

# **Appendix G: Budget 2022/23 Cumulative Equalities Impact Assessment**

## **1. Purpose of Report**

This report assesses the equalities impacts of the savings proposals set out in the Council's Budget for 2022/23.

It provides an assessment of the likely impacts of the budget savings on residents and employees with 'protected characteristics' as defined by the Equality Act 2010. It also considers the impacts on those who could be considered at a disadvantage in accessing opportunities or services (such as people with language difficulties or from low-income households), which is also a consideration in Islington's Equalities Impact Assessment process.

The report assesses the overall impacts of the suite of savings proposals (cumulative impact) set out in the 2022/23 budget on residents and staff. It also provides a more detailed review – by specific groups and by directorate – of the cumulative impacts of existing savings set out last year, and in this new budget, on specific groups, and the actions to reduce or mitigate these impacts.

## **2. Context**

### Our commitment to fairness and equality

The Council's vision is to create a more equal Islington – to create a place where everyone, whatever their background, has the opportunity to reach their potential and enjoy a good quality of life.

Challenging inequality, racism and injustice is mission critical for Islington. We cannot realise our vision of creating an equal borough for all our residents without tackling the inequality that continues to hold back some communities. Our new 'Challenging Inequality Programme' sets out our long-term ambition for challenging inequality, inequity, racism and promoting inclusion. We are determined to improve life chances for our residents and staff; ensuring no one is disadvantaged.

We want to challenge inequality in every capacity available to us, taking advantage of our position as an employer, strategic leader and as a service provider/ commissioner.

### Our Equality Impact Assessment Process

Equality impact assessments (EQIAs) are an important part of ensuring our services are responsive to the needs of our diverse communities and help tackle inequality, creating a fairer borough for all.

In Autumn 2021, the equalities team introduced a new EQIA process to improve efficiency and quality assurance. Each of the savings proposals set out in this budget has been

considered through an equalities lens, with initial screening of all completed via our new EQIA Screening Tool. Where the screening tool identified significant potential (or perceived) negative or positive impacts, a full Equalities Impact Assessment was completed in order to mitigate any risks or spread potential benefits. The Equalities Team was closely involved in all aspects of this process, working with services to identify potential or perceived impacts.

These individual assessments have been used to inform this overall assessment of the impacts of our budget savings proposals on residents and staff and, in particular, on any specific group.

### Our priorities

Over the next decade, we will maintain a relentless focus on tackling inequality and eradicating poverty in our borough. To bring this vision to life, we have developed five clear priorities:

**Nurturing Our Children and Young People:** ensuring that every young person in Islington has access to the opportunities they need to thrive in life, including an excellent education.

**Place to Call Home:** using our power and influence to stand up for private renters and all others in our communities to ensure equity in access to decent, safe and affordable homes.

**Standing with Our Communities:** fostering a place made up of strong communities, where – regardless of background – people feel safe, connected and have the resources they need to make change in their local areas.

**Investing in Local:** addressing precarious employment and ensuring equal access to well-paid jobs with prospects. This has been exacerbated by the pandemic, with the night-time economy and sectors such as leisure and hospitality hit hardest in the borough, which means creating local opportunities is more important than ever.

**Cleaner, Greener, Healthier:** seizing opportunities to create a sustainable future where people can live independent and healthy lives, while enjoying clean air and people-friendly streets.

### Our legal duties

Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council has a legal duty to have “due regard” to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity and
- foster good relations between different groups.

The precise wording of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), together with a list of the ‘protected characteristics’ defined in the Act, is set out at Annex A.

We are required to demonstrate fulfilment of our duty to pay ‘due regard’ in the decision-making process and, as such, we need to understand the effect our policies and practices

have on equality. Although the Council is not legally obligated to reject savings or growth proposals that could have negative impacts on any particular groups, it must carefully and with rigour consider the impact of its proposals on the PSED, take a reasonable and proportionate view about the overall impact on particular groups, and seek to mitigate negative impacts where possible.

In addition, at Islington we go beyond our legal duties to consider impacts on those who could be at a disadvantage in accessing opportunities or services. This includes people from low-income households, carers, migrants, refugees and people with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF), and those with low literacy levels.

