INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2024 - 25

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

Please Note:-

This document describes an initial assessment of equalities impacts in relation to the "*Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2024-25"*.

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

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

Therefore, the council wishes to hear and proactively consider any comments in relation to how any aspect of the information and options presented may impact on any sections of the community as listed above. All feedback in relation to equalities and any point raised within this document will inform a full Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis of the Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 202425.

You can find out more and tell us your views by completing our survey online at Have Your Say Today - South Gloucestershire Council Budget 2024 - Commonplace or sending your comments to:

Email: consultation@southglos.gov.uk
Write to: South Gloucestershire Council, Corporate Research & Consultation Team, Council offices, Badminton Road, Yate, BRISTOL, BS37 5AF
Phone: 01454 868154

Copies of the consultation are available from your local library or one stop shop.

Accessible formats such as copies of the information translated into community languages are available; please use the above contact details to obtain this.

Information about consultation meetings, events and drop in session is available from the consultation web page Have Your Say Today - South Glos Budget 2024 - Commonplace

The consultation on these proposals starts on Monday 16th October 2023 and closes on Friday 8th December 2023.

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	3
Section 1 - Introduction	4 – 5
Section 2 – Inequalities in South Gloucestershire	6 - 20
Equality Priority Areas	6
Key Information in relation to the Equality Priority Areas	7 – 11
What residents have told us over the last 10 years	12 - 20
Section 3 – Cost reduction and income	21 – 36
Cost reduction proposal – Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTR)	22 – 27
Income proposal – Car Parking Charges	28 – 29
Income proposal – Blue Badge Charges	30 – 31
Income proposal - Cemeteries, Exclusive Rights of Burial Charges	32
Income proposal - Garden Waste (Green Bin) Service Charges	33 – 34
Income proposal – Local Land Charges	35
Cumulative analysis of impacts in respect of the package of proposals	36
Section 4 – EqIAA Outcomes	37
Section 5 – EqIAA Sources of Information	38
Appendix 1 - Previous Consultation Feedback	39 - 77

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document may seem lengthy, but in summary, it presents 2 ‘sets’ of information.

Firstly, the document presents 10 areas of life where significant inequalities exist today in South Gloucestershire. This document refers to these 10 areas of life as ‘Equality Priority Areas’ – in other words, they are areas of life where it is really important that inequalities are tackled so that better life outcomes are delivered for everyone.

These 10 areas haven’t been put together by chance; they have been identified as a result of our activity over the last decade in analysing local data and national data, analysing resident’s feedback, analysing local service data and information, and by continuously speaking directly to residents, families and organisations whose purpose is the represent the voices and needs of our communities. The appendix openly presents a 10 year data analysis covering what residents of South Gloucestershire have told us about satisfaction levels with a range of council services, views on the Council and the local area and the types of approaches the council could take in respect of making savings.

Against each one of the 10 Equality Priority Areas, the most significant inequalities which impact upon individual residents and their families, our communities and our area as a whole are explained.

Our consultation is asking residents to tell us which of these 10 areas you would like to see us particularly focus on so that we can tackle the inequalities in the most effective and efficient ways.

Secondly, the document presents 6 specific proposals. The council’s budget deficit before the use of reserves is £7,696k in 2024/25 and £4,777k in 2025/26 and the proposals concern cost reductions to the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and cost recovery through the implementation of a paid for regime for on and off street car parking, Blue Badge administration charges, Exclusive Rights of Burial charges in cemeteries, garden waste (green bin) service charges and local Land Charges.

This document is clear about the impacts of any implementation of these proposals so that residents have clear information and can respond to the consultation. Analysis of responses will allow us to update this EqIAA document which in-turn will influence decision-making.

These 2 ‘sets’ of information and the consultation feedback we receive will be brought together and will be clearly presented as part of decision-making with the clear aim of aligning our work to ensure that we can best tackle the most significant inequalities impacting upon our residents and communities moving forwards.

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

The financial challenge we face

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

Our updated financial position for the coming year

Each year, we update our Medium-Term Financial Plan, which considers our financial position for the coming years. Since February 2023, when this year's budget was agreed, through factors outside the council's direct control, our overall financial position for the years ahead has worsened. We estimate we are approximately £3m worse off in 2024/25 than we had assumed and around £2m in 2025/26, which would result in shortfalls of £7.7m and £4.8m for those financial years. We can balance the books for this year, but only by spending our remaining backup funds (reserves), and only if we meet our previous savings and income targets.

Looking ahead

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

We've made assumptions about how prices and wages might rise in the coming years and on that basis, we estimate we'll need to identify £5m in new savings/income for 2025/26, rising to £11.6m by 2027/28. These savings will be in addition to the £40m of savings that were announced in the February 2023 budget. We'll continue to identify ways to save or raise additional funds and consult on these as appropriate over the coming months and years.

This Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA) document

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

This year we are consulting on two packages of proposals for savings targets. These cover options for reducing the cost of the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme by £400k from 2024/25 and generating £1m of additional income from September 2024 rising to £2m in 2025/26. It is critical these savings are delivered to ensure the council's financial sustainability.

Reducing the cost of the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and the proposals for cost recovery results in the following six key proposals for 2024 – 2025:

1. **Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme**
2. **Paid for on and off-street Parking**
3. **Blue Badge Administration Fee**
4. **Cemeteries, Exclusive Rights of Burial Charges**
5. **Garden Waste (Green Bin) Service Charges**
6. **Land Charges**

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

1. **Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010;**

2. **Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;** this means:-
   - removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic.
   - taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it.
   - encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

3. **Foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;** this means:-
   - tackling prejudice.
   - promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are:

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- marriage and civil partnership;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

- In addition, the council's EqIAA approach includes 'socio-economic groups' and the 'Armed Forces Community'.

SECTION 2 – INEQUALITIES IN SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE

NB. This section will be updated post consultation.

Equality Priority Areas

As a result of the Council's ongoing EqIAA activity, a robustly informed set of 'Equality Priority Areas' have been established.

These Priority Areas are:

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

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

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

Key inequalities in relation to the Priority Areas

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

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

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	Women, Disabled People and People from some Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds. The under-representation of girls in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subjects has been recognised as a problem needing urgent attention with high-profile reviews calling for increased participation in STEM by women and girls, and people from under-represented minority ethnic groups. STEM careers are central to the South Gloucestershire economy, and it is vital that these inequalities are tackled for the benefit of our area.
4. Poverty and financial hardship.	Experience of poverty is growing in South Gloucestershire. In the autumn of 2022, research conducted by the Council found: – Families with children, younger adults <45, women, those from many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, those who are renting privately, those who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness have greater experience of poverty and financial hardship. – Minority ethnic respondents are also suffering disproportionately, with 20% experiencing difficulty or great difficulty, compared to 13% of the population overall. – People with disabilities feel much worse off than a year ago, 33% feel this compared to 21% of non-disabled respondents. Citizen's Advice South Gloucestershire have seen a 10-fold increase in foodbank referrals – up from 6 clients a month on average pre-covid to now over 60 a month. People aged between 22 and 50, disabled people, households with children, people from 'Black/Black British' heritage , and people stating 'other ethnicities' are over-represented in applying to the South Gloucestershire Household Support Fund. The proportion of children eligible for Free School Meals in South Gloucestershire has nearly doubled over the last 6 years with disabled children and young people and children from nearly every minority ethnic group being disproportionately over-represented in this eligibility data. Children and adults in low-income households are more likely to have poorer educational outcomes and have lower paid work as an adult than their peers; have a shorter life expectancy and healthy life expectancy; live in areas more impacted by poor air quality; live in poor quality housing; be an unhealthy weight; develop preventable long term health conditions.
5. Housing.	Affordability of housing is an essential issue to tackle for all and especially considering the over representation of many groups experiencing poverty and financial hardship as set out above.

