

Budget Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) 2026/27 – Service Users

The Budget EIA process is a legal duty supporting good financial decision-making. It assesses how proposals may impact on specific groups differently (and whether/how negative impacts can be reduced or avoided) so that these consequences are explicitly considered. Decisions must be informed by accurate, well-informed assessment of likely impacts so that they are fair, transparent, and accountable. Budget EIAs provide a record of this assessment and consideration. Members are referred to the full text of s149 of the Equality Act 2010 – included at the end of this document – which must be considered when making decisions on budget proposals.

Equality impact assessments describing impacts on service-users		
Directorates	Services	EIA No.
Families, Children and Wellbeing	Front Door for Families	1
	Extended Adolescence	2
	Partners in Change Hub	3
	Youth Arts	4
	Violence against women and girls	5
Homes & Adult Social Care	Community Care	6
	Housing demand management	7
City Operations	City Parks parking charges	8
	Trade and garden waste	9
	Waste services charges	10
	Public toilets charges	11

Budget Proposal: EIA 1

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Front Door for Families reduction
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Kirsty Hanna, Director, Family Help and Protection
Directorate and Service Name:	Families, Children & Wellbeing, Safeguarding and Care

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

A reduction in the staffing establishment of 1.0 FTE – currently vacant - in the Front Door for Families. Contacts have reduced by 13%, therefore this reduction can be managed without significantly impacting service performance in providing children safeguarding services to the city in a timely way.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

This reduction in budget may impact on the response to referrals to the Front Door for Families regarding Children's Social Care. Black and Global majority children, including separated children arriving in the UK, are over-represented in this cohort and so, if there was an impact, they would be disproportionately affected. A significant number of the children referred to the service are also disabled, neurodivergent and/or experiencing mental health issues so they would also be disproportionately impacted.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

No consultation planned as no significant impact identified.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

Extended Adolescent Service.

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	YES
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	YES

Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	YES
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	YES
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	YES
Gender Reassignment	Not applicable
Sexual Orientation	Not applicable
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Not applicable
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	Yes
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	Not applicable
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	Yes
Carers	Yes
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Yes
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	YES
Socio-economic Disadvantage	YES
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	YES
Human Rights	Not applicable
Another relevant group:	YES
Those experiencing substance misuse	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)

- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Not applicable

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

This will be monitored through the Senior Leadership Team performance meeting as well as the Front Door for Families Management meeting

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.

	State Yes or No	
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	yes	All the young people this will impact will be under 18 and will be among the most vulnerable children in society, experiencing trauma and vulnerability
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	yes	Many of the young people requiring support will be disabled, neurodivergent and / or experiencing mental health issues.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	yes	Black and Global Majority Children are over-represented in our services and this is especially the case for children of mixed heritage or from Gypsy, Roma, Traveller backgrounds.
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	no	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	A number of children in our services identify as non-binary or trans. These young people will often also have additional complex needs and vulnerability and may require support from social care.
Gender Reassignment	N/a	N/a
Sexual Orientation	N/a	N/a
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/a	N/a
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	yes	Social care services support families during pregnancy and early infancy
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	N/a	N/a
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Social care services support separated children arriving in the UK and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children

Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing social care are more likely to be young carers and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Social care services support children in care and care leavers and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	yes	Young people in social care services are more likely to have come from families that have experienced domestic violence and are more likely to experience this in their own relationships
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing social care services are more likely to have come from families in poverty, therefore any cuts in adolescent services will impact on those children affected by childhood poverty
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing the social care services are often at risk of homelessness and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Human Rights	n/a	n/a
Another relevant group: Substance misuse	Yes	Young people accessing social care services are more likely to have come from families who have experienced substance misuse and are more likely to have experienced these issues themselves

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)

- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Savings against the Front Door for Families will impact on the service's ability to deal with referrals for families at risk. This may be worsened by other proposed reductions in the Family Help and Protection establishment, leading to the risk of an increase in the number of young people experiencing significant harm and escalating through the service, worsening the impact of these budget proposals. The specific proposals raised in this EIA will be mitigated by the fall in contacts to the Front Door for Families recently – a 13.5% in the year up to the end of September 2025.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

1. SMART action 1: We are a demand led service and are therefore not able to reduce the demand as such. While we do everything possible to prevent children requiring our support, at times children will need to be safeguarded. By July 2026, we will implement the Families Transformation. Families First is a national programme led by the Department for Education (DfE). The overall aims of Families First are to refocus the children's social care system on prevention and to ensure that there is a robust multi-agency child protection system in place. As part of Families First we will create Family Help pods that focus on targeted early help and social work support, as well as creating a Multi-Agency Child Protection Team, which will have oversight of child protection decisions. One of the expected outcomes of Families First is that it will lead to a reduction in demand for high level services and this would include a reduction in referrals, and especially re-referrals, to our services in the longer term.
2. SMART action 2: By July 2026, as part of Families First Transformation we will create roles focused on prevention that support families to create sustainable change and reduce the number of re-referrals to the Front Door for Families.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	4
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25
Accountable Manager:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25

Budget Proposal: EIA 2

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Extended Adolescent Service reduction
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Kirsty Hanna, Director, Family Help and Protection
Directorate and Service Name:	Families, Children & Wellbeing, Safeguarding and Care

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

A £50,000 saving on the Extended Adolescent Service, through reduction of a 1.0fte post currently vacant. This savings proposal could lead to less direct support to vulnerable teenagers. The service aims to keep children out of care; therefore, the risk is that more children enter care if this service is depleted. This will be older children as the Extended Adolescent Service works with 11+, these placements tend to be more expensive and far more likely to be high cost residential.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

This reduction in budget will impact on young people who are supported by the specialist adolescent service. This service supports the young people who are in care or who are at risk of significant harm. This includes young people at risk of criminal exploitation. Black and Global majority young people are over-represented in this cohort and so will be disproportionately affected. A significant number of the young people in the service are also disabled, neurodivergent and / or experiencing mental health issues so will also be disproportionately impacted. Young people open to the service are impacted by complex problems and trauma, including substance misuse.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