### Our diverse population

Islington is an Inner London borough with a diverse population. Data from our 2021 [State of Equalities](#) report paints a profile of Islington as a place alongside our diverse communities:

- **Population:** The population of Islington is estimated to be 244, 372 in 2021. This is an increase of approximately 18% (37, 733 people) since 2011. It is estimated that our population will grow by a further 3% (6,500 people) over the next 10 years. Islington is the most densely populated local authority area in England and Wales, with 16,321 people per square km. This is almost triple the London average and more than 37 times the national average.
- **Age:** Islington has a relatively young population with 38,000 people aged under 18. Of the 176,600 people aged 25-34, 62,900 are aged 25-34. 9% of the population is aged over 65, compared with an average of 12% in London and 19% in England.
- **Ethnicity:** Islington is a diverse borough, with Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic groups accounting for 32% of our population. Children growing up in Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic households in Islington are more likely to be living in poverty in comparison to white children. From February 2020 - December 2020, the rate of stop and searches of people of Black ethnicity in Islington was four times higher than the rate of stop and searches of people of White ethnicity and more than double people of Asian ethnicity.
- **Sex:** The proportion of men and women in the borough is roughly 50/50. However, there are variations in life expectancy between men and women. Life expectancy at birth for men in Islington is 79.7 years, whilst women in Islington have a longer life expectancy of 83.4 years

93% of lone parents with dependent children are female. This is significant because unemployment rates among lone parents are far higher than the wider population - this is likely to affect household income and therefore deprivation levels. In Islington 56% of lone parents are not in employment while just 21% are in full-time employment – half the figure for the wider population.

- **Disability:** In May 2020, there were 5,332 Disability Living Allowance claimants in Islington. The estimated number of Islington residents with a disability in 2020 is 36,656, or 15% of the population. There are 3,886 people in Islington living with a serious mental illness, the highest prevalence of serious mental illness in London.

National research has demonstrated that disabled jobseekers need to apply for 60% more jobs than their non-disabled counterparts. Nationally, across all ages and both sexes, the prevalence of disability is higher among those living in the most deprived areas of the country compared to the least deprived areas of the country.

- **Socio-economic:** Islington is the most deprived borough in London for income deprivation affecting children, and fourth highest for income deprivation affecting older people. Poverty is an issue in every part of the borough: almost every ward includes one of the most deprived LSOAs in Islington. Finsbury Park is the most deprived ward. As mentioned above, children in Black and Minority Ethnic households or in lone parent households, and households with a disabled person, are more likely to be living in poverty.
- **Housing:** Islington has a relatively high proportion of social housing. Those in social housing are more likely to be on low income, though increasingly we are seeing households in the private rented sector struggling. Both social and private sector tenants who have moved to Universal Credit have seen increased levels of debt, which may put their tenancies at risk.

### The impact of COVID-19

We know that COVID-19 has had a disproportionate impact on many disadvantaged groups. COVID-19 has affected residents in many ways including affecting mental health, employment, health and education. Our research supports findings nationally that certain groups are more likely to have been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 – this includes Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic communities, the elderly, young people (particularly those living in large households), and people with mental health conditions. Over the course of the pandemic, there has been a significant increase in mental health diagnoses, with a predicted further 20% rise in moderate-severe anxiety and depression in adults. The number of primary school children in LBI in receipt of free school meals rose by 6% and the number of households claiming Universal Credit has nearly doubled for people from White Other, Other or Asian ethnic groups. There has also been a 55% increase in domestic abuse cases, which has predominately affected women.

However, since the last consolidated EQIA there has also been a significant rollout of the vaccine. Up to 1 December 2021, 159,850 of Islington residents have had at least their first vaccine. 81% of the population aged 50 and over have had at least one vaccination. We have also been supporting residents to access employment support and provide support on applying for appropriate benefits. In November 2021, we also launched Let's Talk Islington to fully comprehend the scale of inequality in Islington and collaborate with residents to co-design a new era of public service delivery.

COVID-19 has also highlighted issues around digital inclusion (exclusion). Over the years an increasing number of services have moved online but COVID-19 has turbo-charged this trend, necessitating the move to more virtual methods of service delivery in order to continue to support residents. This presents a risk for some residents who may not be able to access services online and therefore risk becoming socially isolated. The reasons for this may include a lack of digital skills / confidence to use digital channels, communication challenges e.g. language and literacy barriers, physical or learning disability and affordability issues (digital poverty). Services are encouraged to be mindful of this.

The proposals in this report do not directly impact or amplify the issues identified around digital exclusion. Where consultation is required on proposals, service leads will ensure that a variety of methods engage residents to ensure we reach those that would otherwise be excluded.

