



Appendix 16

Equalities Impact Assessment



Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Form

Section 1: Identifying details

- 1.1 Officer completing EqIA:
Kevin Ledger (Senior Policy and Performance Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council) in collaboration with wider inter-Council LGR Team.

- 1.2 Title of proposal:
Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) – Option B

- 1.3 EqIA start date:
12 November 2025

- 1.4 Proposal implementation date:

Councils wishing to submit reorganisation proposals are required to do so by 28 November 2025, with new unitary authorities becoming operational from April 2028 (known as Vesting Day).

A final proposal will be selected by the Secretary of State, likely to be in Summer 2026. If Option B is selected more detailed implementation plans will be developed with key partners, communities, and service users, which will include further assessments of equalities impacts.

- 1.5 Who will be responsible for implementing this proposal (Officer and/or Team):
To be determined, following decision from Secretary of State.

Section 2: Proposal to be assessed

- 2.1 Type of proposal:
Other - Please specify

If other, please specify

Proposal for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)

2.2 The proposal is:

New

2.3 State the date of any previous equality impact assessment completed in relation to this proposal (if applicable):

Not applicable.

2.4 What are the headline aims of the proposal and the objectives that will help to accomplish these aims?

The Government's White Paper on English Devolution (December 2024), requires all two-tier local government areas, including Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, to reorganise into a single tier of unitary authorities.

This EqIA accompanies the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) proposal for Option B, which aims to set out the advantages and disadvantages of this option for unitarisation. Other options being developed range from Option A through to E. The proposal will help Councils to decide which option to submit as the preference for proposed unitary councils in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Subsequently, the proposal will form part of the evidence base submitted to government, for consideration by the Secretary of State during the LGR decision making process for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Unlike many areas undergoing LGR, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough already benefit from a combined authority structure - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). This provides an established framework for strategic collaboration and devolution.

2.5 Which of the Council's equality objectives does this proposal link to or help to achieve?

The proposal for Option B links to the equality objectives of all Councils within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area, due to the nature of the

proposals included, and the embedded equality considerations in relation to these.

All local authorities are bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), including requirements to have due regard for the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination
- Advance equality of opportunity
- Foster good relations

The proposal for Option B demonstrates compliance with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) by embedding equality considerations throughout its design and implementation plans. It explicitly references approaches to the elimination of barriers to access, advancing equality of opportunity through integrated service models and multi-channel delivery, and fostering good relations via inclusive engagement structures.

All Cambridgeshire District Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council have signed the Cambridgeshire Equality Pledge. This is a commitment to appreciating and valuing the benefits of different communities and to the promotion of equality of opportunity. The proposal for Option B seeks to identify an approach that supports and advances these aims.

2.6 Which groups or individuals will the proposal affect:

☒ Service Users

☒ Councillors

☒ External Stakeholders

☐ Other

☒ Employees

If other, please specify **Not applicable**

2.7 Broadly speaking, how will these groups or individuals be affected? (further details on the specific impacts on different protected characteristic groups are included later in the form)

Service users and other external stakeholders:

- LGR will result in services that are easier to access, with one council to contact for all services. The proposal for Option B sets out a vision for “Simpler councils, stronger services: The right size to thrive, and local enough to care.”
- There are also opportunities for the provision of joined-up services for residents and other service users, enabling the delivery of more holistic services, with associated improvements in outcomes for residents and service users. For example, the proposal for Option B includes reference to the integration of currently County Council-led services (such as social care, education and health services) with currently District Council-led services (including social housing, homeless prevention and financial advice).
- The proposal focuses on economic growth, which supports financial sustainability by growing the tax base - ultimately enabling the councils to fund improved public services for residents.
- The disaggregation of county and district services is a major change, with associated potential for disruption to service users. The proposal for Option B sets out a five-stage Implementation and Transition Plan. This is designed to ensure continuity of statutory services, to minimise disruption for residents and to accelerate the realisation of benefits from LGR. At the core of the plan is the objective to ensure that services are safe and legal on Vesting Day and that residents experience continuity of service.
- The proposal recognises the important role of partners in LGR, for example stating that “collaboration with partners...will be central to achieving efficiencies and improved outcomes as well as realising the full benefits set out.” This will include but is not limited to local authorities, CPCA, Health and Care Partners, Police and Community Safety Partners, Voluntary and Community Safety Partners, Education Providers, Housing Associations and Registered Providers, Businesses and Economic Stakeholders (e.g. Chambers of Commerce and local enterprise partnerships)