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	South Gloucestershire data shows that the following groups are disproportionately over-represented in the housing need data: Females, Disabled People, People aged 25 – 44, People from many minority ethnic groups, LGBTQ+ communities. The majority of those seeking housing and homelessness advice and assistance are women with dependent children, young people, disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups. 50% of homeless young people are LGBTQ+. There is a significant and growing need for accessible and adaptable housing to meet the needs of disabled residents and our ageing population.
6. Accessibility, especially in terms of digital inclusion, transport, the built and natural environment and access to the wider economy.	Disabled people, older people and people with lower incomes are significantly less likely than average to be digitally active and with more services continuing to become offered in a digital format, this is a significant inequality to be tackled. Disabled People and older people are consistently less satisfied than average with bus services and bus stops/shelters. The built and natural environment should be accessible for all – this is not only morally and legally right, it is economically right. Disabled People in the UK (circa 60% of whom are older people) have a spending power of £274bn per year to UK businesses. However, we know that, for example, high street shops in the UK lose out on £267m per month due to inaccessibility. The Covid-19 pandemic shone a light on disproportionalities in terms of having local access to open spaces with some communities having significantly less opportunities than others. Women -led and minority ethnic led companies represent over 25% of all businesses. We know that there are often differing issues which are prioritised by women and minority ethnic led businesses; for example, accessing investment and the services available which nurture and support business growth. In order to positively impact our economy, it is important that these businesses which form such a significant part of our economy are supported in ways which meet both demand and need and which enables them to flourish, ultimately growing our local economy.
7. Mental health.	One in six adults experienced some form of depression in summer in Britain, compared with one in ten before the pandemic. Personal wellbeing measures all remain worse than their pre-pandemic levels. Groups consistently evidence to be most impacted by poor mental health (depression/anxiety) are: – People from most minority ethnic groups, – People living with physical disabilities – People living with learning disabilities

Equality Priority Areas	What does the information tell us?
	– People with sensory impairment – People with alcohol and/or drug dependence – The prison population, offenders and victims of crime – People who are LGBTQ+ – Carers – People who are homeless – Refugees, asylum seekers and stateless persons – Armed Forces veterans In respect of the clearly disproportionately negative levels of poor mental health and wellbeing, it is important that tailored and expert support is available to target services where they are needed most.
8. Health.	There are significant and, in some cases, widening inequalities between people living in the most and least deprived areas in South Gloucestershire as well as among Protected Characteristic and vulnerable groups. For example: – Inequalities exist in risk factors for infant mortality including late booking, smoking and maternal obesity by maternal age, ethnicity, area deprivation and geography. – Smoking prevalence in adults is highest amongst people with severe mental illness, LGBTQ+ communities, people in routine and manual occupations and armed forces veterans. – There is strong evidence of a persistent difference in oral health between most and least deprived quintiles in both 0-5 and 6-10 year olds. – There are notably higher and increasing rates of excess weight among those living in the most deprived 10% of areas in South Gloucestershire. For children, boys are more likely to be above a healthy weight as are children living in poverty - the most significant gaps are experienced by children from 'Black' and 'Asian' ethnic groups. – People at higher risk of alcohol or drugs related harms are: People on a low income, Men, Older people, Adults with learning disabilities, People from the 'White British' ethnic group, People identifying as LGBTQ+, Armed Forces Veterans.
9. Adult and Children's Social Care.	Satisfaction with Adult Social Care services in South Gloucestershire is lower than the South West mean and the All England average. Looking in further detail, Council data indicates that residents from minority ethnic groups and younger adults are least satisfied with adult social care services. The data also indicates that residents from minority ethnic groups are proportionally more likely to be subject of a mental health act assessment and/or be detained under the Mental Health Act. There are also developments to be made in regard to the extent to which care for older adults is positively experienced by people from LGBTQ+ communities. There is a significant over-representation of children and young people from minority ethnic groups in contact with Children's Social Care, and who are subject to Section 47

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

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

The consultation survey aligned to the Council's Budget setting process contains a question to investigate which of the above 10 areas residents would like to see the Council particularly focus upon in its work. The results will be analysed and presented here post consultation.

What residents have told us over the last 10 years

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

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

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

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Support for targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	The majority of respondents (72%) supported this approach. Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristic, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the last ten years (average support over the ten year period is 67%)
Support for reducing the quality of services provided	This approach resulted in the lowest level of overall support (17%). Trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, respondents have consistently not supported this approach over the last ten years (average support over the ten year period is 19%). In particular, **females**, **people aged under 45** and **disabled people** show a trend of lower support for this approach than average with low support levels this year of 13%, 13% and 15% respectively. It is also noted that **Carers** and **LGBTQ+ people** reported lower levels of agreement with this approach.
Support for increasing fees and charges for some services	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 44%. Trends to note are **younger people**, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** are less likely than average to support this approach across the ten year period. Linking to this is data demonstrating that people from these groups are more likely than average to be living in poverty/financial hardship.
Support for making more services available online	72% of respondents supported this approach this year. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 62%. Trends to note are that **people aged under 65** and **particularly those aged under 45** are consistently more likely than average to support this approach. **Disabled people** and **people aged 65+** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average support for this approach being 49% and 48% respectively across the ten year period. It is also noted that both of these groups have reported an increase in

Approach	Feedback and Trends
	support for this approach over the ten year period, with 37% of people aged 65+ supporting at the beginning of the ten year period and 67% supporting this year. Similarly, 41% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the ten year period and 73% supported it this year.
Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	The majority of respondents (75%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the seven year period that this question has been asked is 65%. Trends to note are that **people aged under 65** and **particularly those aged under 45** are consistently more likely than average to support this approach. **Disabled people** and **people aged 65+** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average support for this approach being 38% and 37% respectively across the seven year period that this question has been asked. It is also noted that both of these protected characteristic groups have reported an increase in support for this approach over the seven year period, with 46% of people aged 65+ supporting it at the beginning of the seven year period and 68% supporting this year. Similarly, 43% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the seven year period and 73% supported it this year.
Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	The majority of respondents (86%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is also 86%. Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the ten year period.
Support for scaling back or stopping some services	27% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 24%. **Females** and **disabled people** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with an average of 17% of both groups reporting support for this approach over the ten year period.
Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable	40% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 36%. **People from minority ethnic groups** show a trend for lower than average levels of support for this approach, with 30% supporting this year and an average of 29% supporting over the ten year period.
Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	The majority of respondents (85%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the nine year period that this question has been asked is 83%.

Approach	Feedback and Trends
Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies	The majority of respondents (79%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the nine year period that this question has been asked is 80%. Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach (average support over the nine year period is 80%).
Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (22%). Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 23%. **Females**, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average levels of support over the ten year period being 21%, 20% and 22% respectively.
Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils	39% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 45%. There are no clear trends over the ten year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services	47% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period is 53%. There are no clear trends over the ten year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.

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

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	28% of respondents stated satisfaction with care for older people. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 20%. **People aged 65+** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average with both groups reporting an average 25% satisfaction level across the ten year period. However, disabled people have this year reported their lowest level of satisfaction across the ten years. **People under the age of 65**, **non-disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have tended to be less satisfied across the ten year period. **Both disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups have in 2022 reported their lowest levels of satisfaction across the ten years.**
Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties	27% of respondents stated satisfaction with care for physically disabled people and people with learning difficulties. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 17%. **People aged 65+** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting a 19% and 26% satisfaction level across the ten year period respectively. **Females**, **people under the age of 65**, **non-disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have tended to be less satisfied across the ten year period.
Children's Social Services	26% of respondents stated satisfaction with children's social services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 12%. Both disabled people and people from minority ethnic groups have this year reported low levels of satisfaction. **People aged under 45** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 15% and 12% satisfaction level across the ten year period respectively. There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the ten year period.
Customer services	48% of respondents stated satisfaction with customer services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 34%. **People aged 65+** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 37% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 53% satisfaction level this year. There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the ten year period.