In addition, we have been mindful of pandemic's significant negative economic impact, particularly in its impact on the poorest in our society. The cost of living is also rising, with figures in November 2021 demonstrating the highest rate of inflation in 10 years. We have been mindful of this within our budget setting; services have been especially encouraged to consider the impact of (and provide mitigation for) their proposal on those who are socio-economically deprived or disadvantaged.

### **3. Equalities Impacts: overall cumulative impact**

The overall assessment is that there is **no cumulative negative impact** as a result of the budget savings proposals for 2022/23.

The budget sets out 19 new proposed savings, which will deliver savings of £3.530m in 2022/23. This is in addition to £3.246m continuation of previously agreed savings.

The majority of the proposals to close the budget gap come from council tax and tariff fee rises or changes, service restructures, maximising funding streams and making better use of technology. These will result in 'back office' changes with small impacts on staff but with little or no impact on residents. However, the vast majority of these impacts were not deemed significant enough – or had robust enough mitigation in place to mitigate fully against any negative impacts – to progress to a full EQIA.

Only two of the new savings proposals submitted for 2022/23 required a full EQIA. However, of these, only one ('re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff') had significant negative impacts disproportionately affecting groups with protected characteristics. The other ('streamlining the daytime response services') proposes a small (two FTE) number of staff redundancies but neutralises its equalities impacts and does not disproportionately impact any particular group – this is therefore only included as a summary in section 5.

#### Impacts on all residents

The key proposal disproportionately affecting certain groups is to 're-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff'. The proposal covered in this assessment is two-fold. Firstly, introduced from April, a 10% increase to current permit prices (rounded to the nearest £1) increasing permit income by £0.292m for the year introduced.

Secondly, there will be a complete review of the 14 price bands for Resident Parking Permits based upon CO2 emissions. Reducing the number of bands and grouping the current bands together will simplify the price tariff from 1st October 2022. This proposal only seeks to change resident permit bandings so would not affect wider groups such as carers, community groups, businesses etc. as these are covered under different parking schemes. The immediate impact as of April 2022 would be the increase of permit prices for all residents by 10%. The most recent permit data shows a possible impact on 35,205 permits.

The following is an example of a new tariff with 8 bands showing the estimated number of permits, current and proposed new price (note that there is an additional diesel surcharge for diesel vehicles):

Electric Vehicles (500 Permits): Current Price £25, Proposed New Price £25

CO2 Band 1-100 (2,820 Permits): Current Price £30, Proposed New Price £50

CO2 Band 101-120 (5,865 Permits): Current Price £35-40, Proposed New Price £75

CO2 Band 121-140 (5,920 Permits): Current Price £95-115, Proposed New Price £125

CO2 Band 141-165 (5,592 Permits): Current Price £125-150, Proposed New Price £175

CO2 Band 166-200 (4,148 Permits): Current Price £175-255, Proposed New Price £275

CO2 Band 201-255 (1,662 Permits): Current Price £295-415, Proposed New Price £475

CO2 Band 256+ (424 Permits): Current Price £535, Proposed New Price £575

The table below demonstrates the groups who may be disproportionately impacted, and the service's planned mitigations:

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Age (older people)	Potential impact on those reliant on cars due to old age paying increased costs for resident parking permits	Elderly residents who are supported by carers can rely on doctor's permits and carers permits for those visiting them for health reasons.  There is no additional support that the parking services provides purely for old age; should disability lead to reduced mobility, the blue badge scheme is in place which entitles

		<p>residents to free resident parking permits.</p> <p>The 60 plus oyster card is available providing free transport on all TfL based services to elderly residents. The Freedom Pass provides the same access to transport services across London based on disability, including those who have a disability or injury that prevents them from walking.</p>
Disability	Potential impact on residents with a disability that may require more extensive use of a vehicle based on their mobility	Negative impacts are reduced via the blue badge scheme & the free resident permits which allow those who have a disability to park at no increased charge
Pregnancy and maternity	Potential impact on those reliant on cars due to pregnancy or early childcare paying increased costs for resident parking permits	New parent parking vouchers are available for residents with new children to access 40 hours of free parking
Socio-economic	There is a potential socio-economic impact for residents whose older less environmentally friendly vehicles being impacted by the environmental nature of the permit banding	<p>Specific guidance and provisions around managing money and the support the council provides to people struggling this way is available and will be directed to support residents who struggle with additional costs.</p> <p>Islington offers guidance and support on financial matters for residents including the resident support scheme, direction to independent financial advice and the money advice service as well as more bespoke financial support services such as the Shine Energy Advice service.  <a href="#">Money and debt advice   Islington Council</a></p>

There will be a full consultation for the fully remodelled permits banding; prior to the uplift that is being completed as part of the fees and charges process so will be issued via notice.

