

West Berkshire Council Equity Impact Assessment

Revenue Budget Proposals Overview

January 2026

Contents

Section 1: Summary details.....	2
Section 2: Detail of proposal	4
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics	6
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts.....	8
Section 4: Review.....	9

Section 1: Summary details

Directorate and Service Area	Resources (Finance, Property and Procurement)
What is being assessed (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).	Approval of the Revenue Budget for 2026/27 which includes a number of proposed savings generated by changes to service delivery and/ or increased fees and charges.
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	The Council sets a revenue budget every year to ensure that it has sufficient financial resources to deliver its strategic objectives.
Summary of assessment Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).	This considers the Revenue Budget proposals, for 2026/27. The Council is required to set a balanced budget on an annual basis. This document provides an overview of potential impacts, with further assessment of the specific potential impacts of individual proposals being details at Appendix I of the Revenue Budget paper. The Council must ensure that its strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states: (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; This includes the need to: i. remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; ii. 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. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others. (2) 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. (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others. The following list of questions are helpful to consider when reviewing whether the decision is relevant to equality: • Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community? • Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently? • Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered? • Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality? • Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics? • Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities? • Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council? The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them.
Completed By	Sarah Clarke
Authorised By	
Date of Assessment	26/01/2026

Section 2: Detail of proposal

Context / Background Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.	The budget contains a variety of savings and investment proposals. Those that may have a direct impact on residents have been consulted upon as part of the budget consultation exercise between December 2025 and January 2026. Individual proposals have specific equality impact assessments completed as part of the budget consultation exercise. The cumulative impact of budget savings proposals do not contribute overall to inequality in the district. There are a balanced range of savings proposals that will impact across many different groups across the district. There is an insignificant cumulative impact to service users across the district.
Proposals Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.	It is possible that some of the individual savings proposals may have an adverse impact on the lives of some residents, service users, and/or staff. Where potential impacts have been identified, consideration has been given as to whether steps could be taken to mitigate the adverse impacts of these proposals. Staff may be impacted through any pause on investment activity or through recruiting to posts more slowly, but this should not have an adverse impact upon the lives of employees.
Evidence / Intelligence List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact	Savings proposals with a direct impact on residents have been consulted upon as part of the budget consultation exercise between December 2025 and January 2026. Specific equity impact assessments were completed for individual proposals as part of the budget consultation exercise. The Council received a total of 291 responses to the budget consultations (147 in respect of the general consultation, 147 responses to the proposed fee increases at Henwick Worthy, and 41 responses in respect of the proposal to close the Adult Respite in the Community service.

on different individuals, communities or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.	The general survey sought the views of residents, communities and other parties considered on how services should be prioritised and funded.
Alternatives considered / rejected Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.	Details of alternative options proposed are detailed in the individual consultation proposals and associated documents, which are produced at Appendix I.

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics

Protected Characteristic	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Age	☐	☐	☒	See the EqlAs relating to savings and income proposals, the budget consultation and the resultant responses and recommendations	See individual proposals at Appendix I	See individual proposals at Appendix I	See individual proposals at Appendix I
Disability	☐	☐	☒	See the EqlAs relating to savings and income proposals, the budget consultation and the resultant responses and recommendations	See individual proposals at Appendix I	See individual proposals at Appendix I	See individual proposals at Appendix I
Gender Reassignment	☒	☐	☐				
Marriage & Civil Partnership	☒	☐	☐				
Pregnancy & Maternity	☒	☐	☐				
Race	☒	☐	☐				
Sex	☒	☐	☐				

Sexual Orientation	☒	☐	☐				
Religion or Belief	☒	☐	☐				

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Rural communities	☒	☐	☐				
Areas of deprivation	☒	☐	☐				
Displaced communities	☒	☐	☐				
Care experienced people	☐	☒	☐	The budget includes a proposal to introduce a council tax discount for care leavers			

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
The Armed Forces Community	☒	☐	☐				

Section 4: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

Review Date	See individual proposals
Person Responsible for Review	See individual proposals
Authorised By	Sarah Clarke

EDI employee related EQiA's should now be sent to Human Resources hrenquiries@westberks.gov.uk