No consultation is planned, however work has been undertaken and continues with social work teams and managers to look at how we reduce the number of children and young people needing support from the Extended Adolescent Service, as well as work with external partners including Health to reduce the demands

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

None

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	YES
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	YES
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	YES
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	YES
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	YES
Gender Reassignment	YES
Sexual Orientation	Not applicable
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Not applicable
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	Not applicable
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	Not applicable
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	Not applicable
Carers	Yes
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Not applicable
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	YES
Socio-economic Disadvantage	YES
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	YES
Human Rights	Not applicable
Another relevant group:	YES
Those experiencing substance misuse	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas

- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Not applicable

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

This will be monitored through the Senior Leadership Team performance meeting as well as the Adolescent Violence and Risk Management meeting

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples
---	--------------------------------------	---

	negative impact? State Yes or No	intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	yes	All the people this will impact will be under 18 and will be among the most vulnerable children in society, experiencing trauma and vulnerability
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	yes	Many of the young people supported by the service are also disabled, neurodivergent and / or experiencing mental health issues
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	yes	Black and Global Majority Children are over-represented in our services and this is especially the case for children of mixed heritage or from Gypsy, Roma, Traveller backgrounds.
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	no	no disproportionate impact for this group
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	A number of children in our services identify as non-binary or trans. These young people will often also have additional complex needs and vulnerability and may require support from the adolescent service.
Gender Reassignment	N/a	N/a
Sexual Orientation	Yes	LGBTQ+ young people will often also have additional needs and vulnerability
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/a	N/a
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	N/a	N/a
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	N/a	N/a
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age,	yes	n/a

language, and various intersections		
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	n/a	Young people accessing the adolescent service are more likely to be young carers
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	n/a
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	yes	Young people in the adolescent service are more likely to have come from families that have experienced domestic violence and are more likely to experience this in their own relationships
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing the adolescent service are more likely to have come from families in poverty, therefore any cuts in adolescent services will impact on those children affected by childhood poverty
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	n/a	Young people accessing the adolescent service are often at risk of homelessness
Human Rights	n/a	n/a
Another relevant group: Substance misuse	Yes	Young people accessing the extended adolescent service are more likely to have come from families who have experienced substance misuse and are more likely to have experienced these issues themselves

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Savings against the Family Help and Protection establishment may impact on the support for children and families and lead to an increase in the number of young people accessing the adolescent service and worsening the impact of these budget proposals.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

SMART action 1: We are a demand led service and are therefore not able to reduce the demand as such. While we do everything possible to prevent children requiring our support, at times children will need to be safeguarded. By July 2026, we will implement the Families Transformation. Families First is a national programme led by the Department for Education (DfE). The overall aims of Families First are to refocus the children's social care system on prevention and to ensure that there is a robust multi-agency child protection system in place. As part of Families First we will create Family Help pods that focus on targeted early help and social work support, as well as creating a Multi-Agency Child Protection Team, which will have oversight of child protection decisions. One of the expected outcomes of Families First is that it will lead to a reduction in demand for high level services and this would include a reduction in high level need in the adolescent service.

SMART action 2: As part of Families First, by July 2026, we will create Youth Keyworker roles in the Adolescent Service to reduce demand on the Extended Adolescent Service.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	4
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25
Accountable Manager:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25

Budget Proposal: EIA 3

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Partners in Change Hub
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Kirsty Hanna, Director, Family Help and Protection
Directorate and Service Name:	Families, Children & Wellbeing, Safeguarding and Care

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

A 0.8 FTE reduction in the Partners in Change Hub staffing establishment. The Partners in Change Hub supports social work practice providing direct interventions to families and supporting Social Work Students and newly qualified social workers. The number of newly qualified social workers employed has decreased over the last 2 years.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

This reduction in budget will impact on the support to social workers and keyworkers who are providing support to families from a targeted early help stage, through child in need work, child protection plans and children in care. Tasks will need to be re-distributed within the Partners in Change Hub and this will impact on their workload. Black and Global majority children, including unaccompanied asylum-seeking children, are over-represented in this cohort and so will be disproportionately affected. A significant number of the children in the service are also disabled, neurodivergent and / or experiencing mental health issues so will also be disproportionately impacted.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

No consultation is planned.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

Extended Adolescent Service.

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	YES
------------	-----

Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	YES
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	YES
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	YES
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	YES
Gender Reassignment	Not applicable
Sexual Orientation	Not applicable
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Not applicable
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	Yes
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	Not applicable
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	Yes
Carers	Yes
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Yes
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	YES
Socio-economic Disadvantage	YES
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	YES
Human Rights	Not applicable
Another relevant group:	YES
Those experiencing substance misuse	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Not applicable

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

This will be monitored through the Senior Leadership Team performance meeting as well as the Partners in Change Management meeting

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR

	State Yes or No	If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	yes	All the people this will impact will be under 18 and will be among the most vulnerable children in society, experiencing trauma and vulnerability
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	yes	Many children and young people in our services are disabled, neurodivergent and / or experiencing mental health issues.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	yes	Black and Global Majority Children are over-represented in our services and this is especially the case for children of mixed heritage or from Gypsy, Roma, Traveller backgrounds.
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	no	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	A number of children in our services identify as non-binary or trans. These young people will often also have additional complex needs and vulnerability
Gender Reassignment	N/a	N/a
Sexual Orientation	N/a	N/a
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/a	N/a
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	yes	Social care services support families during pregnancy and early infancy
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	N/a	N/a
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Social care services support separated children arriving in the UK and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing social care are more likely to be young carers and so reduction in

		these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	yes	Social care services support children in care and care leavers and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	yes	Young people in social care services are more likely to have come from families that have experienced domestic violence and are more likely to experience this in their own relationships
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing social care services are more likely to have come from families in poverty, therefore any cuts in adolescent services will impact on those children affected by childhood poverty
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	yes	Young people accessing the social care services are often at risk of homelessness and so reduction in these services may have a disproportionate impact for these children
Human Rights	n/a	n/a
Another relevant group: Substance misuse	Yes	Young people accessing social care services are more likely to have come from families who have experienced substance misuse and are more likely to have experienced these issues themselves

