

Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) of main Budget proposals for 2014/15

(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 26 February 2014, following discussion of the proposed Budget at Overview and Scrutiny Board on 28 January 2014, as well as at Cabinet on 03 February 2014.

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

- Transport, Environment and Residents' Services Select Committee: 13 January 2014;
- Education and Children's Services Select Committee: 20 January 2014; and
- Housing, Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee: 21 January 2014.

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

For 2014/2015, 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 2014/15 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) came into effect on 01 April 2013, and replaced Council Tax Benefit which was abolished as part of the Government's Welfare Reforms (which include the introduction of Universal Credit). H&F decided for 2013/14 and 2014/15 to absorb the cost of the changes, which means that people receive the same or very similar help to pay their council tax as they did under council tax benefit. The relevant regulations that apply, are therefore those set by government¹. In order to assess the impact of the main budget proposals upon which the decision to reduce council tax by 3% is based, relevant borough profile and other data is used to assess which group(s) might be impacted by each proposal and an assessment of that impact is made by reference to the three tenets of the PSED.

(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 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 Three; 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 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 amount².

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.

¹

http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice_and_Benefits/Council_tax/Who_has_to_pay/174433_Council_Tax_Support_Scheme.asp

² 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

The average reduction for people who pay full Council Tax will be £22.74 per Council Tax bill (Band D). This is the reduction that relates to the LBHF element of the calculation.

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 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 LCTS or partial LCTS.

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 LCTS, or above which a person will not be eligible for LCTS or partial LCTS.

However, it is likely that those whose financial circumstances place them only just above the threshold for 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 LCTS or partial LCTS but there is some data which could be used to inform an assessment of the likely percentage of people in this group being of a particular protected characteristic such as age, gender, disability.

However, we do have some data sets on those who claim full and partial LCTS (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment.

Of 18, 283 claimants, 54.72% (pensioner) and 54.7% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.42% (pensioner) and 29.36% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.82% (pensioner) and 15.94% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.63% (pensioner) or 62.67% (non-pensioner), which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole which is 51.3% (see the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census at Table Seven in Annex Two).

In terms of disability, about 11.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 12.6% as at the 2011 census³).

Among those whose income/savings are low enough that they qualify for LCTS, the only group that is (on the basis of the information available) disproportionately represented are pensioners and, to a lesser extent, women. 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 LCTS eligibility threshold) will include greater proportions of pensioners, 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.

³ http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/2011%20Census%20report_LBHF%20briefing_tcm21-177945.pdf

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 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, relative to their income, 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 £3.8M from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £1.4M 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 LCTS. This group is likely to include more pensioners, 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 LCTS and those who are exempt from paying Council Tax.

As stated above, full diversity data for those eligible for LCTS are not held by H&F. However, we do have some diversity data sets on those who claim full and partial LCTS (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment. Pensioners make up 33.09% of all claimants (Table One, Annex One). According to Census 2011 information, those aged 65 and over make up 9% of the borough (Table Four, Annex One), therefore, pensioners are over-represented in the group that claims LCTS.

Of 18,283, 54.72% (pensioner) and 54.7% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.42% (pensioner) and 29.36% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.82% (pensioner) and 15.94% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.63% (pensioner) or 62.67% (non-pensioner), which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole which is 51.3% (see the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census at Table Seven in Annex Two).

In terms of disability, about 11.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 12.6% as at the 2011 census⁴).

⁴ http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/2011%20Census%20report_LBHF%20briefing_tcm21-177945.pdf

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 prohibition 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 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.

A small indirect benefit to this group may arise as the reduction in Council Tax will mean that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of 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, relative to their income, 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 £3.8M from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £1.4M 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 LCTS are nonetheless eligible for partial LCTS, dependent on means. Partial LCTS operates on a 20% taper⁵, which means that LCTS is calculated in the following way:

Assessment of income and capital

The calculation of how much support a claimant will receive is carried out in the same way as it was for council tax benefit. We use the applicable amounts (the minimum amount that the government say that a claimant can live on) provided by the Department for Work and Pensions ('DWP') for the relevant year.

As the calculation is the same, this means we:

- use the same taper of 20% when the income is higher than the applicable amount
- use the same income disregards, disregards for child care and for any payments made to a company pension.

Capital is also treated in the same way as previously under council tax benefit. We ignore the first £6,000 in capital and then add a £1 tariff for income that a claimant would have per £500 above the £6,000 threshold.

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 support (what the support 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 support.

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 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 LCTS is reduced by $£10.00 \times 20\% = £2.00$. Their LCTS 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 LCTS in comparison to those who are not eligible for 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.

⁵

http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice_and_Benefits/Council_tax/Who_has_to_pay/174433_Council_Tax_Support_Scheme.asp

As stated above, full diversity data for those eligible for LCTS are not held by H&F. However, we do have some diversity data sets on those who claim full and partial LCTS (see Annex One) which provide some assistance for this assessment. Table One of Annex One gives the recent data.