The service will continue to monitor the above impacts and screen for unexpected equalities impacts.

Of the proposals that did not progress to a full EQIA, there were potential impacts with mitigating action in place, on the following groups:

- Service users
- Residents
- Staff

However, as these impacts were not significant enough to progress to a full EQIA, they are outlined in **section 5** within the summary of all proposals.

#### Overall equalities impact assessment

Looking at the totality of the savings to be delivered in 2022/23, the impacts on Islington residents and staff are assessed as follows:

- There are no significant impacts on Islington residents as a whole – and where changes have been introduced around universal services and charges, vulnerable residents are not disproportionately impacted and those facing socio-economic disadvantage are protected from financial impacts and offered extra support.
- There are no significant impacts on staff – the number of redundancies from these proposals is low, mostly impacting agency staff, and there are no obvious impacts on specific protected characteristics.

The conclusion is that the Council’s proposals for achieving savings are therefore considered reasonable and have shown due regard to the PSED.

## **4. Equalities groups impacted by savings proposals**

This section looks in more detail at the impacts of specific proposals on protected characteristics and on socio-economic disadvantage. It includes proposals from this year’s budget and from the budget last year that have a potential equalities impact.

Based on individual Equalities Impact Assessments the following protected characteristics are potentially impacted by one or more of the savings proposals for 2022/23:

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Directorate</b>
<b>Age (older people)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff</li> </ul>	Environment
<b>Disability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Floating Support Services (<i>previously agreed saving</i>)</li> <li>• Re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff</li> </ul>	Adult Social Care Environment
<b>Socio-Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff</li> </ul>	Environment



<b>Pregnancy/Maternity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff</li> </ul>	Environment
----------------------------	--	-------------

There are no disproportionate impacts on the following protected characteristics:

- Age (younger people)
- Race
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Socio-economic disadvantage
- Sex
- Sexual orientation
- Religion or belief
- Gender reassignment

## 5. Savings proposals and impacts – by directorate

This section provides a detailed assessment by Directorate of those savings proposals – both new and existing - that will potentially impact specific groups. This includes proposals that necessitated full EQIAs as well as proposals that only necessitated completion of an EQIA screening tool – i.e. the proposal did not demonstrate a significant (negative or positive) equalities impact.

If services did not need to complete a full EQIA, they are advised to continually monitor their savings’ progress against the screening tool to check for unexpected equalities impacts and update where necessary.

### a) Council wide

The proposed increase to council tax, as outlined below, does not necessitate a full EQIA as the increase in real terms was very low and there is sufficient mitigation in place in the form of support for the most vulnerable. As the increase has a council-wide impact, it is necessary to evaluate despite not being classified as a savings option.

- Council tax increase

Excluding the GLA precept, the combined 2.99% increase in the basic Islington council tax equates to an increase of around 73 pence per week for full council taxpayers. Despite the proposed increase in council tax, working aged council tax support recipients living in a Band D property will pay around 82 pence per week less in 2022/23 due to the enhancement of the council tax support scheme

The increase will have a negligible socio-economic impact on residents. However, we will continue to support and protect the most vulnerable groups: foster carers are exempt from paying council tax, older people will continue to receive £100 discount, and families struggling on low incomes can apply for a significantly reduced rate through the enhanced Council Tax Support Scheme.

The total amount of council tax that Islington residents will have to pay will also be determined by the increase in the GLA precept to be confirmed by the Mayor of London. The council's Council Tax Support Scheme also applies to the GLA precept element of council tax.

## **b) Adult Social Care**

### *New savings:*

There were two proposals submitted with potential equalities impacts; neither necessitated a full EQIA. The proposals submitted related to:

- Expanding the Shared Lives provision

An alternative to traditional types of support where a person lives, or stays, with a Shared Lives carer within their local community. Cultural competency support is available for carers, along with a matching service that can match carers based on understanding of religious, ethnic or cultural background and sexual or gender identity. No significant negative equalities impacts are expected.

- Joint Funded Packages

A proposal to agree a process for joint funding arrangements for care packages between LBI and the CCG. There will be no impact on service-users or staff and there are no expected equalities impacts.

