

# Cabinet

## EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

11 February 2013

<u>Item</u>		<u>Pages</u>
4.	REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX LEVELS 2013/14	1 - 24
13.	APPROVAL OF THE 2013/14 HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME	25 - 27

## Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) of main Budget proposals for 2013/14

### (A) Overview and Summary

The Council is obliged to set a balanced budget and Council Tax charge in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The purpose of this EIA is to assess the main items in the budget that is likely to be proposed to Full Council on 27 February 2013, following discussion of the proposed Budget at Overview and Scrutiny Board on 29 January 2013, as well as at Cabinet on 11 February 2013.

The revenue part of the budget and associated equality impacts was also discussed at:

- Transport, Environment and Residents' Services Select Committee: 15 January 2013;
- Education and Children's Services Select Committee: 21 January 2013; and
- Housing, Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee: 22 January 2013.

The revenue part of the budget is found at Section D of this EIA.

For 2013/2014, a balanced budget is proposed, based on various growth areas, efficiency savings, fees and reserves. On the basis of that budget, the Council proposes to reduce Council Tax by 3%. Further information is set out in the accompanying Report.

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, comply with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and in particular section 149 (the Public Sector Equality Duty). This EIA is intended to assist the Council in fulfilling its public sector equality duty ("PSED"). It assesses, so far as is possible on the information currently available, the equality impact of the budget, including the proposal to reduce Council Tax. The requirements of the PSED and case law principles are explained in Legal Implications section of the report to Full Council. The Equality Implications section of that report is informed by this analysis.

### (B) Methodology

The analysis looks, first, at the impact of reducing Council Tax and, secondly, at the budget on which that decision is based. It is not, however, feasible or appropriate to carry out detailed EIAs of all the individual proposed policy decisions on which the budget is based at this stage. Detailed EIAs will be carried out of policy decisions that have particular relevance to the protected groups prior to any final decision being taken to implement those policy decisions. This will happen throughout 2013/14 as part of the Council's decision making process, and changes will be made where appropriate.

The aim in this document is to identify the elements of the budget that may have a particular adverse or a particular positive impact on any protected group so that these can be taken into account by the Council when taking a final decision on the budget and the level of Council Tax. Generally, it is not possible at this stage, and prior to any detailed EIA, to identify measures that will mitigate the adverse effects of any particular policy decision, although where this is possible mitigating measures are identified at the appropriate point in this document.

### (C) Analysis of impact of reducing Council tax by 3%

The impact of the proposal to reduce Council Tax by 3% is assessed in three categories:

- (i) those who pay Council Tax in full;
- (ii) those who do not pay any Council Tax because they receive full Local Council Tax Support ('LCTS') or are exempt from payment; and

- (iii) those who pay partial Council Tax because they receive partial LCTS.

Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) comes into effect from 01 April 2013, and replaces Council Tax Benefit which is abolished as part of the Government's Welfare Reforms (which include the introduction of Universal Credit). The proposed scheme for H&F for 2013/14 is to retain the same criteria and level of support as for Council Tax benefit. Therefore, for the purposes of this report, CTB data is used because LCTS comes into effect on 01 April 2013 and replaces CTB. There is more data on those in receipt of full CTB than those in receipt of partial CTB.

In order to assess the impact of this decision, relevant borough profile and other data is used to assess which group(s) might be impacted in each category and an assessment is made as to the likely impact on the three tenets of the PSED, reducing Council Tax by 3% in 2013/2014. One limiting factor in this analysis is that no diversity data is held for those eligible for, what is, from 01 April 2013, LCTS and what was previously, Council Tax Benefit ('CTB') or, conversely, those not eligible for LCTS/CTB. The Council does, however, have some data on those in receipt of full and partial CTB (Annex One). For the purposes of this report, CTB data is used because LCTS comes into effect on 01 April 2013 and replaces CTB. There is more data on those in receipt of full CTB than those in receipt of partial CTB.

(i) Assessment of impact of reducing Council Tax by 3% on those who pay the full Council Tax

Although precise numbers are not known, most adult residents pay full Council Tax. Those that do not fall into three sub-categories:

- (a) those eligible for full or partial CTB/LCTS, i.e. those receiving this benefit as identified in Annex One;
- (b) those exempt from Council Tax on any of the grounds set out in Annex One; and,
- (c) those who do not have responsibility for payment of Council Tax because they are not responsible for a property, nor required to pay or contribute towards Council Tax by their landlord or similar. The number of people in this latter category is unknown.

In addition, there are households which are eligible for a reduction in Council Tax (but not CTB/LCTS LCTS) where there is a disabled adult or child in the household and because of that person's disability they require an extra bathroom or kitchen, extra space for a wheelchair (if they need to use a wheelchair inside) or a room that is mainly used to meet their needs as a disabled person. If a resident is entitled to this reduction, the bill is worked out using the band below the current band of that person's property. For example, if the home is in Band D, the bill is worked out using Band C. For Band A properties, H&F reduces the council tax by one ninth of the Band D amount<sup>1</sup>.

Although these people pay less Council Tax because of their disability than they would otherwise pay, it is appropriate to include them in this section dealing with the analysis of impact on those who pay the full amount of Council Tax because these two groups will all benefit in the same way as a result of a reduction in Council Tax.

---

<sup>1</sup> Full details are available on the Council's website:  
[http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice\\_and\\_Benefits/Council\\_tax/Disabled\\_persons\\_reduction/35753\\_Council\\_Tax\\_Reductions\\_for\\_residents\\_with\\_disabilities.asp](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice_and_Benefits/Council_tax/Disabled_persons_reduction/35753_Council_Tax_Reductions_for_residents_with_disabilities.asp)

The average reduction for people who pay full Council Tax will be £23.44 per Council Tax bill (Band D). This is the reduction that relates to the LBHF element of the calculation. This now applies to those that had previously been exempt because their property was a second home, was empty or unfurnished, or was undergoing major repair (Cabinet decision of 14 January 2013).

All adults who pay the full rate will benefit financially from the Council Tax reduction. There will also be a small indirect benefit to all taxpayers nationally as the reduction in Council Tax will mean that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of CTB/LCTS that is paid out by the state and therefore a general benefit to the public purse.

Those who will feel the greatest benefit from the reduction in Council Tax, however, will be those whose circumstances mean that they are only slightly above the level at which they would become eligible for CTB or partial CTB (soon to be LCTS and partial LCTS) (see below).

Because of the way in which benefits are calculated and the number of factors that must be taken into account, it is not possible to give a threshold of savings or income (or similar) below which an individual would be eligible for full or partial CTB/LCTS, or above which a person will not be eligible for CTB/LCTS or partial CTB/LCTS.

However, it is likely that those whose financial circumstances place them only just above the threshold for CTB/LCTS eligibility will also have low levels of income/savings, relative to the rest of the population.

H&F does not hold diversity data for those with low income/savings levels. Nor does H&F hold full diversity data for those who are eligible for CTB or partial CTB, which could be used to inform an assessment of the likely percentage of people in this group being of a particular race, gender, age, etc. These datasets are capable of being applied to the new LCTS.

