

## Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) Proposals Equality Impact Assessment



### Equality Impact Assessment

| Title of report or proposal  | f report or proposal Proposition 5 - Waste  |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Lead officer(s)  | Mark Glynn  |                                   | Date                     | January 24                            |  |  |  |  |
| Aims and desired outcomes<br>Are you trying to solve an existin  |   |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| To understand the impact of our impacts of the Waste proposals.  | proposals on our residents and communities  | ve will undertake Equality Impac  | ct Assessments (EqIAs)   | ). This EqIA aims to assess the       |  |  |  |  |
| The waste aspect of the proposi<br>1. Change the frequency o   | tion consists of 2 elements:<br>f Blue Bin collections from fortnightly to month                    | ly.                               |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Following the confirmation approaches for residents   | on of the introduction of the Food Waste Strat<br>s from April 2025.                                | gy in April 2026 (weekly food co  | ollections) we propose t | to offer 2 alternative collection     |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>A free, weekly, food-only</li> <li>a paid for weekly garder<br/>having two separate bins</li> </ul> | waste collection and a free weekly food colle   | ction (residents can choose to ir | nclude their food waste  | with the garden bin if they prefer to |  |  |  |  |
| Scope of the proposal<br>Include the teams or service are  | as from the Council and outward-facing servic   | es or initiatives                 |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| Details of all proposals can be for  | ound in the corresponding reports.  |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
|  | ions you have been / will be exploring <sup>4</sup><br>s cases, issues papers or options appraisals |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| All proposals being explored are   | listed in the corresponding reports.  |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| Who has been involved in t<br>Please list any internal and exter   | •   |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
| Senior management across Plac  | e directorate and CSS directorate have been   | nvolved in development of prop    | posals                   |                                       |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |                                   |                          |                                       |  |  |  |  |

What evidence have you gathered as a part of this EqIA? Which groups have you consulted or engaged with as part of this EqIA?

Sources can include but are not limited to: Statistics, JSNAs, stakeholder feedback, equality monitoring data, existing briefings, comparative data from local, regional or national sources.

Groups could include but are not limited to: equality / disadvantaged groups, VCSFE organisations, user groups, GM Equality panels, employee networks, focus groups, consultations.

This equality impact assessment is a live document and will include evidence gathered from engagement and consultation as the project progresses. Population information gathered from: Census 2021 data; service user data, JSNA data.

Are there any evidence gaps that make it difficult or impossible to form an opinion on how the proposed activity might affect different groups of people?

It is important to note that details for some proposals are not known at time of writing. It is recommended that EqIAs are performed at the project level whilst these projects are being shaped.

#### Step 1: Establishing and developing the baseline

| Characteristic  | Demographic of residents / service users   |
|---|--|
| Age   | <ul> <li>Stockport has more older people and fewer younger adults than the national average. The median age of Stockport is 42 compared to the national average of 40.</li> <li>2021 data shows 20% of Stockport's population are over 65. 61% are aged 15-64, and 20% are under 15 years old.</li> <li>It is likely that the older population of Stockport will increase – projections show that 2 in 9 residents will be aged 65 or over by 2030.</li> <li>Older populations are more common in more affluent areas.</li> <li>Older residents are less likely to have the means (whether connection, devices or skills) to access services and information digitally.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Disability</b><br>Consider people with physical disabilities,<br>sensory impairments, learning disabilities and<br>mental health issues  | <ul> <li>According to the 2021 Census for Stockport, suggests that 18.1% of residents have a disability (2021).</li> <li>44% of Stockport residents have a long-term health condition, which increases with age with 92% of those 85 and over.</li> <li>34% of Stockport households have at least one member with a disability.</li> <li>The proportion of children with SEND is twice as high in more deprived areas of Stockport.</li> <li>An estimated 6,430 of young people (age 5-19) have a mental health disorder.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Gender reassignment</b><br>A person whose individual experience of<br>gender may not correspond to the sex<br>assigned to them at birth. | 2021 data suggests that less than 0.5% of the Stockport population is transgender.   |
| Maternity and pregnancy   | • Birth rates have risen since 2000 in Stockport, although over the last 5 years, fertility rates have been stable, with 3,302 live births in 2018, a rate of 64.3 per 1,000 women.  |