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Savings against the Partners in Change Hub and Professional Education Consultants will impact on the support for social workers to make a difference for families and this will be worsened by other proposed reductions in the Family Help and Protection establishment, such as loss of a post in the Extended Adolescent Service, leading to the risk of an increase in the number of young people experiencing significant harm and escalating through the service, worsening the impact of these budget proposals.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

SMART action 1: We are a demand led service and are therefore not able to reduce the demand as such. While we do everything possible to prevent children requiring our support, at times children will need to be safeguarded. By July 2026, we will implement the Families Transformation. Families First is a national programme led by the Department for Education (DfE). The overall aims of Families First are to refocus the children's social care system on prevention and to ensure that there is a robust multi-agency child protection system in place. As part of Families First we will create Family Help pods that focus on targeted early help and social work support, as well as creating a Multi-Agency Child Protection Team, which will have oversight of child protection decisions. One of the expected outcomes of Families First is that it will lead to a reduction in demand for high level services and this would include a reduction in need from the Partners in Change Hub and recruitment of newly qualified social workers.

SMART action 2: By July 2026, we will create Change Practitioner roles in the Partners in Change Hub to help reduce demand on children's social care.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	4
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
-------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

Responsible Lead Officer:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25
Accountable Manager:	Kirsty Hanna	24.10.25

Budget Proposal: EIA 4

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Reduction of Youth Arts programme
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Kirsty Hanna
Directorate and Service Name:	Families, Children and Wellbeing

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

The proposal is to reduce the Youth Arts Programme through change to staffing establishment: removal of 0.8 FTE, currently vacant. The Youth Participation Team provide a range of services for children and young people who are/have been in care or receiving social work support; this includes youth advocacy, Children in Care Council, Independent Visitor Programme. The service also provides an accredited Youth Arts Programme and wider participation activities, e.g. Youth Council, Youth Wise.

The Youth Arts Award Programme targets young people aged 11 to 19 years (SEND up to 25 years) particularly Children in Care (CiC), Care leavers (with SEND) or young people who are emotionally distressed and are disengaged from education, training or employment. The staff (1.21fte) deliver and accredit the bronze, silver & Gold awards and their aim is to improve mental health and to re-engage the young people into education, training and increase employment opportunities

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

This would result in a loss of opportunity for the most vulnerable children living in the city, including CiC, who are disengaged from education, to achieve a nationally accredited award and reintegrate them back into education, training or employment.

15 young people have been supported since April 2025.

In addition to CiC, the information provided highlights that young people aged 11 to 19 years (SEND up to 25 years), particularly LGBTQ+ young people, those living in poverty, young people with poor mental health, young women and young people with SEND will be disproportionately impacted.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

There has been no consultation but there is an ongoing youth review taking place between September and December 2025

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

N/A

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	Yes
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	Yes
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	No
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	No
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	Yes
Gender Reassignment	Yes
Sexual Orientation	Yes
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	No
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	No
Carers	No
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Yes
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	No
Socio-economic Disadvantage	Yes
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	No

Human Rights	No
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	Yes Children not engaged with education

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Data for children in care and children open to Family Help will be considered at performance boards

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Via monitoring if the virtual school team are reaching this targeted group and if they are able to offer alternative programmes, numbers, demographics and accreditations gained will be evaluated within this service.

Through the SEND and Alternative Provision change programme.

The Youth Participation team will monitor requests/referrals for support within the groups of young people adversely affected, the numbers of request that can be referred on to other services and report any gaps in support for those young people.

Possible increase in complaints if the service is no longer available/ further limiting options for those very vulnerable groups of young people, as listed previously.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal 'staff as residents' consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	Yes	This project targets young people aged 11 to 19 years (SEND up to 25 years). There would be reduction in the number of young people being supported to achieve a nationally accredited award and reintegrate them back into education, training or employment

Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	The award is carefully tailored and delivered to meet each individual young person's needs, resulting in a high level of success in engaging and sustaining participation from disabled young people and particularly autistic young people.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	Yes	Black and Global Majority Children are over-represented in our services and this is especially the case for children of mixed heritage or from Gypsy, Roma, Traveller backgrounds.
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Sex	Yes	The Arts Award predominantly supports young women who could be disproportionately impacted with the reduction
Gender Reassignment	Yes	A number of trans and non-binary young people use the service
Sexual Orientation	Yes	A number of children in care identify as LGBTQ and these young people will often also have additional needs and vulnerability
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	No	
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	Yes	Young people accessing social care are more likely to be young carers

Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	Yes	The programme supports young people from these groups who could be impacted by the reduction
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	Yes	Young people in social care services are more likely to have come from families that have experienced domestic violence
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	Yes	Young people accessing social care services are more likely to have come from families in poverty
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	Yes	<p>This programme targets young people presenting with emotional distress (poor mental health), CiC, Care Leavers (with SEND) and other vulnerable young people that are disengaged from education, training or employment. This would reduce the number being supported to achieve a nationally accredited award and reintegrate them back into education, training or employment</p> <p>The award is carefully tailored and delivered to meet each individual young person's needs, resulting in a high level of success in engaging and sustaining participation from young people with severe mental health issues including young people who find engaging with other services difficult.</p>

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers

- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Yes, youth participation reduction of 0.5 FTE

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

- | |
|---|
| 2. SMART action 1: Consider the use of SEND and AP programme to deliver service for children not engaged in education |
| 3. SMART action 2: Implementation of new young futures hubs to meet the needs of the young people. The programme will provide a one stop shop for support services with a focus on young people's health and wellbeing, those at risk of crime and education and employment from 1 st April 2026 and complement the reduced offer. |

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	1
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Joanne Templeman	18 November 2025
Accountable Manager:	Kirsty Hanna	18 November 2025