However, we do have some diversity data sets on those who claim full and partial CTB (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment. These will apply to the new LCTS. Table 3 of Annex One gives the recent data. It shows that the proportion of full CTB claimants who are pensioners has decreased by 1.45% since 2008, although pensioners remain significantly over-represented among those who are eligible for full CTB/LCTS: in 2010 pensioners made up 35.25% of all CTB/LCTS claimants. Using Borough Profile 2010 data (because it is appropriate for a comparison to 2010) only 10.2% of the general population were pensioners (those aged 65+).

About 54.67% of claimants (pensioner and non-pensioner) are single female, with around 30% (pensioner and non-pensioner) being single male, and around 15.33% being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female CTB/LCTS claimants is therefore about 62.33%, which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole (51.3% at the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census<sup>2</sup>).

In terms of disability, about 11.32% of claimants receive the CTB/LCTS disability premium, which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 14.7% as at the 2001 census, which is the most recent data).

Among those whose income/savings are low enough that they qualify for CTB/LCTS the only group that is (on the basis of the information available) disproportionately represented are pensioners.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/120717%202011%20Census%20report\\_First%20release\\_tcm21-174096.doc](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/120717%202011%20Census%20report_First%20release_tcm21-174096.doc)

However, it can probably be assumed that, in general, those with lower income/savings relative to the rest of the population (but nevertheless above the CTB/LCTS eligibility threshold) will include greater proportions of disabled people, ethnic minority groups, women on maternity leave, single parents (who are normally women) and families with young children than are present in the borough population as a whole.

The reduction in Council Tax will promote equality of opportunity for these groups by appreciably increasing their disposable income.

Residents who are not eligible for CTB/LCTS may consider that there may be an indirect adverse impact to them because if Council Tax is reduced by 3%, H&F will forego income of £1.6M. This may be a particular concern for those in the lower income/savings bracket (even though they will benefit the most from the reduction) because, broadly speaking, they are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (especially care services) than those who are better off. However, in the proposed budget the £1.6M income that H&F will forego is balanced against the Government Grant for freezing Council Tax of £0.6M, by figures such as budget savings of £5.2m from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £2m from the capital debt reduction programme. Although the proposed budget is based in part on various proposed changes to the ways in which services (in all areas) are provided to borough residents, it is not therefore possible to say that there is any direct link between the proposed Council Tax reduction and any particular proposed service change. The potential equality impact of the budget as a whole is assessed in Section D below.

In conclusion, the reduction in Council Tax is likely to have a direct positive effect on all adults in the borough who pay Council Tax (regardless of age, race, sex, disability, etc.). It is likely to be of particular benefit to those who are less well off, but who are not eligible for CTB. This group is likely to include more disabled people, ethnic minority groups, women on maternity leave, single parents (who are normally women) and families with young children than are present in the borough population as a whole.

(ii) Assessment of impact of reducing Council Tax by 3% on those who do not pay any Council Tax as they are eligible for full rebate, or are exempt from payment

This group comprises everybody who is eligible for full CTB/LCTS and those who are exempt from paying Council Tax.

As stated above, full diversity data for those eligible for CTB are not held by H&F. However, we do have some diversity data sets on those who claim full and partial CTB (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment. Table 3 of Annex One gives the recent data. It shows that the proportion of all CTB/LCTS claimants who are pensioners has decreased by 1.45% since 2008, although pensioners remain over-represented among CTB/LCTS claimants: in 2010 pensioners made up 35.25% of all CTB/LCTS claimants. Using Borough Profile 2010 data (because it is appropriate for a comparison to 2010) 10.2% of the general population were pensioners (those aged 65+). Of the full and partial CTB pensioner claimants that are pensioners, the majority of this group (70.02%) are full CTB/LCTS claimants and as such, over-represented as a group that claims full CTB (Table 1 of Annex One).

About 54.67% of full and partial CTB/LCTS claimants (pensioner and non-pensioner) are single female, with around 30% (pensioner and non-pensioner) being single male, and around 15.33% being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female CTB/LCTS claimants is therefore about 62.33%, which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole (51.3% at the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census).

In terms of disability, about 11.32% of claimants receive the CTB/LCTS disability premium, which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 14.7% as at the 2001 census, which is the most recent data). Some disabled people are exempt from paying Council Tax and this may account for the difference in figures.

Further, as set out in Annex Three, some people will be exempt from paying Council Tax on other grounds. These are:

- full time students (men and women, people of different age groups, people of all race groups, disabled people);
- severely mentally impaired people (disabled people);
- foreign diplomats (all groups);
- children aged under 18 (male and female, people of all race groups, disabled people (the new ban on age discrimination in services and public functions does not apply to those under 18 years of age)); and
- elderly or disabled relatives of a family who live in the main property, in certain annexes and self-contained accommodation (older people, disabled people).

People who are exempt from paying Council Tax or who are eligible for full CTB/LCTS will experience no direct benefit from a reduction in Council Tax.

As set out above, this group includes a high proportion of pensioners and women relative to the proportion of pensioners and women in the population as a whole. It does not, however, include a high proportion of disabled people, relative to the general population. In line with the assumption made above in relation to those in low income/savings groups generally, it may include a higher proportion of ethnic minority groups, but data on this is not held.

While this group will not benefit from a Council Tax reduction, they will not be detrimentally affected by it either. The effect on this group of the decision is neutral.

There will, though, be a small indirect benefit to this group as the reduction in Council Tax will mean that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of CTB/LCTS that is paid out by the state and therefore a general benefit to the public purse.

Because the profile of this group is such that members of the group are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (in particular care services), residents who do not pay Council Tax may consider that there may be an indirect adverse impact to them because if Council Tax is reduced by 3%, H&F will forego income of £1.6M. This may be a particular concern for those in the lower income/savings bracket (even though they will benefit the most from the reduction) because, broadly speaking, they are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (especially care services) than those who are better off. However, in the proposed budget the £1.6M income that H&F will forego is balanced against the Government Grant for freezing Council Tax of £0.6M, by figures such as budget savings of £5.2m from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £2m from the capital debt reduction programme. Although the proposed budget is based in part on various proposed changes to the ways in which services (in all areas) are provided to borough residents, it is not therefore possible to say that there is any direct link between the proposed Council Tax reduction and any particular proposed service change. The potential equality impact of the budget as a whole is assessed in Section D below.

(iii) Assessment of impact of reducing Council Tax by 3% on those who pay partial Council Tax

Some people who are not eligible for full CTB/LCTS are nonetheless eligible for partial CTB, dependent on means. Partial CTB/LCTS operates on a 20% taper, which means that benefit is calculated in the following way:

**Applicable amount:** The applicable amount is the amount set by the government and it is what the government states a claimant needs to live on to cover basic expenses, such as food and fuel charges. It is made up of several elements depending on the claimant's circumstances, their household and any disabilities they may have.

**The calculation:** 20% of the income above the applicable amount is taken away from the maximum benefit (what the benefit would be if the income was at or below the applicable amount level). The lowest amount a person could qualify for is £0.01 per week council tax benefit.