Pensioners make up 33.09% of all claimants, and 39.1% of those that claim partial LCTS are pensioners (Table One, Annex One). According to Census 2011 information, those aged 65 and over make up 9% of the borough (Table Four, Annex One), therefore, pensioners are over-represented in the groups that claim LCTS and partial LCTS. Data on partial LCTS claimants is not available by gender or other diversity dataset.

Of 18, 283 claimants (i.e. full and partial LCTS), 54.72% (pensioner) and 54.7% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.42% (pensioner) and 29.36% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.82% (pensioner) and 15.94% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.63% (pensioner) or 62.67% (non-pensioner), which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole which is 51.3% (see the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census at Table Seven in Annex Two).

In terms of disability, about 11.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly lower percentage of people with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 12.6% as at the 2011 census⁶). This is not broken down further into full and partial LCTS.

A small indirect benefit to this group may arise as the reduction in Council Tax will mean that there is a corresponding reduction in the amount of 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 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, relative to their income, 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 £3.8M from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £1.4M 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 LCTS. In

⁶ http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/2011%20Census%20report_LBHF%20briefing_tcm21-177945.pdf

addition, there will be a small indirect benefit to all residents through the reduction in cost to the public purse of 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 £22.74 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 LCTS or partial LCTS. These are likely to include greater proportions of pensioners, 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 LCTS (which includes a proportion of pensioners that is over-represented as compared with the LBHF population at 39.1% as against 9%, as well as a high proportion of women) will also benefit from a reduction in Council Tax, but to a lesser extent because of the way partial LCTS is calculated. Based on data available for all LCTS claimants, this group is likely to include more women than men, as against the general population.

There will be no benefit to those who are eligible for full LCTS or who are exempt from paying it. The effect on this group will be neutral. Based on data available for all LCTS claimants, this group is likely to include more women than men, as against the general population, as well as more pensioners than non-pensioners, as against the general population, and a higher proportion of BME groups.

Of 18, 283 claimants (i.e. full and partial LCTS), 54.72% (pensioner) and 54.7% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.42% (pensioner) and 29.36% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.82% (pensioner) and 15.94% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.63% (pensioner) or 62.67% (non-pensioner), which is rather higher than the percentage of females in the H&F population as a whole which is 51.3% (see the most recent release of data from the 2011 Census at Table Seven in Annex Two).

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, relative to their income, 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 £3.8M from tri-borough/bi-borough working and £1.4M 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

Public Health and the overall Budget

There are no significant services funding changes to be made as part of the 2014/15 budget setting to the public health budget.

SAVINGS, EXISTING EFFICIENCIES, AND NEW EFFICIENCY SAVINGS

Adult Social Care (ASC)

Some of the ASC line items are to do with back office change that affects staff and as such will not have an impact on frontline service users. Because these will not have an equality impact on the borough population, they are not analysed further here. As with all staff changes, EIAs are carried out to inform reorganisations. Other line items are to do with more efficient ways of delivering services to the public and those are included here.

Reduced admissions into residential and nursing homes through better support in the community: £475K

This saving follows on from last year's saving under the same heading, and 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, agreed by Cabinet in December 2011, and reported on in February 2013. 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.

Tri-Borough initiative to manage prices in residential and nursing placements: £135K

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 across the Tri-Borough area 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.

Customer Journey for Operational Services: £185K

This saving arises from a review of social work practice and how services are delivered. This includes processes used to help residents and how these could be made easier to navigate to cost less but also to provide better services to older and disabled people. This saving is therefore of high relevance to older and disabled people and people with learning disabilities and the impact should be positive.

Review of high cost placements, supported at home packages and direct payments: £910K

This line item refers to a combination of: where residents get services from, more regular reviews of packages, and benchmarking cost against Tri-Borough partners' services. The combined work will reduce cost and will not impact adversely on residents as these measures will ensure that the service provided are the most appropriate and the best value for money.

There will be more timely and appropriate interventions in an integrated care co-ordinated approach which will provide appropriate levels of care.

Efficiencies to be achieved from the homecare procurement exercise and new operating model: £118K; and

Personalisation - Changing the approach to an outcome based on the new operating model for Direct Payment Clients: £115K

Both of these items arise from a focus on reablement ethos which encourages independence and stability. This will also include more regular reviews to ensure that older and disabled residents are getting the right services.

Review intensive support contract: £50K

This arises from a new tendered contract. However, take-up of this service is lower and so the saving arises from this aspect.

Review of third sector payments within the Older People Commissioning Sector: £38K

This arises from an underspend in 2013/14, which is a saving for 2014/15.

Review of Learning Disability (LD): residential supported living £108K

This is part of the strategy for LD accommodation and support and this line item will affect a very small number of service users. A consultation on the future of the service is underway and a report will be presented to Cabinet in February 2014 which will fully consider equalities issues and actions to minimise these.