Budget Proposal: EIA 5

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Violence Against Women and Girls Budget
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Anne Clark, Strategic Lead Commissioner VAWG
Directorate and Service Name:	Families, Children & Wellbeing

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

£75,000 saving by reducing funding for Pan Sussex posts associated with the Pan Sussex Domestic Abuse Board and funding the Transformation Manager post at Stonewater Refuge. The project work of this post has now reached completion.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

This reduction in budget will impact on the partnership contributions to the Board and may mean that East and West Sussex County Councils will have to increase their contributions. The Council has been contributing to the Pan Sussex Domestic Abuse Board Manager and Community Engagement Officer role. Both roles are line managed via West Sussex Council and focus primarily on East and West Sussex engagement. Officers from Brighton and Hove will continue to be a member of the Board. There is no significant impact on the wider groups in the community. The work of the Transformation Manager has completed so there is no impact from this saving.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will be done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

No consultation is planned, however, we will consult with Pan Sussex Partners to advise of this development.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

None

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	No
------------	----

Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	No
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	No
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	No
Sex	Yes, all postholders are females who are affected
Gender Reassignment	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	No
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	Not applicable
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	No
Carers	No
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	No
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	YES
Socio-economic Disadvantage	No
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	No
Human Rights	Not applicable
Another relevant group: Those experiencing substance misuse	No

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

There is not a process that will capture data on how a decision not to fund these posts will impact those with protected characteristics.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

This will be monitored through ongoing partnership engagement with the Pan Sussex Board.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
- [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
- Service specific data
- Community consultations
- Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
- Lived experiences and qualitative data
- [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
- [Health Inequalities data](#)
- Good practice research
- National data and reports relevant to the service
- Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
- Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact?	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith
	State Yes or No	OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.

Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	No	These roles do not provide support to those affected by VAWG
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	No	These roles do not provide support to those affected by disability
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	no	As above
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	Although the majority of people affected by VAWG are female, these posts do not work directly with those affected by VAWG to provide support.
Gender Reassignment	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Sexual Orientation	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	These roles do not provide support to people

Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	yes	These roles work to support the implementation of the Pan Sussex Domestic Abuse Strategy and administrate the Pan Sussex Domestic Abuse Board. There is minimal interface with those affected currently by Domestic Abuse. However, withdrawing financial support for these functions may mean that there is a minimal impact on those affected by DA in the City.
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	These roles do not provide support to people
Human Rights	n/a	n/a
Another relevant group: Substance misuse	No	These roles do not provide support to people

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)

- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

No

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

1. SMART action 1: Brighton and Hove City Council's VAWG Unit will continue to support the Pan Sussex Board and attend its meetings and subgroups.
2. SMART ACTION 2: The workload of VAWG Unit staff will continue to be monitored and we will continue to work to ensure those affected by Domestic and sexual violence are not disadvantaged by these budget saving proposals.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score: 1

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Anne Clark	30.10. 2025
Accountable Manager:	Anne Clark	30.10. 2025

Budget Proposal: EIA 6

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Community Care Budget
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Steve Hook, Director of Adult Social Care
Directorate and Service Name:	Health and Adult Social Care, Operations

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

The overall net budget for this service area is £77.2m and the proposed saving for 2026/27 is **£2.296m**.

This is proposed to be done by continuing with the agreed direction of travel for Adult Social Care focusing upon reducing demand through several approaches:

- reduction of long-term care placements in nursing and residential care, particular focus on working age service users
- ensure reviews demonstrate support services are adequate to meet needs and represent efficiency and value for money
- increase the reablement offer to those who require it
- managing provider fee uplifts considering the current market fee position
- focus on preventative interventions and promoting independence in line with the target operating model, including advice, and signposting and increasing the use of technology enabled care

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

Older people, disabled people and carers are groups who are affected when changes are made in Adult Social Care, considering intersectional impacts. However, due to the nature of these changes being focused on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care, promoting independence in the community and ensuring value for money, there are no identified negative disproportionate impacts for these groups.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Continued engagement with partners, people with learning disabilities and their families through the Learning Disability Partnership Board.

We regularly engage with care and support providers and will continue our ongoing engagement. We will continue to negotiate with providers throughout the year on fee uplift requests so that services can continue to meet the care and support needs of the individuals within their care.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

None

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	YES
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	YES
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	YES
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	YES
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	YES
Gender Reassignment	NO
Sexual Orientation	YES
Marriage and Civil Partnership	NO
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	Not applicable
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	NO
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	NO
Carers	YES
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Not applicable
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	NO
Socio-economic Disadvantage	NO
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	YES
Human Rights	NO

Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	NO
--	----

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Equalities data is gathered in line with statutory guidelines as indicated by DHSC and NHSE. Assessments and reviews of individuals gather further information to fully understand the strengths and needs of each person requiring care and support. Although this is not monitored currently for trends and analysis, each individual’s needs are considered throughout their care and support planning. Where we do not have data available, we will seek to improve this and continue to engage with people in the community to understand the impacts further.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

The Director for Adult Social Care (DASS) retains the responsibility for professional leadership and operational delivery for meeting statutory need and will ensure governance arrangements support social work professional practice to ensure that statutory duties and responsibilities are appropriately met and best practice is followed.