Service Area	Trends
Environmental health and trading standards	33% of respondents stated satisfaction with environmental health and trading standards. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 25%. **People aged 65+** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 26% and 25% satisfaction level across the ten year period respectively and satisfaction levels of 36% and 34% this year respectively. There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the ten year period.
Housing advice services	26% of respondents stated satisfaction with housing advice services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 13%. **People aged under 45 years**, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 18%, 15% and 17% satisfaction level across the ten year period respectively. This year, satisfaction levels for these groups were 43%, 25% and 30% respectively. There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the ten year period.
Highways and Roads	31% of respondents stated satisfaction with highways and roads. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 29%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 37% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 44% satisfaction level this year. **Disabled people** have tended to be less satisfied across the ten year period with an average satisfaction level of 23% across the period.
Free Car parking	67% of respondents stated satisfaction with free car parking. Across the five year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 61%. **Disabled people** have tended to be less satisfied than average across the period with an average satisfaction level of 54% across the period.
Libraries	79% of respondents stated satisfaction with libraries – this is the highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 56%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than average with libraries across the ten year period. **The consultation results for the last three years have shown a significant drop in satisfaction levels expressed by people from minority ethnic groups with a satisfaction level of 47% this year.**

Service Area	Trends
Local Bus Services	28% of respondents stated satisfaction with local bus services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 42%. This year showed the lowest level of satisfaction amongst residents of the last ten year period at 28%. **People aged over 65 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 50% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 32% satisfaction level this year. This shows that satisfaction levels are declining in this group as well as overall. **People aged under 65 years** and **disabled people** have tended to be less satisfied than average across the ten year period.
Parks and open spaces	78% of respondents stated satisfaction with parks and open spaces – the second highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the nine year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 68%. **People from minority ethnic groups** are showing a trend of lower than average satisfaction – this year satisfaction levels were 58% and across the ten year period the satisfaction level for this group is 55%.
Planning	27% of respondents stated satisfaction with planning. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 17%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 22% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 38% satisfaction level this year. **Disabled people** are consistently less satisfied than average with an average satisfaction level of 13% across the period.
Public Health	37% of respondents stated satisfaction with planning. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 24%. There appears to be no particular trends in either higher or lower than average levels of satisfaction for any particular groups across the ten year period. However, **it is noted that people from minority ethnic groups report a lower than average satisfaction level across the period of 18% and lower than average satisfaction levels across two of the last three years**.
Schools	57% of respondents stated satisfaction with schools. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 34%. Overall satisfaction with schools has been increasing consistently over the last five years. **People under the age of 45** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 50% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 63% satisfaction level this year. **People over 65** and **disabled people** are consistently less satisfied than average with schools reporting average satisfaction levels across the ten year period of 25% and 27% respectively.

Service Area	Trends
	Satisfaction levels of people from minority ethnic groups has dropped significantly in 2022 when compared to last at 27% this year.
Sport and leisure facilities	65% of respondents stated satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 49%. **People under the age of 45** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 64% satisfaction level across the ten year period and a 63% satisfaction level this year. The satisfaction level of **people aged over 65** has been increasing over the last 4 years. **Disabled people** consistently have the lowest levels of satisfaction with an average satisfaction level of 39% across the period. **It is noted that the satisfaction levels reported by people from minority ethnic groups have been lower than average for the last 3 years and are particularly low in 2022 at 34%.**
Waste and recycling services	77% of respondents stated satisfaction with waste and recycling services. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 72%. This is the highest average satisfaction level across the time period for all services. **It is, however, noted that the satisfaction levels reported by people from minority ethnic groups have been lower than average for the last 3 years and are particularly low this year at 51%.**
Welfare benefits and council tax reduction for which the council is responsible	34% of respondents stated satisfaction with welfare benefits and council tax reduction. Across the ten year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 23%. **Females**, **people aged over 65 years** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average satisfaction level across the ten year period of 26%, 28% and 33% respectively. **People aged under 65** and **people from minority ethnic groups** tend to be less satisfied than average, with people from minority ethnic groups reporting a particularly low level of satisfaction of 15% this year.

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

Consultation Topic	Feedback
Over the past two years, do you feel that South Gloucestershire has become a better place to live, is the same or is worse?	Just 5% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become better as a place to live over the last two years. 41% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become worse as a place to live over the last two years and this is the highest level over the nine year period that this question has been asked. In particular in 2022, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** were more likely to say the area has become worse – 52% and 49% respectively. **People in the age group 46 – 65 years** have shown a greater likelihood to say that the area has become worse over the last nine year period that this question has been asked.
Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live	The majority of respondents (70%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live. Average satisfaction over the ten year period is 77%. The data shows a decline in satisfaction with 81% satisfied at the beginning of the ten year period and 70% satisfied this year. In respect of Protected Characteristics, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have been most likely to have lower levels of satisfaction with the local area as a place to live over the ten year period.
Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things	49% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the council runs things. Average satisfaction over the ten year period is 58%. In respect of Protected Characteristics, **people from minority ethnic groups** have been most likely to have lower levels of satisfaction with the way the Council runs things over the ten year period, reporting a 37% satisfaction rate this year.
The council keeps me informed about services	64% of respondents agreed that the council keeps them informed about the services it provides. Average agreement over the ten year period is 49%. There are no clear trends relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
The council keeps me informed about proposals for change	58% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change. Average agreement over the nine year period that this question has been asked is 47%. Over the nine year period **disabled people** are less likely to agree.
I can influence decisions affecting my local area	Just 15% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area. Average agreement over the nine year period that this question has been asked is 21%.

Consultation Topic	Feedback
	Over the nine year period, **disabled people** have reported lower levels of agreement with an average agreement level of 19% across the period.
The council acts on the concerns of local residents	31% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents. Average satisfaction over the ten year period is 32%. **People aged under 45** have reported a lower level of agreement across the ten year period with an average agreement level of 28%.

You can view the full data at Appendix 1 of this EqIAA document.

SECTION 3 – COST REDUCTION AND INCOME

NB. This section will be updated post consultation.

As mentioned in the introduction, we are consulting on two packages of proposals. These cover options for:

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

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

Cost Reduction

1. Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme

Income Generation

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

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

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT – LOCAL COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME

Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impacts of the proposals

Option 1: Including Universal Credit as an income.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Disability

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

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

NB.
DLA – Disability Living Allowance
PIP – Personal Independence Payment
ESA - Employment and Support Allowance
More information about these benefits is available on the government website here

Summary of Key Points Emerging in relation to each option

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

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

Mitigating the impacts

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

The consultation survey asks residents which option would be their preference should a new scheme be implemented and the results of this will be disaggregated according to Protected Characteristic and taken into consideration as a clear part of the decision-making process.

Initial Outcome

Overall, regardless of option, this proposal would result in a negative impact, particularly for those with lower incomes as these are the persons targeted by the scheme itself. Our data shows that People from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds, Disabled People, Women and Younger People are disproportionately more likely to experience lower incomes and would therefore, be proportionately more impacted by any implementation of these proposals.

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT – PAID FOR ON AND OFF- STREET PARKING

Description

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

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

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

Impacts

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

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

Mitigating Actions

In respect of disabled people, any policy development would bring potential to mitigate impact for some disabled people through implementation of a policy of free parking for blue badge holders. It is noted that a small percentage of disabled people are Blue Badge holders - the latest estimates[1] indicate that 16.0 million people in the UK had a disability in 2021/22 and there were 2.35 million valid Blue Badges held as at 31 March 2021[2]. This equates to 14.7% of disabled people holding a Blue Badge. This shows that any policy to implement free parking for Blue Badge holders would result in a partial mitigation of impacts.

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

[1] Department for Work and Pensions' Family Resources Survey
[2] Department for Transport (DfT)

Initial Outcome

Any proposal taken forward would be subject to detailed consultation in line with legislative requirements for Traffic Regulation Orders and would be accompanied by a comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis (EqIAA) at that point.

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT – BLUE BADGE ADMINISTRATION FEE

Description

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

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

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

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

We know that in South Gloucestershire, there are currently:

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

Age of Blue Badge holders

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

Age and Sex of Blue Badge holders

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

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

Impacts

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

- Families with children
- Younger adults <45

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

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

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

It is important to note that the national charity Scope, has reported the extra cost of disability[3]:

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

Mitigating Actions

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

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

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

Initial outcome

Overall, this proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly for those with lower incomes and our data shows that disabled people overall are more likely than average to be living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity as well as be facing extra costs (e.g. Spending on specialist disability-related products and services that are essential, higher usage of essentials such as having to use more energy or extra accessible transport options etc.).

[3] Disability Price Tag 2023: the extra cost of disability

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT – CEMETERIES, EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS OF BURIAL CHARGES

Description

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

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

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

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

Impacts

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

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

Mitigations

None identified.

Initial outcome

This proposal is likely to increase the cost of funeral directors' bills paid by residents as funeral directors would need to cover the increase in costs and pass this increase to residents.
This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes as set out above.