Councillors:

- Councillors play a key role in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of the proposals and determining which option to submit to government.
- The proposal recommends a reduction in the number of Councillors in the region from 331 to 190 during the transition period. This equates to a reduction of 42% from the current number of councillors in the North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area and a 44% reduction from the current number in the Greater Cambridge area. This would result in a higher councillor to elector ratio than is currently the case for District Councillors on average, but a lower ratio than is the case for County Councillors. On average, LGR submissions propose a 49% reduction.
- The proposal recognises the role that Councillors will need to play in realising the benefits of LGR; particular in relation to understanding local contexts, the provision of strategic and community leadership, and accountability.

Employees:

- Local authority staff will play a pivotal role in implementing the chosen proposal and the Implementation and Transition Plan states that “collaboration with staff...will be central to achieving efficiencies and improved outcomes as well as realising the full benefits set out.”
- The Implementation and Transition Plan outlines seven different workstreams, including ‘People and Culture’, which includes consideration of staffing models, pay, terms and conditions, organisational development and a range of additional points of relevance to staff.

2.8 If any part of the proposal is being undertaken by external partners, please specify how the Council will ensure that they will meet equality standards?

The proposal has been developed in partnership between Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire Councils, with input from Huntingdonshire, Fenland and Peterborough Councils. Additional expert advice has also been sought, and this will continue where appropriate. As previously mentioned at 2.5, all local authorities are bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Within the proposal for Option B, the Implementation and Transition plan forms sets out a high-level roadmap, milestones and governance for a safe, legal and well sequenced transition to new unitary arrangements in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, going beyond the role of any individual authority and looking at the requirements of LGR in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as a whole.

Extensive further collaboration will take place with local authority and non-local authority partners following confirmation of the chosen option.

Where external consultants or companies provide services feeding into the LGR process, procurement processes, governance and contract management approaches will be followed throughout. This includes the requirement to ensure that equality standards are upheld.

Section 3: Evidence and data

- 3.1 Please indicated which of the following types of research have been carried out to inform the proposals and the assessment of how different groups of people (including the [9 protected characteristics](#)) may be impacted? Please provide details in relation to each type or research undertaken.

Research Type	Details
Desk-based research	Extensive analysis of publicly available data has taken place to inform the development of the proposal for Option B and an inter-council Data and Insight Group was set up to provide the grounding for all proposals.

	This included review and analysis of data setting out the demographic makeup of each council area (see proposal demographic analysis).
Lessons learned from previous schemes or projects	Learning has been taken from similar unitarisation processes, particularly in relation to Cumbria, North Yorkshire and Somerset who have been through reorganisation programmes over the past 10 years. Surrey have proceeded through the LGR process in advance of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Progress is being monitored, and learnings will continue to be identified from other parts of the country as LGR continues.
Review of statutory and / or best practice guidance	The LGR team have been in constant contact with MHCLG, Local Government Association, Local Government Information Unit and Local Partnerships throughout the proposal development process. This has included attendance by Council Leaders, CEOs and Officers at various LGR focussed events.
Engagement with individuals, community groups or subject matter experts	Multiple proposal specific public surveys have taken place helping to inform the development of the proposal for Option B. Two stakeholder focus groups have taken place, with details provided within the annexes of the proposal. A survey has also been run by the CPCA as a temperature check exercise for the region.
Formal Consultation	Deeper statutory consultation with stakeholders and residents is due to take place between Jan and May 2026. This will be undertaken by MHCLG.
Other	Not applicable.

3.2 If you have not undertaken any consultation, please detail why not, or when consultation is planned to take place.

As above.