As the starting point of the calculation, the Council uses the council tax charge after deductions for single person discount and any disabled relief. Whatever is left is the eligible council tax. There are also deductions for non-dependants.

**Example**

A person's applicable amount is £20 per week. This is the maximum CTB/LCTS they could get. They do not have any non-dependants living with them. Their income is £30 per week, i.e. it exceeds their applicable amount by £10.00 per week.

Using the 20% taper, their maximum CTB/LCTS is reduced by  $£10.00 \times 20\% = £2.00$ . Their CTB entitlement is £18.00 per week.

Any reduction in Council Tax will therefore have a correspondingly smaller impact on those who are eligible for partial CTB/LCTS in comparison to those who are not eligible for CTB/LCTS at all. These people will experience some benefit from any reduction in Council Tax, but not as much as those who pay full Council Tax.

As stated above, full diversity data for those eligible for CTB are not held by H&F. However, we do have some diversity data sets on those who claim full and partial CTB/LCTS (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment. Table 3 of Annex One gives the recent data. It shows that the proportion of all CTB/LCTS claimants who are pensioners has decreased by 1.45% since 2008 although pensioners remain over-represented among CTB/LCTS claimants: in 2010 pensioners made up 35.25% of all CTB/LCTS claimants. Using Borough Profile 2010 data (because it is appropriate for a comparison to 2010) 10.2% of the general population were pensioners (those aged 65+). Of the full and partial CTB/LCTS pensioner claimants that are pensioners, the minority of this group (29.98%) are partial CTB claimants. However, pensioners in this group are still over-represented in comparison to 10.2% of the general population, which are pensioners (Borough Profile 2010). This shows that pensioners as a group are under-represented in the partial CTB/LCTS claimant data compared to those pensioners on full CTB/LCTS but still over-represented as claimants of CTB/LCTS (of some kind) compared to the rest of the Borough. Data on partial CTB/LCTS claimants is not available by gender or other diversity dataset.

About 54.67% of full and partial CTB/LCTS claimants (pensioner and non-pensioner) are single female, with around 30% (pensioner and non-pensioner) being single male, and around 15.33% being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female CTB/LCTS claimants is therefore about 62.33%, which is rather higher than the

percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole (51.3% at the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census).

In terms of disability, about 11.32% of claimants receive the CTB/LCTS disability premium, which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 14.7% as at the 2001 census, which is the most recent data). Some disabled people are exempt from paying Council Tax and this may account for the difference in figures.

In addition, there will be a small indirect benefit to this group as the reduction in Council Tax will mean that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of CTB/LCTS that is paid out by the state and therefore a general benefit to the public purse.

Because the profile of this group is such that members of the group are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (in particular care services), residents who are eligible for partial CTB/LCTS may consider that there may be an indirect adverse impact to them because if Council Tax is reduced by 3%, H&F will forego income of £1.6M. This may be a particular concern for those in the lower income/savings bracket (even though they will benefit the most from the reduction) because, broadly speaking, they are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (especially care services) than those who are better off. However, in the proposed budget the £1.6M income that H&F will forego is balanced against the Government Grant for freezing Council Tax of £0.6M, by figures such as budget savings of £5.2m from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £2m from the capital debt reduction programme. Although the proposed budget is based in part on various proposed changes to the ways in which services (in all areas) are provided to borough residents, it is not therefore possible to say that there is any direct link between the proposed Council Tax reduction and any particular proposed service change. The potential equality impact of the budget as a whole is assessed in Section D below.

#### Summary of Assessment of impact of reducing Council Tax by 3% considering all in sub-sections (i), (ii), and (iii) above

Those who will directly benefit from a decision to reduce Council Tax will be all those who pay full Council Tax and, to a proportionately lesser extent, those who receive partial CTB/LCTS. In addition, there will be a small indirect benefit to all residents through the reduction in cost to the public purse of CTB/LCTS payments by the state.

All full Council Tax payers will benefit from the reduction in Council Tax. So, too, will those who pay Council Tax in a lower band than they otherwise would do because they benefit from the Council's scheme for reducing Council Tax for disabled people who need extra room in their home on account of their disability. On average, this reduction will be £23.44 for those who are Band D Council Tax payers: this relates to the LBHF element of the calculation of Council Tax.

Those to whom the reduction in Council Tax is likely to be most beneficial are those low income groups whose incomes are just above the threshold for CTB/LCTS or partial CTB/LCTS. These are likely to include greater proportions of disabled people, ethnic minority groups, women on maternity leave, single parents (who are normally women) and families with young children than are present in the borough population as a whole. A decision to reduce Council Tax will promote equality of opportunity for these groups.

Those who are eligible for partial CTB/LCTS (which includes a much larger proportion of pensioners than is present in the borough population as a whole – 29.98% as against 10.2% and a somewhat higher proportion of women than is present in the population as a whole –



about 62.33% as against 51.3%) will also benefit from a reduction in Council Tax, but to a lesser extent because of the way partial CTB/LCTS is calculated.

There will be no benefit to those who are eligible for full CTB/LCTS or who are exempt from paying it. The effect on this group will be neutral. This group also includes proportionately more pensioners (35.25% as against 10.2%) and proportionately more women (62.33% as against 51.3%) than in the general population.

All residents may consider that there may be an indirect adverse impact to them because if Council Tax is reduced by 3%, H&F will forego income of £1.6M. This may be a particular concern for those in the lower income/savings bracket (even though they will benefit the most from the reduction) because, broadly speaking, they are more likely to be in receipt of Council services (especially care services) than those who are better off. However, in the proposed budget the £1.6M income that H&F will forego is balanced against the Government Grant for freezing Council Tax of £0.6M, by figures such as budget savings of £5.2m from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £2m from the capital debt reduction programme. Although the proposed budget is based in part on various proposed changes to the ways in which services (in all areas) are provided to borough residents, it is not therefore possible to say that there is any direct link between the proposed Council Tax reduction and any particular proposed service change. The potential equality impact of the budget as a whole is assessed in Section D below.

#### **(D) Analysis of overall impact of the proposed Budget**

#### **SAVINGS, EXISTING EFFICIENCIES, AND NEW EFFICIENCY SAVINGS**

##### **Adult Social Care (ASC)**

The majority of the ASC line items are to do with staff reorganisations, for which staff and where relevant, service equality impact assessments are carried out. Other line items that have a frontline impact or connection are included here:

##### Third Sector Investment Fund, £150K

This line item is likely to be of relevance to equality groups including: disabled people; women; BME groups; and people of different age groups. It is included here because of its relevance to those protected groups. However, these savings are the same as those identified in a Report which was agreed by the Cabinet in July 2010. This was accompanied by a full EIA. There is no change to that decision and this line item is implementing the recommendations as agreed in 2010.

##### Third Sector Grants – Small Pot: one-off of £68K

This saving arises from the fast track small grants scheme, some of which was not spent because the applications received were not of a satisfactory standard. No adverse impact has been identified as a result of the small grants not being awarded.

##### Third Sector Grants – 10% reduction across all areas as contracts end (on-going £100K)

This item arises from reducing the grants fund to give an on-going saving of £100K. This will leave a budget of £2.9m. However, there is no guarantee that any contract would be renewed as this is clear at the outset and as such this should not have any discernible impact on any protected group.