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT - GARDEN WASTE (GREEN BIN) SERVICE CHARGES

Description

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

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

Impacts

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

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

Mitigations

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

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

Initial Outcome

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

INITIAL ASSESSSMENT – LOCAL LAND CHARGES

Description

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

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

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

Impacts

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

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

Mitigations

None identified.

Initial Outcome

This proposal would be likely to result in a negative impact, particularly in respect of those with lower incomes as set out above.

Cumulative analysis of impacts in respect of the package of proposals

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

Key:

✓ = Positive Impact identified	✘ = Negative Impact identified	Blank = Neutral impact identified

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

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

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

It will be important to analyse all resident consultation feedback, especially feedback from those most likely to be impacted, as part of developing this EqIAA as this will influence decision making.

SECTION 4 - EqIAA OUTCOMES

NB. This section will be updated post consultation.

This is an Initial EqIAA and as such, there is no outcome at this stage. As a result of consultation, resident feedback will be analysed, this EqIAA will be updated and this will form part of decision-making moving forwards.

In addition to the six specific proposals under consideration, It is also important to note that the process of developing this EqIAA takes into consideration the 10 identified Equality Priority Areas – the key areas where national and local research, and our engagement and consultation activity with organisations, groups and individual residents all combine to evidence the largest and most significant inequalities, which ultimately negatively impact upon individual residents and their families, and our area as a whole. The consultation contains a question to investigate which of the Priority Areas residents would like to see the Council particularly focus upon in its work and all of these 10 Priority Areas, including resident consultation feedback will be considered as a clear part of decision-making in respect of the Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2024-25.

The council wishes to hear and proactively consider any comments in relation to how any aspect of the information and options presented may impact on any community or protected characteristic groups. All feedback in relation to equalities and any point raised within this EqIAA document will inform a full Equality Impact Assessment and Analysis of the Council Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2024/25.

SECTION 5 – EqIAA EVIDENCE

NB. This section will be updated post consultation.

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

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

APPENDIX 1 – PREVIOUS CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

Introduction

The following tables show information regarding consultation feedback over the last 10 year period and is disaggregated according to 'group'.
Data in respect of Religion or Belief and Gender Reassignment is not provided for 2023/24, due to low numbers of respondents.

The data shown covers percentages of respondents who stated agreement with each approach to making services more affordable to run.
Note:
Areas highlighted GREEN are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more above the proportion of all respondents.
Areas highlighted RED are those where the proportion of people with this characteristic is 10% or more below the proportion of all respondents.

The next 5 – 10 years

Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**51%**	54%	48%			54%	54%	47%	50%	51%	52%	59%																			
2015/16	**67%**	65%	68%			65%	67%	66%	69%	67%	68%	55%																			
2016/17	**68%**	70%	65%			70%	68%	61%	61%	70%	69%	64%																			
2017/18	**64%**	68%	61%			60%	68%	63%	65%	64%	65%	58%																			
2018/19	**69%**	70%	67%			61%	64%	72%	73%	68%	70%	50%																			
2019/20	**68%**	68%	68%			75%	67%	66%	68%	68%	69%	57%	71%	57%	40%	48%	70%	69%	70%	67%	66%	100%	67%	50%	100%	71%	72%				
2020/21	**68%**	66%	69%	72%	69%		69%	66%	67%	68%	68%	57%	71%	73%	50%	67%	50%	67%	68%	60%	67%	56%	100%	40%	-	46%	69%				
2021/22	**70%**	71%	70%			77%	68%	71%	71%	71%	70%	71%	75%				50%	71%	71%	80%	69%	100%	100%	33%	0%	63%	73%				
2022/23	70%	75%	67%			61%	70%	71%	73%	70%	71%	69%	80%				-	72%	72%	100%	73%	-	100%	0%	-	50%	70%				
2023/24	**72%**	70%	75%			76%	72%	72%	80%	71%	74%	64%	73%						72%									73%	71%	69%	72%

Reducing the quality of services provided

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**25%**	19%	29%			17%	25%	24%	19%	23%	22%	37%																			
2015/16	**20%**	21%	18%			19%	20%	20%	20%	20%	19%	23%																			
2016/17	**23%**	20%	26%			24%	23%	21%	15%	24%	23%	28%																			
2017/18	**20%**	16%	23%			17%	21%	19%	16%	20%	20%	18%																			
2018/19	**23%**	25%	23%			25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	24%	21%																			
2019/20	**16%**	12%	21%			16%	18%	15%	20%	16%	17%	12%	20%	41%	10%	22%	80%	16%	16%	33%	15%	25%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%				
2020/21	**15%**	16%	13%	9%	13%		17%	13%	14%	15%	14%	10%	21%	36%	0%	14%	0%	15%	15%	0%	15%	11%	25%	0%	-	0%	16%				
2021/22	**18%**	14%	22%			16%	17%	19%	16%	19%	18%	22%	20%				50%	18%	18%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	16%				
2022/23	**14%**	12%	16%			7%	17%	16%	11%	15%	13%	24%	15%				-	13%	13%	0%	13%	-	0%	67%	-	21%	15%				
2023/24	**19%**	13%	25%			13%	19%	24%	15%	20%	20%	16%	15%						19%									15%	20%	24%	18%

Increasing fees and charges for some services

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

Making more services available online

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**61%**	60%	64%			89%	69%	37%	41%	63%	61%	74%																			
2015/16	**62%**	63%	62%			80%	67%	44%	51%	64%	62%	61%																			
2016/17	**64%**	62%	68%			85%	57%	45%	46%	67%	66%	62%																			
2017/18	**56%**	53%	60%			81%	66%	42%	42%	58%	55%	64%																			
2018/19	**56%**	54%	60%			86%	67%	47%	41%	60%	57%	56%																			
2019/20	**68%**	69%	70%			98%	65%	46%	55%	72%	69%	77%	86%	76%	70%	52%	90%	69%	70%	67%	59%	100%	33%	100%	0%	65%	80%				
2020/21	**60%**	58%	63%	89%	88%		67%	46%	46%	64%	60%	62%	71%	73%	83%	48%	100%	61%	61%	20%	56%	67%	50%	60%	-	62%	70%				
2021/22	**64%**	60%	68%			83%	74%	51%	49%	67%	64%	66%	62%				100%	65%	66%	80%	60%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	73%				
2022/23	**59%**	52%	66%			72%	75%	59%	46%	63%	59%	76%	72%				-	60%	60%	50%	55%	-	0%	100%	-	64%	70%				
2023/24	**72%**	70%	77%			78%	76%	67%	73%	73%	75%	67%	68%						78%									69%	74%	78%	73%

Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2017/18	**58%**	55%	63%			80%	68%	46%	43%	61%	58%	64%																			
2018/19	**57%**	54%	62%			87%	64%	49%	44%	61%	57%	60%																			
2019/20	**70%**	68%	73%			97%	67%	50%	59%	72%	70%	83%	86%	78%	80%	56%	90%	70%	71%	67%	60%	100%	33%	83%	0%	53%	81%				
2020/21	**62%**	59%	66%	83%	88%		69%	50%	49%	66%	62%	63%	67%	73%	67%	43%	100%	62%	64%	20%	57%	67%	50%	80%	-	77%	72%				
2021/22	**67%**	63%	71%			84%	76%	55%	50%	70%	67%	67%	64%				50%	68%	69%	60%	61%	100%	100%	67%	0%	53%	79%				
2022/23	**63%**	56%	70%			80%	81%	63%	50%	68%	63%	80%	72%				-	64%	65%	50%	59%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	75%				
2023/24	**75%**	72%	79%			78%	80%	68%	73%	76%	77%	69%	68%						78%									71%	75%	81%	75%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**84%**	82%	86%			91%	86%	75%	85%	84%	84%	82%																			
2015/16	**86%**	86%	86%			89%	87%	82%	81%	87%	86%	81%																			
2016/17	**86%**	85%	87%			89%	88%	77%	77%	88%	87%	77%																			
2017/18	**85%**	86%	86%			87%	90%	82%	80%	86%	86%	91%																			
2018/19	**87%**	86%	89%			91%	92%	85%	86%	88%	88%	79%																			
2019/20	**87%**	86%	88%			100 %	85%	86%	83%	87%	87%	90%	94%	100 %	60%	63%	90%	88%	88%	67%	86%	100 %	67%	100 %	100 %	76%	89%				
2020/21	**87%**	86%	89%	96%	93%		88%	85%	85%	88%	87%	85%	96%	91%	83%	81%	50%	88%	89%	80%	88%	89%	75%	100 %	-	54%	88%				
2021/22	**85%**	85%	86%			87%	88%	82%	80%	88%	86%	81%	87%				100 %	88%	87%	60%	85%	33%	100 %	67%	0%	89%	89%				
2022/23	**86%**	85%	87%			89%	90%	87%	81%	88%	86%	87%	89%				-	86%	87%	75%	86%	-	100 %	100 %	-	79%	89%				
2023/24	**86%**	84%	89%			84%	89%	85%	88%	86%	88%	78%	80%						90%									92%	83%	86%	86%

