

Report to Cabinet
11 March 2015
Report of Executive head of strategy, people and neighbourhoods
Subject Reducing inequalities action plan

Item

6

Purpose

To consider a series of actions to target council activity at reducing key economic, social and financial inequalities.

Recommendation

To

- (1) agree the overall approach
- (2) delegate authority to the executive head of strategy, people and neighbourhoods in liaison with the deputy leader to agree the final version of the plan taking on board comments from members.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the new corporate priority “A fair city”

Financial implications

All activity to be funded from within existing budgets and other resources

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Waters - Resources

Contact officers

Russell O’Keefe, Executive head of strategy, people and neighbourhoods 01603 212908

Bob Cronk, Head of local neighbourhood services 01603 212373

Phil Shreeve, Policy, performance and partnerships manager 01603 212356

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. Cabinet received a report on 26th March 2014 which agreed to extend the financial inclusion work into a broader inequality reduction plan. It highlighted some of the persistent inequalities within Norwich such as child poverty, low wages and in-work poverty and a number of unequal health outcomes.
2. As well as highlighting a number of activities taken over previous years it suggested a number of initial actions as well as the development of a broader reducing inequalities action plan for the future, in line with the development of a new corporate plan.
3. The Council continues to face significant budget pressures so activities within this action plan are mainly based upon refocusing existing activities already identified within service plans and budgets as well as continued collaborative work with partners.
4. It is envisaged that this could form the basis of a rolling three action plan capable of review and amendment each year as challenges change or opportunities arise.

Key themes

5. A number of key themes have emerged based upon previous work and ongoing activity across services:
 - a) Making best use of resources both within the council and across partner agencies and all sectors.
 - b) The connection between low income and poor health and other life outcomes including education and quality of life.
 - c) Well documented variations in income and other outcomes across parts of the city and the need to explore not only universal offers but also targeted work in particular communities.
 - d) The fact that not all people and communities are always equally placed to necessarily benefit from either initiatives, schemes or any general economic upturn.
 - e) Just as health is now often perceived “as everybody’s business”, so reducing inequalities can become part of the whole council “business as usual” and cut through all activities.
 - f) It should be possible to expect that all our activities and funding streams consider reduction of inequalities and making best use of those assets and funds to try to reduce the gaps.

Key principles

6. Drawing together universal service provision but targeting of certain activities toward parts of the city where inequalities are the most marked, where there are opportunities to work with partners and add value to existing resources.

7. Join up activity where it is both possible and where there is evidence of need with other public and voluntary sector partners and other sources of funding in order to maximise impact and reduce duplication given that some individuals may experience multiple issues of inequality.
8. Take advantage of new opportunities where they arise e.g accessing new funding streams if they were to become available.

Initial geographic areas for targeting

Based on an assessment of the wards where inequalities are most marked (see Appendix 1 for some key statistics) it is proposed to focus initial targeted work on Mile Cross, Mancroft and Lakenham wards. Due to current opportunities to work better with partners on the ground and join up better with existing resources in Catton Grove ward some initial targeted work is also proposed to be carried out there.

Seven areas of activity

9. Looking where impact may have a realistic chance of making a difference, seven broad areas of investigation and action are suggested:
 - a) **Regeneration and development** – consider the implications and opportunities to further advance equality (and avoid increasing inequality) via e.g. City Deal, Local Enterprise Partnership, new housing development and economic development.
 - b) **Develop living wage and social value** into broader policies across a number of key themes over the three years, including:
 - i) Contracts e.g procurement and award
 - ii) Grants and commissioned services – moving a range of sectors toward living wage
 - iii) Other partnerships and funding streams and an explicit expectation to directly impact inequality (health, culture, active travel)
 - iv) Civic leadership – how best to further advocate for reducing inequality and supporting living wage e.g incentives to become living wage employers
 - c) **Open spaces / physical activity / food** – look at the linkages between open spaces and sports strategy plans, opportunities for Community Led Local Development (or its successor), links between allotments, food, low income etc. Review Go4Less and how that may enable targeted activity or support.
 - d) **Digital inclusion** – based upon the three year service transformation challenge award action planning. This has at its heart work with digitally excluded communities and opportunities inclusion may afford in terms of jobs, income, reducing costs etc.
 - e) **Housing**– assessing the opportunities within the council's approach to housing including the impacts of rent levels and high quality capital improvements, use of housing resources to support community wide activity and provision which reduces inequality (welfare reform, advice, engagement, facilities etc.)

