

## Equality Analysis (Stage 2)

Equality Analysis is a way of considering and analysing the impacts of proposed changes on each of the protected characteristic groups as set out in the Equality Act 2010. Those impacts must be considered for service users, residents and for council employees. Equality Analysis is part of the decision-making process and should begin as soon as sufficient information about the proposed change is known and before any changes have been implemented.

Please complete this **Equality Analysis (Stage 2)** if any potential risks or negative impacts on the protected groups were identified in the Equality Analysis – Screening (Stage 1), or if you have been advised to do so.

Ref no. of Equality Analysis – Screening (Stage 1)	EA0351
Start date of Equality Analysis (Stage 2)	01/03/2024
Lead Officer/s	Robert Sager (Local Growth Programme Manager – Devolution, East Riding of Yorkshire Council); Nathan Turner (Head of Strategy and Policy, Hull City Council)
Directors	Claire Watts (Director of Economic Development and Communications, East Riding of Yorkshire Council); Alex Codd (Assistant Director Economic Development & Regeneration, Hull City Council)
Title of the proposed change	Devolution Proposal
Type of change (i.e. new policy or strategy, review of a policy or strategy, service change, service review, budget changes, change to terms and conditions, new project).	<p>Hull City Council and East Riding of Yorkshire Council are considering a proposal that could lead to the establishment of a mayoral combined authority (Hull and East Yorkshire Combined Authority or 'HEYCA'). Under the terms of the current proposal, the new combined authority would gain access to powers and investment targeted at improving the productivity, connectivity, inclusivity, and sustainability of the area; neither local authority is currently able to access these powers and investment independently.</p> <p>If established, an elected mayor and HEYCA will lead collaboration between the constituent councils and act as the recipients of powers and funding from Government under the Proposal. The Proposal sets out the detailed background and context leading to its development, the constituent councils' ambitions for HEYCA, HEYCA's proposed governance arrangements and next steps.</p> <p>This EIA does not seek to replicate information contained in the Proposal and should be read in conjunction with it. This EIA examines the possible equalities impacts arising from the Proposal.</p>

Please provide details of and rationale for the proposed change.

Overview:

The Proposal describes the constituent councils' shared objectives for the HEYCA, their priority focus areas, planned activities in each of those focus areas, and the outcomes the HEYCA is expected to achieve for residents in the area.

HEYCA will benefit from the devolution of additional powers from Westminster and other public bodies. HEYCA will also hold some powers and functions that are currently exercisable by the constituent councils acting alone. In most cases those powers and functions will also be retained by the constituent councils, and in some cases HEYCA's exercise of those powers and functions is additionally subject to the consent of the relevant council; but there are some instances where powers or functions of the constituent councils will be exclusively available to HEYCA either from creation of the combined authority, or after a certain defined period of time.

The proposed powers and functions which will be available to the elected mayor and to HEYCA are described in the Proposal and set out in detail in an annex to the Proposal. The Proposal also explains how the HEYCA will exercise those powers in a way that ensures that the identities and interests of all communities within the Hull and East Yorkshire area are fully represented.

The Proposal explains how business interests and other interests will be represented on HEYCA through additional memberships and/or potential advisory bodies.

Rationale:

The devolution proposal offers the opportunity to leverage Hull and East Yorkshire's sectoral strengths in the transition to a more productive, low carbon economy whilst improving the living standards and economic opportunities for their most deprived communities. This will build on a long and successful history of partnership working between the two authorities which has pioneered new delivery approaches and policy development across a range of economic development interventions, but with a focus on their combined strengths in sustainable energy generation, flood risk and environmental management, and water-sensitive regeneration.

The desired outcomes of establishing a combined authority are set out in the Proposal (consultation document), which forms the backbone of an eventual submission to Government, if made. This document asserts that this additional investment and local decision making could better represent and address the needs of residents in Hull and East Yorkshire and support the local ambitions and access to opportunities.

Central to this is the election of a directly elected mayor who, in addition to holding several key powers and the ability to direct investment funds, can act as a champion for the area's interests, deliver on local priorities, and be accountable to local people.

Timeline:

Following agreement by both local authorities on 21 December 2023 (for which a Stage 1 Equality Analysis was completed – ref: EA0351), a joint public consultation on the devolution proposal

was conducted from 2 January to 27 February 2024. This consultation responded to a requirement within the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act and sought views from residents, businesses, and stakeholders regarding the proposal.

Independent consultation analysis is being undertaken by TONIC, from which a report will be produced and published. Three broad outcomes are possible: (1) to submit the proposal as it currently stands; (2) to submit the proposal with amendments based upon the feedback received during the consultation; or (3) not to submit the proposal and halt the devolution process altogether.

