

Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) of main Budget proposals for 2015/2016

(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 25 February 2015, following discussion of the proposed Budget at the Finance and Delivery Policy and Accountability Committee on 27 January 2015, as well as at Cabinet on 2 February 2015.

The revenue part of the budget and associated equality impacts was also discussed at the following Policy and Accountability Committees:

- 1.1. Community Safety, Environment & Resident Services 13 January 2015;
- 1.2. Economic Regeneration, Housing & the Arts 29 January 2015;
- 1.3. Children & Education 19 January 2015.
- 1.4. Health, Adult Social Care & Social Inclusion 20 January 2015.

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

For 2015/2016, 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 1%. 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 2015/16 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 1%

The impact of the proposal to reduce Council Tax by 1% 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 1 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, and continues, to absorb the cost of the changes, which means that residents 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 1% 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 1% 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 residents 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.

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

Although these residents 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.

The average reduction for residents who pay full Council Tax will be £7.35 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. 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 residents 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 17,371 claimants, 54.62% (pensioner) and 53.56% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.87% (pensioner) and 28.74% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.51% (pensioner) and 17.7% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.36% (pensioner) or 62.40% (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 13.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly higher percentage of residents 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 residents, 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 1%, H&F will forego income of £0.5M. 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 £0.5M 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 £1M from investment income/capital debt reduction and £1m from a lower contribution to reserves. 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 residents, 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.

Assessment of impact of reducing Council Tax by 1% 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 33.67% 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 17,371, 54.62% (pensioner) and 53.56% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.87% (pensioner) and 28.74% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.51% (pensioner) and 17.70% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.36% (pensioner) or 62.40% (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 13.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly higher percentage of residents with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 12.6% as at the 2011 census).

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

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

Residents 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. 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 1%, H&F will forego income of £0.5M. 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 £0.5M 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 £1M from investment income/capital debt reduction and £1m from a lower contribution to reserves. 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 1% on those who pay partial Council Tax

Some residents who are not eligible for full LCTS are nonetheless eligible for partial LCTS, dependent on means. Partial LCTS operates on a 20% taper⁴, 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:

- (i) use the same taper of 20% when the income is higher than the applicable amount
- (ii) 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.

4

These residents 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 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 33.67% of all claimants, and 38.67% 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 17,371 claimants (i.e. full and partial LCTS), 54.62% (pensioner) and 53.56% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.87% (pensioner) and 28.74% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.51% (pensioner) and 17.70% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.36% (pensioner) or 62.40% (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 13.02% of claimants receive the LCTS disability premium (Annex One, Table Three), which is a slightly higher percentage of residents with a disability than there are in the H&F population as a whole (which was 12.6% as at the 2011 census⁵). This is not broken down further into full and partial LCTS.

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 1%, H&F will forego income of £0.5M. 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 £0.5M 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 £1M from investment income/capital debt reduction and £1m from a lower contribution to reserves. 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 1% 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 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.

⁵ http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/2011%20Census%20report_LBHF%20briefing_tcm21-177945.pdf

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 residents who need extra room in their home on account of their disability. On average, this reduction will be £7.35 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 residents, 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 17,371 claimants (i.e. full and partial LCTS), 54.62% (pensioner) and 53.56% (non-pensioner) are single female, with 31.87% (pensioner) and 28.74% (non-pensioner) being single male, and 13.51% (pensioner) and 17.70% (non-pensioner) being in a couple. As most couples will be male/female, the total percentage of female LCTS claimants is therefore about 61.36% (pensioner) or 62.40% (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 1%, H&F will forego income of £0.5M. 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 £0.5M 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 £1M from investment income/capital debt reduction and £1m from a lower contribution to reserves. 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

Adult Social Care (ASC)

The 2015/16 efficiencies have been grouped under headings relating to back office savings. Where measures affect staff the equalities impacts are considered as part of staffing establishment reorganisations. Other items are to do with more efficient ways of delivering services to the customers and carers and those are detailed below.

