

# Disability Equality Survey - December 2006

## Key Findings for South Holland

This document is intended to be read alongside the Full Disability Equality Consultation report which was produced by SMSR Ltd. It is a short summary of the full report, focusing on the key survey results and the implications for South Holland District Council.

### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 All local authorities have a new statutory duty introduced through the Disability Discrimination Act 2005, which came into force on the 5<sup>th</sup> December 2006. As part of the Lincolnshire Districts Equality and Diversity Project, SMSR Ltd (an independent research company) were commissioned to carry out a consultation exercise during November and December 2006. The consultation focused on the perceptions and attitudes towards disability in Lincolnshire and on our Access to Services agenda.
- 1.2 The Lincolnshire Districts Equality and Diversity Project works in partnership with: Boston Borough Council; City of Lincoln Council; East Lindsey District Council; North Kesteven District Council; South Holland District Council; South Kesteven District Council; West Lindsey District Council. Lincolnshire County Council also has representation on the Equality and Diversity Project Steering Group.

### 2 Methodology

- 2.1 The consultation process combined three different methodologies: a telephone survey; an online survey; and focus groups/in depth interviews.

**a) Telephone Survey** - a total of 2,859 telephone surveys were conducted with a quota of 400 for each District. The area quotas were all based on a representative profile based on the 2001 Census statistics.

**b) Online Survey** - an online survey was posted on the SMSR website with a link to the survey on all seven of the Councils own websites. The questionnaire was exactly the same as the telephone survey and 34 residents completed an on-line survey.

**c) Focus Groups** - a series of 7 focus groups and a selection of in-depth telephone interviews were carried out across the Districts in September 2006.

### 3 Summary of Results

- 3.1 This Disability Consultation was commissioned by the Lincolnshire Districts Equality and Diversity Project and so the survey report produced by SMSR Ltd has been written for the Project as a whole. This means that the report covers the county as a whole and display results for each District, therefore the report is very long. Below is a short summary of the key findings from the survey based consultation overall and for South Holland specifically, along with the implications for South Holland District Council.
- 3.2 Results are shown for disabled and non disabled respondents where appropriate. Unfortunately results cannot be further broken down to show South Holland disabled respondents due to the small number of respondents this would

produce. Therefore where differences between disabled and non disabled respondents have been highlighted, any differences are at the County level. However this will give a very good indication of disabled peoples views at District level.

### **Communicating with Councils**

- 3.3 35% of respondents overall had contacted their Council in the last 12 months, while 30.5% of respondents in South Holland had contacted SHDC in the last 12 months.
- 3.4 Contacting the council by telephone was the dominant method of contact for two thirds of respondents (64.8% overall, 69.4% South Holland). Contacting the council 'in person' and by 'letter' were other popular methods used in each district. For South Holland specifically 17.7% of respondents contacted SHDC in person and 8.9% by letter. The results indicated that disabled people (25.2%) tended to visit the council in person more often than non-disabled people (15.7%).
- 3.5 Almost two-thirds of respondents overall (65%) had access to the Internet, fewer respondents in South Holland have access to the internet (58.4%). Of those with internet access in South Holland most respondents have access to the internet at home (87.8%). Less than 10% of respondents currently communicate with each Council by e-mail or via the Internet, however considerably more disabled people (23.5%) use email and the Internet as methods of contacting the councils compared to non disabled people (7.5%).
- 3.6 Fewer South Holland respondents contacted SHDC by email or via the internet compared to other Lincolnshire district councils.

### **Implication for SHDC**

- 3.7 With disabled respondents more likely than non disabled respondents to visit the Council in person, or contact SHDC by email or via the internet, the value of these communication methods is reinforced. SHDC could investigate whether any improvements are needed to help people using these contact methods for example, making transactions / requests on the internet as quick and easy as possible, making sure Customer Services can provide alternative formats and so on.
- 3.8 Alternative forms of communications that have been requested by respondents overall are:
- the interpreting and translation service
  - Braille, large print, audiotapes and electronic format services
  - a sign language interpreter
  - hearing induction loop or portable loop system
  - Readspeaker option on the website.
- 3.9 In all cases alternative communication formats accounted for less than 1% of the contact methods used, although of course for this small number of respondents they are very important. When asked about possible future needs, 2% – 3% of respondents overall would request to use these services in the future.

### Implication for SHDC

- 3.10 There may be an increase in the take up of alternative communication formats and therefore SHDC need to consider how this increase could be resourced, including how information on these services are communicated to customers.

