consultancy budget
Gateway staffing – reduced contingency	£43,515 savings from reducing the contingency for staffing in Gateway
Overpayment recovery	£50,000 recovered in overpayments from housing and council tax benefits
Re-structure proposals	£62,240 savings from re-structuring within the revenues and benefits service
5 – Corporate Governance	
Staffing re-structure	£27,345 from re-structuring the arrangements for supporting the Mayoral and Civic arrangements
Procurement of online legal material	£5,000 savings in the procurement of online legal material

7. What are the Key Performance Indicators?

Success will be measured through achievement of these savings, whilst protecting front line services as far as possible. Quarterly performance monitoring by Scrutiny Committee, and quarterly finance monitoring by Governance Committee will challenge delivery of the Corporate Plan, against a backdrop of reduced capacity and fewer resources.

8. Brief Summary of Research and Background Data

The EIA should identify sources of information which will be used to assist in determining any adverse impact or discrimination against different groups in the community. In preparing the EIA, a range of quantitative and qualitative; national and local data sources have been considered to compose a brief profile of each equality grouping.

The following data sources have been considered:

- Census 2001
- Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment
- Lancashire Sub Regional Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and Related Services Assessment

The following table provides a brief summary of the different equality groups in Central Lancashire.

Equality Group	Central Lancashire Summary
Age	<p>In 2007, South Ribble had a total resident population of 108,103 persons, representing a 3.0% increase since the last Census in 2001, recording a resident population of 104,936 persons.</p> <p>South Ribble is forecast to see an 8.2% population increase to 113,511 persons by 2017; an increase of 5,408. In line with national trend forecasts, the older age categories will experience the greatest increases as a proportion of total resident population. According to the 2001 Census 41.8% of the South Ribble population were above the age of 45 years. By 2017 it is expected that this proportion will increase to 48.5%, with the greatest increase of 48.1% in the 65-74 year old age group. Apart from the older age categories substantial increases are expected in the 20-34 year olds (18.4%) across South Ribble.</p>
Gender	<p>The 2001 Census identifies that within South Ribble there are slightly more females (53,253) compared to males (50,614). This reflects both the regional and national position.</p> <p>There is no data available to reflect a spatial variation within the Borough with regard to gender.</p>
Race	<p>The 2001 Census indicates that ethnic minorities make up only 2% of the population in South Ribble. The largest ethnic minority group are Indians, making up 0.5% of the population. 96.9% of the population were born in the UK, 1.3% was born elsewhere in the European Union, and 1.8% of the population were born outside of the European Union.</p> <p>The Lancashire Sub Regional Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and Related Services Assessment revealed that there are no authorised caravan sites located in Chorley or South Ribble, however there are 18 Local Authority caravan sites in Preston. The survey revealed that there are also</p>

	<p>unauthorised gypsy sites located in Preston.</p> <p>In 2008/09 there were 200 registrations by foreign nationals in South Ribble. This was 100 fewer than in the previous year (a decrease of 33%). Most people (60) registering were Polish. The second largest groups (20 people in each) were Slovaks and Hungarians.</p>
Sexual Orientation	The 2001 Census indicates that 0.14% of people in South Ribble were identified as living in a same sex couple, compared to 0.16% regionally and 0.19% nationally.
Religion or Belief	The 2001 Census indicates that 84.7% of the South Ribble population are Christians and 8.7% have no religion. The remainder of the population is composed of Buddhist (0.1%), Hindu (0.4%), Muslim (0.3%), and other (0.1%). 5.6% of respondents chose not to state their religion.
Disability	<p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) identifies the housing needs arising from limiting long term illness (LLTI) or disability. In South Ribble 21.4% of households with no older members contain at least one person with a limiting long term illness or disability compared with 42.1% of older person households.</p> <p>44% of people living in an older person household have a LLTI or disability in South Ribble have a physical disability, 19.5% have a hearing impairment and 9.8% have an age related illness.</p>

9. Methods and Outcome of Consultation

Consultation is carried out with residents on an ongoing basis. In 2011, a comprehensive public consultation was carried out – the [‘My Neighbourhood’](#) programme was introduced across the Borough. Feedback from this exercise informed the new My Neighbourhood Plans, which set out priorities and actions for public services across five discrete areas. Each area has a forum of borough councillors, as well as partners such as Police, Progress Housing, Lancashire County Council, and parish and town councils.