Section 4: Impact of proposal on those with protected characteristics

4.1 Provide details of how the following characteristics may be impacted (positively or negatively) by the proposals.

Group	Details of Impacts
All (general to all of the below)	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> – The transition to unitaries could disrupt statutory services relied upon by high-intensity service users (for example those needing accessing social care, housing, SEND support), creating barriers between authorities. <u>Engagement and Representation</u> - Governance redesign may reduce visibility of minority voices if engagement relies solely on digital channels. <u>Financial Impact</u> - Council tax harmonisation (e.g., 4–5% increase in Peterborough) could disproportionately affect low-income households across all characteristics. <u>Workforce Transition</u> - Staff with protected characteristics may face uncertainty during organisational change. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Services for High-Intensity Users</u> – LGR offers the opportunity to remove inter- and intra-authority barriers, creating simpler access for residents with complex needs. <u>Alignment of EDI Commitments</u> - LGR offers a chance to harmonise policies (including those relating to EDI) across multiple current council areas.

	<u>Digital Transformation</u> – LGR offers to the opportunity for the introduction of new platforms that can simplify access and enable personalised support for all residents. <u>Community Voice</u> - Governance redesign offers the chance to embed inclusive engagement models. <u>Financial Resilience</u> - Efficiency savings delivered through LGR can be reinvested into frontline services, enhancing provision for vulnerable groups. Distribution Factors: • All protected characteristics are represented across the proposed new council areas, but their distribution varies: ◦ Greater Cambridge (Cambridge City & South Cambridgeshire) generally has higher ethnic diversity, younger population, and higher digital engagement. ◦ North Cambridgeshire & Peterborough generally has higher proportions of older residents, rural isolation, and socio-economic disadvantage. • These differences underline the need for collaboration and tailored approaches. This is explicitly addressed within the proposal for Option B, which recognises the distinct profiles of the two new councils while committing to shared standards and collaborative arrangements for service delivery and policy alignment.
Age	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> - Older residents could experience disruption in adult social care during transition; younger populations could face disruption in relation to education and youth services.

	<u>Access to Services</u> - Older people may struggle with digital-first service models, while younger people could be impacted by disruption to existing council-led youth engagement activities during restructuring. <u>Financial Impact</u> - Council tax harmonisation could disproportionately affect older residents on fixed incomes and younger low-income households. <u>Community Engagement</u> – Older and younger people may risk disengagement if consultation is not inclusive (young people in particular are disproportionately disengaged from consultation and voter registration, while older people may be more likely to struggle to participate in digital-first consultation). Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Services</u> – LGR offers the opportunity to design more consistent adult social care and youth services across new councils, thereby improving safeguarding processes for children and adults at risk. <u>Digital Transformation</u> - LGR offers to the opportunity for the introduction of digital platforms that can improve access for younger people and enable remote support for older residents with mobility issues. <u>Localised Service Models</u> – The inclusion of patch-based approaches within the proposal could bring services closer to rural older populations and create youth-focused hubs. <u>Financial Resilience</u> - Efficiency savings delivered through LGR can be reinvested into prevention and early help for both older and younger residents. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers a chance to embed older people's forums and youth panels in decision-making.
--	--

	Distribution Factors: - Fenland and Huntingdonshire (within the proposed North Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area) have the highest proportion of residents aged 65+, creating significant adult social care demand. - Cambridge and Peterborough have younger profiles, with Cambridge heavily skewed by students and Peterborough showing strong growth in working-age groups. This has implications for housing affordability, skills development, and employment programs.
Disability	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity Risks</u> – The transition to two new councils could disrupt adult social care and SEND services, causing delays in assessments or care packages. <u>Access to Services</u> – A digital-first approach may disadvantage those with cognitive or physical impairments. <u>Transport and Mobility</u> - Disabled residents in rural areas may risk isolation if services centralise. <u>Housing and Adaptations</u> - Harmonisation of housing policies could affect access to adapted homes or grants. <u>Employment and Workforce Transition</u> - Disabled staff transferring under contract transferal process need continuity of reasonable adjustments. <u>Financial Impact</u> - Council tax harmonisation (4–5% increase in Peterborough) could affect disabled people on fixed incomes. <u>Community Engagement</u> - Disabled residents may be underrepresented if engagement relies on digital channels.

Possible Positive Impacts:

Improved Service Integration - Two unitary councils allow streamlined adult social care and SEND services, reducing duplication.

Embedding Digital Transformation with LGR - LGR offers to the opportunity for new digital platforms that can enable faster referrals and remote support for mobility-impaired residents.