### *Previously agreed Savings*

There were three approved saving proposals, which identified potential impacts on protected characteristics. Below is a brief update on the project's progress (and associated equalities impacts) in the last year:

- "Low Support" Housing Related Support Recommissioning

The project completed in September 2021, resulting in the decommissioning of 118 units of supported housing accommodation. No unexpected equalities impacts arose. Although the residents accessing supported housing services are usually of a lower socio-economic status, residents in receipt of these services received support to remain in place without continued receipt of support, to move into alternative supported housing accommodation that could better meet their needs, or supported to move into either private rented or social housing.

An audit of affected residents' needs, co-produced with residents, at the beginning of this project, outlined the needs and preferences of each affected resident's preferred housing option. Commissioners worked closely with support providers, landlords and colleagues in Housing Needs to ensure that residents' needs and preferences a manner that was proportionate with their needs.

The housing options of affected residents included remaining in their current accommodation, with support from a housing provider either removed altogether or supplanted by floating support, depending on individual needs and preferences. Other options included supporting residents to move into social housing, or private rented sector housing. A small number of residents were rehoused into alternative supported housing that could better meet each applicable resident's needs.

Where residents moved into independent housing, each resident was supported to access the Resident Support Scheme for financial and practical support for their move. Successful and timely decommissioning of services resulting in re-designed pathways of supported housing.

- Review and Reduce the Floating Support Service

As of 7 December 2021, the project to manage the reduction of budget for the Floating Support contract is ongoing. There are no unexpected or adverse equalities impacts to report at the time of writing. There is close partnership working between Floating Support provider, commissioners, Housing colleagues and other providers of tenancy sustainment services to mitigate impacts of budget reduction.

The service review of Floating Support recommended a re-configuration of the service, which is currently in process.

There have been successful and timely budget reductions implemented up to time of writing and relationships developed by tenancy sustainment services. The Council and Floating Support in partnership are monitoring the risks to access due to the potential creation of a waiting list for the service.

- Review charging policy with a view to maximise income

The project for charging an administration fee for full cost social care service users has not gone ahead as of December 7 2021. After completing an initial EQIA, the service was advised not to take the project forward.

## **c) Children's Social Services**

### *New savings*

This year's budget sets out four savings proposals. The EQIA screening tools made the assessment that none had a significant enough negative or positive equalities impact to necessitate completion of a full EQIA, or had robust mitigation in place to offset any impacts. The proposals included:

- Deleting 3 PTE posts in Targeted Youth Support, to replace with 1 FTE post

No impact on service delivery but low negative impact on two PTE staff with union consultation in place. The PTE staff will be replaced with 1 FTE post so service provision will run as normal.

- Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) savings

Achieved by delaying the commissioning of and seeking alternative funding for two new projects (including an LGBTQ+ independent domestic violence advocate) and the decommissioning of two existing services. The decommissioned projects had very low uptake so is expected to have minimal impact on service users. Service users will continue to receive support through the Integrated Gangs Team and the Intimate Partner Violence Service. There is a low negative impact on LGBTQ+ survivors and young people as the targets and beneficiaries of the delayed and decommissioned services; mitigation action will ensure they are support by other parts of the service that have capacity. It is not expected that service-users will be disproportionately impacted, as they will be appropriately signposted and reassigned to other services and support.

- Review of management structure in Learning and Culture

The proposal to delete the vacant Head of Service post will deliver a £0.080m saving. The risks of removing the post are mitigated because functions have continued with no service impact whilst the post has remained vacant. No equalities impacts are expected.

- Reduction of £25k Local Authority contribution to Islington Safeguarding Children's Partnership (ISCP)

No impact on service delivery or on staff, as funding reductions reflect a consistent underspend in the ISCP budget.

### *Previously agreed savings*

There were no previously agreed savings proposals with equalities impacts submitted.

## **d) Community Wealth Building**

### *New savings*

There were two savings proposals from Community Wealth Building, neither of which progressed to a full EQIA at the time of writing:

- Creation of a Corporate Landlord Service

Consolidation of a range of property and asset management activity in a unified service. Although three FTE posts will be lost through this restructure, staff are to be redeployed or absorbed into new roles. There is some impact on schools, through the planned ceasing of a free post-delivery, and consultation will take place with schools

to ensure a smooth transition. There are no expected equalities impacts, and whilst there are no planned redundancies, staff consultation will take place. This proposal did not necessitate a full EQIA.