Scaling back or stopping some services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**30%**	21%	39%			20%	32%	29%	26%	30%	29%	44%																			
2015/16	**27%**	31%	23%			29%	28%	23%	22%	27%	27%	19%																			
2016/17	**28%**	24%	33%			31%	29%	21%	22%	29%	28%	28%																			
2017/18	**25%**	21%	29%			22%	28%	23%	19%	26%	25%	25%																			
2018/19	**24%**	22%	27%			30%	23%	24%	22%	25%	25%	19%																			
2019/20	**19%**	14%	23%			17%	21%	17%	13%	19%	19%	14%	37%	46%	0%	15%	80%	18%	18%	0%	20%	13%	0%	67%	0%	12%	18%				
2020/21	**17%**	15%	19%	6%	9%		19%	17%	13%	18%	16%	16%	13%	18%	0%	10%	0%	17%	17%	0%	16%	0%	0%	40%	-	8%	18%				
2021/22	**22%**	17%	26%			26%	21%	21%	22%	22%	22%	22%	13%				50%	22%	22%	20%	22%	0%	0%	33%	0%	16%	23%				
2022/23	**17%**	11%	21%			18%	18%	18%	11%	18%	16%	19%	20%				-	16%	16%	0%	17%	-	0%	0%	-	36%	17%				
2023/24	**27%**	16%	36%			20%	30%	30%	17%	30%	27%	24%	27%						26%									29%	27%	35%	26%

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

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

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2015/16	**86%**	87%	84%			85%	88%	84%	85%	86%	86%	97%																			
2016/17	**85%**	84%	86%			91%	85%	73%	72%	88%	87%	70%																			
2017/18	**80%**	77%	82%			86%	84%	75%	66%	82%	80%	92%																			
2018/19	**79%**	77%	82%			90%	77%	77%	64%	81%	79%	73%																			
2019/20	**84%**	83%	86%			100%	82%	78%	75%	86%	84%	89%	97%	78%	70%	63%	90%	85%	86%	67%	81%	88%	100%	100%	0%	94%	88%				
2020/21	**82%**	80%	83%	91%	91%		83%	79%	74%	85%	82%	84%	79%	82%	67%	67%	100%	83%	84%	60%	81%	89%	75%	60%	-	62%	87%				
2021/22	**84%**	81%	86%			95%	85%	79%	75%	86%	84%	85%	89%				100%	84%	85%	100%	82%	100%	100%	33%	0%	84%	89%				
2022/23	**80%**	78%	84%			84%	87%	82%	72%	84%	80%	80%	82%				-	81%	83%	100%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	79%	85%				
2023/24	**85%**	82%	89%			86%	85%	86%	90%	85%	87%	79%	78%						88%									83%	84%	89%	84%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2015/16	**82%**	83%	82%			83%	84%	81%	82%	83%	83%	77%																			
2016/17	**82%**	81%	83%			84%	84%	69%	66%	84%	84%	72%																			
2017/18	**79%**	77%	80%			84%	79%	77%	69%	80%	79%	84%																			
2018/19	**80%**	79%	82%			85%	80%	79%	70%	82%	80%	71%																			
2019/20	**79%**	80%	79%			93%	77%	77%	77%	80%	80%	64%	89%	78%	60%	67%	90%	80%	82%	33%	78%	88%	67%	100%	0%	82%	83%				
2020/21	**81%**	79%	84%	87%	81%		81%	81%	76%	83%	81%	85%	88%	91%	50%	81%	100%	81%	82%	80%	81%	89%	75%	40%	-	62%	83%				
2021/22	**80%**	79%	82%			86%	83%	77%	67%	83%	80%	76%	75%				100%	81%	81%	60%	80%	100%	100%	33%	0%	74%	84%				
2022/23	**79%**	78%	81%			78%	83%	82%	72%	82%	80%	80%	79%				-	80%	82%	75%	80%	-	100%	100%	-	71%	81%				
2023/24	**79%**	75%	83%			77%	83%	78%	76%	79%	82%	67%	76%						82%									78%	81%	82%	79%

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**28%**	26%	32%			23%	30%	27%	26%	28%	29%	30%																			
2015/16	**27%**	28%	25%			27%	28%	24%	21%	27%	27%	26%																			
2016/17	**27%**	22%	32%			28%	28%	21%	23%	28%	28%	22%																			
2017/18	**25%**	22%	29%			24%	26%	25%	20%	26%	25%	22%																			
2018/19	**22%**	20%	24%			20%	22%	22%	16%	23%	22%	27%																			
2019/20	**21%**	19%	23%			25%	22%	17%	17%	22%	21%	23%	34%	22%	10%	19%	80%	20%	20%	0%	19%	13%	0%	67%	0%	35%	21%				
2020/21	**19%**	17%	22%	9%	21%		20%	19%	16%	20%	19%	22%	29%	9%	0%	33%	0%	19%	19%	0%	21%	22%	25%	0%	-	23%	17%				
2021/22	**22%**	18%	26%			19%	23%	23%	20%	23%	23%	18%	15%				50%	23%	23%	20%	24%	67%	0%	67%	0%	11%	22%				
2022/23	**21%**	16%	26%			23%	21%	23%	17%	23%	22%	9%	15%				-	22%	22%	0%	22%	-	100%	33%	-	36%	19%				
2023/24	**22%**	17%	26%			13%	26%	26%	19%	22%	22%	19%	24%						23%									18%	23%	35%	21%

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

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

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**54%**	56%	54%			60%	53%	58%	50%	55%	57%	52%																			
2015/16	**56%**	55%	57%			51%	51%	65%	60%	55%	56%	55%																			
2016/17	**53%**	52%	54%			48%	55%	57%	49%	53%	55%	45%																			
2017/18	**54%**	54%	55%			52%	49%	60%	49%	55%	55%	49%																			
2018/19	**56%**	57%	57%			57%	49%	59%	60%	57%	57%	44%																			
2019/20	**53%**	54%	52%			58%	48%	57%	50%	54%	53%	63%	51%	54%	80%	59%	80%	53%	54%	33%	55%	88%	33%	83%	100%	59%	51%				
2020/21	**54%**	55%	53%	52%	45%		50%	58%	48%	55%	53%	62%	63%	55%	83%	62%	50%	55%	55%	60%	58%	67%	75%	60%	-	23%	50%				
2021/22	**54%**	53%	57%			52%	53%	57%	57%	54%	55%	54%	56%				50%	56%	55%	40%	58%	100%	100%	33%	0%	42%	52%				
2022/23	**53%**	55%	52%			48%	57%	54%	51%	54%	53%	72%	54%				-	54%	55%	75%	55%	-	100%	100%	-	50%	52%				
2023/24	**47%**	44%	51%			45%	45%	55%	34%	51%	49%	39%	46%						48%									44%	49%	54%	47%

The Local Area and the Council

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

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

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

Budget year	**Total**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
14/15	**81%**	80%	82%			80%	82%	80%	82%	81%	82%	74%																			
15/16	**63%**	69%	60%			66%	65%	63%	50%	65%	65%	60%																			
16/17	**81%**	84%	81%			83%	81%	81%	71%	83%	84%	78%																			
17/18	**81%**	84%	78%			83%	81%	81%	79%	82%	82%	74%																			
18/19	**81%**	85%	79%			83%	74%	84%	84%	82%	83%	77%																			
19/20	**81%**	83%	80%			87%	79%	84%	81%	82%	83%	68%	71%	92%	90%	74%	90%	83%	84%	67%	85%	63%	67%	33%	100%	76%	82%				
20/21	**79%**	80%	78%	67%	82%		78%	80%	80%	79%	80%	62%	58%	100%	100%	90%	50%	80%	81%	60%	83%	56%	25%	40%		85%	77%				
21/22	**79%**	83%	79%			85%	77%	81%	80%	80%	80%	68%	84%				50%	81%	80%	100%	82%	100%	100%	100%	0%	74%	80%				
22/23	77%	80%	75%			70%	78%	79%	74%	79%	78%	78%	85%				-	79%	81%	75%	82%	-	100%	33%	-	64%	78%				
23/24	**70%**	72%	71%			72%	71%	71%	61%	73%	74%	56%	78%						73%									71%	71%	68%	72%