Localised Service Models - Inclusion of plans for the expansion of micro-providers and community-based care has potential to reduce isolation for disabled people in rural areas.

Financial Resilience - Efficiency savings delivered through LGR could be reinvested into frontline services, enhancing specialist provision.

Housing Strategy Alignment – The proposal presents the opportunity to standardise and improve adapted housing policies across new councils.

Community Voice - Engagement redesign offers a chance to embed disability forums and co-production.

Transport Solutions - Patch-based approach could integrate accessible transport planning.

Distribution Factors:

- Peterborough and Fenland show the highest prevalence of disability-related needs, driving significant demand for adult social care and specialist services, including market shaping for providers.
- SEND pressures are increasing across Greater Cambridge, requiring integrated education and care planning to meet rising demand.

Gender Reassignment	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Access to Services</u> - Risk that trans and non-binary residents experience barriers to accessing health, housing, and support services during transition. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Inclusive Policy Harmonisation</u> – LGR presents the opportunity to standardise and strengthen equality policies across both new councils. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers a chance to include trans and non-binary representation in decision-making. Distribution Factors: • The proposal acknowledges the need for inclusive engagement and service design to ensure equality for all protected characteristics. • Cambridge is a nationally significant centre for the transgender community.
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> - Disaggregation of services could temporarily affect registration services (marriages, civil partnerships) and related functions such as housing advice for couples. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Services</u> – LGR presents the opportunity to streamline registration services with other life-event services (housing, benefits) for married/civil partners.



	Distribution Factors: Census data shows that marriage and civil partnership rates are broadly consistent across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, with slightly higher proportions of married couples in rural districts (South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire) and lower rates in urban areas such as Cambridge City and Peterborough.
Pregnancy and maternity	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Workforce Transition</u> - Staff on maternity or paternity leave may face uncertainty during organisational change if not kept informed of developments and opportunities. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Early Help and Family Support</u> – LGR presents the opportunity to strengthen early intervention through integrated Family Hubs and Best Start programs. <u>Localised Service Delivery</u> – Inclusion of patch-based models within the proposal can bring maternity and early years support closer to rural communities. <u>Digital Innovation</u> - Digital platforms can improve appointment booking and access to advice for expectant mothers. Distribution Factors: - The business highlights early years and family support needs as a priority across both proposed councils. - Higher concentrations of need are expected in Peterborough and Fenland due to deprivation, while Greater Cambridge faces pressures linked to population growth and housing expansion.

Race	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Access to Services</u> - Risk that ethnic groups could experience service disruption or reduced cultural competence during transition. Services explicitly targeted to ethnic groups could also be impacted, such as management of Traveller sites or community development support. <u>Community Cohesion</u> - Potential loss of trust if local identity and anti-discrimination initiatives are not preserved, or where communities have strong connections to particular teams. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Targeted Service Design</u> - Larger councils can better tailor services to diverse communities through economies of scale and data-driven planning. <u>Stronger Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers an opportunity to embed representation from ethnic minority groups in decision-making and to draw and build upon existing strong relationships. <u>Economic and Skills Opportunities</u> - Growth strategies in Greater Cambridge and Peterborough can support employment for ethnic minority communities. Distribution Factors: • Cambridge and Peterborough have the most ethnically diverse populations, with around 25% of residents from minority ethnic backgrounds, compared to 4–11% in rural districts. • Rural areas within North Cambridgeshire & Peterborough are significantly less diverse.
------	---

Religion and belief	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Community Engagement</u> - Risk that faith-based groups lose influence or visibility during governance transition, reducing trust and cohesion). <u>Service Delivery</u> - Potential for new scheduling or policy decisions to overlook religious observances (e.g. prayer times, festivals). <u>Digital Inclusion</u> - Some faith communities may face language or digital barriers to accessing services. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Strengthened Partnerships</u> - Larger councils can formalise partnerships with faith groups to deliver community support and cohesion programs. <u>Inclusive Policy Development</u> – LGR presents the opportunity to standardise equality and anti-discrimination policies across new councils. <u>Community Safety</u> - Ability to scale up initiatives tackling hate crime and promoting cohesion. Distribution Factors: • Cambridge and Peterborough have more religiously diverse populations, including significant Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh communities, while rural districts are less diverse and predominantly Christian. • Faith groups play a strong role in community cohesion and local engagement, particularly in Cambridge and Peterborough.
----------------------------	---