- Procured spend savings: additional target using existing delivery approach

The Council is expected to deliver on its existing procured spend savings target and the associated opportunity pipeline supports delivery of an additional target. The existing savings delivery approach and governance will roll-on in support of this new savings target. Consistent with the existing savings target, this target will require Council-wide support from finance and commissioning managers to deliver the saving. It is important to retain the principle that the procured spend savings target has 'first call' on any reductions in third party spend. Residents, staff, visitors, businesses and service users are expected to be impacted – however, it was not possible to outline this at the time of writing because the spend target is an initiation stage. Consultation will occur initially internally on potential opportunities, and where specific groups are likely to be impacted by a change, the appropriate consideration of consultation will be given.

*Previously agreed savings*

There were no previously agreed savings proposals with equalities impacts submitted. This directorate did not exist prior to the 2021/22 financial year and therefore no previously agreed savings exist.

## **e) Environment**

*New savings:*

This year's budget for 2022/23 sets out nine savings proposals, two of which progressed to a full EQIA.

- Re-design and simplify the resident parking zone permit price-tariff (full EQIA completed)

See section 3 for details.

- Stream-lining of in-house compliance services (full EQIA completed)

In order to give coverage across day and night for enforcement, our compliance, street trading and out of hours Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) teams have overlapping functions. The review of the customer journey for waste enforcement and street trading identified that there is excess capacity during the day when enforcement demands are lower. Therefore, the proposal is to streamline the daytime services by merging the compliance and street trading teams, a reduction in two FTEs across a staff group of 31. The proposal to streamline expects no adverse impacts on service delivery, due to the removal of duplication of activity and intelligence-led deployment, directed to those times of day when the service is in high demand. As the full service

will retain its response rates and service quality, the proposal is expected to not impact upon residents, businesses, other service users, or the customer journey.

The working practices within the council will not change for the staff group impacted by these changes. Although there will be two fewer staff, because the proposal addresses excess capacity during the day (when enforcement demands are lower), the stream-lining of daytime services across a staff group of 31 will not detrimentally impact on the workloads placed on staff groups, irrespective of their background or if they are from protected groups.

The proposal initially seeks voluntary redundancies but if this is unsuccessful, it will embark on a consultation process with the entire staff group, designed in conjunction with HR to ensure no bias. Therefore, considering the explanation and mitigation above, the savings proposal records no potential equalities impacts.

- Review of in-house compliance service

This proposal set out an initial intention to reduce the number of staff in the compliance team by two staff, with a full consultation with staff planned. The service is planning to complete a full EQIA after the consultation is complete and a saving decision made.

- Electronic Cars Parking Vouchers

Electronic parking vouchers currently comprise:

- Permission to Park vouchers - Scheme for trades people carrying out work in the borough (£28.50 per day)
- Visitor permits - Permits for resident's visitors to park (£14.50 per day).

The proposal is to introduce an additional daily surcharge on petrol vehicles (£2 surcharge) and diesel vehicles (£5 surcharge) vehicles, and to retain prices for electric vehicles (other than inflationary increase). This is in line with the charging approach already introduced in short stay parking.

- For Permission to Park vouchers, the daily rate would increase to £33.90 for diesel, £33.90 for petrol and remain at £28.90 for electric vehicles.
- For Visitor Vouchers, the daily rate would increase to £19.50 for diesel, £16.50 for petrol and £14.50 for electric vehicles. Visitor vouchers can be purchased on the basis 30 minute units.

All these permits and vouchers including the daily surcharge is pro-rata for shorter period of the day (half hour, hour etc.)

The proposal only covers visitor vouchers; residents parking in the borough would presumably have a resident permit. If driving somewhere in borough to access services and there was not parking provided as part of the service you would utilise on-street parking. Non-resident visitors accessing a service in Islington would utilise

an on-street parking provision rather than a visitor voucher. Staff would also not utilise a visitor voucher, there are local provisions for staff depending on their job requirements.

The proposal sets out the following mitigations to potential equalities impacts below:

- Carers: Carers have access to a carers permit and would not use a visitor voucher.
- Disability: Those who require a permit would have access to the concessionary rates. Additionally, no cost increases to concessionary rates which those receiving Incapacity Benefit or Disability Living Allowance.
- Pregnancy / maternity: The resident pays the permit voucher, if required by a visitor within pregnancy or maternity. A dispensation for new parent vouchers allows those with newly born children to allow their family/friends utilise a free visitor voucher near the time of a new child (born or adopted).
- Age (older people): No cost increases to concessionary rates that anyone over 60 could claim.