| Characteristic   | Demographic of residents / service users  |
|--|---|
|  | <ul> <li>Birth rates have grown most rapidly in the most deprived areas of Stockport, which represent 35% of the population yet account for 45% of new births.</li> </ul>   |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership   | <ul> <li>According to 2021 data, in Stockport 46.4% of people are married or in a civil partnership.</li> <li>0.4% are same-sex couples living together, and 45.1% are opposite-sex couples living together. 0.9% of residents are married or in a civil partnership but are not living together.</li> </ul>  |
| Race<br>Not all ethnic groups will have the same<br>experiences so if possible specify whether the<br>impact is likely to be different for different<br>ethnic groups e.g. Indian people, people of<br>Black Caribbean heritage. This also includes<br>Gypsy and Traveller populations<br>Religion or Belief | <ul> <li>2021 data shows that Stockport is as ethnically diverse as the national average for England.</li> <li>87% of Stockport residents are White and 12% are from a Black, Asian or Ethnic Minority background.</li> <li>Ethnically diverse communities tend have a younger age profile than the rest of the borough.</li> <li>People who are Pakistani are the biggest non-White British / Irish population.</li> <li>The distribution of diverse communities within Stockport is not even, with the areas of Heald Green, Gatley, and the Heatons being particularly diverse. Some of these areas, the proportion of ethnically diverse communities is over a third of the total population.</li> <li>According to 2021 data, the largest religious group in Stockport is Christianity with 48% of the population identifying as Christian, although this is decreasing over time (a 15% percentage point decrease since 2011).</li> </ul> |
| Sex  | <ul> <li>Those with no religion are the second-most common (40%), which has been increasing alongside the Muslim population (5.5%).</li> <li>These populations are also not even across Stockport. People living in the south of the borough are more likely to be Christian and Muslims make up around 20-25% of the population in areas of Heald Green and Gatley. Gatley also has a large Jewish community.</li> <li>51% of Stockport residents are female and 49% are male, in line with the national average.</li> </ul>   |
| Sexual orientation<br>People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual  | <ul> <li>51% of Stockport residents are female and 49% are male, in line with the national average.</li> <li>2021 data shows that around 3% of the Stockport population are lesbian, gay, bisexual or other.</li> <li>2021 data shows 1.2% of the Stockport population is living as a same-sex couple (this includes couples who are married, in a civil partnership, or unmarried / never registered a civil partnership).</li> </ul>  |
| Socioeconomic status   | <ul> <li>2021 data looking at 4 areas of potential deprivation (education, employment, health and housing) shows that 49% of households in Stockport were deprived in at least one of these 4 areas.</li> <li>Areas of deprivation were more common in the central and northern parts of the borough.</li> <li>6% of residents in Stockport claim Job Seekers' Allowance / Universal Credit. From October 2019 to February 2021, Universal Credit claimants doubled from 4,725 to 10,685.</li> <li>2019 data showed that 0.56% of households in Stockport were noted to have destitution, and it is likely that the pandemic and the cost of living crisis has increased this.</li> </ul>   |
| Other<br>Please add in here any additional relevant<br>comments or feedback where the protected<br>characteristic is not known   | <ul> <li>According to 2021 data, 2.3% of households in Stockport had no members that have English as their main language, and 0.8% cannot speak English at all.</li> <li>91% of people living in Stockport were born in the UK. 4.8% of people in Stockport have a non-UK identity.</li> </ul>  |
| Carers   | <ul> <li>A breakdown of residents who are unpaid care leavers in the areas where this proposition will affect, the<br/>borough average is 9.4%.</li> </ul>  |

| Characteristic                  | Demographic of residents / service users                        |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Care leavers                    | No relevant data available.                                     |
| Those experiencing homelessness | No relevant data available.                                     |
| Veterans                        | According to 2021 data, Veterans make up 3.3% of the population |
| Asylum seekers and refugees     | No relevant data available.                                     |

# Step 2: Assessing the proposal's impacts against the baseline and identifying ways to minimize negative effects.

| Impact<br>no. | Characteristic        | Positive or<br>negative<br>impact | Impact<br>source | Impact details and rationale  | Suggested mitigation and rationale   |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 1             | Age – older<br>people | Likely/potentially<br>negative    | Proposals        | The proposal will affect properties with gardens.<br>As the baseline data suggests, older people live in<br>more affluent areas of the borough so are more<br>likely to have a garden, therefore may be more<br>likely to be impacted by the garden waste<br>proposals. | As part of a Greater Manchester initiative,<br>residents are entitled to a reduced compost bin<br>via -<br>https://getcomposting.com/collections/bestselling<br> |

| Impact<br>no. | Characteristic  | Positive or<br>negative<br>impact | Impact<br>source | Impact details and rationale   | Suggested mitigation and rationale                       |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 2             | Age – younger<br>people   | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.  | N/A  |
| 3             | Disability<br>Consider people<br>with physical<br>disabilities,<br>sensory<br>impairments,<br>learning<br>disabilities and<br>mental health<br>issues | -                                 | -                | At the beginning of this proposal there was no<br>known evidence to suggest that these groups will<br>be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.<br>Following feedback from the public consultation,<br>some people with disabilities have advised that<br>they physically wouldn't be able to go to a tip to<br>dispose of their garden waste and so felt they<br>would have no choice but to pay for the additional<br>service, in some cases this was in relation to<br>accessibility to a car. | Please see <b>Impact no. 1</b> mitigation and rationale. |
| 4             | Gender<br>reassignment<br>A person<br>whose individual<br>experience of<br>gender may not<br>correspond to the<br>sex assigned to<br>them at birth.   | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these<br>groups will be disproportionately impacted by the<br>proposals.  | N/A  |
| 5             | Maternity and pregnancy   | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.  | N/A  |
| 6             | Marriage and<br>Civil Partnership   | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.  | N/A  |