Delivery of these savings will be monitored corporately by savings delivery board, alongside other strategic programmes

We will continue to review the impacts of this proposal through annual service user surveys and bi-annual carer surveys, as well as monitoring compliments and complaints. We will also gather stakeholder feedback through existing partnership boards and forums. Any impacts to individuals are assessed through reviews and care and support planning.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**

- [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
- Service specific data
- Community consultations
- Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
- Lived experiences and qualitative data
- [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
- [Health Inequalities data](#)
- Good practice research
- National data and reports relevant to the service
- Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
- Feedback from internal 'staff as residents' consultations
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	No	Focus on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care and promoting independence in the community.
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	No	Focus on prevention of admission into long term residential and nursing care and promoting independence in the community.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	

Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	No	
Gender Reassignment	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	No	
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	No	
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/blind, ethnicity, expatriate	No	

background, and various intersections		
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

There is a significant reorganisation of Integrated Care Boards as part of a national programme. Locally that will involve Sussex ICB merging with Surrey Heartlands ICB. This will be closely monitored through Integrated Health Governance in partnership with Brighton & Hove City Council.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

1. No mitigation actions are available due to: no disproportionate impacts identified

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	1
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Steve Hook, Director Adult Social Care	06-11-2025
Accountable Manager:	Genette Laws, Corporate Director Homes & Adult Social Care	06-11-2025

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Housing Demand Management
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Harry Williams, Director of Housing People Services
Directorate and Service Name:	Homes & Adult Social Care – Housing People Services

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

4 key workstreams which will deliver savings in Homelessness, Rough Sleeping and Temporary Accommodation and the proposed saving totals £5.143m:

- Increasing supply: of more affordable Temporary Accommodation (delivery of the Dynamic Purchasing System, exempt accommodation, EPC Grant Scheme & Council owned TA
- Reducing unit cost: of existing Temporary Accommodation: delivery of Greenwich Model & TA Charging Policy
- Improving effectiveness in prevention homelessness: Reduce households placed in Temporary Accommodation with new Housing Advice Team
- Accelerating move on from Temporary Accommodation: direct offers of social housing to households in Interim Accommodation

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

All households accessing help with housing and homelessness from the council could access and therefore be impacted by this policy. However, the data shows that there are a number of groups most likely to experience homelessness and would more likely take up this offer and be impacted by the policy. These groups are:

- People aged between 25 and 44
- Disabled people
- Single parent households
- Black, Caribbean, African residents and residents of 'other ethnic groups'
- Women
- Other groups including survivors of Domestic Violence and Abuse; care leavers and people with substance misuse issues.

The initiative works on a consent basis and households have the choice to refuse or not proceed the offer.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Consultation has been completed recently on Homelessness & Rough Sleeping Strategy

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

None

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	Yes
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	Yes
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	Yes
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	Yes
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	Yes
Gender Reassignment	Yes
Sexual Orientation	Yes
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Yes
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	Yes
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	Yes
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	Yes
Carers	Yes
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	Yes
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	Yes
Socio-economic Disadvantage	Yes
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	Yes
Human Rights	Not applicable

Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	Yes
--	-----

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Not applicable

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Director for Housing People services will have responsibility for delivery of this programme and will monitor progress through Housing People Services Performance Management Framework (currently in development) and Service Plans. We will continue to monitor customer contact including complaints and Councillor Enquiries.

Delivery of these savings will be monitored corporately by savings delivery board, alongside other strategic programmes

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)

- [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
- Service specific data
- Community consultations
- Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
- Lived experiences and qualitative data
- [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
- [Health Inequalities data](#)
- Good practice research
- National data and reports relevant to the service
- Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
- Feedback from internal 'staff as residents' consultations
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	No	
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	<i>In Brighton & Hove, disabled people disproportionately experience homelessness and are therefore more likely to be impacted by this programme.</i>
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	Yes	<i>In Brighton & Hove, Black, Caribbean, African residents and residents of 'Other ethnic group' disproportionately experience homelessness and</i>

		<i>are therefore more likely to be impacted by this programme.</i>
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	<i>Women are disproportionately represented among lead homeless applicants and are therefore more likely to be impacted by this programme.</i>
Gender Reassignment	Yes	<i>The number of people indicating that their gender identity is different from their sex registered at birth in Brighton & Hove is more than three times greater than the average across of England.</i> <i>Brighton & Hove is home to health services, charities and peer support services for LGBTQ+ residents.</i>
Sexual Orientation	Yes	<i>Brighton & Hove is home to health services, charities and peer support services for LGBTQ+ residents.</i>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	Yes	<i>In Brighton & Hove, single parent households disproportionately experience homelessness and are therefore more likely to be impacted by this policy.</i>
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age,	No	

language, and various intersections		
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	Yes	<i>9% of applicants to Brighton & Hove City Council between April and December 2024 –were found to have a priority need for accommodation as a result of being homeless due to that person being a victim of domestic abuse.</i>
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	No	
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	Yes	Implications outlined above.
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

To be reviewed once all savings proposals are drafted

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

- | |
|---|
| 1. No mitigation actions are available due to: no disproportionate impacts identified beyond what we are already experiencing within services |
|---|

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	2
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Harry Williams, Director of Housing People Services – Homelessness & Housing Options	06-11-2025
Accountable Manager:	Genette Laws – Corporate Director Homes & Adult Social Care	06-11-2025

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Introduce/review car parking charges at Victoria Park and other City Parks sites
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Mike Harris, Head of Parks and Leisure
Directorate and Service Name:	City Operations, Parks & Leisure

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

Introduce/review car parking charges at Victoria Park and other City Parks sites, e.g. Lower and Upper Waterhall, Wild Park, Saunders Park, Rottingdean Recreation Ground, Happy Valley, Easthill Park, Sheepcote Valley car park and view point, Devils Dyke x 2 parking areas, Castle Hill car park.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

Where parking is a problem, access for park users can be impacted by blocking dropped kerbs and pedestrian walk ways. The enforcement of marked parking bays and double yellow lines ensures that parking is limited to spaces which enable better access for all and provision of disabled bays or wider access bays in suitable locations for park users.

At Victoria Recreation Ground the Victoria Road site is managed by One Parking Solutions (OPS), the site has restrictive parking hours (2 hours max stay) and these are reputedly limiting the use of the playground and bowling ground. The Bowls Pavillion has been allowed 8 permits for parking to be included in their lease but have failed to sign the lease in 2 years, which means we have received no income or benefit for this unusual concession.

Displacement effects may negatively affect residential areas in Portslade, Rottingdean and Woodingdean which are not already in a parking management zone.

Lack of access to smartphones can limit access due to reliance on paybyphone in paid parking in our public parks.