A public consultation will take place, which is required as part of the fees and charges notice process. This will occur before implementation of the savings proposals to allow a more thorough assessment of the views and potential impacts of the residents affected. Additionally, a comprehensive communications plan will ensure all changes to parking vouchers are communicated clearly to residents with direction for those with possible mitigations to alternative provisions.

- Enforcement of environmental and highways offences  
The way in which environmental and highway offences are enforced will be reviewed. The only additional enforcement will be littering from cars, though we already enforce littering from pedestrians. The proposal would consolidate the enforcement of different environmental and highway offences, which we already enforce within different teams. No equalities impacts are expected.
- Reduce bulk overtime and agency usage for weekend shifts in Street Operational Services  
By recruiting to 22 vacant posts to cover 35-hour weeks including weekend shifts, agency and overtime usage will be reduced across Street Environment Operations. The saving is generated through the difference between the cost of weekend agency staff and equivalent contracted council staff. Throughout the process of implementing the proposal, the relevant staff and unions will be engaged throughout. Regular meetings are in place between management and the unions to be able to engage and pick up issues related to staff changes.
- Bunhill Heat & Power Network

This is the estimated net initial operating surplus for the new Bunhill Heat and Power Network. This takes into account reduced heating costs for local residents and all operating costs for running the heat network, including the purchase of gas to operate the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) engine. Income comes from the sale of heat and electricity, as well as from renewable heat incentives government grant. The full business plan will come into force in July 2022.

- Revise approach to Commercial Waste Services

A review of Commercial Waste Services has been undertaken alongside the development of a draft commercial waste and recycling strategy. Taking into consideration collection and disposal costs, focussing on the in-borough commercial waste market will enable us to withdraw a single waste crew (currently covered by agency staff). No equalities impacts are expected; in-house FTE staff will not be impacted.

- Additional income in the Highways and Streetworks team

This savings options relates to existing, additional income that is being generated from Streetworks Licences for scaffolding, hoarding and materials. The service over-achieved on the income budget in 2020/21 and is forecast to do so again in the current financial year (2021/22). Whilst there are individual pressures within the overall position, the proposal estimate £0.200m of additional income that can be baselined in the budget. This saving recognises the additional, ongoing income the service can expect.

- Greenspace and Street Environment Operations

This option encompasses five service operation changes within Greenspace and Street Environment Operations (SEO) to improve service operation and deployment. This includes:

- 1) Organise all cleaning teams in both services to respond to low-level graffiti and flyposting removal by providing graffiti wipes/scrapers/snips to street cleansing staff, reducing agency staff by one FTE (£0.068m).
- 2) Mechanical sweepers to carry out a litter bin washing programme on their pre-existing rounds (£0.033m). This will enable the removal of one FTE pavement washer without a reduction in borough-wide pavement washing.
- 3) As evidenced in the recent switch from vehicles to bikes in SEO, Greenspace will also reduce vehicles (£0.030m saving) by switching to electric bikes (reduction of three vehicles) for supervisors and implementing static gardeners (reduction of three vehicles).
- 4) Reducing downtime for Grounds Maintenance crews by deploying more locally meaning the grounds services will be able to further develop their commercial offer to carry out more paid works (£0.020m saving).
- 5) Introduce weekend contracts for the Parks litter team to reduce overtime in the service (£0.050m). This approach was successful when introduced in SEO.



### *Previously agreed Savings:*

There was one approved savings proposal, which identified potential impacts:

- Business Information Team Restructure

The savings for 2021/22 had no impact on staffing within the service, which included:

- From part of post which became vacant following staff member taking redundancy as they were at age to take this and get their pension
- From vacant post in service

The service is no longer within Community Safety. Following the SLT restructure earlier this year, the service area is Business Improvement and Performance

The service has reorganised how it works to keep service delivery by spreading some of the work to account for when staff are on leave.

The second part of the review for the 2022/23 year is still due to go ahead in its current form as described but is dependent on some external work we are currently doing with HM Land Registry, which will take part of the service delivery. This follows HM Land Registry legislation to take on this task as outlined in the EQIA.

## **f) Fairer Together**

### *New savings*

There were no new savings proposals with equalities impacts submitted for 2022/23.

### *Previously agreed savings*

There were no new savings proposals with equalities impacts submitted. This directorate did not exist prior to the 2021/22 financial year and therefore no previous existing savings.

## **g) Homes and Neighbourhoods**

### *New savings*

The Homes and Neighbourhoods directorate (previously Housing directorate) did not submit any new savings for 2022/23 with equalities impacts.

