INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

COUNCIL REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2025 - 26

Date(s) of completing the EqIAA:	July 2024 - 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 2025-26"*.

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 2025/26.

You can find out more and tell us your views by completing our survey online at Have Your Say Today - Council Budget 2025/26 - 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.

The consultation on these proposals starts on Wednesday 13 November 2024 and closes on Friday 3 January 2025.

CONTENTS

	Page
Document Overview	3
Section 1 - Introduction	4 – 5
Section 2 – Inequalities in South Gloucestershire	6 - 15
Equality Priority Areas	6
What residents have told us over the last 10 years	7 - 15
Section 3 – Cost reduction and income proposals	16 – 41
Approach 1: Reviewing our internal costs	17 - 19
Approach 2: Finding more efficient ways of working and delivery models	20 - 24
Approach 3: Managing responsibility for paying for, and delivering services	25 – 26
Approach 4: Outsourcing	27
Approach 5: Generating additional income	28 – 31
Approach 6: Stopping, cutting back and prioritising services	32 - 33
Cumulative impacts	34 – 41
Section 4 – EqIAA Outcomes	42
Section 5 – EqIAA Sources of Information	43
Appendix 1 - Previous Consultation Feedback	44 - 82

DOCUMENT OVERVIEW

This document may seem lengthy, but in summary, it presents three 'sets' of information.

Firstly, the document presents data and information collected over a significant time period concerning resident views as follows:

- Resident views on the approaches that could be taken to make services more affordable to run.
- Resident views on the local area and the council.
- Resident satisfaction levels with council services.

This information has been continuously collected since 2013 and this document sets out analysis of the information over the time period. This approach is significant as for the majority of these areas and issues, the Council has 11-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.

Secondly, the document presents some proposals which are 'grouped' under the following headings:

- Approach 1: Reviewing our internal costs
- Approach 2: Finding more efficient ways of working and delivery models
- Approach 3: Managing responsibility for paying for, and delivering services
- Approach 4: Outsourcing
- Approach 5: Generating additional income
- Approach 6: Stopping, cutting back and prioritising services and support

This document is clear about the potential impacts of any implementation of these proposals so that residents have clear information and can respond to the consultation equipped with that information. Post consultation, analysis of the feedback received will allow us to update this EqIAA document which in-turn will influence decision-making.

Thirdly, the document presents information assessing the cumulative impacts of the proposals in respect of Protected Characteristic groups.

These three '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 inequalities impacting upon our residents and communities moving forwards.

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

Councils locally and nationally are facing daunting financial challenges as the cost of delivering services increases much faster than the opportunities to generate income. Factors like inflation, higher energy bills and increased interest rates are pushing up our costs in the same way that everyone's cost of living has risen. And demographic pressures – most notably the rapid increase in the number and proportion of older people in our society – twinned with the increasing number of people struggling to make ends meet, mean demand for support is at an all-time high.

This means that the amount we must spend to deliver the same level of services to everyone who is eligible for them goes up each year – and right now, it is escalating rapidly.

Our updated financial position for the coming year

Our forward planning and hard work delivering savings and income targets has left us better placed over the short term than most other Local Authorities. By implementing identified efficiencies and increasing Council Tax by 4.99%, we can deliver a balanced budget for the next financial year. And we are confident that as things stand currently, by following this same approach, using our remaining financial reserves set aside for this purpose, and delivering the previous savings we have committed to, we can balance our income and outgoings again for the financial year 2026/27.

Looking ahead

The cost and demand pressures we face are not going away and the picture is more challenging and uncertain over the longer term. Even after delivering the £40m of savings we agreed as part of the budget signed off in February 2023, our projections show that in four years' time in our annual budgeting we will be almost £16m per year short just to stand still in terms of the services we provide.

Adding to the uncertainty, the Business Rates Retention Scheme, which South Gloucestershire Council is part of, is due to expire in 2025/26. The scheme allows the council to retain a proportion of Business Rates, contributing approximately £15m a year in income.

Given these pressures and the uncertainties over local government financing, we think it is prudent to consider difficult choices now to plan and save for potentially rainier days ahead.

We're proposing some new measures for consideration through our budget consultation process, but we'll continue to identify ways to save or raise additional funds and consult on these separately as appropriate over the coming months and years.

The difficult choices ahead

The Council has a fundamental budget problem: our costs are increasing at a far greater rate than our income. And because of future uncertainties around some funding streams, we will need to plan ahead and adopt a combination of the following approaches to reduce costs, generate additional income and ensure our ongoing financial security. Some of these options involve investing more money now to improve outcomes and save money over the longer term, which means we need to make larger more immediate savings elsewhere.

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.

This EqIAA also reiterates the statutory duty of the council, 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', the 'Armed Forces Community' and 'Care Leavers'.

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 formed part of consultation 12 months ago and as a result, the council has formally adopted a Tackling Inequalities Plan. The Plan sets out 60 objectives and progress against these objectives is published on an annual basis.

The Equality Priority Areas are shown below and 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.

- **Health and Wellbeing**
- **Educational attainment and experience**
- **Poverty & financial hardship**
- **Housing**
- **Adult Social Care**
- **Children's Social Care**
- **Employment**
- **Accessibility, especially in terms of:**
  - **digital inclusion,**
  - **transport,**
  - **the built and natural environment, and**
  - **access to the wider economy**
- **Tackling inequalities as part of work to address the Climate and Nature Emergency**
- **Hate Crime**

In addition to identifying the likely impacts for our diverse communities in respect of the proposals under consideration, this EqIAA is also clear on the impacts of any implementation of the proposals upon the ability of the council to deliver against any of the above Equality Priority Areas as set out in the Tackling Inequalities Plan.

What residents have told us over the last 11 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 11-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.

The table below shows the percentage of residents supporting the range of approaches that could be taken to make services more affordable to run. The approaches are listed in order of most highly supported to least supported according to the 2024/24 Budget consultation results.

The table also shows the average support level over the eleven-year period. It is noted that this eleven-year analysis also places the approaches in order of most highly supported to least supported order according to the 2024/24 Budget consultation results, except that '*Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need'* gains slightly more support over the period than '*Making more services available online*', however the difference in levels of support is small.