##### Review of Support Planning £120K

Support Planning helps disabled adults to plan what they may want to change in their lives, what they want to stay the same and how they would spend their individual budgets to support them to live independently. As such, this service is of high relevance to disabled adults and will help to advance equality of opportunity between disabled people and non-

disabled people, and will help to encourage disabled people to participate in public life. This line item refers to a staff reorganisation only and the quality of service will not be affected, and so there is no impact on disabled people as a result of this reorganisation.

#### Reprocurement of Supporting People contracts (on-going £300K)

This line item is additional to the existing target of £369k for 2013/14, leaving an overall budget of £8.7m. The Supporting People tenders are being evaluated and the outcome of tenders will be known in January. It will be at this stage that the impact can be fully assessed.

#### Better gate keeping into residential and nursing care (£1,450,000)

This saving arises from low scale integration work, whereby a more planned discharge of clients back into their homes results in better outcomes and a lower number of clients because people are not having to be re-admitted to hospital so often. This will help to advance equality of opportunity for older and disabled people and to encourage participation in public life by helping them with their care after hospital. It is of high relevance to disabled adults, and to older people who have been admitted to hospital, with the focus being on managing the exit from hospital in a proactive and holistic way such that money is saved.

This line item also supports delivery of one of the Council's two Equality Objectives, as required by S153 of the Equality Act 2010 and agreed by Cabinet in December 2011. The objective is:

*Continuity of Care: Reduce unplanned admissions to hospitals and nursing care homes through early intervention by integrated health and social care services.*

#### Managing Inflation requests from providers: £200K

This line item refers to inflation-related requests made by providers of such services as care and residential nursing homes, making this of high relevance to older and disabled people. This is being managed by ASC and a standard system has been set up to ensure that recent case law and the views of stakeholders including care providers are assessed and taken into account when agreeing fees. Each case is judged on its own merits in line with emergent case law and the needs of providers to run a service that is fit for purpose. Therefore there should be no impact on older or disabled people, or on providers as a result of this approach.

#### Reduction in demand for all aged people with care placements and care packages: £450K

This line is of high relevance to older and disabled people and relates to better, proactive support for this group. As such, the savings arise from a more planned approach and not from a reduction in service and so there will be no impact on older and/or disabled people.

#### Underspends

On going saving of £40k contribution to MTFs as result of review of no recourse to public funds clients.

The on-going saving of £40K is regarded as manageable and as not having an impact because the department anticipates that it can manage demand within the reduced budget. This item will be of high relevance to BME groups and those of various nationalities. The council has a statutory responsibility to offer assistance to asylum seekers under the National Assistance Act 1948. We have a duty to provide accommodation and benefits to asylum seekers while they await the outcome of their case with the Home Office. Following changes in the law due to the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, asylum seekers that arrived after April 2000 no longer have a right to assistance and do not have to be provided for by the council. Therefore, the on-going saving of £40K will be of relevance to those who arrived before April 2000 but it will not have an impact as the service can be managed sufficiently.

### **Childrens' Services (CHS)**

Children's Services have a number of line items which have similar themes: Preventative; Process and Staff; and Procurement.

#### Preventative Savings

Reduction of Looked After Children (LAC) due to better preventative services: £320K

Family Services Savings:

Transport costs reduced as a result of there being fewer children in care: £60K

Independent Reviewing Officer costs reduced as a result of there being fewer children in care: £50K

Reduced expenditure on leaving care services resulting from there being fewer children in care: £60K

**Total: £490K**

These line items will advance equality of opportunity for children and young people by focusing on prevention. This is in order to provide more timely interventions and to prevent problems from escalating that could result in more serious outcomes for service users, as well as in a higher cost to the council. These line items will be of high relevance to children and young people with all protected characteristics except that of age.

#### Process and Staff

Family Services Savings:

Changes following Munro Review: £250K

Delaying of management: £135K

More efficient procurement of workers providing support to disabled children and their families: £75K

**Total: £460K**

These line items will advance equality of opportunity for children and young people by putting in place better processes to support them and their needs. This includes the needs of disabled children and their families, and will support the encouragement of disabled children in public life by providing them and their families with support. This will also indirectly support families and those who care for disabled children. These line items will be of high relevance to children and young people with all protected characteristics except that of age. Impacts on staff will be covered by EIAs on reorganisation proposals where this is appropriate and relevant.

#### Procurement

More efficient procurement of placements for children in care: £128K

This line item will be of medium relevance to children and young people of all protected characteristics except age. This line item will indirectly help to foster good relations, and to advance equality of opportunity. This will be achieved by procuring service more efficiently and is not a reduction in service.

#### Children's Commissioning (£200K on-going)

This saving arises from contract rationalisation, renegotiation of existing contracts, retendering on a tri borough basis where appropriate, increasing the use of framework agreements, and de-commissioning in line with changes in need or with revised legislative requirements. Areas that will be included in this amongst others are taxis, play, and voluntary sector provision. No adverse impact has been identified as this can be achieved by procuring services more efficiently not reducing service delivery.

#### Children's Centres (£33K)

This saving arises from a reduction in the size of the Children's Centre spot purchasing fund. This was established in 2011 to meet any one-off or exceptional needs arising from implementation of the revised Children's Centre model. There has been only a limited call on this fund in 2012/13 and no adverse impact has been identified as a result of the proposed reduction.

## **Environment, Leisure & Residents' Services (ELRS)**

### End Auto Public Conveniences ('APC') Contract: £134K

This line item refers to a contract to provide public toilets at a number of locations and is included in the Budget as the savings arise in 2013/14. The removal of these toilets as a result of ending the contract was agreed by Cabinet on 12 November 2012. That report and EIA identified the potential negative impacts on disabled people but also noted that no RADAR keys had been used since the APCs were installed in 2005 (indicating that in practice very little use of these facilities has been made by disabled people). Alternatives were available for disabled people. It was also identified that there may be a negative impact on mothers with babies as although there are publicly accessible toilets with baby changing facilities, these were identified as being somewhat limited and the majority charge a fee. However, it was not considered possible to measure current mother and baby usage of APC's, although as with disabled users it was not anticipated to be high.

### LBHF-only Reviews, and Bi-Borough (LBHF and RBKC) Reviews of services

There are a number of service reviews in the ELRS savings proposals. The majority of these savings will arise from focusing services to deliver the most benefit to residents, and/or deleting vacant posts that have not meant a reduction in service because they have been held vacant. All reviews will undergo a staff EIA, and where there may be frontline impact(s), or where more work needs to be done to ensure that frontline impact(s) are minimal, service EIAs will be undertaken to inform the design of the reorganised services.

Some of the proposed reorganisations are relevant to some protected group(s), and those line items are included here for the fiscal year 2013/14.

### Review of Anti-Social Behaviour ('ASB') Unit (part of wider HRD Review): £15K

This line item is to do with a review of the team that supports victims of ASB. Victims of ASB include people with disabilities, people of different race groups, and lesbians, those who are homosexual or bisexual, and those who have, or who are transitioning from one gender to another (transgender).