Satisfaction with the way the council runs things

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

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about services

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

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about proposals for change

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2015/16	***46%***	47%	47%			47%	46%	46%	22%	49%	45%	52%																			
2016/17	***43%***	43%	45%			39%	45%	44%	43%	44%	44%	52%																			
2017/18	***41%***	40%	42%			41%	39%	43%	36%	42%	41%	38%																			
2018/19	**41%**	43%	39%			39%	38%	43%	33%	42%	42%	40%																			
2019/20	42%	42%	44%			43%	44%	44%	41%	44%	43%	51%	66%	32%	60%	41%	90%	44%	44%	33%	44%	25%	67%	67%	100%	59%	44%				
2020/21	47%	47%	47%	57%	44%		47%	46%	41%	48%	47%	43%	54%	73%	0%	57%	50%	49%	50%	40%	50%	33%	25%	40%	-	31%	49%				
2021/22	53%	56%	52%			54%	56%	53%	41%	56%	54%	46%	46%				100%	55%	54%	20%	55%	100%	100%	67%	0%	26%	56%				
2022/23	49%	51%	49%			38%	51%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	59%				-	51%	52%	75%	52%	-	0%	33%	-	43%	52%				
2023/24	**58%**	58%	60%			61%	63%	55%	53%	61%	63%	36%	49%						60%									58%	60%	67%	60%

I can influence decisions affecting the local area

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	***18%***	17%	19%			17%	15%	21%	22%	17%	19%	6%																			
2015/16	***52%***	48%	57%			54%	56%	45%	41%	54%	53%	52%																			
2016/17	***21%***	23%	20%			21%	21%	21%	22%	21%	21%	28%																			
2017/18	***17%***	19%	16%			12%	18%	19%	17%	17%	19%	13%																			
2018/19	***21%***	23%	19%			22%	20%	21%	21%	21%	21%	27%																			
2019/20	***18%***	18%	19%			23%	17%	16%	16%	19%	18%	37%	49%	3%	20%	26%	70%	19%	18%	0%	19%	0%	0%	33%	100%	41%	19%				
2020/21	***17%***	18%	16%	30%	21%		17%	16%	14%	18%	17%	15%	25%	27%	0%	14%	0%	18%	18%	20%	18%	11%	25%	0%	-	15%	20%				
2021/22	***15%***	17%	14%			16%	15%	15%	12%	16%	15%	9%	20%				50%	16%	15%	0%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%	16%				
2022/23	13%	15%	11%			6%	16%	12%	11%	13%	13%	17%	16%				-	14%	15%	0%	14%	-	0%	0%	-	21%	14%				
2023/24	**15%**	16%	16%			17%	17%	15%	13%	17%	17%	13%	22%						15%									11%	18%	17%	16%

Agreement that the council acts on the concerns of residents

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

Further questions

In addition to the above questions, the following questions were asked as part of the Council Budget consultation for 2023/24. The following table displays the results.

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

Question	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	Minority Ethnic Groups	White British	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
The council can be relied on to consistently deliver services																
AGREE	**41%**	39%	43%	35%	43%	45%	31%	44%	30%	43%	27%	45%	41%	42%	44%	41%
The council is clear and honest about what it does and why																
AGREE	**38%**	39%	40%	41%	38%	40%	33%	41%	34%	41%	37%	40%	32%	42%	40%	40%
The council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing																
AGREE	**35%**	36%	35%	35%	38%	36%	28%	38%	29%	38%	44%	39%	38%	35%	33%	36%
The council has the public's best interests at heart																
AGREE	**36%**	36%	38%	36%	39%	36%	28%	39%	29%	39%	39%	39%	32%	38%	26%	38%
The council works collaboratively with other organisations and the public																
AGREE	**29%**	33%	27%	35%	31%	24%	20%	31%	23%	31%	27%	30%	29%	30%	17%	31%

Satisfaction with Services

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

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

Care for older people

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**31%**	32%	32%			22%	26%	39%	26%	32%	32%	43%																			
2015/16	**9%**	11%	8%			5%	7%	15%	19%	8%	9%	14%																			
2016/17	**9%**	10%	7%			4%	10%	13%	15%	7%	8%	10%																			
2017/18	**9%**	8%	10%			4%	5%	14%	20%	8%	9%	7%																			
2018/19	**12%**	11%	11%			7%	9%	14%	22%	10%	12%	10%																			
2019/20	**7%**	6%	8%			17%	8%	12%	11%	6%	7%	6%	11%	3%	0%	11%	0%	7%	7%	0%	11%	13%	0%	0%	0%	18%	4%				
2020/21	**34%**	39%	30%	40%	22%		24%	42%	49%	29%	35%	31%	25%	0%	0%	55%	0%	34%	37%	0%	45%	0%	0%	0%		33%	21%				
2021/22	**35%**	36%	36%			13%	32%	42%	37%	34%	37%	18%	55%				0%	36%	35%	100%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	25%				
2022/23	**28%**	30%	28%			17%	23%	32%	35%	26%	29%	26%	29%				-	29%	27%	0%	33%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	21%				
2023/24	**28%**	31%	26%			30%	26%	31%	15%	35%	34%	0%	0%						31%									33%	30%	29%	30%

Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**31%**	31%	31%			28%	29%	35%	29%	31%	34%	14%																			
2015/16	**7%**	8%	6%			5%	6%	10%	16%	6%	7%	3%																			
2016/17	**6%**	7%	5%			3%	7%	5%	18%	4%	5%	9%																			
2017/18	**7%**	6%	7%			4%	4%	9%	18%	5%	6%	8%																			
2018/19	**8%**	6%	8%			9%	7%	7%	17%	6%	8%	8%																			
2019/20	**6%**	5%	6%			18%	5%	7%	16%	4%	6%	5%	3%	0%	0%	15%	0%	5%	6%	0%	7%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%				
2020/21	**25%**	30%	21%	40%	19%		21%	29%	48%	18%	26%	19%	25%	0%	33%	38%	0%	27%	28%	0%	34%	0%	33%	0%		0%	20%				
2021/22	**27%**	29%	27%			19%	27%	31%	38%	27%	27%	18%	45%				0%	29%	28%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	22%				
2022/23	**22%**	20%	21%			21%	17%	24%	35%	17%	21%	14%	18%				-	22%	22%	0%	26%	-	100%	0%	-	0%	18%				
2023/24	**27%**	20%	35%			24%	28%	37%	28%	30%	34%	13%	40%						31%									37%	26%	21%	29%

Children's social services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**31%**	37%	22%			32%	28%	34%	15%	34%	33%	33%																			
2015/16	**4%**	4%	4%			5%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	9%																			
2016/17	**3%**	4%	3%			2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%																			
2017/18	**3%**	3%	3%			4%	2%	3%	6%	2%	2%	5%																			
2018/19	**4%**	3%	4%			5%	6%	10%	9%	3%	4%	2%																			
2019/20	5%	5%	5%			19%	3%	4%	11%	4%	4%	15%	3%	0%	0%	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%	6%	25%	0%	0%	0%	6%	3%				
2020/21	**13%**	11%	15%	56%	8%		13%	12%	17%	12%	11%	21%	13%	14%	33%	0%	0%	14%	13%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%		0%	17%				
2021/22	**14%**	16%	14%			27%	17%	9%	13%	15%	15%	6%	14%				0%	15%	15%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	13%				
2022/23	16%	11%	17%			19%	17%	15%	21%	14%	15%	26%	6%				-	16%	15%	0%	19%	-	100%	100%	-	0%	11%				
2023/24	**26%**	31%	26%			32%	25%	31%	21%	31%	34%	8%	43%						29%									23%	30%	42%	27%