Importantly, the table provides information regarding trends according to Protected Characteristic and this allows for this information to be considered as part of decision making.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
1.	Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	90%	86%	The majority of respondents (90%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-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 11-year period.
2.	Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	86%	83%	The majority of respondents (86%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
				Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach (average support over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%).
3.	Working in partnership and sharing services with other councils and public sector agencies	81%	80%	The majority of respondents (81%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten 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 ten year period is 80%).
4.	Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	72%	66%	The majority of respondents (72%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eight year period that this question has been asked is 66%. 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 54% and 55% respectively across the eight 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 eight year period, with 46% of people aged 65+ supporting it at the beginning of the eight year period and 61% supporting this year. Similarly, 43% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the eight year period and 67% supported it this year.
5.	Making more services available online	70%	63%	70% of respondents supported this approach this year. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 63%. Trends to note are that **people 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 50% and 49% respectively across the 11-year period. It is also noted that both of these groups have reported an increase in support for this approach over the 11-year period, with 37% of

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
				people aged 65+ supporting at the beginning of the 11-year period and 59% supporting this year. Similarly, 41% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the 11-year period and 65% supported it this year.
6.	Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need	64%	66%	The majority of respondents (64%) 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 11-year period is 66%)
7.	Encouraging more people to volunteer their time to become involved in the delivery of services	54%	53%	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 53%. There are no clear trends over the 11-year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
8.	Increasing fees and charges for some services	54%	45%	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 45%. Trends to note are **females**, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** are less likely than average to support this approach across the 11-year period. Linking to this is data demonstrating that people from these same groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty/financial hardship in South Gloucestershire.
9.	Transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils	45%	45%	45% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 45%. There are no clear trends over the 11-year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.
10.	Stopping provision of some discretionary services to protect services to older people and the vulnerable	35%	36%	35% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 36%. **People from minority ethnic groups** show a trend for lower than average levels of support for this approach, with 32% supporting this year and an average of 29% supporting over the 11-year period.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
11.	Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	24%	23%	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (24%). Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 23%. **Females**, **disabled people** and **LGBTQ+ people** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average levels of support over the ten year period being 21%, 20% and 23% respectively.
12.	Scaling back or stopping some services	19%	23%	19% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 23%. **Females** and **disabled people** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with an average of 19% and 18% respectively reporting support for this approach over the 11-year period.
13.	Reducing the quality of services provided	16%	19%	This approach resulted in the **lowest** level of overall support (16%). 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 11-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 12%, 13% and 14% respectively. It is also noted that **people from minority ethnic groups** had the lowest level of support for this approach (9%) and **Carers** and **LGBTQ+ people** reported lower levels of agreement with this approach (12% and 13% respectively).

Full data tables are shown in Appendix 1 of this EqIAA document.

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

Service Area	Trends
Care for Older People	33% of respondents stated satisfaction with care for older people. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 21%. **People aged 65+** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average with both groups reporting an average 26% satisfaction level over the elven year period. **Disabled people, carers** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have shown a positive increase in satisfaction levels this year.
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 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 18%. **People aged 65+** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting a 21% and 28% satisfaction level across the 11-year period respectively. **Disabled people, carers** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have shown a positive increase in satisfaction levels this year.
Children's Social Services	18% of respondents stated satisfaction with children's social services. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 12%. **Younger people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 19% satisfaction level across the 11-year period. There are no groups for whom levels of satisfaction have been consistently lower than average across the 11-year period.
Customer services	47% of respondents stated satisfaction with customer services. Across the nine year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 35%. There are no groups for whom a particular trend is showing across the nine year period.
Environmental health and trading standards	27% of respondents stated satisfaction with environmental health and trading standards. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 25%. There are no groups for whom a particular trend is showing across the 11-year period.
Housing advice services	16% of respondents stated satisfaction with housing advice services. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 13%. **People aged under 45 years** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 19% and 15% satisfaction level across the 11-year period respectively.

Service Area	Trends
Highways and Roads	18% of respondents stated satisfaction with highways and roads. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 28%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 35% satisfaction level across the 11-year period. **Disabled people** have tended to be less satisfied across the 11-year period with an average satisfaction level of 23% across the period and a 15% satisfaction level this year.
Free Car parking	83% of respondents stated satisfaction with free car parking. Across the six year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 65%. **Disabled people** have tended to be less satisfied than average across the period with an average satisfaction level of 58% across the period.
Libraries	76% of respondents stated satisfaction with libraries - the second highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 58%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to report higher levels of satisfaction than average with libraries with an average satisfaction level of 66% across the period.
Local Bus Services	39% of respondents stated satisfaction with local bus services. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 42%. **People aged over 65 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 49% satisfaction level across the 11-year period. **People aged under 65 years** and **disabled people** (37%) have tended to be less satisfied than average across the 11-year period.
Parks and open spaces	77% of respondents stated satisfaction with parks and open spaces – the highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the ten year period that this question has been asked, there has been an average satisfaction level of 69%. **Disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** have tended to have a slightly lower than average satisfaction level across the period at 59% and 63% respectively.
Planning	21% of respondents stated satisfaction with planning. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 17%. **People aged under 45 years** have tended to be more satisfied than average across the 11-year period. **Disabled people** are less satisfied than average with an average satisfaction level of 13% across the 11-year period.

Service Area	Trends
Public Health	35% of respondents stated satisfaction with Public Health. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 25%. There appears to be no particular trends in either higher or lower than average levels of satisfaction for any particular groups across the 11-year period.
Schools	47% of respondents stated satisfaction with schools. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 35%. **People under the age of 45** and **females** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average 50% and 47% satisfaction level respectively across the 11-year period. **People over 65** and **disabled people** are consistently less satisfied than average with schools reporting average satisfaction levels across the 11-year period of 27% and 28% respectively.
Sport and leisure facilities	64% of respondents stated satisfaction with sport and leisure facilities. Across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 51%. **Disabled people** consistently have the lowest levels of satisfaction with an average satisfaction level of 40% across the period.
Waste and recycling services	67% of respondents stated satisfaction with waste and recycling services – this is the third highest level of satisfaction this year across all services. Across the 11-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.
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 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 24%. **Females**, **people aged over 65 years** and **disabled people** have tended to be more satisfied than average, reporting an average satisfaction level across the 11-year period of 28%, 29% and 33% respectively. **People aged under 45** and **people from minority ethnic groups** tend to be less satisfied than average reporting an average satisfaction level across the 11-year period of 20% and 17% respectively.

Full data tables are shown in Appendix 1 of this EqIAA document.

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 4% of respondents stated that they felt the area had become better as a place to live over the last two years. 43% 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 ten year period that this question has been asked. In particular, **LGBTQ+ people** and **carers** were more likely to say the area has become worse – 48% and 53% 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 ten year period that this question has been asked.
Satisfaction with the local area as a place to live	The majority of respondents (65%) stated that they were satisfied with the area as a place to live. Average satisfaction over the 11-year period is 76%. In respect of Protected Characteristics, **LGBTQ+ people, disabled people, carers** and **people aged under 45** reported the lowest levels of satisfaction with the local area this year.
Satisfaction with the way South Gloucestershire Council runs things	34% of respondents stated satisfaction with the way the council runs things. Average satisfaction over the 11-year period is 56%. The data shows a decline in satisfaction with 60% satisfied at the beginning of the 11-year period and 34% satisfied this year. 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; across the 11-year period, there has been an average satisfaction level of 38%.
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 11-year period is 50%. **People aged under 45** have the lowest level of agreement over the 11-year period with an average agreement level of 44%.
The council keeps me informed about proposals for change	52% of respondents agreed that the Council keeps them informed about proposals for change. Average agreement over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 47%. Over the ten year period **disabled people** are less likely to agree.
I can influence decisions affecting my local area	Just 14% of respondents felt that they could influence decisions in their local area. Average agreement over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 21%. Over the ten year period, **disabled people** have reported lower levels of agreement with an average agreement level of 19% across the period.