Procurement of Learning Disabilities supported living contract (Yarrow): £324K

This saving will arise from a contract renegotiated led by procurement of this service.

Protect community transport provision by encouraging the use of travel methods such as taxi cards, blue badges and freedom passes through the Travel Support Strategy plan: £45K

This line item is part of the Support Planning Model. As part of this, service users have a Travel Support Plan and this would help them to use other forms of transport with support.

Provide statutory advocacy services and withdraw non-statutory advocacy support and funding: £165K

This line item arises from a procurement exercise in which a unit costed model is proposed. The level of advocacy would be the same but the Council would only pay for the advocacy that is used by service users. As such there is no impact on service users as the level of service is not proposed to change.

Reprovide all funding for employment and training services and review of Learning Disabilities Development fund: £111K

This service will be carried out by the Housing and Regeneration Department within existing resources.

Supporting People - Procuring of contracts by negotiating with providers and decommissioning of services: £875K

This line item refers to negotiating with providers and decommissioning of services. Such decisions are subject to the usual decision making process which may include carrying out an Equality Impact Analysis at which stage the impact can be fully assessed.

Review of Elgin Resource centre contract: £25K

This item refers to a contract variation and extension.

**Procurement savings from Olive House contract: £28K; and
Procurement savings from Elm Grove & Elgin Close contract: £70K**

These line items refer to renegotiations of both contracts which result in savings in extra care sheltered housing. There is no impact on service users as a result.

Improve outcomes and reduce dependency amongst residents through better joint services with the NHS: £103K

This item refers to money being received by the Council from the NHS.

The following savings arise from a review of staffing arrangements and will not impact on the public sector equality duty:

- Review of Support Planning: £39K
- Commissioning, Finance and in-house services: £48K
- Overheads (training, project management): £65K
- Review of Older People Day Care Services: £35K
- Review of Community Access team: £22K
- Learning Disabilities Supported Living Review: £43K
- Review of Mental Health Commissioned Services: £22K
- Mental Health Social Work costs: £183K
- Integrated commissioning with health: £200K
- Recruitment budget: £40K

Extension of Framework-i contract in line with Tri-Borough partners: £127K

This saving arises from better use of IT and does not impact on frontline services or the public sector equality duty.

Children's Services (CHS)

Some Children's Services savings for 2014/15 are with respect to staffing changes to the back office and as such do not have an impact on front line service provision. In such cases equalities impacts are considered as part of staffing establishment reorganisations. Other savings items relate to the efficient means to deliver services to the public and are detailed below.

Children with Disability Project (Tri-b): £204k

New model for delivering overnight Respite care: There is the potential for a negative equalities impact as the delivery of the proposals to increase the day care offer could result in a reduction in the provision of overnight respite for some users. A full EIA will be developed as proposals progress and impact will be reviewed and monitored throughout, including extensive engagement with service users.

Direct Payments implemented and used for all Care Packages across the three boroughs: This proposal will result in a positive impact as service users who opt to use Direct Payments will have more control over the provision that they receive. Any potential for negative impact will be managed via consultation with stakeholders and ensuring sufficient mechanisms are in place for families who need support with accessing a direct payment.

Procurement - Short Breaks Services: There will be a positive impact for service users of short breaks by providing more choice in provision, which is a requirement of the legislation. However, a full EIA will be developed when the procurement activity commences.

Parent Partnerships: As Parent Partnerships is a relatively small commissioning exercise, no equality impact is expected although a full EIA will be completed in conjunction with business case.

Tri-borough Staffing Structures - Creating a Tri-Borough Head of Disabled Children Post and Rationalising service structures across the three boroughs: No equalities impact is envisaged at this stage. However any potential impact will be monitored via the development of detailed EIAs for any consultations that affect a significant number of staff or impact front line services.

Looked After Children and Leaving Care Project (Tri-b): £752k

IFA review - 10 less IFAs per year: Improved quality and stability of placements is expected via increasing in-house placements provision.

10 more relative placements: Where appropriate kinship arrangements can have a positive impact by keeping children in an extended family environment and out of local authority care.

Increase speed and number of children moving to permanence/ Special Guardianship Orders: Positive impact for children through quicker outcomes and moves to permanent placements

Social Care Legal Services: The same quality standards will be implemented across the Tri-borough

Adoption & Fostering trading (trading of adopters to the market): A possible positive impact may be realised if there becomes a wider pool of adopters and foster carers

Revised contact service configuration: Potential for a positive impact on quality, particularly that contact can take place more local to the child's placement

Reduce number of older young people not using placements effectively or claiming benefits: A positive impact is expected as the initiative enables young people to make transition to independent living

Children Residential Care: No negative impact expected but this will be kept under review through continuing evaluation of outcomes

Revised commissioning of semi-independent accommodation: This activity aims to achieve a positive equality impact for care leavers in terms of improving the quality of service provision. A full EIA will be completed in conjunction with the commissioning plan and business case