### Access

- 3.11 Difficulties accessing a range of local facilities are shown below:

Facility	% difficult / very difficult overall	% difficult / very difficult South Holland
Hospital	38.7	41.1
Railway station	38.1	39.7
County Council Offices	32.0	35.0
Local Police Station	27.0	31.8
District Council Offices	25.9	27.1
Shopping Centre	23.9	27.3
Leisure/Sports Centre	24.1	23.4
Bank / cash point	19.4	22.2
Library	15.7	17.0
Chemist / Pharmacy	15.3	15.3
Doctor's surgery	14.6	15.5
Post Office	12.3	17.2
Local Parish Council Office	13.3	15.3
Fresh fruit and vegetables shops	13.3	10.3
Bus stop	12.4	12.8
Local Park or green space	10.6	9.4
Local shops	10.5	11.6
Village Hall / Community Centre	10.3	12.3

- 3.12 For most of the services and facilities listed, more than 10% of respondents overall and South Holland respondents mentioned having some level of difficulty in regard to access.
- 3.13 A Hospital and a railway station are the services which are the most difficult to access, for two fifths of South Holland respondents these facilities are difficult to access (consistent with South Holland Quality of Life results). It is also worth noting that around one in 10 respondents find it difficult to get to a doctors surgery (15.5% South Holland respondents) and to a shop selling fresh fruit and vegetables (10.3% South Holland respondents) – both are issues connected with health / healthy lifestyle.

### Implication for SHDC

- 3.14 These results support the 'health', and 'thriving and safe communities' themes of the Community Plan 2006-2009 Action plan. We need to continue working with the LSP to develop ways to deliver healthcare and improve public transport so people can access these more easily.
- 3.15 All facilities were more difficult to access for the disabled, the average difference being +13.5%. Over half of disabled respondents have difficulty accessing a hospital (54.9%).

- 3.16 Due to the rural nature of South Holland some facilities will be difficult to access, however SHDC may have a role in helping people to travel to these facilities. For example customer services could actively promote (in person or on the telephone):
- the ‘Hospital Car Service’ transport scheme (find out correct name) so people find it less difficult to access the hospital
  - various public transport options and times so people who find it difficult to access a railway station have other travel options.
- Posters detailing these options could also be displayed at SHDC managed sites and other local authority sites for example libraries.

### Attitudes

#### i) Living in Lincolnshire

- 3.17 Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a set of statements about living in Lincolnshire.

Figures in italics are South Holland results

Statement	Agreed / strongly agreed	Neither	Disagreed / strongly agreed	DK
I have an income which supports my needs	72.8 <i>77.6</i>	5.7 <i>3.4</i>	16.2 <i>12.1</i>	5.3 <i>6.9</i>
I am satisfied with the level of social services and health services available to me	65.9 <i>68.7</i>	4.6 <i>4.2</i>	21.0 <i>19.7</i>	8.5 <i>7.4</i>
I am satisfied with the level of public and community transport services available	48.2 <i>53.9</i>	3.4 <i>2.7</i>	34.3 <i>30.1</i>	14.1 <i>13.3</i>
I can influence decision in my local area	35.7 <i>36.5</i>	5.3 <i>4.7</i>	47.4 <i>48.3</i>	11.7 <i>10.6</i>
I believe people with disabilities in Lincolnshire have a strong voice	35.0 <i>35.9</i>	5.5 <i>4.2</i>	24.3 <i>21.7</i>	35.2 <i>38.2</i>
I have more services and facilities in my area than I did 12 months ago	22.2 <i>24.7</i>	16.9 <i>12.8</i>	47.3 <i>45.3</i>	13.7 <i>17.2</i>
I would like to be involved / more involved with voluntary and community groups in my area	19.5 <i>16.0</i>	9.5 <i>7.4</i>	63.6 <i>71.9</i>	7.4 <i>4.7</i>

- 3.18 Two thirds or more of respondents overall and in South Holland agreed that ‘I have an income which supports my needs’ and ‘I am satisfied with the level of social services and health services available to me’. Less than half of respondents agreed with each of the remaining statements.
- 3.19 Around a third of respondents overall and in South Holland agreed that they ‘can influence decisions’ in their local area and ‘believe people with disabilities in Lincolnshire have a strong voice’. These statements are both about people being able to have their say.

### Implication for SHDC

- 3.20 While SHDC cannot increase opportunities for people to have their say on everything that goes on in their area we can increase opportunities relating to council services. Opportunities have increased over recent months for example, web casting events such as Council tax consultation and Gypsy site consultation

(so that people who do not physically attend events have an opportunity to watch what is happening and participate by email). However to truly involve residents more often will require heavy investment and Council wide commitment to acting on residents feedback.