Consultation Topic	Feedback
The council acts on the concerns of local residents	26% of respondents felt that the Council acts on the concerns of local residents. Average satisfaction over the 11-year period is 31%. **People aged under 45** have reported a lower level of agreement across the 11-year period with an average agreement level of 27%.
The council can be relied on to consistently deliver services	This question has been asked for the past 2 years. 30% of respondents felt that the Council can be relied on to consistently deliver services. This is a reduction of 11% over the previous year. **People aged under 45, disabled people** and **LGBTQ+ people** have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years. **People aged 65+** have reported a higher than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.
The council is clear and honest about what it does and why	This question has been asked for the past 2 years. 30% of respondents felt that the Council is clear and honest about what it does and why. This is a reduction of 8% over the previous year. All groups reported a lower level of agreement than the previous year.
The council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing	This question has been asked for the past 2 years. 30% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 5% over the previous year.
The council has the public's best interests at heart	This question has been asked for the past 2 years. 28% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 8% over the previous year. **Disabled people, Carers, LGBTQ+ people, people from minority ethnic groups** and **the armed forces community** have reported a lower than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.
The council works collaboratively with other organisations and the public	This question has been asked for the past 2 years. 22% of respondents felt that the Council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing. This is a reduction of 7% over the previous year. **Females** have reported a higher than average satisfaction level for both of the 2 years.

Full data tables are shown in Appendix 1 of this EqIAA document.

SECTION 3 – COST REDUCTION AND INCOME PROPOSALS

NB. This section will be updated post consultation.

As mentioned in the introduction, the council is consulting on some proposals. These proposals are 'grouped' under the following headings:

Approach 1: Reviewing our internal costs
Approach 2: Finding more efficient ways of working and delivery models
Approach 3: Managing responsibility for paying for, and delivering services
Approach 4: Outsourcing
Approach 5: Generating additional income
Approach 6: Stopping, cutting back and prioritising services and support

Each proposal is considered in turn on the following pages of this Initial EqIAA document.

Approach 1: Reviewing our internal costs

Our starting point as we face financial challenges is to consider what we are spending to ensure we are operating as efficiently as we can. Our mantra to our staff is that they should treat every penny they spend at work as if it were their own and we have already delivered savings of over £100m since 2010.

Ensuring we are securing best value for money from all our suppliers

We work hard to ensure we get the best value when we spend money on goods and services. Where it is prudent to do so, we sign longer term agreements with suppliers to achieve the best value for taxpayers, and on an ongoing basis we review contracts and costs to make sure we are continuing to secure the lowest prices.

Options under consideration

- We are proposing a further review of all major contracts and purchasing, setting a new target to reduce spend on these big-ticket items by 2028/29.

Initial Equality Assessment

The council procures a wide range of goods and services which are designed and delivered in order to positively impact upon our diverse communities and, in some instances, positively target particular communities.

As such, any reduction in contracts and purchasing brings potential to negatively impact communities across all Protected Characteristics.

In response to this, any furtherance of the proposed review would be accompanied by a detailed EqIAA, which would be developed through working with those we contract with, as well as service users and residents, in order to closely understand impacts for our communities This would include the consideration of any impacts in respect of our Equality Priority Areas and objectives as set out in the Tackling Inequalities Plan

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

The council has a limited portfolio of land, buildings and other property assets. We continue to review options for property, ensuring we are making best use of these assets to generate income and reduce costs.

We have made substantial savings in this area in recent years. For example, we have significantly reduced the costs of our office estate. We are now a smaller organisation with more people able to perform part, or all, their roles from home, and so we have rented out some of our office space that we no longer need. In the last year, we have let out a large part of our main office building in Yate to a partner organisation. This delivers dual benefits in generating income and supporting better partnership working.

We are also purchasing property as an 'invest to save' measure to better support individuals with especially complex needs. One of the council's largest expenses is for residential placements; specialist facilities for young people with complex needs and care homes for older people and those who need social care support. For people with the most complex needs, residential placements can cost many hundreds of thousands of pounds per person per year. We want to investigate the cost/benefit analysis of securing dedicated housing for these small groups of people, so the council can deliver the ongoing support they need more cost-effectively.

We have demonstrated that this approach, providing wraparound care for groups of people with similar needs, delivers better outcomes as it typically means their care is provided much closer to home and wider support networks. And these better outcomes are achieved whilst substantially reducing the long-term costs to the taxpayer.

Options under consideration

- We will continue to review the property we own and identify whether over the short, medium and long term we want or need to use it, rent it out or to sell it.
- We propose to conduct cost benefit analysis to determine the business case for further investment in properties to be used for long-term accommodation for individuals with complex needs. Whilst this involves additional short-term investment, it should save us significant amounts of money over the longer term through reducing costs of expensive residential care.

Initial Equality Assessment

Residents have consistently told us that 'making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings' is their most highly supported approach to balancing our budgets. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year and as an average over the last 11-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 11-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Making more efficient use of council assets such as land and buildings	90%	86%	The majority of respondents (90%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is also 86%.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
			Significant trends to note are that regardless of protected characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach over the 11-year period.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

Assessing property which can be used for residential care, has a clear potential to have positive impacts, especially in regard to the Protected Characteristics of Age and Disability.

It is also noted that this work is likely to bring clear potential to positively impact on the Priority Area of '*Adult Social Care*' as set out in the Tackling Inequalities Plan, namely the objectives to:

i. *Ensure high satisfaction levels across all adult social care service users.*
ii. *Ensure excellent Care Homes in South Gloucestershire which meet the needs of all.*
iii. *Deliver excellent Home Care services for all.*
iv. *Assess our commissioning approach to Home Care to ensure it sufficiently reflects the changing needs arising from increasing diversity in our community.*
v. *Increase the proportion of older people (over 65yrs) who are still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital.*
vi. *Ensure excellent reablement services which meet the needs of all diverse service users.*
vii. *Increase independent living opportunities for people with Learning Disabilities.*

Adult Social Care continues to deliver an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Plan, which focusses on delivering parity of satisfaction and outcomes for all groups, particularly highlighting people from minority ethnic groups, LGBTQ+ communities and people with Learning Disabilities as disparities exist for these groups. As such, the delivery of extra care housing for older people, and for long-term accommodation for people with complex needs, brings clear potential to reduce disparities experienced by some groups.

The review of property we own is subject to ongoing EqIAA.

Approach 2: Finding more efficient ways of working and delivery models

Local authorities have been asked to make significant savings over the past decade and South Gloucestershire Council has done this by ensuring we are working as efficiently as we can. However, we are constantly seeking out best practice from across the public sector and more broadly to find new, cheaper and more effective ways of delivering services.