Sex	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Care Responsibilities</u> - Women, often in positions as primary carers, may experience increased burden during transition if services are disrupted. <u>Workforce Transition</u> - Female staff in care and support roles may face uncertainty during organisational change. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Improved Service Design</u> - Opportunity to embed gender-sensitive approaches in housing, safety, and care services. <u>Economic Opportunities</u> - Growth strategies and skills programs can support women's employment and career progression. This is significant as nationally there is gender pay gap, with women tending to earn less than men. While women face specific barriers, such as often having to balance work with roles as primary caregivers, men also benefit from growth strategies and skills programs. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers a chance to strengthen representation of women in decision-making. Distribution Factors National and local trends indicate women are more likely to be unpaid carers and employed in lower-paid roles within care and support services.
Sexual orientation	Possible Negative Impacts:

	<u>Service Continuity</u> - Transition to new councils could disrupt access to specialist services (e.g. LGBTQ+ support groups, hate crime reporting pathways). Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Services</u> – LGR presents the opportunity to embed LGBTQ+ inclusion across housing, community safety, and wellbeing services. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers a chance to strengthen LGBTQ+ representation in decision-making. Distribution Factors • Census and ONS data indicate that LGBTQ+ populations are more concentrated in urban areas such as Cambridge City and Peterborough, with smaller but significant communities across rural districts. • These patterns are referenced in the demographic and community engagement sections of the proposal.
Care experienced (what is this?)	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> - Risk of disruption to safeguarding and care planning during transition, affecting vulnerable children and care leavers. <u>Housing and Support</u> - Care leavers may face uncertainty in housing and support arrangements during policy harmonisation. <u>Engagement</u> - Care-experienced young people may be underrepresented in consultation and service redesign. Possible Positive Impacts:

	<u>Service Improvement</u> – LGR offers opportunity to move children’s services from “inadequate” to “good” or “outstanding” through transformation. <u>Local Provision</u> - Expansion of in-borough fostering and residential care reduces reliance on out-of-area placements. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers a chance to embed care-experienced voices in decision-making. Distribution Factors • Peterborough and Fenland have higher levels of deprivation, which are associated with greater demand for children’s social care services, including support for care-experienced young people. • Greater Cambridge faces pressures linked to population growth and housing expansion, which may affect care planning and placement availability.
Digital exclusion	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> - Transition to digital-first systems could disrupt access for residents without internet or devices. <u>Access to Services</u> - Risk of exclusion from key services (housing, benefits, registration) if digital channels dominate. <u>Engagement and Representation</u> - Digitally excluded residents may be underrepresented in consultations and decision-making.



	<u>Financial Impact</u> - Lack of digital access could prevent residents from using online tools to manage council tax harmonisation or hardship schemes. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Support</u> – LGR provides the opportunity to embed assisted digital services alongside other life-event support (housing, benefits). <u>Digital Inclusion Programmes</u> - LGR creates scope for unified digital inclusion strategy across new councils. <u>Community Voice</u> - Engagement redesign offers chance to strengthen offline participation channels. Distribution Factors • Digital exclusion is more prevalent in rural districts (Fenland, East Cambridgeshire, parts of Huntingdonshire) due to limited broadband coverage and lower digital literacy among older populations. • Urban areas (Cambridge City, Peterborough) have higher connectivity but still include pockets of exclusion linked to socio-economic disadvantage. See proposal demographic and infrastructure analysis (p. 88–89) and digital transformation plans.
Rural isolation	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Access to Services</u> - Residents in rural areas may experience reduced access to health, social care, and council services if delivery becomes centralised. <u>Digital Exclusion</u> - Poor broadband and mobile coverage could limit access to digital-first services.