All Departmental savings proposals are detailed in this report. They mainly relate to transformation agenda, investment from Health, Public Health and some staffing reorganisations.

Detailed EIA's will be carried out at the time the proposals are in development when the impact can be fully assessed.

Transformation Projects:

The strategic plan for Adult Social Care over the coming years is to improve frontline services and deliver on major service transformation programs. This will be done through:

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|---|--|
| Customer Journey Operations Alignment | £615k |
| Prevention Strategy with the aim to reduce costs by investing in assistive technology | £206k |

Customer Journey Operations Alignment £615k: The aim of the measure is to design and implement a single ASC operating model and organisation structure which will include a core service offer to meet local service requirements.

This is likely to have a positive impact for the customer as it would

- improve the customer and carer experience, streamline processes and make the best use of the operations staff.
- It would also enable the Council deliver a better quality of service to customers and carers by reducing bureaucracy.
- It would also put the users and carers in charge of their information that goes through the system and improve integration with social care workers when the information required is always readily available.

Prevention strategy with the aim to reduce costs by investing in assistive technology £206k: This would have positive impact for users as it requires investment in assistive technology to prevent the cost of home care services. This proposal is based on increasing the number of people using telecare thereby enabling them to stay at home for longer.

Procurement and Contract Efficiencies:

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|--|--|
| Reprocurement of contracts with a view to manage prices in residential and nursing placement and care at home | £597k |
| Home Care procurement exercise and new operating model | £118k. |
| Supporting People- reprocurement of supporting people contracts and contract negotiations with a view to manage prices within budget | £843k |

Reprocurement of contracts with a view to manage prices in residential and nursing placement and care at home £597k

The aim of the contract efficiency savings is to reduce the cost of the Adult Social Care services currently commissioned through external providers

This would have a positive impact for the Council and ultimately benefit the service users as the Council would:

- Benchmark against the market to ensure contracts represent the best value for money and are competitively priced.
- Renegotiate contract terms and reprocure services where necessary to secure the best value and minimise concentration of risk
- Reduce the number of contracts to ensure these can be effectively managed within available contract management resources.
- Harmonise contract management processes and systems.

Home Care procurement exercise and new operating model £118k

One of the key priorities of the Department is enable more people stay independent for longer by providing Home care services through a new operating model. The Home care service contract is currently out to tender with the new model of service focusing on improving customer outcomes.

The service user would benefit from this positively as the new proposals will include regular reviews to ensure that older and disabled customers and their carers are getting the right service.

Supporting People- reprocurement of supporting people contracts and contract negotiations with a view to manage prices within budget £843k.

This proposal is centered around the reprocurement of supporting people contracts which is likely to have a positive impact on customers as aspects of this measure will involve reprocuring to ensure that a more efficient service is being provided.

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.

Reconfiguration of Services.

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|--|--|
| Reducing the need for expensive out of Borough supported accommodation for Learning Disabilities | £89k |
| Substitution of external day care providers by maximizing in house day care provision | £87k |
| Review of Learning Disability care income | £37k |
| Review of high cost and high needs placements for continuing Health funding: | £106k |
| Identify contracts that would benefit from investment from Public Health funding /Supporting People: | £551k |
| Identify contracts that would benefit from investment from Public Health/Third Sectors: | £94k |

There are a number of savings proposals which would impact the Learning Disabilities (LD) services. These include:

Learning Disability Supported Accommodation & Day Care services £89k & £87k

This will have a positive impact for Adult Social Care customers as this aims to meet the increase in demand and numbers of people with Learning Disabilities in the borough through new housing developments and a programme of remodelling existing accommodation services & Day Care services over the longer-term. There is a shortage of supply of high quality specialist housing provision in the borough to meet current and future complex health, social care and physical needs.

Through the delivery of new and re-modelled in-borough housing and support options for people, the Council's aims to provide access to a range of quality local housing provision avoiding the need for out of borough expensive residential care provision.