Changing working practices

Technology has an important role to play. We are making increasing use of technology to improve access to services and make it cheaper and more efficient to deliver support. But we know there is an important balancing act to ensure we are not excluding people who either don't have access to or can't use technology.

Whilst some people will prefer to speak to a person, we know currently too many people who would find it quicker and easier to do things online are forced to call us or visit us in person because our online forms and wider technology doesn't work as well as it could. This is frustrating and inefficient, leading to longer waiting times for people who need to talk to us. And it is expensive for taxpayers.

We plan to invest in building better technology to reduce the requirement for people to call or visit us, making it quicker and easier delivering savings over the long term.

We believe we can also put technology to good use in automating some of the more administrative parts of our work. AI opens up further opportunities in this area, and over the coming months, we want to investigate how other organisations are realising these benefits and where appropriate, implement them at the council.

This may involve up-front investment, but we have already seen good case studies where it has proven beneficial in reducing costs without impacting quality of services.

Outside of this work, we have put the onus on our staff to challenge the 'way we've always done things', asking them to suggest and implement better ways of doing their jobs.

Many of these changes are small. Others are more significant, but the cost/benefit analysis is so clear that we don't need to ask you about them.

A good example of one such change, which we'll be implementing shortly, involves adjusting our waste processes, which will allow us to take waste directly from kerbside collections to waste treatment plants without having to visit the Sort It recycling centres for weighing and sorting. This saves us time and money and we know you'll appreciate not having to queue up behind one of our collection vehicles when you're visiting the tip.

Options under consideration

- Invest in better technology to allow more people to contact us and complete straightforward processes online.
- Continue investigations into new technology, seeking out opportunities to reduce administrative tasks.

Initial Equality Assessment

Resident views in relation to 'changing working practices to make better use of technology, and more efficient ways of working', has been the approach with the second highest levels of support by residents over recent years. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year as an average over the last 10-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 10-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Changing working practices to make better use of technology and more efficient ways of working	86%	83%	The majority of respondents (86%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%. Significant trends to note are that regardless of Protected Characteristics, the majority of respondents have consistently supported this approach (average support over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 83%).

See Appendix 1 for full data.

It is important that technology is used as a cost-effective way to more efficiently and effectively serve residents. Resident views in relation to the approaches of 'using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services', and 'making more services available online', have been the fourth and fifth most highly supported approaches by residents over recent years. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year as an average over the last 8-11 year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting these approaches to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 8 – 11 year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services	72%	66%	The majority of respondents (72%) supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the eight year period that this question has been asked is 66%. 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

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
			average to support this approach with average support for this approach being 54% and 55% respectively across the eight 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 eight year period, with 46% of people aged 65+ supporting it at the beginning of the eight year period and 61% supporting this year. Similarly, 43% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the eight year period and 67% supported it this year.
Making more services available online	70%	63%	70% of respondents supported this approach this year. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 63%. Trends to note are that **people 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 50% and 49% respectively across the 11-year period. It is also noted that both of these groups have reported an increase in support for this approach over the 11-year period, with 37% of people aged 65+ supporting at the beginning of the 11-year period and 59% supporting this year. Similarly, 41% of disabled people supported this approach at the beginning of the 11-year period and 65% supported it this year.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

Our consultation and engagement work has shown that people aged under 65 have a high level of support for the use of digital technology and making services available online.

In contrast, it is clear that disabled people and people aged 65+ are consistently less likely than average to support these approaches and we know that digital technologies and online services can often present barriers to people who are not digitally active.

There are two broad points to raise in respect of the utilisation of digital technologies:-

1. Supporting people to be digitally active.

2. Providing access to services in ways which are flexible and inclusive of those who are not digitally active.

The council provides a variety of support to enable people to be digitally active, such as free access to PCs and Wi-Fi in public libraries and One Stop Shops, and operating the Digital Champion Volunteer Scheme, which provides free one-to-one digital help and support. The council continues to work with internal services, partners and community organisations to address the digital divide in our communities.

In respect of the proposals, 'investment in better technology which allows more people to contact us and complete straightforward processes online' is an approach that links closely with the council's work to support digital activity amongst residents. It is also noted that the provision of a range of approaches which are inclusive and meet the needs of our diverse residents are enshrined in council policy.

In terms of continuing to investigate new technology in order to seek out opportunities to reduce administrative tasks, this brings potential to positively impact across all Protected Characteristics, given that this would ultimately release more time for staff to spend on direct work to meet resident needs.

Any technology proposed for adoption is subject to detailed EqIAAs in order to ensure no negative impacts as well as the identification of approaches which are inclusive and meet the diverse needs of our diverse residents.

Element 2 - Reducing demand for services

Rationing services targeted at the most vulnerable in society often leads to poor outcomes for individuals and costs us all more over the long term. However, we've seen from previous experience that we can reduce demand for many of our most expensive services - especially social care - if we concentrate support and resources on preventative measures.

Our pilot 'Mockingbird' scheme is one example of how this focus on prevention is delivering a win-win for all parties. Mockingbird involves giving additional support to our foster carers and connecting individual carers into local 'constellations', providing opportunities for families to meet up, to share expertise and experience and spread the load of caring for young people with complex and challenging needs.

Whilst it is early days, we've already seen benefits for young people, foster carers and for the council. Investing in and better supporting foster carers helps them do what they do, bringing greater stability for young people. This results in fewer family breakdowns and fewer young people being separated from the people and places they know and placed in expensive residential care.

This approach has been especially beneficial in better supporting young people with the most challenging needs, and so we are increasing investment in more groups of foster carers with a view to increasing stability for young people and delivering savings over the longer term.

Within adult social care, we are working with our colleagues in the NHS on initiatives which prevent and minimise the need for the most expensive care. An area where we want to put greater focus is in 'reablement' support. This means spending more time with older people after a stay in hospital, caring for them in a setting focused on ongoing care and physiotherapy and re-teaching skills to allow them to remain independent. Prioritising this type of support is shown to prevent accidents and reduce the number of people who require much more expensive hospital or social care support because they can no longer live independently after a stay in hospital.

Option under consideration

- We plan to continue and expand on initiatives like Mockingbird and reablement, which have demonstrated opportunities to save money by reducing demand for our most expensive services, whilst delivering the same or better outcomes.

Initial Equality Assessment

The pilot Mockingbird scheme has resulted in fewer family breakdowns, which means fewer young people being separated from the people and places they know and placed in expensive residential care.

Males from minority ethnic groups experience proportionately more placement moves than others in care – in other words, less stability. The Mockingbird scheme supports greater stability for families and young people and our 'Business As Usual' EqIAA process ensures that the impacts across Protected Characteristic groups is continuously monitored in order to ensure positive outcomes for all and this will continue. It is noted that the evidence in respect of the pilot scheme shows that this proposal is likely to result in a positive impact for all Protected Characteristic groups, including for males from minority ethnic groups.