Complex parenting assessments: A positive impact is expected from the procurement of a fully fit for purpose service contract and EIA will be finalised in conjunction with finalisation of business case

Passenger Transport Procurement: £125k

Passenger Transport Procurement: The passenger transport procurement covers home to school transport for SEN children; home to day care centres and other transport for vulnerable adults and transport for looked after children. Eligibility criteria for this transport is not part of the scope of this work. Parents of SEN service users and day care centre managers were consulted at the beginning of the process to ascertain what was important to them and their clients in the delivery of this service. Tender specifications have been drawn up and tenders evaluated to ensure that current levels of service quality and safeguarding are met by any new provider. An equality impact assessment has been undertaken. The project team acknowledges that transition to new operators, drivers and escorts may have an impact for some disabled service users in the short term while adjustments to new personnel are made. This is not expected to have any greater impact on service users than changes to personnel within the existing operations. An in house transport management team is being put in place. This team will work with schools, day care centres, service users and their parents and carers as well as with service providers to proactively manage the transition from current to new provision.

Further Commissioning and Procurement Savings: £132k

Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG): With respect to young people with learning difficulties with Destination Tracking; NEET returns/brokerage and Section 139 Assessments, no equalities impact is envisaged. The savings reflect changes to LA statutory duties in this area. An equivalent duty to provide IAG now rests with secondary schools and is monitored by governing bodies.

LBHF Youth Services: The saving reflects a school which has discontinued its after-school youth club. No alternative provider has been found at this stage. The school will continue to provide a wide range of school-based activities for pupils.

Tri Borough School Meals Service (saving against Dedicated Schools Grant funding): A consultation with schools is expected to ensure that the requirements of all pupils are met. Eligibility policies are not part of the scope of this work. There is not expected to be any negative impact on service users but the impact will continue to be reviewed through contract monitoring arrangements.

Family Services Restructure and Service Review Savings: £610k

The following items reflect planned changes to staffing establishments and structures. No equality impacts are envisaged at this time although detailed equality impact assessments are to be completed as proposals are finalised. Changes around Family Support and Child Protection reduction from 4 teams to 3; Tri-borough Head of LAC; Localities to 2 teams; Structure review and reduction of agency staffing; Improved quality and continuity of service through retention and permanent staff and reducing turnover; Business Support Officer reduction in Contact and Assessment and reduction of 1 LAC Social Worker post.

Safeguarding & Quality Assurance: A reduced number of looked after children will mean less statutory reviews

Combined Assessment Services: Improved quality is expected through combining services and procuring a multi-disciplinary assessment rather than our current single agency service.

Tri-borough Southwark/UASC: Service to the same population will be provided by specialist tri borough service – this should increase quality through specialisation.

Savings resulting from targeted actions with respect to placements: £70k

Secure Welfare placements: Reducing use of secure welfare by the provision of alternative community placements

Reduce residential use: Improved quality and stability of placements via reduced use of residential homes and increased use of fostering placements

Leaving Care: £215k

Improvements in timescales in moving to independent accommodation leading to positive impact for Young People leaving care through moves to permanent accommodation and independence.

Other Family Services Savings

Reduction in cost from care proceedings pilot: £120k

No equality impact envisaged as the pilot does not change who is taken through care proceedings but simply shortens the length

Rationalisation of Service Delivery and Location Costs: £55k

Cobbs Hall relocation/other premises: No equality impact envisaged as current security post not needed in the new location as already provided in that setting

E-readers for panel papers: No equality impact envisaged as the same information will be provided to panel members but in electronic form

Early help and intensive intervention with parents to reduce young people entering care by 5 per year: £160k

Targets repeat removals resulting in a positive impact for families at risk of repeat removals and providing intensive interventions to reduce children being removed

Disabled children support package review: £50k

Support will be provided at appropriate levels according to need.

Environment, Leisure and Residents' Services (ELRS)

A number of the ELRS 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.

Alternative funding for enhanced policing contract: £440K

This line item refers to other ways of funding the £440K, which includes potentially using S106 money to do this. As such, this item will have no impact on residents or service users as the service will not change.

Finance and 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 these are dealt with below.

Reduction in Voluntary Sector Grants expenditure of 10% and London Boroughs Grant Levy – Shortfall of funding from 2014/15: £2K

The Council grants expenditure is proposed to reduce by 10%. In particular this is likely to include: women's groups, BME groups, and groups for disabled people. A reduction is likely to have a negative impact because there will be less money to allocate as grant funding. The criteria for allocation of funding has not changed.

The specifications on which the grant funding is allocated have been reviewed for the next funding round. Specifications ensure that the grants are allocated to organisations that are financially sound and are in a position to deliver quality services developing projects that are preventative and complimentary to the statutory services and which consider council priorities and strategies.