- 3.21 There are a number of differences between disabled and non-disabled respondents in relation to the value statements about living in Lincolnshire. Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree that they:
- can influence decisions in their local area (59.1% disabled, 46.3% non disabled)
  - are satisfied with the level of public and community transport services available (40.8% disabled, 33.5% non disabled)
  - believe people with disabilities in Lincolnshire have a strong voice (35.8% disabled, 23.2% non disabled)
  - have an income which supports their needs (29.5% disabled, 14.9% non disabled)
  - are satisfied with the level of social services and health services available to them (26.9% disabled, 20.4% non disabled).

**ii) Local Authority**

- 3.22 Respondents were also asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the following set of statements about their Council.

Figures in italics are South Holland results

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Agreed / strongly agreed</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Disagreed / strongly disagreed</b>	<b>DK</b>
My District Council is well informed on the needs of disabled people	32.1 <i>35.3</i>	4.7 <i>2.7</i>	12.5 <i>11.0</i>	49.7 <i>51.0</i>
In my area Council buildings are accessible and welcoming	60.7 <i>71.2</i>	4.4 <i>3.4</i>	10.7 <i>7.2</i>	24.3 <i>18.2</i>
I believe the Council takes complaints seriously	50.2 <i>58.9</i>	6.5 <i>6.9</i>	19.8 <i>16.7</i>	23.5 <i>17.5</i>
The Council's leaflets' and publications are easy to understand	79.1 <i>84.2</i>	3.0 <i>3.2</i>	7.6 <i>4.9</i>	10.3 <i>7.6</i>

- 3.23 Overall this information is relatively positive, especially for 'the Council's leaflets' and publications are easy to understand' (84.2% of South Holland respondents agreed). The major weakness is that respondents didn't know if their authority was well informed on the needs of disabled people (49.7% overall, 51.0% South Holland). In addition disabled respondents disagreed with this statement (26.1% more than non disabled respondents (11.2%).

- 3.24 There were small differences between disabled and non disabled respondents for the remaining statements about respondents local authority.

**Implication for SHDC**

- 3.25 It is worth noting that large proportions of respondents answered don't know for each of the statements (about living in Lincolnshire and the Local Authority) that focus on people with disabilities. SHDC should consider this issue. Do we need more information about the needs of disabled people or do we have this information but need to provide / publicise this information more effectively?

**Safety**

- 3.26 Respondents were asked to state how safe they felt in the following situations.

Statement	Safe Overall	Safe South Holland	Unsafe Overall	Unsafe South Holland
In your home during the day	97.3	96.3	1.6	1.7
In your home at night	93.0	93.6	3.9	3.2
Out and about in your local area during the day	93.7	93.9	4.2	3.7
Out and about in the nearest town centre during the day	88.2	89.9	7.9	6.1
Out and about in your local area at night	64.5	64.5	24.9	25.4
Out and about in the nearest town centre at night	41.3	41.4	43.8	43.1

3.27 These figures suggest that respondents generally feel safe, except in a 'town centre at night' and for some 'out and about in their local area at night'.

3.28 Feelings of safety amongst South Holland respondents are consistent with Lincolnshire overall.

3.29 In ALL cases disabled persons are LESS likely to feel safe and in some particular cases, considerably so:

- out and about in the nearest town centre during the day (71.6% disabled respondents feel safe, 91.7% non disabled)
- out and about in your local area at night (45.6% disabled, 66.5% non disabled)
- out and about in the nearest town centre at night (28.4% disabled, 42.5% non disabled).

### Implication for SHDC

3.30 These findings suggest that some disabled people may feel more vulnerable in the community. We must be aware of this when providing our services.

### Problems in local area

3.31 Respondents were asked to state how much of a problem they felt the following issues were in relation to their local area:

**Figures in italics are South Holland responses**

Problem	Major	Minor	None	DK
Lack of facilities for young people	41.0 <i>37</i>	23.0 <i>19</i>	26.0 <i>39</i>	10.0 <i>5</i>
Crime in General	14.0 <i>14</i>	53.0 <i>54</i>	26.0 <i>27</i>	7.0 <i>4</i>
Road safety (including speeding/drink driving)	25.0 <i>26</i>	40.0 <i>34</i>	30.0 <i>37</i>	6.0 <i>3</i>
Availability of public transport	19.0 <i>18</i>	22.0 <i>19</i>	51.0 <i>55</i>	8.0 <i>8</i>
Vandalism to buildings, cars, playground etc	17.0 <i>16</i>	36.0 <i>31</i>	41.0 <i>50</i>	6.0 <i>3</i>
Under age drinking in public	16.0 <i>15</i>	25.0 <i>21</i>	52.0 <i>57</i>	8.0 <i>6</i>
Access to policing services	15.0 <i>21</i>	25.0 <i>20</i>	51.0 <i>49</i>	10.0 <i>9</i>
Solvent abuse, drugs misuse	14.0 <i>14</i>	25.0 <i>30</i>	45.0 <i>45</i>	17.0 <i>12</i>