Approach 3: Managing responsibility for paying for, and delivering services

We work closely and effectively with many public sector agencies, town and parish councils and the wider voluntary and community sector to improve the lives of local people. We share resources and join up services where it allows us to improve the support we can offer. However, in a world where resources are more constrained, we must consider what support is affordable and which group or organisation is best placed to deliver services. We must also ensure that each organisation is paying a reasonable share of the costs.

Ensuring a reasonable split of costs

Social care is particularly expensive. We must find a way to work with our partners in the health sector to reduce demand, reduce costs and manage funding and contributions.

Working with partners to understand the impact of withdrawing funding from discretionary community-based services

Due to the budget pressures, we are likely to have to withdraw funding from delivering discretionary services like maintenance of local facilities such as public conveniences, playing fields and other open spaces. However, we recognise the community and local value of these services and therefore over the next year we will open discussions with Town and Parish Councils and Voluntary and Community Sector Organisations to understand this impact and (where possible) find the best, most efficient way of delivering services going forwards. This will include understanding residents' priorities and how services could be paid for and provided. For some areas, it may make sense for Council teams to continue to complete some of these maintenance tasks. Other towns and villages already have individuals or teams – often supported by community groups – who do a fantastic job making sure your places are looking fantastic.

Options under consideration

- Continue discussions with health partners to ensure we are working efficiently in partnership and agree how everyone can pay their fair share for the increasing costs of health and social care.
- Talk to Town & Parish Councils and the wider voluntary sector to find the most efficient way to maintain local facilities like public conveniences, playing fields and other open spaces.

Initial Equality Assessment

Resident views in relation to the approach of transferring services to community groups, social enterprises and town and parish councils has received a slightly lower level of support from residents over recent years in comparison to other approaches. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year and as an average over the last 11-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 11-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Transferring services to community groups,	45%	45%	45% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
social enterprises and town and parish councils			approach over the 11-year period is 45%. There are no clear trends over the 11-year period relating to Protected Characteristic groups in respect of this approach.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

In respect of the overarching approach of working with our partners in the health sector to either reduce demand, reduce costs, or else ensure everyone is paying a fair amount towards achieving our joint priorities, there are no impacts identified at this stage. However, as specific approaches are identified, these will be subject to detailed EqIAAs.

There are clear impacts in respect of the maintenance of local facilities, and these impacts particularly relate to those who have the highest usage rates. For example, in terms of parks, we know that younger people and families have the highest proportionate usage, and this includes disabled young people as a range of inclusive play equipment is available across many play areas.

Any proposals as a result of engagement with Town & Parish Council and the wider voluntary sector would require EqIAAs to be developed from the initial proposals development stage and as part of taking forward any changes.

Approach 4: Outsourcing

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

In recent budget consultations, local people have indicated that they believe the council delivers services more efficiently and effectively than private companies could. However, in line with our approach of ensuring we are achieving best value from every penny we spend, we continue to review and compare costs and outcomes of outsourcing versus delivering services ourselves. For example, following an open market competition, we have recently agreed to sign a new contract with Suez who will continue to collect rubbish and recycling from kerbside, but we have taken in-house the operation of recycling centres.

Options under consideration

- We are not proposing to outsource any additional major services at this time as there are no areas where the evidence is clear that a private sector organisation can deliver the service to the same standard more cost-effectively than the council can.

Initial Equality Assessment

Resident views in relation to the approach of transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies has received a low level of support from residents over recent years. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year and as an average over the last 10-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 10-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies	24%	23%	This approach resulted in a low level of overall support (24%). Average support for this approach over the ten year period that this question has been asked is 23%. **Females**, **disabled people** and **LGBTQ+ people** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with average levels of support over the ten year period being 21%, 20% and 23% respectively.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

There are no proposals to outsource any additional major services at this time and as such, no equalities impacts are identified in respect of this element of the draft budget.

Approach 5: Generating additional income

The other side of the budget coin is to increase what we earn.

Increasing fees and charges for some services

Until the last few years, we have kept charges for discretionary services much lower than in other parts of the country – and far below the costs of delivering that support. And it has been an anomaly for people to not have to pay to use public car parks in South Gloucestershire.

However, as our finances have become more constrained, it has felt unfair to continue to subsidise the cost of services like collecting grass cuttings when not everyone has a garden, and to not charge people for parking to allow us to cover the cost of providing and maintaining car parks. We have therefore changed our approach to stop subsidising these services so we can prioritise funding towards essential support like social care for the vulnerable.
We plan to continue our recent approach, ensuring fees are set at a fair level, which keeps track with the cost of providing those services.

Options under consideration

- Increasing the cost of the green waste subscription service to £70 per year for 2025/26. This increase, from the current annual fee of £60, allows us to continue to cover the escalating costs of providing the service. This fee would also bring us into line with what is charged by neighbouring councils.

Initial Equality Assessment

Resident views in relation to the approach of increasing fees and charges for some services has received an increasing level of support from residents from 40% support 11-years ago to 54% support last year. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported this approach last year and as an average over the last 11-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 11-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
8.	Increasing fees and charges for some services	54%	45%	54% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 45%. Trends to note are **females**, **disabled people** and **people from minority ethnic groups** are less likely than average to support this approach across the 11-year period. Linking to this is data demonstrating that people from these same groups are disproportionately more likely to be living in

	Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
				poverty/financial hardship in South Gloucestershire.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

Any increase in costs of services would particularly impact people with lower incomes. Service subscribers are those residents with gardens, who are proportionately more likely to be middle to higher income wage earners. However, this does not mean that 'low income' residents will not 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 negatively 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

Consultation results from a year ago found that the 'groups' with the largest disagreement levels with an increase to this charge were People aged 65+ and Disabled People.

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 for use as required. 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 for collection of a single bin from a single address).
- Household Waste and Recycling Centres will continue to accept garden waste

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.

Increasing Council Tax

Our main source of income is Council Tax. Whilst we recognise the financial pressures local people face, each percentage increase in council tax provides us with approximately £1.9m in additional income each year. This is a much bigger sum than we can raise or save from any other option we are considering through this consultation. In the calculations Central Government uses to allocate funding to Local Government, they assume Council Tax will increase by the maximum permitted percentage of 4.99%, so any alternative to increasing taxes by this amount would mean we need to make more substantive cuts to services.

In recent years, residents completing our budget consultation have recognised this dilemma and supported increasing Council Tax – last year, 83% of respondents were in favour of some kind of increase and of this group, the highest proportion preferred the maximum possible increase of 4.99%.

Currently, legislation requires us to hold a referendum if we want to increase the main rate of Council Tax by more than 4.99% (of which 2% is ringfenced to be spent on adult social care). In this section of the consultation, we are keen to understand your views on different levels of increases, including an option of increases of more than 4.99% should legislation be changed to allow higher increases.

Options under consideration

- Our draft budget assumes that we will increase Council Tax by the maximum currently permitted percentage of 4.99%. However, we are seeking views through the consultation on different levels of increases and are looking to capture views on rises above this current cap, should this become an option.