| Impact<br>no. | Characteristic   | Positive or<br>negative<br>impact | Impact<br>source | Impact details and rationale  | Suggested mitigation and rationale |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 7             | Race<br>Not all ethnic<br>groups will have<br>the same<br>experiences so if<br>possible specify<br>whether the<br>impact is likely to<br>be different for<br>different ethnic<br>groups e.g.<br>Indian people,<br>people of Black<br>Caribbean<br>heritage. This<br>also includes<br>Gypsy and<br>Traveller<br>populations |                                   | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.       | N/A                                |
| 8             | Religion or<br>Belief  | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.       | N/A                                |
| 9             | Sex  | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals.       | N/A                                |
| 10            | Sexual<br>orientation<br>Consider how the<br>proposed policy<br>may differently im<br>pact people who<br>are lesbian, gay<br>or bisexual   | -                                 | -                | There is no known evidence to suggest that these<br>groups will be disproportionately impacted by the<br>proposals. | N/A                                |

| Impact<br>no. | Characteristic                         | Positive or<br>negative<br>impact | Impact<br>source | Impact details and rationale  | Suggested mitigation and rationale   |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| 11            |  | Negative                          | Proposal         | Any introduction of charges will impact those on lower incomes who choose to subscribe to the service.        | A discounted price of £39 will be offered to residents that are in receipt of council tax support.   |
|               | Socioeconomic<br>status                |                                   |                  |   | Please see <b>Impact no. 1</b> mitigation and rationale relating to alternatively composting as an economically effective way to manage garden waste and reducing the cost of subscription by sharing a subscription with a neighbour. |
| 12            | Socioeconomic<br>status                | Positive                          | Proposal         | Introduction of charge will not affect properties that are flats or terraces with yards etc.                  | N/A  |
|               | encouraged to consortionately impact o |                                   |                  | s where you have relevant data, especially if y   | our proposal is predicted to   |
| 13            | Carers                                 |                                   |                  | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. | N/A  |
| 14            | Care leavers                           | -                                 |                  | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. | N/A  |
| 15            | Those<br>experiencing<br>homelessness  | -                                 |                  | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. | N/A  |
| 16            | Veterans                               | -                                 |                  | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. | N/A  |
| 17            | Asylum Seekers<br>and refugees         | -                                 |                  | There is no known evidence to suggest that these groups will be disproportionately impacted by the proposals. | N/A  |

Please state if there are any additional comments or suggestions.

N/A

#### Step 3: Conclusions and outcome

If you have <u>not</u> undertaken any community engagement for this EqIA, please indicate this and explain why.

We have consulted on these proposals through our overall public consultation that took place between 21<sup>st</sup> November – 20<sup>th</sup> December. This consultation report is shared alongside this EqIA.

If there are impacts identified that cannot be mitigated against, are there any justifications for not taking any action to improve the negative impacts that have been identified?

The council faces many financial pressures and risks and meeting core service delivery requirements whilst delivering longer term change is acutely challenging. Delivering a resilient budget can only be achieved through difficult decisions, robust prioritisation and ambitious changes in the way we work if we are to continue to meet the needs of local people today and in the future.

Are there any adverse impacts that can be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group, or for any other reason? Please state why.

N/A

Are there any other proposals or policies that you are aware of that could create a cumulative impact?

This is an impact that appears when you consider services or activities together. A change or activity in one area may create an impact somewhere else.

Please see MTFP cumulative equality analysis.

We are aware that some residents may be affected by both the ASC Charging proposals and the Charging for Garden Waste proposal. The mitigation actions to the waste proposal are identified above in section 2, for the ASC Charging proposals please see the relevant EqIA.

Based on your equality impact analysis, please indicate the outcome of this EqIA.

| Please indicate the outcome of the EqIA and provide justification and / or changes planned as required.  |  |             |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| A.   | No major barriers identified, and there are no major changes required – proceed.   |             |  |  |  |  |
| B.   | Adjustments to remove barriers, promote equality and / or mitigate impact have been identified and are required – proceed.   | $\boxtimes$ |  |  |  |  |
| C.   | Positive impact for one or more of the groups justified on the grounds of equality – proceed.  |             |  |  |  |  |
| D.   | Barriers and impact identified, however having considered available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice – proceed with caution, knowing that this policy or practice may favour some people less than others. Strong justification for this decision is required. |             |  |  |  |  |
| E.   | This policy identifies actual or potential unlawful discrimination – stop and rethink.   |             |  |  |  |  |
| Please describe briefly how this EqIA will be monitored.<br>When will this be reviewed? What mitigating actions need to be implemented and when? |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| This EqIA w  | ill be returned to at various stages of proposal development.  |             |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |             |  |  |  |  |