Delegated authority has been given to the leaders of both local authorities to take a decision on whether to submit the proposal to the Secretary of State; this decision is expected in April 2024. Before a decision is taken on whether to progress with the devolution proposal, a Stage 2 Equality Analysis is required to establish the potential impact (positive, negative, or neutral) of the proposal on protected characteristic groups. This analysis will utilise the responses to the consultation, as well as focus groups held during the consultation period, as its evidence base.

Should a decision to be taken to proceed (outcomes 1 or 2) with a submission made to Government, draft legislation will be prepared, and both councils are expected to take a final decision on submission in May 2024. If approved, the legislation (Statutory Instrument) will then be laid before Parliament. The current timeline suggests the first mayoral election will take place in May 2025, with the combined authority itself being established in Autumn 2024.

### Available data and demographics

This section will help build up a picture of who and how many people with a protected characteristic may be impacted by the proposed change.

**Is there any existing data that will help you understand the potential impact of the proposed change? Please detail this below:**

#### Equality Analysis

A Stage 1 equality analysis (ref: EA0351) was undertaken by both councils in relation to the devolution proposal in advance of a decision to proceed with a public consultation, as submitted in the published papers to each full council. Stage 1 analyses provide a snapshot of impact on protected characteristic groups. Broadly, the Stage 1 analysis determined that:

*No detrimental impacts to any individual groups of people were identified in respect of the proposed governance arrangements or the powers and funding contained within the deal. This judgement was based on a consideration of the nature of the powers and changes to governance arrangements, which do not in themselves change services received by people in Hull and East Yorkshire. Instead, there is potential for the funding and powers to be used to reduce inequalities, based on the decisions that a future HEYCA might make.*

Guided by relevant equalities officers with the local authorities, both councils determined that Stage 2 analysis would be required following the consultation, using the results of the consultation to inform and challenge the determination/assertion made in Stage 1. Stage 2 analyses are in-depth, consultation-informed assessments that comprehensively consider the potential positive and negative impacts of a proposed change to policy or service delivery.

This Stage 2 Equality analysis follows closure of the consultation, allowing decision-makers in both councils the opportunity to fully consider the results with specific reference to those with protected characteristics; it considers the following data sources:

- Baseline demographic data, primarily derived from the 2021 census
- Devolution consultation responses – quantitative and qualitative

- Focus group responses
- Event summaries.

### Supplemental Documents

Where possible, officers have secured Equality Analyses conducted by other local authorities who have gone through the devolution process. These are useful comparators, allowing consideration of matters perhaps not raised by residents in Hull and East Yorkshire.

The strategies of both local authorities also provide an evidence base to understand the population of the Hull and East Yorkshire area, not just in terms of equalities/demographic data but also in respect of the wider determinants of health and labour market participation which at times share linkages with protected characteristic groupings. The adoption of such strategies would have accompanied similar equality analyses, helping to provide additional, supplemental context and inspiration for potential problem-solving/mitigation of negative impact or maximisation of positive impact.

There is no information to suggest that there were any equalities-related customer comments or complaints in respect of the devolution proposal in the pre-consultation period. Comments of relevance (though not specific to equalities) received in this period concerned the manner of conducting the public consultation, perceptions of decision pre-determination and why a public referendum was not being pursued. To this end, The Consultation Institute was procured to ensure independent advice and guidance was sought to help the constituent councils meet the requirements of public consultation (the Gunning Principles) and, where possible, reach best practice standards.

### **Consultation**

People with protected characteristics must be consulted on changes that they could potentially be impacted by.

*Points to consider when answering the below:*

- *Have you followed guidelines for a fair consultation as detailed in the Consultation Guidance?*
- *Have you consulted directly with a protected characteristic group?*
- *Have you carried out a survey, workshop or focus group?*
- *When did you consult and how long did the consultation period last?*
- *What method did you use i.e. online questionnaire, paper survey etc.?*

### **How have you consulted with protected groups? Please detail below and include participation levels.**

An open public consultation was conducted between 2 January and 27 February 2024, in alignment to the requirements of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act in respect of devolution. An external consultancy (The Consultation Institute) was procured to ensure alignment to the Gunning Principles, the common law standards for conducting a public consultation. In addition, expertise was sought from the Business Intelligence team at East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

Over a series of questions covering the primary aspects of the proposal (the Devolution Deal, Connectivity, Productivity, Inclusivity, Sustainability, Governance), respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with the proposed plans, and a free-text box was available for respondents to explain the reasons for their rating. A free-text box was also available at the end of the consultation for any other comments followed by equality monitoring questions. The consultation, therefore, offers quantitative and qualitative data for analysis and consideration.

The consultation used an 'online first' approach, to ensure that both local authorities could monitor response rates in respect of demographic groups/equalities and target underrepresentation in a 'live' manner. A midpoint review of this data helped to set out the rationale for focus groups. (It should be noted that, as well as equality monitoring questions at the end of the consultation form, a specific question about protected characteristics and impact was included.)