Low income /living in a deprived area having limited access to high quality natural environment and not being able to afford paid parking is a cumulative impact of cost of living increases.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Early engagement with disability and access forums and the Community Engagement Team to identify best community forums to speak to will help to inform the draft parking design. To make a new Traffic Regulation Order we advertise proposals for new restrictions in a public notice. You can [comment on the proposals](#) during a 21 day period. The comments are considered by the Project Team. If there are 6 or more objections which cannot be answered by response and

further explanation and withdrawn the design may be altered to mitigate and approval sought from senior officers/ members or withdrawn. If the proposals are approved, we seal the traffic regulation order and make the necessary changes with line marking and signage in the city.

The consultation is written in Plain English and notices with details to respond are advertised on location and in the newspaper.

Previously, the sustainable travel plan for Stanmer Park as a destination park worked with Brighton & Hove buses to provide subsidised bus routes to ensure access to the countryside, a premier heritage destinations and the engagement activities provided there.

Community Engagement survey data (e.g. Wild East) show which greenspaces people travel to and where from in the city.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

City Infrastructure/Parking Services

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	NO
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	NO
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	NO
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	NO
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	NO
Gender Reassignment	NO
Sexual Orientation	NO
Marriage and Civil Partnership	NO
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	NO
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	NO
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	NO
Carers	NO
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	No

Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	NO
Socio-economic Disadvantage	NO
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	NO
Human Rights	NO
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	NO

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

The data may be gathered by Parking Services who receive the TRO comment or objections but is not passed on to Cityparks. Parking design and implementation, signage, lining and provision of bays are dictated by highways regulations which are national standards.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Parking Services do their own assessment of objections and complaints to the service. For example in Stanmer Park, the reintroduction of paid parking machines in 2 locations to respond to complaints about age biased digital access.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal 'staff as residents' consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	Yes	Young people and older people are more likely to be on low incomes and therefore more likely to be adversely impacted by any parking charges. Age UK tell us that many older people face a difficult existence in retirement as a result of having a limited income combined with the extra costs of ageing. Introducing paid parking at city park locations may add to older people's financial pressures and limit / deter them from visiting. Older residents may be more likely to be digital excluded - Parking Services have plans to address this in some locations.

Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	<p>Research carried out by Scope found that the cost of living with a disability or families with disabled children is significantly higher than households with no disabled people. Transport was identified as one of the main factors for this increase in costs. Introducing parking fees may add to financial pressures on these families and limit / deter them from visiting. Link to research. Disability Price Tag Disability charity Scope UK</p> <p>Blue badges are issued to disabled people who are drivers or non-drivers allowing free parking for an unlimited amount of time in pay and display bays and parking in disabled bays.</p>
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Sex	No	<p>The intersection of sex and disability and caring is a consideration. 90% of lone parent households with dependents in the city are headed up by women. The percentage of women providing unpaid care is 58% in comparison to men (42%).</p> <p>Introducing parking fees may add to financial pressures and limit / deter them from visiting.</p>
Gender Reassignment	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	No	
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for	No	

age, language, and various intersections		
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	Yes	Research carried out by Carers UK found that many unpaid carers experience financial hardship because of their caring role. Introduction of parking charges at city park locations may limit / deter them from visiting.
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	No	
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/ blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	No	
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas)		

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas

- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Any other proposals related to introduction or increase of parking charges may worsen the impacts of this proposal.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

SMART action 1: Engagement with park user group and community forums prior to TRO advertisement.
SMART action 2: Early engagement with identified relevant groups prior to TRO advertisement.
SMART action 3: A sustainable travel plan ensuring needs of relevant groups are addressed.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	1
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

N/A

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Mike Harris, Head of Parks and Leisure	20 November 2025
Accountable Manager:	Mike Harris, Head of Parks and Leisure	20 November 2025

Budget Proposal: EIA 9

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Income from trade and garden waste
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Louise Lawrence, Head of Strategy & Service Improvement
Directorate and Service Name:	City Operations, Environmental Services

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

The council currently provides a chargeable fortnightly garden waste collection to residents who sign up to the service, and a chargeable waste collection service to businesses across the city with a trade waste agreement. The proposal is to increase the cost and market both services more widely to generate a surplus to reinvest in services.

There is also a proposal to introduce a fee for collection of waste from third sector organisations.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

It is difficult to determine the level of impact as the service is demand led, and customer equality data is not collected. There are other companies that provide garden and trade waste collections in the city. Residents can also dispose of their garden waste for free at one of the Household Waste & Recycling Sites (HWRS).

Current policy in place provides free waste collection from third sector organisations. Introduction of a fee for this service may significantly impact organisations that don't generate profit, compared with sites that are hired out for commercial activity and organisations with single outlets compared with multiple outlets.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will be done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Consultation will be undertaken through the Council's budget setting consultation process which sets out the proposed savings and revenue raising choices that the council will need to make in order to set a balanced budget for 2026/27.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

None

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	No
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	No
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	No
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	No
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	No
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	No
Carers	No
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	No
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	No
Socio-economic Disadvantage	No
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	No
Human Rights	No
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness

- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Through the digital improvements being made to the garden waste service, opportunities for collecting this data can be explored.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Budgets will be monitored.

Equality data will be collected through customer feedback / Stage 1 complaints.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations

- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	No	Younger and older people may have limited income and so be disadvantaged in terms of the charges for waste.
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	Disabled people may have lower incomes than other working age adults and so be disadvantaged in terms of the charges for waste. Disabled people are more likely to be unemployed or in low-waged work than non-disabled people.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	No	
Gender Reassignment	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and	No	

non-binary gender spectrum)		
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	No	
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	Yes	<p>People on low incomes may be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. They may not be able to afford to pay for the service.</p> <p>People without access to a car may be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. They may not be able to access the HWRS to dispose of the items for free.</p>
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

--

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

1. SMART action 1: Continue to promote other means of disposing of garden waste, such as taking to the HWRS, home composting or using another service.
2. SMART action 2: Analyse Stage 1 complaints and feedback to identify trends related to accessibility or affordability.
3. SMART action 3: Review existing approach for waste collection from third sector organisations and ensure any fees introduced are applied fairly

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	3
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Louise Lawrence, Head of Strategy and Service Improvement	24/11/25
Accountable Manager:	Rachael Joy, Director of Environmental Services	24/11/25

Budget Proposal: EIA 10

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Introduce new charged-for services including bin replacements, wheelie bin cleaning service and Christmas tree collection.
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Louise Lawrence, Head of Strategy and Service Improvement
Directorate and Service Name:	City Operations, Environmental Services

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

- Introduce a fee for customers requesting bin replacements, for which the council currently does not currently charge.
- Introduce a new bin cleaning service available to both residents and businesses throughout the city.
- Introduce a new charged for Christmas tree collection service for residents.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

Low-income households may be disproportionately negatively impacted by bin replacement charges.