- f) **Transformation and budget challenges** – continued and robust examination of transformation and budget changes through the prism of financial and other inequality matters. Additional work on developing and utilising the socio economic considerations within the equality impact assessment tool for this as well as other policy and change activity to reduce unintended consequences. Existing work to support debt and money advice, income maximisation and expenditure minimisation
- g) **Affordable warmth** – recognising the links between housing and health as well as income and life opportunities. Continue to build and source additional opportunities to address the poorest quality housing in Norwich (e.g. within the private rented or owner occupied sector)

Action plan

- 10. A set of draft high level actions are proposed at Appendix 2.
- 11. These will require more detailed project plans to be worked up within services and in liaison with key partners and where practicable with local communities.

Engagement of members

- 12. As part of considering the council's new corporate plan, Scrutiny Committee requested that key draft supporting actions plans such as the reducing inequalities plan are sent to members so that they can determine whether they would wish to add them to the scrutiny work programme. Other members have requested the opportunity for cross party involvement in the plans. It is, therefore, proposed that following cabinet the reducing inequality plan is circulated to all members for comment and any changes to the plan from this process agreed as part of the delegation proposed in this report.

Appendix 1 – Local area deprivation

Measures of inequality at ward level

There are a number of ways in which inequality in different parts of the city could be assessed. These in turn would likely highlight different geographic areas evidencing unequal outcomes between those areas. Inevitably there will need to be an element of “best fit” across a variety of possible measures including where there are may be opportunities in some areas that will help support the council and its partners to make a difference. The data presented here is drawn primarily around factors such as:

- Poverty
- Benefit claims
- Life expectancy
- Fuel poverty
- Income

These in turn could be analysed either as percentages or actual numbers affected within any given area, especially in the latter case where numbers are relatively small or where the differing sizes of total population may impact percentages.

The tables below show a range of variable across all 13 wards and also highlight those wards which feature in the most unequal bottom four wards.

Poverty

A selection of poverty data relating to children and also pensioner households. This will use 60% of median household income as the definition of poverty. Also included are general child development indices:

Ward	IMD		Child Poverty		Child Well Being Index		Pensioner poverty	
	Avg IMD	Rank	Percentage	Rank	Index	Rank	Percentage	Rank
Bowthorpe	7952	3	38.6%	5	26579	3	30.1%	3
Catton Grove	10488	7	30.6%	8	22720	8	23.9%	8
Crome	9697	6	36.3%	7	23186	7	20.0%	11
Eaton	25884	13	7.9%	12	8436	13	10.1%	13
Lakenham	8652	5	37.8%	6	26760	2	27.6%	5
Mancroft	5441	1	39.4%	4	27407	1	37.7%	1
Mile Cross	6561	2	41.6%	2	25877	4	35.1%	2
Nelson	25364	12	7.3%	13	10241	12	15.2%	12

Sewell	14658	10	22.7%	10	18301	10	23.8%	9
Thorpe Hamlet	12097	8	26.1%	9	19248	9	24.1%	7
Town Close	18599	11	22.7%	11	17021	11	23.2%	10
University	13878	9	39.8%	3	25251	6	27.3%	6
Wensum	8438	4	42.0%	1	25270	5	28.2%	4

Employment measures

Broadly this looks percentage of families (i.e. with children) where no one is in work, percentage claiming JSA and the percentage claiming benefits:

Ward	No adult in employment		JSA		% on benefits	
	% with dep children	Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage	Rank
Bowthorpe	8.9	1	2.1%	8	15.42	7
Catton Grove	5.4	7	2.7%	5	16.07	6
Crome	6.7	5	2.9%	3	17.19	4
Eaton	1.7	13	0.9%	12	6.22	12
Lakenham	6.2	6	2.8%	4	18.02	3
Mancroft	3.7	9	4.1%	1	23.06	1
Mile Cross	8.1	3	3.8%	2	19.46	2
Nelson	1.9	12	0.9%	12	3.9	13
Sewell	4.2	8	2.1%	8	10.63	10
Thorpe Hamlet	3.3	10	2.3%	7	14.48	8
Town Close	2.3	11	1.7%	10	10.68	9
University	7.5	4	1.1%	11	8.82	11
Wensum	8.4	2	2.7%	5	16.39	5