Initial Equality Assessment

Our research, insights and consultation work, tell us that the people least likely to want to see higher levels of increases to Council Tax include:

- Women;
- People from minority ethnic groups, including people from 'White Other' groups;
- People aged under 45;
- Disabled people

National and local evidence shows that these groups are more likely to be living in financial hardship. In the autumn of 2022 research conducted by the Council found:

- Families with children, younger adults <45, women, those from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, those who are renting privately, those who have been unemployed or experienced long-term sickness have noted greater difficulty or have had to make more changes.
- 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.

It is clear that an increase of 4.99% would impact more greatly for people with lower incomes, however, at the same time, a higher increase helps in mitigating further cuts to services which would disproportionately impact residents with lower incomes.

Ensuring we are collecting all that we are owed

We believe there are opportunities to reduce costs and increase our income by collecting the money that is owed to us in a timelier manner. Our staff responsible for debt collection do a good job, but we can work in more efficient ways to help ensure we are bringing money in when it is due.

Options under consideration

- Introduce best practices and new efficiencies within our debt collection function.

Initial Equality Assessment

This would clearly impact most greatly for those people who are living on lower incomes and be experiencing financial insecurity as follows:

- 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

However, the council delivers a programme of work to support residents who may be experiencing financial difficulties and this would be continued. It is also noted that debts are owed regardless of Protected Characteristics.

The approaches taken to debt collection are subject to detailed EqIAA in order to ensure that vulnerable residents are supported in their awareness of processes taken.

Approach 6: Stopping, cutting back and prioritising services and support

Through our budget-setting process, the council has been at pains to prioritise changes which do not impact our ability to deliver services. We are in a relatively financial stable position now, so can minimise cuts in the short term. But this has only been possible because we have taken difficult decisions early. Therefore, given the cost pressures and uncertainties around our future funding, we think we will need to continue this approach of planning ahead and make some cuts over coming months and years.

Cuts to council delivered services

Because the financial pressures we face are not immediate, we are not proposing any further cuts to the services delivered directly by the council through this consultation process.

But given uncertainties around our future funding, we think we will need to make some cuts over the coming months and years. We are investigating some measures right now. But we need to do more work to evaluate potential impacts, so we'll bring them forward and consult on them separately as appropriate.

Local people have supported the approach we have taken in recent years to prioritise support on the most vulnerable, for example, children who have had a very difficult start to life, and older people and disabled people who need to rely on the council for social care support. We will need to prioritise in this way to a greater extent going forward. This means both halting non-core services which are currently subsidised by taxpayers and scaling back or stopping some discretionary services so we can protect essential services supporting those in greatest need.

Reviewing our funding to other organisations

Our approach is to ensure every penny we spend is used in the most effective and targeted way to deliver local people's priorities. This includes what we give to voluntary sector organisations through grants and commissioning. We are proposing to review this area of spend, which could mean changes to funding for some organisations. In making decisions, we will consider the alignment of work with our priorities and the potential impacts of any changes to funding on what support can be delivered. Over the next year we will work with our voluntary sector partners to review opportunities to maximise the value of spend; considering how our combined resources can be used to best effect.

Options under consideration

- Open discussions with partner organisations who we currently support through direct funding to ensure the most effective way of delivering priorities.

Initial Equality Assessment

Resident views in relation to the approach of scaling back or stopping some services has received a low level of support with support levels broadly decreasing over the 11-year period. The table below shows the percentage of consultation respondents who supported these approaches last year and as an average over the last 11-year period.

Table to show the percentage of respondents supporting this approach to delivering the council savings plan in the longer term as elicited via the 2024/25 council budget consultation and over the 11-year period that this question has been asked as part of council budget setting consultations.

Approach	24/25 Budget percentage support	Average (11-year) percentage support	Key points emerging and trends
Scaling back or stopping some services	19%	23%	19% of respondents supported this approach. Average support for this approach over the 11-year period is 23%. **Females** and **disabled people** are consistently less likely than average to support this approach with an average of 19% and 18% respectively reporting support for this approach over the 11-year period.

See Appendix 1 for full data.

Reducing spend through reductions to voluntary sector organisations in receipt of direct funding brings clear potential for negative impacts. In particular, voluntary sector organisations deliver a range of equality-focussed work which directly benefits residents from diverse communities. This proposal includes work to ensure alignment with our priorities and these are clearly set out in our Tackling Inequalities Plan. As such, any work to review the direct funding we give to voluntary sector organisations would involve clear assessment and consideration of impacts in respect of contribution to the delivery of the objectives set out in the Tackling Inequalities Plan. This would form part of a detailed EqIAA should this work be taken forward.

Cumulative analysis of impacts in respect of the 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	Children & Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65's	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Hetrosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK armed forces	Not UK armed forces	Care Leavers	Tackling Inequalities Plan Impact?
Further review of all major contracts and purchasing, setting a new target to reduce spend.	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Potential Negative
Continue to review the property we own and identifying whether in the short, medium or long term we want or need to use it, rent it out or to sell it.																			

Proposal	Female	Male	Children & Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65's	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Hetrosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK armed forces	Not UK armed forces	Care Leavers	Tackling Inequalities Plan Impact?
Conduct cost benefit analysis to determine the business case for further investment in properties to be used for long-term accommodation for individuals with complex needs. Whilst this involves additional short-term investment, it should save us significant amounts of money over the longer term through reducing costs of expensive residential care.						✓	✓												Potential positive for 'Adult Social Care' priority
Invest in better technology to allow more people to contact us and complete straightforward processes online.				✓	✓	✘	✘												-
Continue investigations into new technology, seeking out opportunities to reduce administrative tasks.				✓	✓	✘	✘												-
Continue and expand on initiatives like Mockingbird and reablement, which have demonstrated opportunities to save money by reducing demand for our most expensive services, whilst delivering the same or better outcomes.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Potential positive for 'Children's Social Care' and 'Adult Social Care' priority

Proposal	Female	Male	Children & Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65's	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Hetrosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK armed forces	Not UK armed forces	Care Leavers	Tackling Inequalities Plan Impact?
Continue discussions with health partners to ensure we are working efficiently in partnership and agree how everyone can pay their fair share for the increasing costs of health and social care.																			
Talk to Town & Parish Councils and the wider voluntary sector to find the most efficient way to maintain local facilities like public conveniences, playing fields and other open spaces.			✘			✘	✘								✘				Potential negative for 'Accessibility' priority
Increasing the cost of the green waste subscription service.	✘		✘	✘			✘			✘					✘				
Increase Council Tax by the maximum currently permitted percentage of 4.99%.	✘		✘	✘			✘			✘					✘				Potential negative for 'Poverty and Financial Hardship' priority
Introduce best practices and new efficiencies within our debt collection function.																			-

Proposal	Female	Male	Children & Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65's	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Hetrosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK armed forces	Not UK armed forces	Care Leavers	Tackling Inequalities Plan Impact?
Reviewing our funding to other organisations.	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	Potential Negative

The following table provides an overview of the cumulative/combined impacts of the proposals.