No final decision will be made until all applications for grant funding are received and analysed, then recommendations made for funding are proposed to Cabinet. When that happens, further consideration to impact(s) on equality groups will be given. Recent past experience indicates that although the Council receives a large number of applications, not all of these meet the criteria for funding e.g. because the application does not answer all of the points that are required to be answered in demonstrating how the potential project will measure how it will improve the well-being of local residents.

The London Borough Grants Levy will be of high relevance to all voluntary groups who are in receipt of grant funding by the Council and in particular this is likely to include: women's groups, BME groups, and groups for disabled people. This is not in the control of the Council. This is run by London Councils, who made the efficiencies following consultation with all London Boroughs. An equalities impact assessment was carried out by London Councils, which administers the London Boroughs Grants Scheme.

The London Boroughs' Grants Scheme was created as a consequence of Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985. It inherited, from the former Greater London Council, a programme of funding to voluntary sector organisations whose activities were either London-wide or formed part of a London-wide pattern of service provision. All London boroughs are currently required via a Section 101 agreement made between the boroughs and London Councils (LC) to contribute to the budget of the London Boroughs Grants Scheme. The Scheme is run by the LC Grants Committee, and seeks to fund London-wide voluntary organisations and those which operate in more than two boroughs.

Individual councils do not have the authority to determine the level of contribution they will make to the scheme. Constituent councils are required to contribute to any London Boroughs Grants Scheme expenditure, which has been incurred with the approval of at least two-thirds of the constituent councils. Contributions are, under Regulation 6(8) of the Levying Bodies (General) Regulations 1992, to be proportionate to constituent councils' populations.

Calculation of borough contributions is on a "per head of population" basis, as required by the governing statute (LGA 1985, S48). London Councils is required to use the population figures as determined by the Secretary of State.

Deletion of HB Appeals Officer post £20K

This is one of two posts; the other post remains. Part of the £20K saving will be used to fund support as and when is required on Housing Benefit (HB) appeals. HB Appeals will die out as HB moves to Universal Credit. As such, there should be no impact on service users.

Workforce reduction – proportionate saving in maternity budgets £25K

This is a reduction due to reducing numbers of Council staff. There is no change in maternity policy, and there will be no impact on service users.

Other Savings, total £944k

There are a number of potential reorganisations in FCS, and these are informed by EIAs as and when they occur. These are listed below:

- Re-tender credit/debit card transaction contract £15K
- Reduction in contribution to Insurance fund £200K
- Reduction in Internal Audit supplies and services budget £10K
- Investment income stretch target (increase of 0.2%) £250K
- Hammerprint Xerox contract £50K
- E-sourcing via new system £15K
- Reduction in subscription budget £25K

The savings given above are unlikely to have an impact on residents or service users, and represent better ways of providing services to frontline departments while ensuring that resources are allocated where they need to be.

Housing and Regeneration Department (HRD)

Additional Pension Fund Service Deficit absorbed by the HRA based on actuarial calculations: £209K

This efficiency relates to the additional contribution to the Council's pension fund deficit required from the Housing Revenue Account rather than the General Fund. This efficiency will not have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in amenity recharge from the HRA: £50K

This efficiency relates to a reduction in charges to the General Fund from the Housing Revenue Account. The charges relate to the perceived benefit to the General Fund of the amenity provided to residents from the Council's housing land.

Reduction in costs and risks associated with Hamlet Gardens: £150K

This efficiency relates to the reduced procurement cost expected to result following the expiry of an expensive lease for temporary accommodation, and the Council procuring suitable alternative accommodation more cost effectively. This efficiency is not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in Housing Benefit Subsidy Loss on HALD portfolio: £20K

Introduction of and changes to Local Housing Allowances (LHA) has restricted Housing Benefits paid to customers. In 2013/14, 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. This saving is a budgetary provision that is now no longer required.

Cessation of subscription to Locata choice-based letting system: £70K

The cessation of the use of Locata is consequent upon changes to the Council's Scheme of Allocation. The new "Assisted Choice" model of making accommodation offers provides a more tailored approach to the client's housing needs than did Locata and this change is not expected to have significant equalities implications.

Minor reorganisation of roles and responsibilities with Housing Options: £40K

This efficiency relates to a staffing reorganisation which has been designed to best meet the requirement to deliver the revised housing strategy. This reorganisation shows no adverse equality impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

Review of income generation opportunities and cost reductions in Adult Learning & Skills Service: £211K

This efficiency results from cost reductions arising from a review of the staffing structure and the identification of income generation opportunities associated with the delivery of learning and skills course provision. The review will have no adverse equality impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

Transport & Technical Services (TTS)

The majority of savings are concerned with back office staff, accommodation, advertising income, IT, and changes to charges. As such they are unlikely to have any equalities implications for any particular groups with protected characteristics. Where there are staff changes leading to savings, EIAs are carried out.