Review of Learning Disability Care Home £37k

This is part of the LD Strategy for accommodation and support and this is likely to have an adverse impact on a small number of customers and their carers. The savings proposed is year 2 of the review and to date external and individual service users meetings have taken place to discuss and arrange the service provision for the users. The equalities issues have been fully considered and steps such as an independent facilitator has been employed to consider and mitigate any negative impact this may have on service provision.

Review of all high cost and high needs placements for continuing Health funding £106k

This refers to a combination of where residents get services from, more regular reviews of packages and benchmarking cost against partners' services most appropriate and the best value for money.

This would have a positive impact as there would be more timely and appropriate interventions in an integrated care co-ordinated approach which would provide appropriate levels of care.

Identify contracts that would benefit from investment from Public Health Supporting People: £551k

This proposal is for funding from public health for LBHF Housing support services. The Department would work with Public Health to review the housing support contracts and identify how the service specifications and contracts can be strengthened to include clear and measurable public health activity and this may have a positive impact on service users.

Identify contracts that would benefit from investment from Public Health/Third Sectors £94k

This would impact users of this service positively as this proposal is seeking funding from Public Health to improve the pathway to employment for people with Learning Disabilities.

Investment from Health.

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|---|--|
| Investment from Health through the Better Care Fund | £2m |
| Integrated Commissioning with Health | £260k |
| Improve Outcomes and reduce dependency amongst residents through better joint services with NHS | £157k |
| Additional income to be derived from collection of rental income from Central London Communities Health Care colleagues | £100k. |

Investment from Health through the Better Care Fund: £2m. This represents the net benefit share that H&F will receive from Health for the savings that will be achieved in the local health system by reducing urgent care bed usage and reducing demand for hospital. This will be achieved by supporting existing integrated services by extending and increasing capacity in adult social care crisis response, community independence and home care services.

We are looking to fundamentally transform the quality and experience of care across health and social care over the next five years. The proposal is to create new joined up support and care within communities which would aid integration of operational services encompassing community nursing, therapies and care management and have a positive impact for service users in health and social care.

Integrated Commissioning with Health: £260k

The savings arise from a review of Joint Commissioning between Health and Adult Social Care staffing arrangements. As this is a back office review, it does not have a direct impact on service users and in such cases an equalities impact would be considered as part of staffing reorganisation.

Improve Outcomes and reduce dependency amongst residents through better joint services with NHS: £157k

This item relates to money being received by the Council from the NHS. There are no anticipated equality issues.

Additional income to be derived from collection of rental income from Central London Communities Health Care colleagues £100k.

This measure is proposing to charge Central London Community Healthcare (CLCH) service charges for the space shared with the Learning Disabilities team. The Joint Learning Disabilities team is based at Parkview and the Council is in discussions with CLCH regarding a contribution to the service charges. There are no anticipated equality issues.

Shared Services:

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|--|--|
| Efficiencies proposed from the amalgamation of back office functions | £464k |

Efficiencies proposed from the amalgamation of back office functions

This measure includes a review of senior management posts and the review of training programme £260k.

Review of the workforce development, planning and business support teams: £187k and shared services client affairs team £17k: As this is a back office review, it does not have a direct impact on service users and in such cases an equalities impact would be considered as part of staffing reorganisation.

Other Efficiencies.

| | H&F 2015/16 Savings |
|---|--|
| Joint work to be undertaken with Children's and Housing on No Recourse to Public Fund clients | £100k |
| Review of supplies and services budget: | £90k. |

Joint work to be undertaken with Children's and Housing on No Recourse to Public Fund clients: £100K.

This proposal is for joint asylum service between Adult Social Care, Children's Services and Housing with the aim reducing budget pressures in this areas across the three departments.

The Adults No Recourse to Public Funds budget is projecting an underspend in 2014/15. There are no anticipated equality issues.

Review of supplies and services budget: £90k.

Budget analysis to ascertain which budgets classed within supplies and services are projecting a range of small underspends and reduce the budgets accordingly to meet efficiency targets. There are no anticipated equality issues.

Growth.

Increase in demand for Learning disabled customers placements and care packages: £205k.