Impacts	Female	Male	Children and Young People	People of younger ages (<45)	46 to 65	Over 65's	Disabled	Non disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Hetrosexual	Religion	No religion	Lower income	UK armed forces	Not UK armed forces	Care Leavers
Negative	**4**	**2**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**7**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**2**
Positive	**1**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Impacts in respect of the Tackling Inequalities Plan Priority Areas

The following table provides an overview of the cumulative/combined impacts of the proposals in respect of the Tackling Inequalities Plan Priority Areas.

Priority Area	Impacts
Accessibility, especially in terms of: transport, the built and natural environment, and access to the wider economy	1 Negative
Poverty and Financial Hardship	1 Negative
Adult Social Care	2 Positive
Children's Social Care	1 Positive

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.

Analysis of 2024/25 consultation feedback in relation to cumulative impacts

The following table shows the percentage of residents responding to the consultation held in winter 2024 who felt that each topic had got better and had got worse over the last 5 years.

Topic	Resident Feedback		Notes regarding feedback - Protected Characteristics
	Worse	Better	
Condition of roads and paths	78%	9%	**Disabled people** were the most likely to say that the condition of roads and paths had got worse. Analysis of satisfaction with 'Highways and Roads' over the last 11-years shows that disabled people have tended to be less satisfied than average across the period with an average satisfaction level of 56% across the period. '*Access…to the built and natural environment…*' is one of the 10 identified Equality Priority Areas and we know this is of particular importance for disabled people.
How affordable Council Tax is for my household	45%	5%	**Younger people, people from 'White Other' groups, people from minority ethnic groups** and **women** were most likely to say that affordability of council tax has become worse. This matches with our data evidencing that these same groups are more likely than average to be experiencing financial hardship.
How clean, tidy and well maintained my local streets and open/communal spaces are	44%	14%	**Disabled people** and **carers** were the most likely to say that cleanliness, tidiness and maintenance of streets and open/communal spaces has got worse. This links to '*Access…to the built and natural environment…*' which is one of the 10 identified Equality Priority Areas, and we know this is of particular importance for disabled people.
Reduced funding/ less resources affecting other services I use (e.g. schools, charities, community groups)	26%	3%	**Younger people** were the most likely to say that reduced funding/less resources affecting other services used has become worse.
Problems with housing, planning or development	25%	4%	**Disabled people**, followed by **people from minority ethnic groups** and **younger people** were the most likely to say that problems with housing, planning or development has got worse. These same groups are disproportionately over-represented in our housing need data.

Topic	Resident Feedback		Notes regarding feedback - Protected Characteristics
	Worse	Better	
Higher cost of council services I use	25%	6%	**People from minority ethnic groups** and **disabled people** were the most likely to say that higher costs of council services used has got worse. This matches with our data evidencing that these same groups are more likely than average to be experiencing financial hardship.
How safe I feel in my local area	24%	11%	**Disabled people, carers** and **LGBTQ+ people** were most likely to say how safe they feel in the local area has got worse. This links to data evidencing increases in disablist, homophobic and transphobic hate crime in South Gloucestershire.
Availability of social care services or services affecting my or my family's health/ wellbeing	21%	5%	**Disabled people, carers** and **LGBTQ+ people** were most likely to say the availability of social care services or services affecting health/wellbeing has got worse.
Quality of council services (e.g. helpfulness of staff, responsiveness or speed of service, getting a satisfactory outcome)	19%	13%	The data does not show any particular disparities according to Protected Characteristic.
Availability or accessibility of council services (e.g. opening hours or services no longer being delivered)	19%	6%	**LGBTQ+ people** and **disabled people** were most likely to say that availability or accessibility of council services has got worse.

Cumulative impacts over time

The current Council Savings Programme commenced for the 2022/23 budget year. Since this time, numerous proposals have been identified (with associated EqIAAs), and as a result, numerous proposals have been taken forward and implemented (with associated EqIAAs).

A 'cumulative analysis' has been undertaken which assesses all proposals since the 2022/23 budget year (whether proposals have been implemented, are in the process of being implemented, or have not yet been commenced).

The following table shows the results of the cumulative assessment:

Table to show the number of positive and negative impacts likely to be experienced across the savings programme to 2024/25 according to characteristics.

	Female	Male	Children and Young People	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
Positive Impacts Identified	0	0	3	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Negative Impacts Identified	16	3	8	10	3	10	22	1	1	17	9	1	3	1	17	1	0

The table shows that Disabled People have experienced the most negative impacts in respect of the savings programme. People from minority ethnic groups, people on lower incomes and women have also experienced a significant number of negative impacts. Younger adults, LGBTQ+ people and children & young people, have also experienced a significant number of negative impacts.

It is important that this information is factored into decision making in respect of the 2025/26 budget setting process and continues to be monitored closely.

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 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 as set out in the Tackling Inequalities Plan 2024-28 – 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 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 2025/26.

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 Council Budget and Council Savings Plan Consultation Output Report, January 2024
- 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

Resident responses to the approaches that could be taken to make services more affordable to run.

Targeting resources on the most vulnerable and people most in need

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	71%	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%
2024/25	**64%**	65%	65%	61%	69%	61%	69%	65%	66%	50%	74%						67%									66%	68%	67%	67%

Reducing the quality of services provided

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	11%	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%
2024/25	**16%**	12%	19%	13%	16%	16%	14%	16%	16%	9%	13%						15%									12%	15%	15%	15%

Increasing fees and charges for some services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	51%	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%
2024/25	**54%**	48%	61%	52%	53%	55%	46%	57%	55%	48%	55%						52%									52%	52%	51%	52%

Making more services available online

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	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%
2024/25	**70%**	67%	72%	87%	75%	59%	65%	71%	69%	80%	84%						74%									67%	74%	72%	73%

Using digital technology more widely to support the delivery of services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	86%	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%
2024/25	**72%**	68%	76%	86%	76%	61%	67%	74%	71%	82%	77%				76%											72%	76%	75%	75%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	95%	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%
2024/25	**90%**	90%	92%	87%	91%	91%	90%	92%	91%	93%	94%						90%									90%	89%	89%	90%

Scaling back or stopping some services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	8%	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%
2024/25	**19%**	13%	22%	15%	19%	19%	16%	19%	18%	11%	16%						17%									16%	18%	18%	18%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	23%	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%
2024/25	**35%**	32%	39%	24%	35%	40%	32%	36%	36%	32%	16%						33%									32%	34%	32%	33%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	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%
2024/25	**86%**	84%	90%	88%	85%	86%	80%	88%	87%	91%	94%						86%									80%	86%	85%	85%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	84%	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%
2024/25	**81%**	82%	82%	80%	81%	82%	79%	83%	81%	91%	87%						80%									77%	80%	80%	81%

Transferring services to other organisations like commercial companies

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	15%	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%
2024/25	**24%**	22%	26%	20%	25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	25%	19%						24%									26%	24%	25%	25%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	30%	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%
2024/25	**45%**	44%	48%	50%	44%	44%	45%	47%	46%	46%	52%						47%									42%	46%	47%	47%

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

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	49%	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%
2024/25	**54%**	54%	56%	50%	49%	59%	58%	55%	54%	70%	74%						54%									52%	53%	53%	53%

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?