Customer Services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2016/17	**16%**	17%	16%			12%	17%	21%	22%	15%	16%	24%																			
2017/18	**17%**	17%	16%			14%	12%	21%	23%	16%	17%	18%																			
2018/19	**18%**	19%	16%			16%	13%	19%	28%	17%	18%	21%																			
2019/20	**27%**	28%	27%			40%	22%	28%	29%	27%	27%	38%	40%	22%	30%	15%	70%	28%	28%	0%	31%	25%	67%	0%	0%	29%	25%				
2020/21	**54%**	56%	52%	67%	58%		46%	59%	52%	54%	55%	50%	56%	57%	50%	62%	0%	56%	57%	0%	62%	50%	50%	0%		33%	51%				
2021/22	**47%**	56%	41%			40%	44%	53%	49%	48%	49%	31%	51%				0%	50%	48%	0%	52%	0%	100%	0%	0%	50%	45%				
2022/23	**45%**	50%	41%			43%	41%	45%	44%	45%	46%	40%	58%				-	47%	47%	33%	49%	-	100%	0%	-	75%	43%				
2023/24	**48%**	51%	48%			46%	48%	53%	47%	51%	52%	35%	54%						51%									45%	49%	36%	51%

Environmental health and trading standards

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**53%**	50%	56%			58%	55%	48%	29%	58%	55%	69%																			
2015/16	**9%**	10%	8%			8%	8%	10%	12%	9%	9%	20%																			
2016/17	**8%**	7%	8%			5%	9%	11%	12%	7%	7%	13%																			
2017/18	**8%**	8%	8%			10%	6%	10%	11%	8%	8%	10%																			
2018/19	**9%**	9%	9%			8%	7%	10%	15%	9%	9%	13%																			
2019/20	**14%**	15%	14%			28%	10%	15%	18%	14%	14%	20%	51%	27%	20%	4%	70%	14%	13%	0%	17%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	11%				
2020/21	**40%**	40%	40%	64%	35%		37%	41%	38%	41%	40%	37%	47%	50%	25%	33%	0%	41%	42%	25%	43%	0%	0%	0%	-	63%	40%				
2021/22	**37%**	41%	36%			29%	32%	44%	45%	39%	38%	25%	46%				0%	40%	39%	0%	40%	100%	0%	0%	-	46%	37%				
2022/23	**34%**	34%	33%			33%	31%	37%	36%	33%	35%	24%	35%				-	35%	36%	33%	39%	-	100%	33%	-	40%	28%				
2023/24	**33%**	41%	27%			28%	35%	36%	34%	32%	34%	33%	20%						40%									40%	30%	15%	35%

Housing advice services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**33%**	34%	31%			38%	31%	28%	18%	34%	33%	50%																			
2015/16	**3%**	4%	3%			3%	3%	4%	8%	3%	4%	3%																			
2016/17	**4%**	4%	3%			2%	3%	6%	11%	3%	3%	7%																			
2017/18	**3%**	3%	3%			3%	3%	3%	6%	3%	3%	3%																			
2018/19	**5%**	5%	5%			7%	6%	4%	12%	4%	5%	6%																			
2019/20	5%	6%	4%			18%	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	6%	23%	0%	0%	4%	70%	5%	5%	0%	5%	13%	0%	0%	0%	12%	5%				
2020/21	**17%**	17%	18%	20%	20%		16%	17%	27%	13%	17%	29%	10%	14%	33%	29%	0%	17%	16%	0%	16%	0%	0%	0%	-	25%	16%				
2021/22	**15%**	19%	14%			17%	17%	14%	15%	17%	16%	13%	35%				100%	16%	16%	0%	18%	100%	0%	0%	-	20%	10%				
2022/23	18%	19%	14%			33%	18%	14%	21%	16%	16%	26%	12%				-	18%	19%	0%	20%	-	100%	0%	-	25%	14%				
2023/24	**26%**	28%	28%			43%	25%	21%	25%	29%	30%	30%	60%						29%									30%	28%	15%	29%

Highways and roads

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

Free car parking

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2019/20	50%	50%	50%			55%	49%	55%	47%	51%	52%	31%	66%	49%	50%	41%	70%	51%	51%	33%	51%	25%	67%	67%	0%	47%	52%				
2020/21	**63%**	63%	64%	70%	63%		60%	65%	60%	64%	64%	56%	65%	40%	83%	43%	100%	64%	65%	80%	67%	40%	75%	50%	-	55%	60%				
2021/22	**65%**	69%	64%			69%	61%	69%	59%	67%	66%	60%	73%				0%	67%	66%	75%	69%	0%	0%	100%	-	53%	64%				
2022/23	59%	61%	58%			54%	58%	60%	48%	62%	59%	43%	53%				-	60%	61%	75%	62%	-	100%	33%	-	70%	57%				
2023/24	**67%**	71%	64%			71%	64%	68%	54%	70%	68%	63%	76%						65%									52%	70%	58%	68%

Libraries

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**78%**	79%	77%			82%	76%	80%	76%	80%	78%	86%																			
2015/16	**48%**	45%	51%			57%	40%	52%	49%	48%	49%	57%																			
2016/17	**45%**	50%	39%			50%	41%	46%	49%	44%	44%	52%																			
2017/18	**41%**	46%	36%			53%	34%	43%	38%	42%	43%	31%																			
2018/19	**37%**	42%	31%			49%	29%	36%	34%	38%	36%	44%																			
2019/20	**38%**	46%	30%			53%	33%	38%	40%	38%	38%	37%	60%	8%	40%	33%	80%	38%	39%	33%	40%	38%	0%	50%	100 %	41%	34%				
2020/21	**68%**	73%	63%	77%	77%		62%	69%	68%	68%	68%	71%	60%	29%	75%	75%	0%	69%	71%	40%	71%	40%	67%	100 %	-	43%	71%				
2021/22	**60%**	63%	59%			72%	55%	63%	60%	63%	62%	47%	58%				100 %	63%	62%	100 %	63%	100 %	0%	0%	-	40%	64%				
2022/23	**66%**	69%	63%			69%	63%	66%	67%	66%	67%	51%	65%				-	67%	68%	100 %	68%	-	100 %	50%	-	29%	68%				
2023/24	**79%**	82%	76%			81%	79%	77%	69%	81%	82%	47%	80%						80%									82%	78%	77%	79%

Local bus services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**52%**	52%	56%			50%	47%	65%	41%	54%	55%	39%																			
2015/16	**36%**	38%	36%			25%	33%	49%	42%	36%	36%	34%																			
2016/17	**35%**	36%	36%			28%	40%	36%	26%	36%	37%	35%																			
2017/18	**36%**	37%	35%			25%	25%	47%	38%	36%	37%	30%																			
2018/19	**38%**	37%	39%			36%	29%	42%	30%	40%	39%	42%																			
2019/20	**34%**	32%	35%			37%	28%	47%	29%	35%	34%	39%	69%	30%	40%	70%	-	34%	33%	67%	38%	25%	33%	17%	0%	35%	30%				
2020/21	**57%**	59%	57%	50%	43%		47%	67%	56%	58%	57%	58%	65%	55%	100%	0%	-	58%	59%	75%	63%	71%	75%	75%	-	45%	52%				
2021/22	**56%**	60%	53%			52%	47%	63%	55%	56%	58%	40%	55%				50%	58%	56%	100%	60%	100%	100%	0%	-	45%	54%				
2022/23	**50%**	50%	50%			42%	48%	49%	39%	52%	49%	59%	61%				-	51%	51%	75%	56%	-	0%	33%	-	25%	46%				
2023/24	**28%**	29%	29%			35%	21%	32%	19%	32%	30%	24%	28%						31%									24%	28%	27%	29%