It is difficult to determine the level of impact for bin cleaning and Christmas tree collection as these services will be demand led. There are other companies providing bin cleaning and Christmas tree collections in the city. Residents can also dispose of their Christmas trees for free at one of the Christmas tree recycling points in the city.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Consultation will be undertaken through the Council's budget setting consultation process which sets out the proposed savings and revenue raising choices that the council will need to make in order to set a balanced budget for 2026/27.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

Income from trade waste and garden waste

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	No
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	No
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	No
Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	No
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	No
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	No
Carers	No
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	No
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	No
Socio-economic Disadvantage	No
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	No
Human Rights	No
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness

- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Through the digital improvements being made to existing charged for services, such as garden waste, opportunities for collecting this data can be explored.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Budgets will be monitored for uptake of the services.

Equality data will be collected through customer feedback / Stage 1 complaints.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations

- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
- Insights, gaps, and data analyses on 'who' the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	Yes	Older people on fixed incomes may find new charges for bin replacement financially challenging; some may struggle with online payment. Students/young adults in HMOs and private rentals may experience more frequent bin churn (lost/contaminated bins), amplifying exposure to charges.
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	Disabled people are more likely to be unemployed or in low-waged work than non-disabled people, therefore may be disadvantaged by introduction of bin replacement charges. Disabled people may experience accessibility barriers in requesting/replacing containers.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	No	
Gender Reassignment	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	

Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	No	Households with primary carers (disproportionately women) could experience additional burden organising replacements and payments.
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	No	
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	Yes	People on low incomes may be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. They may not be able to afford to pay for the services.
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	No	
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No	

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Existing charges for garden and trade waste services.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

SMART action 1: Undertake a full Equalities Impact Assessment as part of drafting new policy on bin replacement charges considering accessibility needs and possible exemption criteria.
--

SMART action 2: Continue to promote other means of disposing of Christmas trees, such as taking to a recycling point in the city.

SMART action 3: Analyse Stage 1 complaints and feedback to identify trends related to accessibility or affordability.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score: 1

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Louise Lawarence, Head of Strategy and Service Improvement	21/11/25
Accountable Manager:	Rachael Joy, Director of Environmental Services	24/11/25

Budget Proposal: EIA 11

Title of budget saving being assessed:	Introduction of charging for high footfall public toilets
Name and title of officer responsible for this EIA:	Louise Lawrence Head of Strategy and Service Improvement
Directorate and Service Name:	City Operations, Environmental Services

Briefly describe the budget saving proposal:

Introduce a charge at public toilets with high footfall.

Summarise the most significant impacts identified by this assessment including which groups will be disproportionately negatively affected drawing out intersectional impacts as applicable:

The proposal will affect the community as a whole, as well as visitors to Brighton and Hove (all potential public toilet users). It may have a disproportionate impact on disabled people, children, older people, homeless people and general accessibility.

Consultation, engagement and supporting EIAs

What consultations or engagement activities are being used to inform this assessment?

If consultation is planned or in process – state this and state when it will be done/completed even if indicative. If no consultation completed or planned, state this, giving an explanation.

Consultation will be undertaken through the Council's budget setting consultation process which sets out the proposed savings and revenue raising choices that the council will need to make in order to set a balanced budget for 2026/27.

What other budget or service EIAs can assist/have been used to inform this assessment?

Public toilets refurbishment programme

Current data and impact monitoring

Do you currently collect and analyse the following data to enable monitoring of the impact of this proposal?

Consider all possible intersections (Delete and State Yes, No, Not Applicable)

Age	No
Disability and inclusive adjustments, coverage under equality act and not	No
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage (including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers)	No

Religion, Belief, Spirituality, Faith, or Atheism	No
Gender Identity and Sex (including non-binary and Intersex people)	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnant people, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across the gender spectrum)	No
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees	No
Carers	No
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people	No
Domestic and/or Sexual Abuse and Violence Survivors, and people in vulnerable situations (All aspects and intersections)	No
Socio-economic Disadvantage	No
Homelessness and associated risk and vulnerability	No
Human Rights	No
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	No

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- People being housebound due to disabilities or disabling circumstances
- Environmental barriers or mobility barriers impacting those with sight loss, D/deafness, sensory requirements, neurodivergence, various complex disabilities
- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery

- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

If you answered “NO” to any of the above, how will you gather this data to enable improved monitoring of impact for this proposal?

Public toilets are available to all residents and visitors to the city. It is not possible to monitor the characteristics of people using the sites, however installation of paddle gates will enable footfall numbers to be monitored accurately.

What are the arrangements for monitoring, and reviewing the impact of this proposal?

Customer complaints will continue to be monitored and reviewed.

Feedback from organisations advocating or supporting people with protected characteristics will be reviewed to ensure any disproportionate impacts of charging are identified.

Impacts

Briefly state source of data or data analysis being used to describe the disproportionate negative impacts. Preferably provide link to data/ analysis if open data source.