Feedback	Budget year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	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%	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%
	24/25	***4%***	3%	4%	7%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%	9%	3%						4%									3%	3%	3%	3%
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%	23%	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%
	24/25	**43%**	40%	42%	41%	46%	41%	46%	41%	42%	30%	48%						44%									53%	43%	45%	45%

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

Budget year	**Total**	Female	Male	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%	75%	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%
24/25	**65%**	69%	67%	56%	66%	70%	56%	69%	68%	66%	52%						63%									57%	65%	62%	62%

Satisfaction with the way the council runs things

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	61%	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%
2024/25	**34%**	38%	37%	25%	31%	41%	29%	38%	38%	32%	29%						28%									21%	28%	26%	26%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	45%	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%
2024/25	**52%**	53%	57%	34%	54%	57%	53%	55%	56%	50%	48%						48%									47%	47%	48%	47%

Agreement that the council keeps me informed about proposals for change

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	51%	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%
2024/25	**52%**	52%	57%	38%	54%	56%	53%	56%	56%	57%	58%						48%									50%	47%	49%	48%

I can influence decisions affecting the local area

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	26%	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%
2024/25	**14%**	16%	14%	10%	15%	14%	12%	16%	16%	16%	10%						13%									8%	14%	13%	13%

Agreement that the council acts on the concerns of residents

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	34%	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%
2024/25	**26%**	28%	28%	19%	25%	30%	23%	29%	29%	21%	26%						23%									19%	23%	22%	22%

Further questions

In addition to the above questions, the following questions have been asked as part of the Council Budget consultation for 2 years. The following tables display 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.

The council can be relied on to consistently deliver services

Budget Year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	**41%**	39%	43%	35%	43%	45%	31%	44%	43%	30%	27%	45%	41%	42%	44%	41%
2024/25	**30%**	32%	33%	19%	29%	35%	27%	33%	33%	36%	23%	27%	24%	27%	25%	25%

The council is clear and honest about what it does and why

Budget Year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	**38%**	39%	40%	41%	38%	40%	33%	41%	41%	34%	37%	40%	32%	42%	40%	40%
2024/25	**30%**	32%	33%	22%	30%	33%	25%	34%	33%	32%	19%	26%	20%	26%	25%	25%

The council contributes towards improving the local area and residents' wellbeing

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	**35%**	36%	35%	35%	38%	36%	28%	38%	38%	29%	44%	39%	38%	35%	33%	36%
2024/25	**30%**	32%	32%	23%	30%	32%	25%	33%	33%	34%	23%	28%	20%	27%	27%	26%

The council has the public's best interests at heart

Question	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	**36%**	36%	38%	36%	39%	36%	28%	39%	39%	29%	39%	39%	32%	38%	26%	38%
2024/25	**28%**	30%	31%	20%	28%	32%	21%	32%	31%	25%	19%	26%	19%	25%	24%	24%

The council works collaboratively with other organisations and the public

Budget Year	Total (all respondents)	Female	Male	18 to 44	45 to 64	65+	Disabled	Non-disabled	White British	Minority Ethnic Groups	LGBTQ+	Heterosexual	Carer	Not a Carer	UK Armed Forces	Not UK Armed Forces
2023/24	**29%**	33%	27%	35%	31%	24%	20%	31%	31%	23%	27%	30%	29%	30%	17%	31%
2024/25	**22%**	26%	23%	16%	23%	24%	22%	24%	24%	34%	23%	22%	21%	21%	21%	21%

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	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%	31%	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%
2024/25	**33%**	37%	34%	33%	32%	35%	40%	34%	36%	56%	33%						31%									45%	23%	31%	31%

Care for physically disabled and those with learning difficulties

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	30%	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%
2024/25	**27%**	27%	32%	23%	26%	32%	40%	27%	31%	40%	14%						26%									46%	17%	28%	28%

Children's social services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	32%	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%
2024/25	**18%**	15%	22%	30%	14%	15%	22%	18%	19%	33%	0%						18%									24%	15%	17%	18%

Customer Services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	63%	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%
2024/25	**47%**	46%	49%	45%	48%	47%	46%	48%	47%	69%	38%						44%									37%	46%	43%	43%

Environmental health and trading standards

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	50%	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%
2024/25	**27%**	28%	27%	25%	29%	24%	21%	28%	27%	47%	0%						28%									37%	23%	27%	27%

Housing advice services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	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%
2024/25	**16%**	16%	19%	22%	17%	14%	19%	17%	17%	40%	13%						16%									17%	12%	15%	14%

Highways and roads

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	42%	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%
2024/25	**18%**	21%	16%	21%	17%	16%	15%	19%	18%	20%	22%						20%									15%	21%	18%	18%

Free car parking

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	67%	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%
2024/25	**83%**	86%	82%	82%	83%	84%	79%	84%	83%	86%	86%						85%									88%	85%	85%	85%

Libraries

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	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%
2024/25	**76%**	82%	73%	80%	76%	76%	70%	79%	77%	81%	86%						77%									81%	75%	77%	77%

Local bus services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	47%	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%
2024/25	**39%**	38%	43%	33%	37%	42%	28%	43%	41%	33%	23%						37%									36%	35%	36%	37%

Parks and open spaces

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	84%	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%
2024/25	**77%**	80%	78%	80%	76%	77%	67%	80%	78%	81%	81%						78%									77%	78%	77%	77%

Planning

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	34%	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%
2024/25	**21%**	23%	21%	27%	22%	18%	19%	22%	22%	45%	8%						23%									23%	22%	24%	24%

Public Health (not including NHS services)

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	43%	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%
2024/25	**35%**	38%	38%	37%	38%	33%	27%	41%	38%	39%	42%						37%									25%	40%	36%	36%

Schools

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	71%	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%
2024/25	**47%**	53%	49%	54%	48%	40%	36%	52%	47%	77%	46%						49%									46%	50%	47%	47%

Sport and leisure facilities

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	81%	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%
2024/25	**64%**	74%	61%	66%	64%	63%	50%	69%	67%	71%	68%						66%									62%	68%	66%	66%

Waste and recycling services

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	78%	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%
2024/25	**67%**	70%	67%	49%	66%	75%	63%	69%	69%	60%	55%						65%									69%	63%	63%	63%

Welfare benefits and council tax reduction

Budget year	**Total (all respondents)**	Female	Male	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%	34%	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%
2024/25	**34%**	43%	32%	27%	31%	42%	35%	38%	39%	24%	47%						34%									38%	36%	36%	36%