This is a positive impact as there will be additional funding to meet the 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. These items will have a neutral service impact as the increase in budgets will meet the needs of these customers and carer and there will be no change to the service or to the eligibility for the service as a result.

Fees & Charges

Abolition of charging for Home Care Services.

The Council has a discretionary power to charge for social care services provided to residents who live in the community. The power to do so is contained in Section 17 Health and Social Services and Social Security Adjustments Act 1983 ("HASSASSAA 83").

Hammersmith & Fulham Council provides a range of domiciliary services (home care, day care and transport services) to its customers who qualify for the service. The Council has been charging a contribution towards the cost of providing home care services only based on its Charging Scheme since January 2009.

Charges for home care services have been a flat rate of £12.00 per hour since April 2012. The minimum charge unit is 15 minutes or £3.00 per quarter of an hour. Charges for home care services are based on actual hours of services provided.

In December 2014 the administration, as part of its commitment to social inclusion and in line with its election manifesto pledge, signalled its intention to abolish charges for home care.

Abolishing home care charges is expected to have a positive impact on current and future home care users as it improves their financial position and wellbeing for the 1266 current customers receiving homecare services in Hammersmith & Fulham of which 313 were contributing towards the cost of care.

Following the decision a small number of home care users who refused the services due to charging are anticipated to return back for assessment of services, which is expected to improve the independence and wellbeing of those affected.

Meals on Wheels: Reduction of charge to £3 per meal.

Hammersmith & Fulham provides a meal services for customers of the borough who meet the Council's Fair Access to Care Services (FACS) and charges customers a flat rate contribution towards the service.

Meals services are provided to customers by the contractor Sodexo Ltd. There is a part of a contract framework agreement with Sodexo Ltd and Hammersmith and Fulham Council is the lead authority. The contract commenced on 8 April 2013 and covers a five year period.

In December 2014 the administration, as part of its commitment to social inclusion and in line with its election manifesto pledge, decided to review customer charges for meals services and proposed to reduce the charge from £4.50 to £3 per meal.

A reduction in the meals charges is expected to have a positive impact on 127 current and future customers as it improves their financial position and wellbeing.

Children's Services (CHS)

Some Children's Services savings for 2015/16 are with respect to staffing changes to the back office and as such do not have a direct 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 Disabilities

Key Protected Characteristics: Disability, Age, Race, Gender

| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
|---|---------------------------|
| Use The Haven for specialist residential support and also home support | 125k |
| More home support for disabled children with less residential and foster care placements | 260k |

Use The Haven for specialist residential support and also home support £125k:

Potentially positive impact by using locally provided services to children in borough. The EIA will outline specifically how relevant groups may benefit from the new service model e.g. better access to provision, improved choice of services etc.

More home support for disabled children with less residential and foster care placements £260k: Positive impact as enabling children and families to remain at home with targeted support. The EIA will outline specifically how relevant groups may benefit from the service model e.g. better access to provision, improved choice of services etc.

Early Help

Key Protected Characteristics: Race, Religion, Gender, Age

| Project/Service Area: | LBHF15/16 Savings |
|---|-------------------|
| New Support Service to families where children have been removed – reduce the number of new care proceedings | 60k |
| Entry to Care – reduce young people entering care by 5 per annum | 100k |
| Children’s Centres – Re-commissioning strategy | 368k |
| Children’s Centres – Spot Purchasing | 36k |

New Support Service to families where children have been removed – reduce the number of new care proceedings £60k: Targeting repeat removals. Positive impact anticipated for families and young people who have had repeat removals. This will enable children to remain at home with birth parents. The EIA will outline specific groups which may be subject to repeat removals e.g. age and disability.

Entry to care – reduce young people entering care by 5 per annum £100k: Targeting repeat removals. Positive impact anticipated as teams will work with families earlier to enable children to remain at home. The EIA will outline specific groups which may be over-represented e.g. race and gender.

Children’s Centres re-commissioning strategy £368k: No anticipated impact for 2015/16 as contribution in funding from Public Health will retain same level of service.