Libraries

There are £100K total savings identified in the Libraries budget:

Fulham Library: £81K

This is a historical item and relates to the "more than a library" project. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

Home Library Service: £10K

This line item relates to the deletion of 0.5FTE post. An EIA was carried out for this item, which deleted this post and created a new dedicated team to deliver the service. There were no adverse impacts on customers.

Libraries Management System savings: £9K

This line item relates to a back office saving on a new contract. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

GROWTH

ASC

Increase in demand for learning disabled people placements and care packages; £205K

These line items relate to an increase in the demand for placements for people with needs arising from learning disabilities. These will all be of high relevance to disabled 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. The increase in the budget will match the increased number of people requiring the service. 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

Concessionary Fares settlement; £540k

This growth item relates to the budget for concessionary fares. The Concessionary Fares Settlement & Apportionment published by London Councils in late December 2013 proposed an increase in the amount that London Boroughs have to pay 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, CHS, Libraries

No growth items.

TTS

There are no growth items that are relevant to equality.

Public Health

There are no significant services funding changes to be made as part of the 2014/15 budget setting.

HRD**Potential Homelessness Impact of Welfare Reforms**

The Council will manage the potential homelessness impact arising from the Government's package of Welfare Reforms through a combination of pro-active mitigating action and through growth. The impact of the Overall Benefit Cap exposes the Council to loss of income in the form of bad debt charges of £740k in 2014/15 on the Temporary Accommodation portfolio. It is anticipated that this budgetary pressure will be managed as a risk (in the range £370k - £740k) in 2015/16 and that this risk will then diminish in 2016/17. Further, the estimated impact on bad debts as a result of the implementation of Direct Payments is £805k in 2014/15, rising to £1,675 for 2015/16 and 2016/17. Any equalities impacts will arise from changes in Government policy. To the extent that the growth is mitigation leading to the prevention of homelessness or of the use of B&B, the impact will be positive to BME groups and households headed by women, which tend to be over-represented amongst homeless households.

FEES AND CHARGES**Libraries**

There is one new charge, which is for an SMS communications service (at 20p per text). This is an elective service to remind customers that the item borrowed is due back. There is a cost-free email service. Additionally, customers would know when the item was due back from the time that the item was borrowed. Therefore, there are no impacts on any particular group as a result of this elective service.

ASC**Home care: no increase**

It is proposed that there is no increase to the home care charge of £12.00 per hour between 2013/14 and 2014/15. This is because Cabinet approved that the rate of charge is limited to £12.40 based on the level of assessed needs and cost of service. The home care charge of £12.00 is compared with the average home care purchasing rate of £12.41. In 2014/15 a new home care offer focusing on flexible support and outcomes contracts is proposed and the charge will be reviewed at this particular point. Hammersmith & Fulham will still be amongst the London Boroughs with the lowest contribution towards home care. 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: no increase

In line with Council policy, the Meal's charge has increased over the last three years. The Meals service has been outsourced since July 2013. The Service User charge per meal was increased to £4.50 with effect from April 2013 with the cost of the Meal at £6.93, leaving a subsidy of £2.43. A review of the arrangements will be undertaken for both the service model and charging for the delivered meals service. The data collection, benchmarking and best practice review will take place early in 2014 with a fuller consultation planned later in the year. Therefore it is proposed not to increase charges in 2014/15, pending the outcome of the review.

ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS

There are no fees and charges relevant to equality.

RISKS AND CHALLENGES

ASC

Identification of the risks and challenges in this section allows ASC to plan and prepare for associated increases in cost.

Demographic changes, Ageing population: £450K

Growth is expected to be one per cent per annum in LBHF. Presently, there is a reduction in client numbers which is expected to plateau and then to rise.

Care transfers into social care; £750K

This relates to increases due to continuing care transfers into social care and demographic pressures.

Increase in demand for learning disabled people placements and care packages; £235K

See growth section for comments.

Equipment budgets; £200K

Increased pressure on equipment budgets as a whole as the Health & Social Care community work together to deliver on admission avoidance & delaying the admission to Residential or Nursing Facilities.

Maximising revenue from Careline; £400K

The service is being reviewed with Commissioning to look at recommissioning a telephony / Monitoring service on a Bi or Tri-Borough basis. A local response service will be developed as part of the wider rapid Response Service developments.

ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS

There are no risk items relevant to equality.

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 BME groups), 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).

Savings items that will directly support equality of opportunity, and encourage participation in public life include reducing admissions into residential and nursing homes through better support in the community through reablement, in ASC. This 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, agreed by Cabinet in December 2011, and reported on in February 2013. 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.

Another ASC saving includes work on the customer journey for operational services, which will review social work practice and how services are delivered. This includes processes used to help residents and how these could be made easier to navigate to cost less but also to provide better services to older and disabled people. This saving is therefore of high relevance to older and disabled people and people with learning disabilities and the impact should be positive.

Growth items that will promote equality of opportunity include the growth in the areas of ASC and HRD. One of these in ASC deals with the increase in demand for learning disabled people placements and care packages, which will all be of high relevance to disabled 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. Overall, there will be a neutral impact as the increase in budgets will meet the needs of these groups.