Parks and open spaces

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2015/16	**59%**	59%	60%			69%	57%	56%	51%	61%	60%	66%																			
2016/17	**57%**	60%	54%			67%	55%	41%	34%	59%	58%	60%																			
2017/18	**61%**	66%	58%			79%	62%	56%	51%	64%	62%	58%																			
2018/19	**57%**	60%	53%			70%	56%	54%	41%	60%	57%	58%																			
2019/20	67%	68%	67%			82%	61%	63%	59%	70%	69%	56%	80%	86%	80%	52%	80%	69%	69%	67%	69%	88%	33%	33%	0%	59%	69%				
2020/21	**79%**	78%	80%	85%	83%		76%	80%	71%	80%	80%	66%	71%	91%	100%	81%	50%	80%	80%	100%	80%	75%	75%	20%	-	75%	80%				
2021/22	**79%**	82%	77%			75%	76%	84%	73%	80%	81%	64%	78%				100%	80%	79%	100%	82%	100%	0%	33%	-	65%	79%				
2022/23	79%	80%	78%			71%	80%	81%	73%	81%	80%	65%	77%				-	81%	82%	75%	81%	-	0%	0%	-	77%	81%				
2023/24	**78%**	79%	79%			79%	80%	79%	71%	81%	82%	58%	86%						80%									80%	78%	77%	80%

Planning

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**32%**	30%	35%			35%	33%	30%	12%	36%	35%	17%																			
2015/16	**9%**	10%	8%			9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	3%																			
2016/17	**9%**	8%	11%			11%	9%	9%	7%	9%	9%	6%																			
2017/18	**7%**	6%	8%			11%	7%	6%	5%	8%	7%	7%																			
2018/19	**7%**	6%	8%			9%	10%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%																			
2019/20	**12%**	12%	13%			22%	12%	11%	9%	13%	12%	10%	31%	24%	0%	7%	70%	13%	12%	0%	14%	13%	0%	50%	0%	6%	12%				
2020/21	**24%**	24%	24%	29%	38%		26%	20%	22%	25%	24%	31%	31%	22%	25%	10%	0%	24%	25%	67%	25%	0%	33%	0%	-	38%	25%				
2021/22	**20%**	19%	22%			24%	19%	21%	16%	22%	21%	18%	19%				0%	22%	21%	0%	20%	67%	0%	0%	-	18%	24%				
2022/23	**18%**	17%	18%			24%	23%	17%	14%	19%	18%	21%	10%				-	19%	20%	0%	18%	-	0%	0%	-	14%	21%				
2023/24	**27%**	33%	24%			38%	24%	23%	24%	29%	29%	19%	40%						27%									32%	25%	24%	28%

Public Health (not including NHS services)

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

Schools

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**62%**	62%	61%			64%	63%	54%	44%	63%	61%	57%																			
2015/16	**18%**	17%	21%			39%	16%	7%	12%	20%	18%	31%																			
2016/17	**16%**	19%	15%			35%	7%	9%	8%	17%	17%	19%																			
2017/18	**17%**	21%	15%			43%	18%	9%	15%	18%	18%	17%																			
2018/19	**13%**	15%	11%			30%	20%	6%	9%	14%	12%	19%																			
2019/20	19%	21%	17%			35%	18%	12%	21%	19%	19%	32%	46%	0%	20%	11%	80%	19%	19%	0%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%	18%	20%				
2020/21	**46%**	50%	42%	74%	67%		43%	38%	47%	47%	46%	48%	40%	14%	33%	56%	0%	48%	49%	50%	47%	40%	0%	0%	-	29%	49%				
2021/22	**45%**	52%	41%			65%	44%	39%	35%	48%	46%	31%	41%				0%	47%	46%	100%	44%	100%	0%	0%	-	71%	49%				
2022/23	44%	48%	42%			56%	52%	36%	37%	45%	44%	61%	40%				-	46%	46%	0%	46%	-	100%	0%	-	60%	46%				
2023/24	**57%**	53%	63%			63%	60%	43%	42%	63%	66%	27%	55%						59%									65%	60%	29%	59%

Sport and leisure facilities

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**68%**	72%	64%			81%	69%	59%	42%	71%	69%	67%																			
2015/16	**34%**	33%	37%			52%	32%	26%	32%	35%	35%	49%																			
2016/17	**31%**	36%	26%			44%	25%	22%	25%	32%	31%	36%																			
2017/18	**34%**	38%	29%			60%	35%	24%	22%	35%	34%	31%																			
2018/19	**31%**	35%	27%			49%	41%	24%	25%	32%	31%	33%																			
2019/20	45%	50%	41%			63%	42%	34%	30%	49%	46%	45%	66%	46%	70%	30%	80%	46%	47%	33%	46%	63%	67%	67%	0%	24%	48%				
2020/21	**68%**	67%	68%	89%	72%		68%	64%	58%	71%	69%	63%	62%	43%	60%	67%	0%	69%	70%	75%	68%	67%	67%	67%	-	50%	71%				
2021/22	**58%**	65%	54%			71%	57%	56%	59%	61%	59%	50%	70%				0%	61%	60%	100%	62%	100%	0%	0%	-	63%	59%				
2022/23	59%	62%	56%			63%	60%	57%	54%	59%	59%	50%	52%				-	60%	62%	67%	63%	-	0%	50%	-	67%	57%				
2023/24	**65%**	66%	63%			63%	67%	65%	47%	70%	70%	34%	82%						71%									76%	61%	61%	66%

Waste and recycling services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	16-34	35-44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2014/15	**70%**	73%	69%			67%	70%	76%	52%	73%	72%	59%																			
2015/16	**64%**	62%	66%			62%	60%	71%	59%	66%	65%	63%																			
2016/17	**69%**	72%	67%			63%	72%	72%	68%	69%	71%	66%																			
2017/18	**69%**	73%	67%			69%	68%	72%	61%	71%	71%	70%																			
2018/19	**70%**	75%	66%			65%	65%	73%	64%	72%	72%	65%																			
2019/20	71%	74%	69%			76%	67%	79%	70%	72%	72%	63%	83%	73%	90%	56%	90%	73%	73%	67%	73%	63%	33%	50%	0%	82%	73%				
2020/21	**77%**	80%	76%	85%	71%		74%	81%	74%	79%	78%	80%	71%	64%	67%	86%	50%	79%	79%	60%	81%	78%	50%	80%	-	67%	77%				
2021/22	**80%**	85%	76%			75%	75%	86%	79%	80%	81%	62%	82%				100%	81%	79%	80%	82%	100%	100%	67%	-	67%	78%				
2022/23	77%	81%	75%			72%	72%	78%	76%	78%	78%	65%	79%				-	78%	79%	100%	80%	-	0%	67%	-	83%	76%				
2023/24	**77%**	77%	78%			70%	77%	86%	69%	79%	81%	51%	82%						80%									76%	77%	78%	78%

Welfare benefits and council tax reduction

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

CHARACTERISTICS OF CONSULTATION RESPONDENTS

Consultation Respondents (The following table shows the number of respondents to the Budget Consultation process in each of the last 10 years):

Budget year	Total	Female	Male	16 - 34	35 - 44	Under 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	Bisexual	Gay man	Gay woman/ lesbian	Other	Identify as Trans - Yes	Identify as Trans - No	Heterosexual	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Any other religion	No religion	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
14/15	**681**	*315*	*314*			*83*	*357*	*200*	*46*	*576*	*584*	*27*																			
15/16	**1426**	*682*	*716*			*349*	*563*	*491*	*185*	*1203*	*1275*	*35*																			
16/17	**1127**	*508*	*568*			*361*	*561*	*170*	*102*	*949*	*931*	*86*																			
17/18	**1270**	*595*	*616*			*188*	*432*	*591*	*171*	*1039*	*1051*	*88*																			
18/19	**1045**	*480*	*519*			*138*	*218*	*667*	*107*	*843*	*928*	*52*																			
19/20	**1753**	*841*	*853*			*669*	*559*	*453*	*212*	*1435*	*1537*	*84*	*35*	*37*	*#*	*27*	*10*	*1542*	*1352*	*#*	*815*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*17*	*691*				
20/21	**1342**	*661*	*647*	*54*	*108*	*162*	*511*	*625*	*200*	*1068*	*1187*	*68*	*24*	*11*	*#*	*21*	*#*	*1165*	*1050*	*#*	*708*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*13*	*414*				
21/22	**1398**	*586*	*734*			*180*	*466*	*673*	*203*	*1083*	*1220*	*108*	*61*				*#*	*1192*	*1186*	*#*	*730*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*19*	*431*				
22/23	**1475**	*612*	*783*			*88*	*361*	*624*	*239*	*1155*	*1290*	*54*	*61*				*#*	*1259*	*1118*	*#*	*829*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*14*	*390*				
23/24	**1159**	462	608			301	448	318	181	897	917	*115*	41						588	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	*#*	157	671	72	1010

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