Children’s Centres spot purchasing £36k: No anticipated impact on the delivery of core children’s centre services. Removal of this additional resource means there is no ability to add additional resource locally when identified. Analysis of families which have accessed spot purchasing will help identify children who may be affected. The EIA will also consider Children With Disabilities (CWD), Children in Need (CiN) and low income families.

Looked After Children (LAC) and Leaving Care Project

Key Protected Characteristics: Disability, Age, Race, Religion Gender.

| Project/Service Area: LAC & Leaving Care | LBHF 15-16 Savings |
|---|--------------------|
| More in house foster carers recruited so that less independent fostering placements (IFAs) needed (10) | 250k |
| Increase the number of children placed with relatives (10) | 70k |
| Staffing – reduction in locality team staff costs through Early Help review | 200k |
| Reduce back office staffing | 60k |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| | |
| Legal expenditure reduced as care proceedings length reduces | 110k |
| Better support to foster carers to reduce residential need | 250k |
| Looked After Children (LAC) - Reduction in length of time in care | 125k |
| Increase in number of Housing Benefit claims | 100k |
| Reduction in Security costs | 30k |
| Reduced Looked After Children (LAC) service staffing in line with reduction in LAC numbers | 300k |

More in house foster carers recruited so that less independent fostering placements (IFAs) needed (10) £250k; No anticipated impact on service users. The EIA will outline data trends for particular groups accessing IFA and stipulate whether the current provision is meeting the needs of the local LAC population.

Increase the number of children placed with relatives (10) £70k: Positive impact on children who are able to be placed with extended family and therefore benefit from familiar carers contact with family. The EIA will reflect whether any particular groups would benefit from this increase e.g. any specific areas of need. An increase could help placements which closely reflect the Looked After Children population.

Staffing – reduction in locality team staff costs through Early Help review £200k: No disproportionate effect on any group: The EIA will include a breakdown of the staff profile and outline any anticipated impact on service delivery/service user accessibility.

Back office staff reduction CAS £60k: No anticipated impact on service user. The EIA will stipulate whether the **Business Support Officers (BSOs)** have contact with service users.

Legal expenditure reduced as care proceedings length reduces £110k: Positive impact on children and families as shorter court proceedings will lead to quicker outcomes and better placement stability for the child. The EIA will highlight any particular groups which are subject to care proceedings and data trends on placement stability to demonstrate the impact of the pilot.

Better support to foster carers to reduce residential need £250k: Positive impact on children who will need to be placed in residential and respite placement less frequently. The EIA will outline data trends for those who access residential and respite provision. Further detail will also incorporate feedback from service users.

Looked After Children - Reduction in length of time in care £125k: Positive impact on children who are able to be placed within a permanent family environment at an earlier stage and therefore likely to benefit from stability and better life chances. The EIA will outline data trends e.g. LAC stability and any groups where there are gaps/greatest need e.g. those with disabilities and BME groups.

Increase the number of Housing Benefit claims £100k: This aims to reduce the costs for young people leaving care. No anticipated impact on service users. Consideration should be noted for particular groups e.g. complex cases, those with learning difficulties and Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) who may have difficulty accessing benefits and specialist advice. Also to note the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham is one of the first Local Authorities to implement universal credit and there may also be some associated delays in claimant accessing benefits. The EIA will outline the relevant support which will be provided to increase uptake of eligible benefits.

Reduction in security Costs £30k: The EIA will confirm alternative plans for security at Cobbs Hall and will include how the existing/future premises can adequately safeguard staff/service users.

Reduced Looked After Children (LAC) service staffing in line with reduction in LAC numbers £300k: No impact on service users if numbers are stable or continue to fall. The EIA will incorporate mitigating provision if there is an increase in numbers. Particular groups include Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC), those with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) and those on remand.

Safeguarding

Key Protected Characteristics: Age, Race, Gender, Disability, Maternity and Pregnancy

| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
|--|---------------------------|
| Safeguarding & Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) Service Configuration and Rationalisation | 121k |

Safeguarding & Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB) Service Configuration and Rationalisation £121k: No anticipated impact on service users. Up to 7 posts could be at risk as this saving will mostly be achieved through re-organisation. The EIA will include analysis of the service workforce profile to identify any groups which may be adversely affected.