Data and analysis sources may include (not an exhaustive list):

- **Consider a wide range (including but not limited to):**
 - [Population and population groups](#)
 - [Census 2021 population groups Infogram: Brighton & Hove by Brighton and Hove City Council](#)
 - [Census](#) and [local intelligence data](#)
 - Service specific data
 - Community consultations
 - Insights from customer feedback including complaints and survey results
 - Lived experiences and qualitative data
 - [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\) data](#)
 - [Health Inequalities data](#)
 - Good practice research
 - National data and reports relevant to the service
 - Workforce, leaver, and recruitment data, surveys, insights
 - Feedback from internal ‘staff as residents’ consultations
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on intersectionality, accessibility, sustainability requirements, and impacts.
 - Insights, gaps, and data analyses on ‘who’ the most intersectionally marginalised and excluded under-represented people and communities are in the context of this EIA.

Assess impact for different population groups	Is there a possible disproportionate negative impact? State Yes or No	Describe the potential negative impact, considering for differences within groups For example, different ethnic groups, and peoples intersecting identities e.g. disabled women of faith OR If no impact is identified, briefly state why.
Age including those under 16, young adults, multiple ethnicities, those with various intersections.	Yes	Children, young families and older people are more likely to need to use the toilet more frequently and this will have a disproportionate financial impact on them. They may be less likely to find alternative suitable facilities nearby. Controlling access to the toilets physically may impact disproportionately on parents/carers with buggies trying to access the facilities.
Disability includes physical and sensory disabled, D/deaf, deafened, hard of hearing, blind, neurodiverse people, people with non-visible disabilities.	Yes	Disabled people with limited mobility will potentially be unable to access other toilets further away. They may need to use the toilet more often and this will have a disproportionate financial impact on them. They may be less likely to find alternative accessible facilities nearby.
Ethnicity, 'Race', ethnic heritage including Gypsy, Roma, Travellers	No	
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Atheism, and philosophical belief	No	
Gender and Sex including non-binary and intersex people	Yes	Women and girls may need toilets more often due to menstruation or menopause. Charging could exacerbate gender-based inequalities in access.
Gender Reassignment	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No	
Pregnancy, Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Menopause, (In)fertility (across intersections and non-binary gender spectrum)	Yes	Pregnant people are more likely need to use the toilet more often and this will have a disproportionate financial impact on them. Menopausal people may need access to toilet facilities more frequently that other members of the public due to common perimenopausal

		symptoms such as irregular periods, recurrent UTIs, hot flushes.
Armed Forces Personnel, their families, and Veterans	No	
Expatriates, Migrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Carers considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	
Looked after children, Care Leavers, Care and fostering experienced people considering for age, language, and various intersections	No	Lone parents and people caring for individuals with health conditions requiring frequent toilet use, may be disproportionately affected.
Domestic and/or sexual abuse and violence survivors	No	
Socio-economic disadvantage considering for age, disability, D/deaf/blind, ethnicity, expatriate background, and various intersections	Yes	Charging at public toilets sites will have a disproportionate impact on people who have lower incomes.
Homeless and rough sleepers considering for age, veteran, ethnicity, language, and various intersections	Yes	Homeless people and rough sleepers are less likely to have access to a consistent source of income, thereby unable to pay for access to public toilets. They may feel a greater stigma when using other facilities and may not feel welcome.
Human Rights	No	
Another relevant group (please specify here and add additional rows as needed)	Yes	Lone parents, carers, and individuals with health conditions requiring frequent toilet use may be disproportionately affected. Intersectional impacts are also noted for people with substance use disorders, survivors of abuse, and sex workers.

Additional relevant groups that may be widely disadvantaged and have intersecting experiences that create exclusion and systemic barriers may include:

- Ex-offenders and people with unrelated convictions
- Lone parents
- People experiencing homelessness
- People facing literacy and numeracy barriers
- People on a low income and people living in the most deprived areas
- People who have experienced female genital mutilation (FGM)
- People who have experienced human trafficking or modern slavery
- People with experience of or living with addiction and/ or a substance use disorder (SUD)
- Sex workers

Cumulative impacts

Are there other budget proposals from other service areas that might worsen or mitigate the impacts from your proposal? Please give a brief description including name of other service(s).

Potentially other budget proposals that affect disabled people, older people, people with childcare responsibilities, people on low incomes.

Action planning

What SMART actions will be taken to mitigate the disproportionate impacts identified in section 3? If no mitigating action is possible, please state and explain why. Add additional rows as required.

SMART action 1: Continue to monitor complaints to see if people with protected characteristics are disproportionately affected by the changes
SMART action 2: Ensure communications about the charges at public toilet sites are inclusive
SMART action 3: Publicise other toilets available, such as libraries, museums, shopping centres etc. Encourage businesses to sign up to a Community Toilet Scheme / Use Our Loo Scheme, to allow the public to use their toilets
SMART action 4: Ensure paddle gates installed do not limit how accessible the public toilets are.
SMART action 5: Ensure paddle gates' specification allows for parents/carers with buggies to access the toilets.

Outcome of your assessment

Based on the information above give the proposal an impact score between 1 – 5.

1= proposal has minimal impact and/or mitigating actions will significantly minimise the impact

3= proposal will have a significant negative impact; however, mitigation actions will reduce the impact considerably.

5= proposal has significant impact and mitigating actions will have limited effect on reducing impact.

Proposal's impact score:	4
--------------------------	---

Publication

All Equality Impact Assessments will be published. If you are recommending, and choosing not to publish your EIA, please provide a reason:

n/a

Directorate and Service Approval

Signatory:	Name and Job Title:	Date: DD-MMM-YY
Responsible Lead Officer:	Louise Lawrence, Head of Strategy and Service Improvement	21/11/25
Accountable Manager:	Rachael Joy, Director of Environmental Services	24/11/25

Equality Act 2010: section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to —
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- (2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).
- (3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to —
- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
 - (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- (4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
- (5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (a) tackle prejudice, and
 - (b) promote understanding.
- (6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.
- (7) The relevant protected characteristics are—
- age;
 - disability;
 - gender reassignment;
 - pregnancy and maternity;

- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—

(a) a breach of an equality clause or rule;

(b) a breach of a non-discrimination rule.

(9) Schedule 18 (exceptions) has effect.