Forum	Chair	Vice Chair	Lead Officer
Eastern	Cllr Barrie Yates	Cllr Mike Nelson	Tony Stirland
Western Parishes	Cllr Peter Stettner	Cllr Colin Coulton	Alison Hardman
Central	Cllr Graham Walton	Cllr Jacqui Mort	Suzanne Simpson
Leyland	Cllr Matthew Tomlinson	Cllr Fred Heyworth	Jo Staines
Penwortham	Cllr Dorothy Gardner	Cllr Jenny Hothersall	Rebecca Heap

Alongside the development of budget proposals, a [Citizen's Panel](#) survey was carried out, with results published in January 2011. The panel consists of 1314 residents, who broadly reflect the demographic make up of the borough's population. 20.8% of the panel (at the time of recruitment) identified themselves as being disabled, or having a long term illness. 1.2% are from a BME background. The gender balance is almost equal, with 50.2% male respondents and 49.8% female. The age breakdown is as follows:

18 – 34	8.5%
35 – 44	14.1%
45 – 54	15.1%
55 - 64	26.6%
65+	35.6%

The survey asked residents about their satisfaction with the Council and the services it provides, as well as their top priorities for improving the area. Feedback from the survey was in line with Local Area Plans, with a clear will to focus on front line services such as streetscene and refuse collection / recycling.

- 92.8% of respondents are satisfied with South Ribble as a place to live
- 72.3% of respondents are satisfied with the way the Council runs things
- 62.5% of respondents agreed that the Council provides value for money
- 91.5% of respondents believe that people get on well together in their local area
- 53.7 % of respondents feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area
- 88.1% of respondents are satisfied with the refuse collection service
- 83.7% of respondents are satisfied with the borough's parks and open spaces

The top priorities to maintain / improve the area were:

- Policing – reducing crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour – 32%
- Cleanliness – reducing litter, dog fouling, street sweeping – 35%
- Highways – condition of roads, congestion, safety – 35%

Following publication of the budget proposals, local stakeholders and organisations have been written to, and feedback sought. The distribution list of the local strategic partnership has been used, to ensure that representatives from the public, private and voluntary sectors are included. Details of the proposals have been publicised on the Council's website – www.southribble.gov.uk and an e-mail address set up specifically for budget queries.

The budget proposals were put out for public consultation with residents, partners and employees prior to them being considered by the Council.

10. Results of Initial Screening:

The following questions have been considered in order to evaluate the various equality groups:-

Age – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of age? All age groups.

Disability – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of disability? Disability is recognised under the Equality Act as ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term effect on a person’s ability to carry out normal day to day activities.’

Gender Reassignment – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of gender reassignment? The Equality Act recognises this where a person is proposing to undergo, is undergoing, or has undergone a process (or part of a process) for changing sex.

Marriage / Civil Partnership – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of marriage or civil partnership? Under the Equality Act, no such protection exists for single or unmarried people.

Pregnancy / Maternity – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of pregnancy or maternity?

Race – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of race? Race is recognised under the Equality Act as a person’s skin colour, nationality or ethnic origin.

Sex – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of gender? Including men, women and transgender people.

Sexual Orientation – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of sexuality? Including heterosexual, gay, lesbian and bisexual people.

Religion or belief – Is there any concern that these proposals could cause differential impact on the grounds of religion or faith? All faiths recognised in the European Convention of Human Rights are included.

A commentary has been provided for each policy where appropriate. The appraisal will utilise the following symbols to identify the potential impact of each policy on each equality group.

Symbol	Impact
+	<i>Positive</i>
O	<i>Neutral / Negligible</i>
-	<i>Negative</i>
P	<i>Potential issue</i>

Policy	Protected Characteristics									Commentary
	Age	Disability	Gender reassignment	Marriage / civil p'ship	Pregnancy / maternity	Race	Religion or belief	Sex	Sexual Orientation	
1 – Neighbourhoods										
Staffing Review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group – internal staffing re-structure
Review of vehicle fleet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Waste management contract	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Trade waste income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Partnership income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
2 – Shared Financial Services										
Review of budget	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Base budget review	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group. Impact assessment to be carried out as part of the review
3 – Regeneration & Health Communities										
Review of catering services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group. Impact assessment to be carried out as part of review.
3 – Shared Assurance Services										
Insurance policy re-negotiation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Staffing re-structure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group – internal staffing re-structure

Policy	Protected Characteristics									Commentary
	Age	Disability	Gender reassignment	Marriage / civil p'ship	Pregnancy / maternity	Race	Religion or belief	Sex	Sexual Orientation	
4 – Business Transformation										
Desktop replacement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Consultancy budget	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Gateway staffing – reduced contingency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Overpayment recovery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group
Re-structure proposals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group – internal staffing re-structure
5 – Corporate Governance										
Staffing re-structure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group – internal staffing re-structure
Procurement of online legal material	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific impact on any equality group

11. Decisions and/or Recommendations (including supporting rationale)

None at this stage – individual impact assessments may be required as the detail of budget proposals is worked up

12. Equality Action Plan (if required)

N/A