Education/Schools

Key Protected Characteristics: Disability, Age, Race, Religion, Gender

| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
|---|---------------------------|
| Draw in funding for specific expenditure – on children's education and on families with attendance and employment issues | 400k |
| School Standards | 150k |
| School Meals/Catering | 347k |

Draw in funding for specific expenditure – on children’s education and on families with attendance and employment issues £400k: Potential positive impact for children and families through promoting better education and employment prospects. The EIA will incorporate trend data to demonstrate the impact of initiatives.

School Standards £150k: It is not considered that there will be any significant equalities implication. In many instances, the funding for the service is to continue and the saving is a result of a proportion of this funding coming from an alternative source (Dedicated Schools Grant). Where there is a staff reorganisation, a full EIA will accompany any consultation proposals.

School Meals/Catering £347k: No anticipated equalities issues. The meal service caters for a variety of dietary requirements for pupils. The EIA will stipulate where savings will be made and highlight any impact on the quality/range of services provided. The EIA will also outline if there are any anticipated increase in costs to parents/families.

Finance

Key Protected Characteristics: Age, Race, Gender, Disability, Maternity and Pregnancy

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
| Finance reorganisation | 250k |

Finance reorganisation £250k: No anticipated impact on frontline services. Proposals will be subject to staff consultation to inform the design of future staff and implementation arrangements. The EIA will include the finance workforce profile to identify if any particular groups are affected.

Other adjustments

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
| Grant realignment | 219k |

Grant realignment £219k: No anticipated impact on any user groups as this is not a real saving, rather a realignment of the overall requirement to be delivered by Children’s Services.

Commissioning

Key Protected Characteristics: Age, Race, Gender, Disability, Maternity and Pregnancy

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project/Service Area: | LBHF 15/16 Savings |
| Commissioning staff reduction | 140k |

Commissioning staff reduction £140k: There is unlikely to be an adverse impact on any protected characteristic within the community as commissioning and service activity will

continue to be delivered and efficiencies identified to mitigate the staffing reduction. The staffing reduction may affect more women than men, reflecting the workforce profile within the directorate. The proposals will be subject to staff consultation to inform the design of future staffing and implementation arrangements. Other protected characteristics to be considered will include Pregnancy and Maternity, Age and Race.

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.

Income from Duct Asset Concession: £160K

This line item refers to increased income from the concession contract for use of the council's underground CCTV ducting network. In the medium to long term the new contract will expand internet service across the borough, making it more accessible and affordable for residents. This also enables further e-inclusion benefits from the government's new grant scheme to enable households to buy internet access. As such this is expected to have a positive impact on equalities.

2.

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.

Workforce reduction – proportionate saving in maternity budgets: £75K

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.

Business Intelligence: £1,010k

A range of business intelligence projects are in progress that seek to validate discounts offered, payments made and grants claimed by the council.

The forecast benefit is £1,010k. By improving the validation process there will be a direct positive effect on all adults in the borough who pay Council Tax (regardless of age, race, sex, disability, etc). Funding will be generated that supports front line services.

Alternative Funding of Third Sector Investment: £150k

The overall grants budget is £0.621m greater than the original 2014/15 budget. A net saving will be delivered through the identification of alternative funding. The Council's grant expenditure includes women's groups, BME groups, and groups for disabled residents. The increased funding is likely to have a positive impact.

Realignment of Social Fund (in line with spend) : £20k

Since April 2013 local authorities had the power, and funding, to provide a safety net to those in the community facing a disaster or an emergency or to enable independent living preventing the need for institutional care. In 2013/14 the total spend was approximately £480k which represented an underspend of £100k against the available budget. The underspend is forecast to reduce to £20k as work continues to ensure that those that require this assistance in the community receive it. The forecast underspend of £20k is taken account of within the proposed budget forecast.