### *Previously agreed savings*

The Homes and Neighbourhoods directorate (previously Housing directorate) did not submit any savings with equalities impacts.

## **h) Resources**

### *New savings*

The Resources directorate put forward one saving proposals in the 2022/23 Budget; this will not have a negative impact on residents, staff or service-users as it relates to the improvement of debt collection systems.

#### *Previously agreed savings*

There were no previously agreed savings proposals with equalities impacts submitted.

## **6. Staffing Impacts**

As summarised in section 3, some proposals will have staffing implications. While the significant majority will come from deleting / not recruiting to vacant posts, some proposals will have implications which may include changes to current roles or a potential risk of redundancy (for a very limited number of staff).

The impacts of these proposals on staff with protected characteristics cannot yet be fully determined but as numbers are low and spread across a number of services / types of roles there are unlikely to be any groups disproportionately impacted. Any changes to staffing structure will require consultation with staff unions in accordance with the council's reorganisation policy and procedures.

Our established organisational change process ensures we support all of our staff through this change. Where restructures are proposed we carry out a comprehensive Staffing Impact Assessment that identifies the implications for those with protected characteristics and finds ways to mitigate accordingly.

Where a redundancy situation is possible, we will take a number of steps including:

- Not filling vacancies in advance of a restructure so as many opportunities as possible are available to our existing staff;
- Using our redeployment process to help staff at risk find suitable alternative employment within the council;
- Considering alternative options to redundancy such as early retirement, flexible working or other 'working differently' options;
- Stress management support and counselling services will be offered to staff through the Employee Assist Programme to help them cope with the additional pressures that structural change may bring.

We have an ongoing commitment to making Islington an employer of choice and are Timewise accredited, supporting flexible working opportunities available where possible, including condensed hours, flexible start and end times and part time working.

The Council is committed to a workforce that is representative of the borough at all levels and will continue to look for new ways to improve progression routes for staff and equip them to be senior managers of the future. We will continue to promote our staff equality

forums as a way of engaging with staff and working together to continually improve their experience of working in Islington.

## **7. Human Rights and Safeguarding**

### **Human Rights**

It is unlawful for the council to act in a way that is incompatible with a European Convention right (unless the council could not have acted differently as a result of a statutory provision).

An interference with a qualified right (e.g. the right to respect for private and family life) is not unlawful if the council acts in accordance with the law and the interference is necessary in a democratic society.

In deciding whether the interference is necessary, the law applies a proportionality test, including whether a fair balance has been struck between the rights of the individual and the interests of the community.

### **Safeguarding**

#### **Implications for safeguarding in Adult Social Care**

Proposals outlined in this document build on the Council's work on Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP). MSP is enshrined in the Care Act (2014) and the Pan London Safeguarding Adults Policies and Procedures.

MSP puts the person at risk of harm or abuse at the centre of decisions and actions about them. Just like the Strengths Based Practice approach for general social work activities, MSP respects that adults often bring ideas and solutions which will work best for them and the outcomes they need support in achieving.

This means that safeguarding adults continues to be integral in the work we are undertaking to really embed strengths-based practice. Ensuring vulnerable adults are safe and focusing on wellbeing is a core element of strengths-based practice and ensures there is consistency in approach whether we are working with a vulnerable person on a support plan or a safeguarding plan.

#### **Implications for safeguarding in Children's Services**

Safeguarding children is about protecting them from maltreatment, preventing their health and development being impaired, ensuring that they grow up in environments which provide safe and effective care and taking action to enable all children to have the best outcomes.

The mitigation identified for each proposal reduces very significantly the risk of poor safeguarding practice. The council's mitigation should include not adopting any policy where safeguarding practice is adversely affected.

The proposals put forward have been tested against effective safeguarding practice. A broad range of quality assurance measures are already in place and will continue to be monitored and responded to robustly.

## **8. Monitoring**

Whilst the overall assessment is that there is not a cumulative negative impact on any group as a result of the savings proposals, there is a need to continue to monitor this. This year, the Equalities Team has reviewed the equalities impacts from current savings to screen for any unexpected impacts as the projects have progressed – this process will continue.

Each individual proposal will continue to be reviewed and updated as required. Consultation will be carried out where required to seek the views of residents and service users. The lead officer for each proposal will be responsible for ensuring that equality considerations remain at the forefront of decision making as each of these proposals are progressed.

## **Annex A:**

### **Public Sector Equality Duty**

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 provides that:

(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 favorably 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, including non-binary and gender-fluid identification
- marriage and civil partnership
- 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.