Another of these items is the proposals for managing the homelessness impact of welfare reforms in HRD. Any equalities impacts will arise from changes in Government policy. To the extent that the growth is mitigation leading to the prevention of homelessness or of the use of B&B, the impact will be positive to BME groups and households headed by women, which tend to be over-represented amongst homeless households.

There are no fees and charges increases that are relevant to equality.

The identification of risk items in ASC will indirectly 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 anticipate the demand for services for older and disabled people and ensure that these demands can be met, avoiding potentially negative impacts.

Items that may have a negative impact include the CHS respite item, which informs a new model for delivering overnight care. However, a full EIA will be developed (as given in the CHS section above).

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 2014/15.

Annex One: LCTS Claimant Data

Table 1: Composition of LCTS claimants in LBHF

	Households			Weekly Payment		
	Full	Partial	Total	Full	Partial	Total
Pensioners	4,317	1,735	6,052	70,755.54	21,137.62	91,893.16
	71%	29%	100%			
Non Pensioners	9,530	2,702	12,232	152,602.80	29,871.78	182,474.58
	78%	22%	100%			
Households with Children	3,621	1,372	4,993	63,333.40	15598.5	78,931.90
	73%	27%	100%			
Households with Disabled Adult	1,879	244	2,123	30,470.40	3006.13	33,476.53
	89%	11%	100%			
Households with Children & Disabled Adult	379	47	426	7,258.23	669.49	7,927.72
	89%	11%	100%			
Households without Children & Disabled Adult	4,164	1,069	5,233	61,931.63	11274.64	73,206.27
	80%	20%	100%			
Overall Totals	13,847	4,437	18,284	223,358.34	51,009.40	274,367.74

Table 2: Council Tax bands of LCTS claimants

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Totals
Pensioners	315	853	1648	1681	897	406	250	2	6052
Working Age	963	1554	3095	3879	1864	647	224	6	12232
	1278	2407	4743	5560	2761	1053	474	8	18284
	6.99%	13.16%	25.94%	30.41%	15.10%	5.76%	2.59%	0.04%	

Table 3: the composition of LCTS claimants by pensioner and non-pensioner claims where households have a disabled adult and the disability premium has been awarded, by male and female only, and by couple.

Total number of claims	18283			
Total number of pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult where the disability premium has been	6282	Number of female only claimants = 3438 or 54.72%	Number of male only claimants = 1974 or 31.42%	Number of claiming couples = 868 or 13.82%

awarded				
Total number of non-pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult where the disability premium has been awarded)	12001	Number of female only claimants = 6565 or 54.7%	Number of male only claimants = 3523 or 29.36%	Number of claiming couples = 1913 or 15.94%
Households with a disabled adult (where the disability premium has been awarded) as a standalone group of the total number of claims	2015	Number of female only claimants = 966 or 47.94%	Number of male only claimants = 908 or 45.06%	Number of claiming couples = 141 or 6.99%

Annex Two: 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

- Tables of data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 6 December 2013]
- Live Births by Usual Area of Residence: ONS 2012 (e.g. for pregnancy and maternity) Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 6 December 2013]
- H&F Framework-i
- Kairos in Soho, *London's LGBT Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Project*, 2007

**Table 4: Age
(QS103EW, ONS)**

Age	#	%
0-4	11,900	6.5
5-10	10,172	5.6
11-16	9,019	4.9
17-24	22,184	12.2
25-39	65,211	35.7
40-49	25,083	13.7
50-64	22,511	12.3
65-74	9,102	5.0
75+	7,311	4.0

**Table 5: Age and disability
Adults not in employment and dependent children and persons with long-term health problems or disability for all (KS106EW, ONS)**

Household Composition	2011	
	number	%
count of Household; All households	80,590	100.0
No adults in employment in household	21,192	26.3
No adults in employment in household: With dependent children	3,897	4.8
No adults in employment in household: No dependent children	17,295	21.5
Dependent children in household: All ages	18,479	22.9
Dependent children in household: Age 0 to 4	9,083	11.3
One person in household with a long-term health problem or disability	15,999	19.9
One person in household with a long-term health problem or disability: With dependent children	2,809	3.5
One person in household with a long-term health problem or disability: No dependent children	13,190	16.4

Table 6: Disability (Framework-i)

Rate of physical disability registrations for H&F:	38.7 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of physical disability registrations for Wormholt & White City:	56.6 registrations per 1000 people (the highest)
Rate of blind/visual impairment registrations for H&F:	6.2 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of blind/visual impairment registrations for Ravenscourt Park:	14.1 registrations per 1000 people (the highest)
Rate of deaf/hard of hearing registrations for H&F:	2.0 registrations per 1000 people
Rate of deaf/hard of hearing registrations for Shepherds Bush Green:	4.0 registrations per 1000 people (the highest)