Council Tax Premium on Long-Term Empty Properties: £20k

The Council proposes to charge a Council Tax premium on properties that have been empty for more than two years. The intention behind use of this power is not to penalise owners of property that is genuinely on the housing market for sale or rent, but to improve the health of the local housing market. Incentives to increase the supply of housing are likely to have a positive equalities impact.

Other Savings

There are a number of potential reorganisations in FCS, and these are informed by EIAs as and when they occur. These are also savings from more effective procurement and other initiatives. The other savings are listed below:

- Stationery contract savings from procurement £60K
- Information Technology procurement savings £151k
- Corporate Services Review £431k
- External Audit fee saving £80k
- Executive Services Efficiencies £90k
- Reorganisations within the Communications, Policy and Performance Team £255k
- A reduction in the cost of managed services for Human Resources £130k and Finance £300k
- Debt restructuring (Treasury Management) £200k
- Publications efficiencies £100k.
- Commercialisation of the Change Management and Innovation Division £50k

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.

3.

Housing and Regeneration Department (HRD)

Reduction in Temporary Accommodation number and cost: £500k

This efficiency relates to the expected reduction in client numbers and the associated net cost of private sector leased and bed and breakfast temporary accommodation. The reduction in the use of bed and breakfast and the consequent increase in settled accommodation will have a positive impact on the families concerned. On the other hand, this alternative accommodation is likely to be further from the borough which may make it more difficult to sustain existing support networks. Overall, therefore, this efficiency is not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in Private Sector Leasing scheme bad debt provision: £200k

This efficiency is related to the above saving and will be delivered through a reduction in the increase to the bad debt provision required due to an improvement in the debt collection rate and a reduction in the income generated from Temporary Accommodation resulting from reduced client numbers. This efficiency is not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in Private Sector Leasing operational costs: £48k

This efficiency relates to a number of reductions in operational cost budgets no longer required to deliver the Private Sector Leasing Temporary Accommodation service. This saving is a budgetary provision that is now no longer required. This reorganisation shows no adverse impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

Reduction in No Recourse to Public Funds: £20k

This efficiency is deliverable with no adverse service impact because the volume of cases has dropped in recent years. Therefore this saving is a budgetary provision that is now no longer required. This efficiency is not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in the cost of Rent Deposit Guarantee scheme: £31k

This efficiency relates to the phased replacement of a rent deposit guarantee scheme for landlords of Temporary Accommodation properties with an alternative landlord incentive payments scheme. This efficiency is not expected to have any significant equalities impact.

Reduction in general running costs: £14k

This efficiency relates to the identification of multiple minor running cost budgets. This saving is a budgetary provision that is now no longer required to deliver the service across Housing Options, Skills & Economic Development. This reorganisation shows no adverse impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

Reduction in amenity recharge from the HRA: £30k

Appendix G

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. This change will have no adverse impacts on staff with protected characteristics.

4.

Transport & Technical Services (TTS)

The majority of savings are concerned with back office staff, accommodation, advertising income, IT, renegotiation of contracts and recognising existing variances. As such they will have no equalities implications for any particular groups with protected characteristics. Where there are staff changes leading to savings, EIAs are carried out.

Growth

Budget growth in TTS has been included to address existing budget pressures and as such does not involve any new actions. There are, therefore, no associated equalities implications.

5.

Libraries

There are £162K total savings identified in the Libraries budget:

Inter-library transport arrangements including scope for Tri-borough service: £34K

This item relates to savings from the review of inter-library transport arrangements across Tri borough. There will be no adverse impacts on customers.

Rentals for space hire and leasing: £5K

This line item relates to increases in income from renting space. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

Resourcing review of reference and stock teams drawing on administrative process efficiencies. £16k

A review of staffing levels will take place following administrative process efficiencies as a result of the new Library Management System and training general staff to support referencing. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

Reduction in spend on new stock: £60k

There will be less spending on new stock because of improved supplier discount and the shift to e-books. There should be no adverse impacts on customers.