### Review of Community Safety Admin Function: £32K

This line item is to do with a post that supports the Community Safety Team. This team supports victims of crime, who will have one or more protected characteristics. It is not likely that the removal of this post will have an impact on frontline service users but the impact on service users will be assessed in order to inform the review.

### Review the Council's Vehicle Maintenance Arrangements: £90K

This line item relates to a review of the operations at the Bagleys Lane Depot. It includes savings arising from combining maintenance contracts and from staff posts. An EIA will be carried out as part of implementation of this item.

### Policing (£240k one-off and £40k on-going).

This line item is to do with use of alternative commercial funding for policing in 2013/14 and results in a saving from the council budget. The saving will not have an impact on protected groups.

### Libraries

In 2013/14 Libraries will make additional savings of £46k. This will be achieved by the full year effect of changes that the service has already made through Tri-borough – reduced management and back office costs, the integration of specialist functions, and the introduction of new operating practices. It will have no negative impacts on front line service delivery or customers so there are no equality implications.

## **Finance & Corporate Services (FCS)**

Many of the FCS line items are to do with back office change that affects staff and as such will not have an impact on frontline service users. As with all staff changes, EIAs are carried out to inform reorganisations. However, some of the line items are to do with more efficient ways of delivering services to the public and those are included here.

### E Services 1a – Increasing My Account Functionality: £200K

This line item is a continuation of a project that began around two years ago, to put services such as viewing Council tax statements and setting up a direct debit for Council Tax, applying for and paying for a parking permit and visitor permits, reporting abandoned vehicles and graffiti, and other services online. This line item will be relevant to all residents and expanding its functionality will bring positive benefits for residents who currently use My Account, and who will use it when additional features have been added.

### E Services Carousel: £256K

This line item relates to the sale of LBHF E Services to other local authorities and will not have an impact on LBHF residents, or reduce LBHF E Services.

### Face to Face Post Office Contract: £20K

This line item relates to an initiative to move more of the Council's transactions to the Post Office. The benefits of this contract will lead to transactional efficiencies and increased access. Transferring face-to-face transactions to the Post Office will be delivered in a phased approach beginning in March 2013. This phased approach will ensure that each transaction is fully scoped and the required integration with back office systems is in place. Phase 1 will include transactions for paying in council tax, rents and service charges.

The impact for residents will be that they may not have to travel as far to transact with the council and may be able to carry out other business at the post office thereby saving time. All post office sites are accessible for disabled people.

### Trade Union Facility reduced in 2012/13: £150K, plus £20K on-going

This line item will reduce the Trade Union facility and as such may have a negative but not unlawful indirect impact on all staff who are union members and use this facility currently. Staff will still be able to seek Union advice where they need to.

### Staffing savings

Transformational Business – Business Support Review: £140K

Bi Borough Audit and Risk Service Staffing (£50k on-going)

Fraud Team Staffing (£40k on-going)

Electoral services (£40k on-going).

The first of these line items relates to a reorganisation of back office functions and will not have an impact on residents. The second and third of these line items are deliverable stretch targets from bi-borough working and will not have an impact on residents. The final of these is a staffing efficiency that is considered deliverable. Staff EIAs are carried out as part of reorganisations.

### Printing, Publications and more use of online (£10k on-going)

This saving arises because the council is no longer required to produce a paper copy of the council tax leaflet. Residents of all protected groups will be able to view the information online. Information provided on the council's website meets online accessibility criteria. Our site provides BrowseAloud, an audio service for visually impaired users, so is more accessible than the printed version. All online content can also be adjusted for type size by people with visual impairment. People with hearing impairment are not disadvantaged.

## **Housing & Regeneration (HRD)**

Only the efficiencies that may have an effect on service users or that require comments to provide assurance of the level of impact on vulnerable groups are included here:

### Reducing costs and financial risks associated with Hamlet Gardens: £350K and Withdrawal from the Hamlet Gardens Temporary Accommodation contract: £200K

These efficiencies relate to the reduced procurement cost expected to result following the expiry of an expensive lease for temporary accommodation, and the Council procuring accommodation more cost effectively. These efficiencies are not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

### Transforming Housing Options: £240K

This efficiency relates to a staffing reorganisation which has been designed to best meet the requirement to deliver the revised housing strategy. Both the strategy changes and the staffing proposals have been the subject of separate EIAs, the latter showing no adverse impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

### Elimination of Housing Benefit Subsidy Loss on HALD portfolio: £300K

Introduction of and changes to Local Housing Allowances (LHA) has restricted Housing Benefits paid to customers. 546 tenancies where existing rents exceeded LHA rates were identified. A combination of negotiation with landlords to reduce rents charged and seeking suitable alternative accommodation where appropriate has been successful in mitigating this risk. To date only 8 tenants are waiting to have their position resolved. This saving is a budgetary provision that is now no longer required.

### Reorganisation of Elderly Resettlement Service: £27K

The service will continue to be provided by the Floating Support team.

## **Transport & Technical Services (TTS)**

Many of the line items included for TTS do not affect service users e.g. supply of cleaning services, advertising, allowing companies to install WiFi onto lamp columns. Others are included here so as to give more context and provide assurance that there are no impact(s) on equality group(s).

### Full effect of previous increase in pay and display charges: £250K

This is the effect of a previous change in price for pay & display, and so does not involve any new council decisions. Therefore there will not be any impact on equality groups.

### Bi-Borough Joint Parking Office: £100K

This efficiency will not change the parking service to the public and therefore will not result in any impact on equality groups.

### Bi-Borough review of TTS (includes: Parking, Highways, Environmental Health): £433K

The reviews are about making efficiencies from joint working between LBHF and RBKC (e.g. sharing managers and other staff). It is not likely that they will have an equality impact, but if in the course of the review we identify that they do, further analysis will be undertaken as the proposals develop.

### One-off use of balances: £30K

This saving arises from a review of deposits for scaffolding and will not impact any protected group.

### Advertising

HRA related advertising (on-going £151k).

Advertising on pavements (on-going £50k).

The first of these is due to be trialled in 2013, and the second is subject to planning permission for advertising hoardings. Neither item will have an impact on protected groups.

## **GROWTH**

### **ASC**

Increase in demand for LD placements and care packages: £700K; Increase in demand, due to demographic and other factors, for care placements and packages: £450K; and Increase in demand for mental health (MH) placements: £250K

These line items relate to an increase in the demand for placements for people with various needs arising from their disability or age-related requirements. These will all be of high relevance to disabled and older people, and will support the participation of disabled people in public life, and help to advance equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled people. However, these items will have a neutral impact as the increase in budgets will meet the needs of these groups and there will be no change to the service or to the eligibility for the service as a result.

### **FCS**

Freedom Passes – Introduction of a new apportionment basis: £670K

This line item is of high relevance to those older and disabled people, who are eligible for a freedom pass. This is a pass which gives older and disabled Londoners free travel on almost all public transport in London and helps to encourage their participation in public life and to advance equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled people. The reason for growth of £670K is to do with the way in which this is funded, which means that LBHF will have to pay more than it did previously in order to fund this scheme. There will be no impact on older and disabled people as the eligibility criteria will not change and they will still be able to access this scheme.