Table 7: Sex
Usual resident population (KS101EW, ONS)

Variable	2011	
	number	%
All usual residents	182,493	100.0
Males	88,914	48.7
Females	93,579	51.3

Table 8: Race
Ethnic group (KS201EW, ONS)

Ethnic Group	2011	
	number	%
All usual residents	182,493	100.0
White	124,222	68.1
White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	81,989	44.9
White: Irish	6,321	3.5
White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller	217	0.1
White: Other White	35,695	19.6
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	10,044	5.5
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Black Caribbean	2,769	1.5
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Black African	1,495	0.8
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: White and Asian	2,649	1.5
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: Other Mixed	3,131	1.7
Asian/Asian British	16,635	9.1
Asian/Asian British: Indian	3,451	1.9
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	1,612	0.9
Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi	1,056	0.6
Asian/Asian British: Chinese	3,140	1.7
Asian/Asian British: Other Asian	7,376	4.0
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	21,505	11.8
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African	10,552	5.8
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean	7,111	3.9
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black	3,842	2.1
Other ethnic group	10,087	5.5

Other ethnic group: Arab	5,228	2.9
Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group	4,859	2.7

**Table 9: Religion and Belief (including non-belief)
Religion (KS209EW, ONS)**

Religion	2011	
	number	%
All categories: Religion	182,493	100.0
Has religion	123,667	67.8
Christian	98,808	54.1
Buddhist	2,060	1.1
Hindu	2,097	1.1
Jewish	1,161	0.6
Muslim	18,242	10.0
Sikh	442	0.2
Other religion	857	0.5
No religion	43,487	23.8
Religion not stated	15,339	8.4

**Table 10: Pregnancy and maternity
Live births (numbers and rates): age of mother and administrative area of usual residence, England and Wales, 2012 (ONS 2012)**

Age of mother at birth								
All ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
2,646	15	45	238	491	970	689	200	13

Age of mother at birth								
All Ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
52.5	6.7	12.3	31.1	37.6	88.6	84.1	29.0	2.2

**Table 11: Marriage and Civil Partnership
Marital and civil partnership status (KS103EW, ONS)**

Marital Status	2011	
	number	%
All usual residents aged 16+	152,863	100.0
Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	85,433	55.9
Married	45,248	29.6
In a registered same-sex civil partnership	743	0.5
Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	4,425	2.9
Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	11,386	7.4
Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	5,628	3.7

Table 12: Living arrangements (QS108EW, ONS)

Living Arrangement	2011	
All categories: Living arrangements	151,028	
Living in a couple: Total	60,569	40.1
Living in a couple: Married	40,917	27.1
Living in a couple: Cohabiting (opposite-sex)	17,046	11.3
Living in a couple: In a registered same-sex civil partnership or cohabiting (same-sex)	2,606	1.7
Not living in a couple: Total	90,459	59.9
Not living in a couple: Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	68,170	45.1
Not living in a couple: Married or in a registered same-sex civil partnership	3,820	2.5
Not living in a couple: Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	3,698	2.4
Not living in a couple: Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	9,517	6.3
Not living in a couple: Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	5,254	3.5

Information set 13: 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 2011 census recorded 17,046 people (or 11.3% of couples), aged 16 and over, living as same sex couples in Hammersmith and Fulham. The same census recorded 2,606 (or 1.7% of couples) as a registered same-sex civil partnership or cohabiting (same-sex) . 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 (that apply and that do not apply)

Further information can be found on our website and a summary of exemptions is given here:

Council tax - exemptions

Exemptions and empty property discounts

Some properties are exempt from council tax. The different classes of exemption are listed below.

Properties occupied by:

- [full time students](#) (they must complete an [application form](#) and return it to us with a council tax certificate from their place of study);
- 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 that:

- 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.

A pitch or mooring that doesn't have a caravan or boat on it is also exempt.

Note: Those who feel they are entitled to an exemption are encouraged to contact the Council and information on how to do that is in the following link:

http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice_and_Benefits/Council_tax/Exemptions/35774_Council_Tax_Exemptions.asp?LGNTF=13

Council tax discounts and exemptions that no longer apply from 1st April 2013

Some discounts / exemptions no longer apply

From 1st April 2013 the following discounts and exemptions previously granted under statutory regulations will no longer apply to properties in Hammersmith & Fulham:

- **Class A exemption** (previously for 12 months), for empty property requiring or undergoing major structural repair works or alterations to make them habitable
- **Class C exemption** (previously for 6 months), for empty unfurnished property
- **10% discount** - (previously for an unlimited period), for second homes or long term empty property.

Information can be found here:

[http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice and Benefits/Council tax/Exemptions/179569 Council tax discounts and exemptions that no longer apply from 1st April 2013.asp](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Directory/Advice%20and%20Benefits/Council%20tax/Exemptions/179569%20Council%20tax%20discounts%20and%20exemptions%20that%20no%20longer%20apply%20from%201st%20April%202013.asp)