	<u>Transport Barriers</u> - Limited public transport may increase isolation and reduce access to employment and education. Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Localised Service Models</u> – Inclusion of patch-based approach within the proposal could bring services closer to rural communities and reduce isolation. <u>Digital Transformation</u> – LGR presents the opportunity for improved digital platforms can enable remote access to services for rural residents. <u>Infrastructure Investment</u> - Reorganisation has the potential to strengthen ability to deliver transport and broadband improvements. Distribution Factors: • North Cambridgeshire & Peterborough is predominantly rural, with large areas in Fenland, East Cambridgeshire, and Huntingdonshire having limited transport and digital connectivity. • Greater Cambridge is more urban, but rural villages still face access challenges for services and infrastructure.
Socio-economic status	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Financial Pressures</u> - Council tax harmonisation could disproportionately affect low-income households, especially in Peterborough where increases of 4–5% are forecast. <u>Access to Services</u> - Digital-first transformation risks excluding residents without devices or connectivity.

	Possible Positive Impacts: <u>Targeted Investment</u> - Larger councils can direct resources to deprived areas for early intervention and community support. <u>Economic Growth</u> - Combined authorities can leverage growth in Greater Cambridge and Peterborough to create jobs and reduce poverty. <u>Financial Resilience</u> - Efficiency savings can protect statutory services and fund targeted support for vulnerable households. Distribution Factors • Peterborough and Fenland are among the 20% most deprived areas nationally, with child poverty rates exceeding 20%. • Greater Cambridge is comparatively affluent but faces housing affordability challenges and pockets of deprivation in urban areas. • This uneven distribution drives different priorities: protection and support in the north, prevention and inclusion in the south.
Armed Forces Community	Possible Negative Impacts: <u>Service Continuity</u> - Transition to new councils could disrupt Armed Forces Covenant delivery and specialist support services. <u>Access to Services</u> - Risk of fragmented access to housing, welfare, and employment support during transition.

	Positive Impacts: <u>Integrated Support</u> - Opportunity to unify Armed Forces Covenant delivery across two councils for consistency and improved outcomes. <u>Housing Strategy Alignment</u> - Harmonisation could standardise and strengthen housing priority for veterans and service families. <u>Employment and Skills</u> - LGR creates scope for coordinated employment pathways for veterans across the region. <u>Community Voice</u> - Governance redesign offers chance to formalise Armed Forces representation in local decision-making. Distribution Factors • Armed Forces personnel and veterans are concentrated near RAF Wyton (Huntingdonshire) and RAF Alconbury, with smaller communities in Fenland and East Cambridgeshire. • Peterborough and Cambridge City have notable veteran populations linked to urban resettlement and housing availability. See proposal demographic and housing analysis and community profiles.
--	--



4.2 Considering the above impacts you have identified above, please detail any actions (specific or general) which may help to enhance or mitigate impacts.

The actions set out below will be further developed within an Equality Impact Assessment for the next stage of the LGR process subject to the selection of Option B as the chosen preference for LGR in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Actions to mitigate negative or enhance positive impacts	Linked Groups (Section 4.1)	Responsible Officer	Completion Timescale
1. Inclusion of proposals to ensure statutory services (Adults, Children's, SEND, Housing, Public Health) remain safe and legal during transition, including disaggregation, dual running of systems and establishment of dedicated transition teams.	Age, Disability, Pregnancy and Maternity, Care Experienced, Socio-economic Status	LGR Proposal Development Team	28/11/25
2. Inclusion of proposals for patch-based and neighbourhood service delivery models to support local access during transition.	Rural Isolation, Age, Disability, Socio-economic Status, Race, Religion, Care Experienced	As above	As above
3. Inclusion of proposals for multi-channel access and assisted digital support alongside digital transformation.	Digital Exclusion, Disability, Age, Race, Religion	As above	As above

4. Inclusion of proposals considering opportunities for AI-enabled tools and predictive analytics to support early intervention.	Disability, Care Experienced, Age, Socio-economic Status	As above	As above
5. Inclusion of proposals for Best Start Family Hubs and early help services.	Pregnancy and Maternity, Age, Disability, Socio-economic Status, Race	As above	As above
6. Inclusion of proposals for harmonised equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) policies for adoption by new councils.	All	As above	As above
7. Inclusion of proposals for inclusive engagement models and Resident Engagement Pathways for transition phase.	All	As above	As above
8. Inclusion of proposals for accessible formats (Easy Read, BSL, captioning) and translated materials for communications.	Disability, Race, Age	As above	As above
9. Inclusion of proposals for retention of discretionary hardship schemes during council tax harmonisation.	Socio-economic Status, Age, Disability	As above	As above
10. Inclusion of proposals for resource ring-fencing for statutory services and early help.	Disability, Age, Care Experienced, Pregnancy and Maternity, Socio-economic Status	As above	As above