Benefit and incomes

Ward	Pension credits	DLA per 000	Income <15K	Median Income
------	-----------------	-------------	-------------	---------------

	Number	Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage	Rank	Income	Rank
Bowthorpe	535	5	68.1	2	32.4	8	28,844	8
Catton Grove	430	9	55.91	7	33.7	7	27,555	7
Crome	600	4	61.17	5	39.5	1	24,017	1
Eaton	280	12	28.32	12	23.6	12	38,661	12
Lakenham	625	2	65.64	4	39.2	3	24,774	4
Mancroft	840	1	88.24	1	38.2	5	26,526	6
Mile Cross	620	3	66.6	3	39.4	2	24,142	2
Nelson	180	13	15.04	13	19.1	13	39,979	13
Sewell	360	11	39.01	11	27.4	9	31,279	9
Thorpe Hamlet	530	6	47.86	8	26.8	11	34,420	10
Town Close	515	7	42.58	9	27.3	10	35,160	11
University	425	10	41.84	10	39.2	4	24,711	3
Wensum	470	8	60.59	6	35.7	6	26,111	5

Fuel Poverty

Ward	Fuel Poverty		Fuel Poverty		Lack Central Heating	
	Percentage	Rank	Numbers	Rank	Numbers	Rank
Bowthorpe	8.6	13	401	11	60	11
Catton Grove	9.6	12	449	9	128	6
Crome	10	10	416	10	83	10
Eaton	9.9	11	385	12	40	12
Lakenham	10.4	8	450	8	98	8
Mancroft	13	7	735	3	155	4
Mile Cross	13.3	6	613	6	118	7
Nelson	19.9	1	806	1	175	3

Sewell	13.6	4	656	4	229	1
Thorpe Hamlet	10.4	9	610	7	216	2
Town Close	14.4	2	764	2	148	5
University	13.4	5	382	13	33	13
Wensum	13.8	3	654	5	97	9

Life Expectancy

Ward	Life Expectancy Female		Life Expectancy Male	
	Age	Rank	Age	Rank
Bowthorpe	83.9	6	78.2	8
Catton Grove	81.5	1	76.2	4
Crome	84.4	10	77.8	6
Eaton	85.3	12	82.2	13
Lakenham	82.4	3	76.1	3
Mancroft	84.0	7	73.3	1
Mile Cross	82.6	5	77.4	5
Nelson	84.6	11	81.2	12
Sewell	81.5	1	78.9	10
Thorpe Hamlet	82.4	3	75.5	2
Town Close	84.1	8	78.6	9
University	85.7	13	79.7	11
Wensum	84.3	9	78.1	7

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report

Detailed guidance to help with completing the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

Report author to complete

Committee:	Cabinet
Committee date:	11 March 2015
Head of service:	Executive Head of Strategy, People and Neighbourhoods
Report subject:	Reducing inequalities action plan
Date assessed:	20 February 2015
Description:	To agree a series of actions designed to target council activity at reducing key economic, social and other inequalities

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Activities should be delivered within existing budgets
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunities to provide cross council support to economic development and reduce inequalities
Financial inclusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	At its heart this plan is designed to reduce financial inequalities and promote financial inclusion
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No direct impact although this and other social factors can be negatively impacted by socio economic inequality
Human Rights Act 1998	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Promotion of more equal life chances
Health and well being	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor health outcomes have a very close correlation to deprivation

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A more equal city and opportunities to participate as well as sharing e.g. work spaces could improve cohesion
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Longer term activity may support better use of food and natural resources to enable access across communities
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As above
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opportunities to explore maximisation of opportunities for local jobs and service provision
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments

	Impact			
Risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is no guarantee all activities will have a positive impact. However they do not represent a significant risk in themselves to the authority
Recommendations from impact assessment				
Positive				
Support for these and similar actions are designed to mitigate some of the inequalities within Norwich				
Negative				
These actions cannot in themselves remove inequality or address wider structural factors or the state of the economy				
Neutral				
Issues				
Expectation management, reassessing some current services or priorities, use of resources as these reduce and therefore ability to sustain delivery				