### **ELRS**

Western Riverside Waste Authority (WRWA) Growth: £230K; and New charge for disposing of contaminated recyclable waste £150K

In relation to the first item, the Council needs to cover the increased costs of waste disposal as disposing of waste via the incinerator has led to an increase in disposal cost per tonne. However, in the long term this disposal method will compare favourably with the alternative option of landfill as well as offering a more environmentally friendly means of waste disposal. In relation to the second item, from January 2013 WRWA will be introducing a new charge for processing contaminated recyclables. All businesses are required by law to have an agreement in place for the removal and disposal of their waste. New charges are proposed for business that contaminate their recyclable waste in order to mitigate the financial risk to the Council. The Council will still be competitively priced after the price increase and no adverse impacts on protected groups should arise as a result of this increase.

### **CHS and HRD**

No growth is forecast for these services and so it is not possible to analyse the impact on equality groups.

## **FEES AND CHARGES**

### **ASC**

Home care: no increase

It is proposed that there is no increase to the home care charge of £12 between 2012/13 and 2013/14. This is because savings are expected to be delivered in 2013/14 which will reduce the average home care unit cost. At this point, the charge will be reviewed again. The home care charge of £12 is compared with the average home care contract rate of £12.22. This service is of high relevance to older and disabled people. In 2013/14, the levels at which people are required to contribute to their home care will still mean that Hammersmith &

Fulham has one of the lowest levels of home care charges among London Boroughs. Unlike nearly all other London Boroughs, a person's savings and property are not taken into account when assessing that person's ability to make a contribution to the cost of home care.

#### Meals on Wheels: increase from £4.30 to £4.50

The price per meal for service users is proposed to be increased from £4.30 to £4.50 in 2013/14 to cover costs that have increased. The Council subsidises this service. H&F continues to try and keep its price lower by making efficiencies in the costs of delivery. This proposed increase will be of high relevance to disabled and older people who are the users of the Meals on Wheels service.

However, it is anticipated that the modest increase will be affordable for this group. The impact of the proposed increase will be monitored at the point that the meal charge rises to see if any users either cancel services saying they cannot afford them, or reduce services to fit their respective budgets. In such circumstances, social care will ensure the reasons why the service user has stopped using the service are recorded and appropriate action would be taken. It is anticipated that through this mechanism the adverse impact on users of the Meals on Wheels service can be mitigated.

#### **ELRS**

##### Cemeteries: various; Transport

Fees and charges for these services will be reviewed at a later date, when each service as a whole will be reviewed. At present there are no changes to the charges and no impact as a result on equality groups. Should the review make proposals to increase fees and charges and the Council decide not to implement these proposals, it would have sufficient funds in reserves and virements to allow it to do so.

##### Libraries: various

Fees and charges for these services will be reviewed at a later date, when each service as a whole will be reviewed. At present there are no changes to the charges and no impact as a result on equality groups. Should the review make proposals to increase fees and charges and the Council decide not to implement these proposals, it would have sufficient funds in reserves and virements to allow it to do so.

##### Leisure: various

Fees and charges in this area are varied and will rise by the amount required to run the service, or, where it is shown that no increase is needed in order to keep us competitive with other facilities (e.g. the four tennis items increasing by 0%). As a result, there will either be no impact because there is no change, or there will be an impact because the charges will increase. Where there is an impact on any equality group because the charges will increase, this is likely to be negative. The Council could mitigate for this by subsidising the service, but the current view is that this is inappropriate and that leisure services, which are used by a wide range of people, should be self-funding.

##### Halls, Parks and Open Spaces

Fees and charges in the hire services are varied and will either be frozen (e.g. HTH Assembly Hall) because of demand, or rise by the amount required to run the service. Where these charges rise, this is likely to be negative. The Council could mitigate for this by subsidising the service, but the current view is that this is inappropriate and that these services, which are used by a wide range of people, should be self-funding.

##### Street Scene Enforcement; Anti-Social Behaviour ('ASB')

None of these charges will rise and so there is no impact.

##### Mortuary Services; Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages



Charges for infectious cases and for all births, deaths, and marriages services (except same day service for copy certificates) will rise in line with the corporate fees and charges inflation. Where these charges rise, this is likely to be negative. The Council could mitigate for this by subsidising the service, but the current view is that this is inappropriate and that these services, which are used by the whole population, should continue to be charged at rates that are in line with inflation.

## **TTS**

TTS fees and charges are mainly charges that residents and businesses pay e.g. building control charges, and charges for valuation services. The charges relating to parking arise from decisions taken by Members at other times, to maintain smooth flow of traffic and reduce congestion. There is no new information about equality groups and that would mean those decisions should be reviewed.

The charges relating to CIL are still subject to consultation which includes an EIA, and more information on that can be found here:

[http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Environment\\_and\\_Planning/Planning/Planning\\_policy/16782\\_2\\_CIL.asp](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Environment_and_Planning/Planning/Planning_policy/16782_2_CIL.asp)

## **Conclusion on impact of the budget**

Overall, the budget contains some items that will promote equality of opportunity for vulnerable groups (in particular older people, the disabled, women and ethnic minorities), a large number of items that are neutral in their impact on equalities and some items where there may be some negative impact (although in most cases steps to mitigate that impact have either already been identified or will be identified as part of more detailed EIAs in due course).

Items that will promote equality of opportunity include the growth in the areas of ASC and FCS which will support the participation of disabled people in public life, and help to advance equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled people. These items will help to manage the demand for services for older and disabled people and those with mental health needs, as well as to help fund free travel on almost all public transport in London.

The proposal not to increase home care charges will not have an effect on those disabled people who use the service. In other areas of the Council, other charging proposals are to be reviewed at a later date and so at present there is no impact.

Items that may have a negative impact include the increase charged to service users for Meals on Wheels, from £4.30 to £4.50. As given above, the Council subsidises this service. H&F continues to try and keep its price lower by making efficiencies in the costs of delivery. This proposed increase will be of high relevance to disabled and older people who are the users of the Meals on Wheels service.

However, it is anticipated that the modest increase will be affordable for this group. The impact of the proposed increase will be monitored at the point that the meal charge rises to see if any users either cancel services saying they cannot afford them, or reduce services to fit their respective budgets. In such circumstances, social care will ensure the reasons why the service user has stopped using the service are recorded and appropriate action would be taken. It is anticipated that through this mechanism the adverse impact on users of the Meals on Wheels service can be mitigated.

In a few cases, detailed EIAs will be required before the full nature of any impact can be assessed, or mitigating measures identified.

Ultimately if, on further analysis, it is decided that any particular proposed policy would have an unreasonable detrimental impact on any protected group, H&F could, if it is considered appropriate, use reserves or virements to subsidise those services in 2013/14.