ICT infrastructure budget efficiencies: £10K

This line item relates to a back office savings on ICT costs. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

Library management system: £37K

This line item relates to a back office savings on the new contract and associated ICT support efficiencies. There are no impacts on any groups arising from this item.

GROWTH

There are no growth items for Libraries.

FEES AND CHARGES

There are no fees and charges relevant to equality.

RISKS AND CHALLENGES

There are no risks items for Libraries.

ALL OTHER DEPARTMENTS

There are no risk items relevant to equality.

Conclusion on impact of the budget

Overall, the budget impact on equality is neutral with some items which may indirectly support equality of opportunity for vulnerable groups (in particular older residents, 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 residents are not having to be re-admitted to hospital so often. This will help to advance equality of opportunity for older and disabled residents 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 residents 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.

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 residents. This saving is therefore of high relevance to older and disabled residents and residents with learning disabilities and the impact should be positive.

Growth items that will promote equality of opportunity include a growth item in ASC which deals with Increase in demand for Learning disabled people placements and care packages.

This may be of high relevance to disabled residents and will support the participation of disabled residents in public life and help to advance equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled residents.

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 residents in public life, and help to advance equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled residents. These items will help to anticipate the demand for services for older and

disabled residents and ensure that these demands can be met, avoiding potentially negative impacts.

In some 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 2015/16.

6.

Annex One: LCTS Claimant Data**Table 1: Composition of LCTS claimants in LBHF**

| | Households | | | Weekly Payment | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Full | Partial | Total | Full | Partial | Total |
| Pensioners | 4,225 | 1,625 | 5,850 | 67,822 | 18,611 | 86,433 |
| | 72% | 28% | 100% | | | |
| Non Pensioners | 8,944 | 2,577 | 11,521 | 139,602 | 26,751 | 166,352 |
| | 78% | 22% | 100% | | | |
| Households with Children | 3,241 | 1,325 | 4,566 | 55,361 | 14,258 | 69,618 |
| | 71% | 29% | 100% | | | |
| Households with Disabled Adult | 2,077 | 170 | 2,247 | 32,599 | 1,910 | 34,510 |
| | 92% | 8% | 100% | | | |
| Households with Children & Disabled Adult | 385 | 49 | 434 | 7,260 | 539 | 7,799 |
| | 89% | 11% | 100% | | | |
| Households without Children & Disabled Adult | 3,353 | 989 | 4,342 | 48,968 | 9,707 | 58,675 |
| | 77% | 23% | 100% | | | |
| Overall Totals | 13,169 | 4,202 | 17,371 | 207,424 | 45,362 | 252,786 |

Table 2: Council Tax bands of LCTS claimants

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | Totals |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|----|--------|
| Pensioners | 316 | 813 | 1,592 | 1,672 | 872 | 396 | 236 | 3 | 5,900 |
| Working Age | 935 | 1,435 | 2,963 | 3,605 | 1,703 | 606 | 218 | 6 | 11,471 |
| | 1,251 | 2,248 | 4,555 | 5,277 | 2,575 | 1,002 | 454 | 9 | 1,7371 |
| | 7% | 13% | 26% | 30% | 15% | 6% | 3% | 0% | |

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 | 17,371 | | | |
| Total number of pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult) | 6,125 | Number of female only claimants = 3,345 or 54.62% | Number of male only claimants = 1,952 or 31.87% | Number of claiming couples = 828 or 13.51% |

Appendix G

| | | | | |
|--|--------|--|--|--|
| where the disability premium has been awarded | | | | |
| Total number of non-pensioner claims (includes households with a disabled adult where the disability premium has been awarded) | 11,246 | Number of female only claimants = 6,023 or 53.56% | Number of male only claimants = 3,232 or 28.74% | Number of claiming couples = 1,991 or 17.7% |
| Households with a disabled adult (where the disability premium has been awarded) as a standalone group of the total number of claims | 2,263 | Number of female only claimants = 1,018 or 44.98% | Number of male only claimants = 987 or 43.61% | Number of claiming couples = 258 or 11.4% |

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