Drunk people causing a nuisance	14.0 13	29.0 27	51.0 57	6.0 3
Groups of people	13.0 12	28.0 25	55.0 62	5.0 2
Rubbish or litter lying around	13.0 6	31.0 29	54.0 64	3.0 2
Joyriding (cars, mopeds etc)	13.0 14	31.0 29	46.0 50	9.0 7
Antisocial behaviour	12.0 12	29.0 30	55.0 57	4.0 2
Poor street lighting	9.0 10	18.0 18	70.0 7	3.0 3
Graffiti on buildings or wall	7.0 7	28.0 27	60.0 64	5.0 3

Continued

<b>Problem</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>DK</b>
Access to Council services	7.0 8	22.0 22	57.0 62	13.0 7
Abandoned Vehicles	5.0 5	28.0 26	60.0 63	7.0 6
Noisy neighbours or parties	4.0 2	17.0 16	74.0 79	5.0 3
Beggars	1.0 0	10.0 9	86.0 90	3.0 1
Rough sleepers	2.0 0	10.0 10	84.0 88	5.0 2

3.32 A 'lack of facilities for young people' is clearly seen as the largest major problem overall. 'Crime in general' and 'road safety' are also seen as a problem by many. South Holland respondents also see these three issues as the main problems in South Holland.

3.33 Looking specifically at Council services almost a third of respondents (29% overall, 30% South Holland) think access to Council services is a major or minor problem. Without further investigation it is not known which Council services respondents have problems accessing or whether they have problems accessing the Council office due to location, opening hours and so on.

3.34 In almost all of these situations the above issues were more likely to be a major problem for a disabled person. The largest differences were for:

- Crime in General (+10.8%)
- Availability of public transport (+9.7%)
- Joyriding (cars, mopeds) (+8.4%).

### **Implication for SHDC**

3.35 Again these findings suggest that some disabled people may feel more vulnerable in the community. SHDC must be aware of this when providing our services.

### **Disability Section**

3.36 9% of the respondents (257/2893) said they had a disability as defined under the Disability Discrimination Act. Amongst South Holland respondents 8.1% had a disability. Disabilities ranged from mobility issues to sensory impairments.

3.37 Some of the disabled respondents (22.6%) stated they had *experienced* some form of verbal abuse (13.2%), physical abuse (4.3%), or had encountered negative attitudes (22.6%).

3.38 Overall, 30.3% of all the respondents said that they had witnessed some form of abuse towards disabled persons, whether it be verbal (9.6%), physical (5.8%), or behavioural (14.9%).

3.39 5% of respondents said they had reported a hate crime or hate incident (4.4% of South Holland respondents).

### **Implication for SHDC**

3.40 Worryingly a fifth of disabled respondents overall have experienced some form of abuse or negative attitudes and nearly a third of respondents have witnessed

some form of abuse toward a disabled person. SHDC should take steps to make sure that disabled people do not experience abuse or discrimination whilst in SHDC managed facilities / at events. Furthermore we should consider how we could reduce these incidents in the wider community, for example anti social behaviour team initiatives.

## **Housing**

- 3.41 81.7% of respondents live in their own/mortgaged property (84.2% of South Holland respondents). Disabled persons were LESS likely to live in an owned/mortgaged property (68% disabled, 83% non disabled) and are more likely to live in Council property (13.6% disabled, 5.1% non disabled) or rented accommodation (10.1% disabled, 6.2% non disabled).
- 3.42 Just over 60% of respondents overall reported some form of problem/issue with their current housing situation. Amongst South Holland respondents the most common problems are: reliant on being able to drive; lack of local services; isolated location; too far from family and friends; parking is an issue.
- 3.43 Disabled respondents are 40% more likely to have a problem with their home/where they live.
- 3.44 Just over 11% of disabled respondents overall said their home needed to be adapted (or were on a waiting list) to increase its physical accessibility for someone in their household with a disability, compared to 1.4% of non disabled respondents.

## **Promotion of equality and diversity**

- 3.45 Respondents were asked 'what else, if anything would you like the partnership to do to promote equality and diversity'. A summary of responses overall follows:
- 47 people said the Council should increase the provision of services and inclusion for young people
  - 27 people said there should be more provision of services and inclusion for disabled people
  - 22 people said the Council should increase awareness about political correctness and equality
  - 12 people said there should be an increase in accessibility to public transport
  - 8 people said to increase the provision of services and inclusion of older people
  - 4 people said more care for the older people/disabled
  - 3 people said raise the national pension.

## **Implication for SHDC**

In terms of equality and diversity issues young people and the disabled come out as the issues respondents would most like the partnership to promote.