## Annex One: CTB Claimant Data

**Table 1: Composition of CTB claimants in LBHF**

	Numbers of households			Weekly payment (Jan 2013)		
	Full CTB	Partial CTB	Total	Full CTB	Partial CTB	Total
<b>Pensioners</b>	3935	1685	5620	£66,020.42	£21,407.47	£87,427.89
	70.02%	29.98%	100.00%			
<b>Non-pensioners, of which:</b>	10622	3075	13697	£175,308.67	£36,217.01	£211,528.68
	77.55%	22.45%	100.00%			
- Households with children	4257	1419	5676	£767,730.08	£17,001.23	£93,731.31
	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%			
- Households with a disabled adult	1766	420	2186	£29,971.85	£5,251.23	£35,223.08
	80.79%	19.21%	100.00%			
- Households with children and disabled adult	376	45	421	£7,561.41	£613.81	£8,175.22
	89.31%	10.69%	100.00%			
- Households without children or disabled adult	4975	1281	6256	£76,168.15	£14,578.36	£9,076.51
	79.52%	20.48%	100.00%			
<b>Total</b>	14558	4760	19318	£241,329.09	£57,624.48	£298,956.57

**Table 2: Council Tax band of CTB claimants**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<b>Pensioners</b>	296	783	1521	1572	791	399	254	4
<b>Working age</b>	1047	1705	3443	4336	2138	758	262	8
<b>Total</b>	1343	2488	4964	5908	2929	1157	516	12
<b>Per cent</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Table 3: All CTB and Pensioner CTB claims**

	All CTB Claims	Pensioner CTB Claims	% Pensioner CTB claims	Other non-pensioner claims	% non-pensioner claims	% total
<b>2008</b>	18,823	6,908	36.70%	11915.00	63.30%	100.00%
<b>2009</b>	19,649	7,042	35.84%	12607.00	64.16%	100.00%
<b>2010</b>	20,030	7,061	35.25%	12969.00	64.75%	100.00%

**Table 4: LBHF diversity data detailing further, the composition of CTB claimants by: age (pensioner and non-pensioner), disability, gender**

Total number of claims	19317			
Total number of pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult where the disability premium has been awarded)	5620	Number of Female only claimants = 3067 or <b>54.57%</b>	Number of male only claimants = 1684 or <b>29.96%</b>	Number of claiming couples = 869 or <b>15.46%</b>
Total number of non-pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult)	13697	Number of Female only claimants = 7493 or	Number of male only claimants = 4112 or	Number of claiming couples = 2092 or

where the disability premium has been awarded)		<b>54.71%</b>	<b>30.02%</b>	<b>15.27%</b>
Households with a disabled adult (where the disability premium has been awarded) as a standalone group of the total number of claims	2186	Number of Female only claimants = 991 or <b>45.33%</b>	Number of male only claimants = 921 or <b>42.13%</b>	Number of claiming couples = 274 or <b>12.53%</b>

**Table 5: LBHF diversity data detailing further, the composition of CTB claimants by gender**

Total number of female claimants (No partner)	10560	<b>54.67%</b>
Total number of male claims (No partner)	5796	<b>30.00%</b>
Couples	2961	<b>15.33%</b>
Total	19317	<b>100.00%</b>

## Annex Two Tables of Population Data

The data in this Annex is from the Borough Profile 2010, from the Census 2001, from the Census 2011 First Release, or, where information for H&F is not available, from other sources which are given below. The most up to date is given in each case and used in the analysis above

### Data sources and information sets

- Census 2001, and Census 2011
- Hammersmith and Fulham 2011 Census Data Report – First Release:  
<http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/120717%202011%20Census%20report%20First%20release%20cm21-174096.doc>
- H&F Borough Profile 2010
- Office of National Statistics Mid Year Population Estimates 2010
- Live Births by Usual Area of Residence of Mother (LBHF) 2010 (From table 2a:  
<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-222793>)
- Kairos in Soho, *London's LGBT Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Project*, 2007

**Table 5a: 2011 data on population by age group and gender**

	All Persons		Males		Females	
	number	%	number	%	number	%
0-4	11,900	6.5%	6,100	6.9%	5,800	6.2%
5-9	8,600	4.7%	4,300	4.8%	4,300	4.6%
10-14	7,600	4.2%	3,800	4.3%	3,800	4.1%
15-19	7,900	4.3%	4,000	4.5%	3,900	4.2%
20-24	17,300	9.5%	8,600	9.7%	8,700	9.3%
25-29	26,000	14.2%	12,500	14.1%	13,500	14.4%
30-34	22,000	12.1%	10,800	12.1%	11,200	12.0%
35-39	17,200	9.4%	8,700	9.8%	8,500	9.1%
40-44	13,700	7.5%	6,700	7.5%	6,900	7.4%
45-49	11,400	6.2%	5,600	6.3%	5,800	6.2%
50-54	8,700	4.8%	4,200	4.7%	4,500	4.8%
55-59	7,100	3.9%	3,300	3.7%	3,800	4.1%
60-64	6,700	3.7%	3,100	3.5%	3,600	3.8%
65-69	5,000	2.7%	2,300	2.6%	2,700	2.9%
70-74	4,100	2.2%	1,900	2.1%	2,200	2.4%
75-79	3,000	1.6%	1,400	1.6%	1,600	1.7%
80-84	2,300	1.3%	900	1.0%	1,400	1.5%
85+	2,000	1.1%	600	0.7%	1,400	1.5%
TOTAL	182,500	100.0%	88,900	100.0%	93,600	100.0%

### 2011 Census First Release, p6

**Table 5b: data on population by age as at 2010 (used until 2011 Census first release)**

Age Structure % Total Population 2008	
0-4	6.5
5-10	5.8
11-16	5
17-24	10.8
25-39	35.7
40-49	13.8

50-64	12.3
65-74	5.3
85+	4.9

Page 7: Borough Profile 2010

**Table 6: Disability**

<b>Limiting Long-Term Illness &amp; Dependent Children</b>			
% of households:	No adults in employment	with dependent children	6.02
		without dependent children	26.19
	With dependent children	all ages	21.62
		aged 0-4	10.2
	With one or more persons with LLTI		27.05

Table 6 of Borough Profile 2010: 2001 Census Key Statistics for H&F

**Table 7: Disability**

<b>Physical Disability, Sensory Impairments</b>	
Rate of physical disability registrations for H&F as a whole:	37.3 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of blind/visual impairment registrations for H&F as a whole:	5.6 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of blind/visual impairment registrations for Ravenscourt Park:	12.5 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of deaf/hard of hearing registrations for H&F as a whole:	2.4 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of deaf/hard of hearing registrations in College Park & Old Oak:	4.6 registrations per 1000 people

p62 of Borough Profile 2010

**Table 8: Sex**

<b>Usual Resident Population: Sex</b>	
	<b>H&amp;F</b>
All resident population	182,500
Males	88,900
	48.7%
Females	93,600
	51.3%

2011 Census, p6, First Release

**Table 9: Race**

<b>Race</b>	<b>H&amp;F</b>	
All People	165,242	
% of people in ethnic groups other than white	22.18	
White	Total white	77.82
	British	58.04
	Irish	4.83
	Other White	14.95
Mixed	White and Black	1.22