11. Inclusion of proposals for workforce transition planning with equality monitoring and wellbeing support.	All	As above	As above
12. Inclusion of proposals for interoperable case-management systems to support digital transformation.	Digital Exclusion, Disability, Care Experienced, Age	As above	As above
13. Inclusion of proposals for expansion of micro-provider networks and community hubs for localised delivery.	Rural Isolation, Disability, Age, Socio-economic Status, Race, Religion	As above	As above
14. Inclusion of proposals for joint commissioning of specialist services where cross-boundary collaboration improves outcomes.	Disability, Care Experienced, Race, Religion	As above	As above
15. Inclusion of proposals for aligning housing strategies and Disabled Facilities Grant policies for adapted housing provision.	Disability, Age, Socio-economic Status, Pregnancy and Maternity	As above	As above
16. Inclusion of proposals for integrating community transport schemes and connectivity improvements into service planning.	Rural Isolation, Disability, Age, Socio-economic Status	As above	As above

17. Inclusion of proposals for digital inclusion programmes to support access.	Digital Exclusion, Age, Socio-economic Status, Disability	As above	As above
18. Inclusion of proposals for forums for underrepresented groups (disability, LGBTQ+, Armed Forces, care-experienced young people).	Disability, Sexual Orientation, Gender Reassignment, Armed Forces Community, Care Experienced	As above	As above
19. Inclusion of proposals for continuation and expansion of community safety and cohesion programmes, including anti-discrimination initiatives.	Race, Religion, Sexual Orientation, Gender Reassignment, Sex	As above	As above
20. Inclusion of proposals for skills and employment programmes linked to economic development strategies.	Socio-economic Status, Age, Disability	As above	As above

4.3 How will you monitor the completion of the above actions the impacts of this proposal, once implemented?

The actions listed at Section 4.2 have been confirmed as completed within proposal development stage for Option B. Following the decision from the Secretary of State, detailed implementation planning will be undertaken by the Shadow Authority and associated workstreams, with progress tracked against the LGR programme milestones. Further Equality considerations and actions will be embedded within these plans, and monitoring will include regular reporting to programme boards, and equality leads to ensure that EqlA actions are delivered.

Section 5: Summary

5.1 Briefly summarise the key findings of the EqlA and the considerations that should be taken into account when deciding how to proceed.

The EqlA identifies that Local Government Reorganisation under Option B presents both risks and opportunities for people with protected characteristics.

Potential negative impacts include short-term disruption to statutory services, digital exclusion, financial pressures from council tax harmonisation, and uncertainty for staff during transition. These risks are mitigated through commitments in the proposal, including a phased Implementation and Transition Plan, multi-channel service access, hardship schemes, and equality monitoring in workforce changes.

Positive impacts include opportunities to integrate services, harmonise equality policies, strengthen community voice, and improve access through digital transformation and patch-based delivery models. Option B prioritises economic balance between the two proposed unitary authorities while creating conditions for inclusive and sustainable economic growth across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

Consideration of these factors, alongside targeted engagement and resource ring-fencing, demonstrates that the proposal can advance equality objectives while minimising adverse impacts.

5.2 Confirm the recommendation of the officer completing the EqIA:

☒ Proceed with the proposal (completing actions identified at section 4) – analysis demonstrates that the proposal is robust, and consideration has been given to opportunities for the advancement of the three objectives of the [Equality Act 2010](#).

☐ Reject the proposal - analysis demonstrates that the proposal will cause unlawful discrimination and it must be removed or changed

Section 6: Sign off

6.1 Officer completing EqIA:

[Kevin Ledger](#)

6.2 Approving officer (Head of Service, Service Area Manager, or Project Sponsor):

Liz Watts – Chief Exec at South Cambridgeshire District Council,

Robert Pollock - Chief Exec at Cambridge City Council,

Isabel Edgar – Director of Operations at East Cambridgeshire District Council

6.3 Date of completion and approval:

25 November 2025