	Caribbean	
	White and Black African	0.63
	White and Asian	0.97
	Other Mixed	1.00
Asian or Asian British	Total Asian	4.44
	Indian	1.65
	Pakistani	1.04
	Bangladeshi	0.61
	Other Asian	1.14
Black or Black British	Total Black	11.12
	Caribbean	5.16
	African	4.88
	Other Black	1.08
Chinese or other Ethnic Group	Chinese	0.79
	Other Ethnic Group	2.00
From 2001 census		

**Table 10: Religion or belief (including non-belief)**

Religion		H&F
All People		165,242
% of people stating religion as:	Christian	63.65
	Buddhist	0.77
	Hindu	1.09
	Jewish	0.79
	Muslim	6.85
	Sikh	0.19
	Other religions	0.43
	No religion	17.64
	Religion not stated	8.59
From 2001 census		

**Table 11a and 11b: Pregnancy and Maternity**

ONS data as at 2010, detailing live births by usual area of residence, gives the following data (numbers and percentages). This is the most recent data available:

**Table 11a**

Age of mother at birth								
All ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
2,773	18	69	300	521	964	740	165	14

**Table 11b**

Age of mother at birth								
All Ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
63.6	8.6	19.9	40.2	51.1	107.3	100.6	27.0	2.7

**(Information set 12): Gender Reassignment and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Heterosexual People**

'In 2005, the Department for Trade and Industry published a figure of 6% as the percentage of LGBT people in the general population...the number of LGBT people in London is thought to be anywhere between 6% and 10% of the total population, increased by disproportionate levels of migration.'

The 2001 census recorded 568 people (or 1.1% of couples), aged 16 and over, living as same sex couples in Hammersmith and Fulham. In 2009 there were 49 civil partnerships in this borough. Data on heterosexuality as such is also not collated although given the estimated numbers of LGBT people, it appears that the majority of the population is heterosexual. Data on transgendered or transitioning people was not available.



**Annex Three: Council Tax Exemptions**

Further information can be found on our website:

[http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice\\_and\\_Benefits/Council\\_tax/Exemptions/35774\\_Council\\_Tax\\_Exemptions.asp?LGNTF=13](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice_and_Benefits/Council_tax/Exemptions/35774_Council_Tax_Exemptions.asp?LGNTF=13) and a summary of exemptions is given here:

Properties occupied by:

- full time students
- severely mentally impaired people;
- a foreign diplomat who would normally have to pay council tax;
- people who are under 18;
- members of a visiting force who would normally have to pay council tax; or
- elderly or disabled relatives of a family who live in the main property, in certain annexes and self-contained accommodation

Unoccupied properties which:

- are substantially unfurnished, are exempt for up to a maximum of six months (after that, full charge);
- are owned by a charity, are exempt for up to six months;
- are left empty by someone who has moved to receive care in a hospital or home elsewhere;
- are left empty by someone who has gone into prison;
- are left empty by someone who has moved so they can care for someone else;
- are waiting for probate to be granted, and for six months after probate is granted;
- have been repossessed;
- are the responsibility of a bankrupt's trustee;
- are waiting for a minister of religion to move in;
- are left empty by a student whose term-time address is elsewhere;
- are empty because it is against the law to live there, including from 1st April 2007 where a planning condition prevents occupation;
- form part of another property and may not be let separately; or
- are not furnished and need structural alteration or major repair work, and for six months after works are completed, if the property remains unoccupied and unfurnished. There is a maximum 12 month limit for this exemption regardless of whether works have been completed.

**LBHF Equality Impact Analysis Tool**

<b>Overall Information</b>	<b>Details of Full Equality Impact Analysis</b>
<b>Financial Year and Quarter</b>	2012/13 Q3
<b>Name and details of policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme</b>	<b>HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE: APPROVAL OF THE 2013/14 PROGRAMME (new)</b> To note and approve the 2013/14 highway maintenance (carriageway and footway) schemes. This report is produced every year.
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Name: Jonathan Addis Position: Contract Performance and Procurement Manager Email: jonathan.addis@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No: 02087533073
<b>Date of completion of final EIA</b>	30/11/2012

<b>Section 02</b>	<b>Scoping of Full EIA</b>
<b>Plan for completion</b>	Timing: Resources:
<b>Analyse the impact of the policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme</b>	<p>Examples of works that are likely to impact more on older and disabled people include:</p> <p><b>Improving Pedestrian Environment - Street Decluttering</b> During the planned maintenance schemes streets are analysed for 'Decluttering'. This involves reducing and consolidating, where possible, the amount of street furniture. Removal of redundant signs posts and attaching signs to lamp columns as well as the removal of bollards all helps reduce the 'clutter' on the street. These small improvements can make the street easier to negotiate for vulnerable road users such as the disabled and elderly by removing potential obstructions.</p> <p><b>Improving pedestrian environment - Ensure dropped kerbs protected from parked cars</b> During the planned maintenance schemes road marking is reviewed to ensure it is compliant with current policy and regulations. Installing Double yellow lines installed on street corners and</p>

checking the levels of dropped kerbs and rectifying where needed. These small improvements can make the street easier to negotiate for vulnerable road users such as the disabled and elderly.

As a result of the overall works, there may be benefits associated with certain groups and not others as detailed below:

Protected characteristic	Analysis
Age	Older people are more likely than others to benefit from resurfaced carriageways and footways, as it provides a smoother ride and reduces likelihood of trip hazards. Making it easier for disabled people to get about removes barriers and encourages participation in public life.
Disability	Disabled people are more likely than others to benefit from resurfaced carriageways and footways, as it provides a smoother ride and reduces likelihood of trip hazards. Making it easier for disabled people to get about removes barriers and encourages participation in public life.
Gender reassignment	N/A
Marriage & Civil Partnership	N/A
Pregnancy & maternity	N/A
Race	N/A
Religion/belief	N/A
Sex	N/A
Sexual Orientation	N/A

#### Human Rights or Children's Rights

Will it affect Human Rights, as defined by the Human Rights Act 1998?

No

Will it affect Children's Rights, as defined by the UNCRC (1992)?

No

<b>Section 03</b>	<b>Analysis of relevant data</b> Examples of data can range from census data to customer satisfaction surveys. Data should involve specialist data and information and where possible, be disaggregated by different equality strands.
<b>Documents &amp; data reviewed</b>	
<b>New research</b>	If new research is required, please complete this section
<b>Section 04</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
<b>Consultation</b>	N/A
<b>Analysis of consultation outcomes</b>	N/A
<b>Section 05</b>	<b>Analysis of impact and outcomes</b>
<b>Analysis</b>	N/A
<b>Section 06</b>	<b>Reducing any adverse impacts and recommendations</b>
<b>Outcome of Analysis</b>	N/A
<b>Section 07</b>	<b>Action Plan</b>
<b>Action Plan</b>	N/A
<b>Section 08</b>	<b>Agreement, publication and monitoring</b>
<b>Chief Officers' sign-off</b>	Name: Ian Hawthorn Position: Head of Highway Maintenance and Projects Email: ian.hawthorn@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No:02087533058
<b>Key Decision Report (if relevant)</b>	Date of report to Cabinet/Cabinet Member: 10/12/2012 Key equalities issues have been included: Yes