Paper consultation forms were made available for completion and submission at the libraries and customer service centres of both councils. Downloaded forms were also made available directly from the website with a Freepost address. Alternative format consultation documents were made available on request; during the consultation, alternative formats were provided in Arabic, Kurdish, Lithuanian, Polish, Romanian, and Turkish. Easy Read documents were also produced.

In total, 4,697 completed responses were submitted to the consultation. Of these, 79 respondents stated, “I have decided against continuing with the consultation and don't want to proceed”, and 8 respondents did not provide a response to any of the consultation questions (although some provided demographic information). Therefore, 4,610 responses were available for analysis. A comparison of baseline protected characteristic data with consultation responses has been provided (see table below), highlighting where participation was under or over baseline levels.

The devolution consultation website also offered the facility to submit questions, report an issue or request alternative formats for the documentation. Responses received in this manner, as well as letters/questions submitted to the councils, are being considered as part of the independent consultation analysis. 30 letter responses were received during the consultation. 15 questions were received from members of the public via the consultation website’s submission form or direct to devolution email accounts.

Extensive communications activity was deployed during the consultation, with over 60 in-person and remote events conducted across the area reaching over 1,100 people, alongside social media (organic and paid-for), direct mailings, email, posters, pop-up banners and even an ‘ad van’. There was significant coverage in the press, as well as TV and radio appearances by the leaders of both councils. Summaries of the events have been produced and are being considered as part of the independent consultation analysis. (A full list of these events can be supplied.)

A series of nine focus groups with 85 attendees were held in response to the midpoint review’s assessment of demographic group participation and other underrepresentation/high non-response bias, as well as business representation. These included:

- An all-female group
- Two under-25s groups
- An unemployed or currently undergoing training/learning group
- A group for those for whom English was not their first language
- A long-term illness or disability group
- A rural group
- Two business groups

In respect of recruitment, non-probability sampling was used (using convenience and snow balling for some groups to obtain the required numbers). Fieldworkers also undertook face to face recruitment either in the specific locations of interest (town centres, city centres, villages) and attended specific locations where it was expected to find people identifying with a given group (community centres, etc).

### Baseline vs Response Data Comparison

The relevant legislation on devolution (the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act) notes: “Before submitting a proposal under this section to the Secretary of State, the authority or authorities preparing the proposal must— (a)carry out a public consultation across the proposed area on the proposal, and (b)have regard to the results of the consultation in preparing the proposal for submission to the Secretary of State.” As such, it is necessary to consider the data for the Hull and East Yorkshire geography in its totality, rather than isolated by local authority area.

The following section sets out the participant profile against the demographic information provided by participants and shows the percentage point difference against the overall population breakdown for the HEYCA area.

In some cases, the baseline census questions do not directly correlate to the options available through the consultation response, where further options were offered in many cases. It should be noted that monitoring questions were not mandatory, and, therefore, a value has been added to the set of respondents who did not answer. Respondents were also given a ‘prefer not to answer’ option.

↑ indicates a higher response rate than baseline. ↓ indicates a lower response rate than baseline.

Please note: The below data has been rounded to the nearest tenth.

Category	HEY Baseline (Census 2021)	HEY Consultation Response
Age	6% 11-16	0.1% 11-16 ↓
	9% 17-24	2.8% 17-24 ↓
	12% 25-34	7.7% 25-34 ↓
	12% 35-44	13.0% 35-44* ↑
	13% 45-54	16.1% 45-54* ↑

	14% 55-64 12% 65-74 7% 75-84 3% 85+	20.7% 55-64* ↑ 19.4% 65-74* ↑ 8.2% 75-84* ↑ 0.7% 85+ ↓ 6.8% Prefer not to say ↑ 4.6% Not answered ↑
Disability (% of the population are classified as disabled under the Equality Act)	19.2%	35.1%* disability ↑ 64.9% no disability 2.2% not answered
Trans Status (This question differs from the census' gender reassignment category)	0.5%	0.9% trans ↑ 63.4% not trans 12.1% prefer not to say 23.6% not answered
Marriage & Civil Partnership	44.6%	Not asked in consultation
Pregnancy & Maternity	9.3 births per 1,000 of the population	Not asked in consultation
Race	94.9% White 1.84% Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh 1.27% Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups 0.98% Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African 0.3% Arab 0.7% Other	81.1% White ↓ 0.7% Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh ↓ 1.7% Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups ↑ 0.8% Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African ↓ 0.2% Arab ↓ 0.7% Other → 9.1% prefer not to say 5.8% not answered
Religion or Belief	47.4% Christian 43.6% No religion 1.8% Muslim 0.9% Sikh 0.6% Other religion 0.5% Buddhist 0.5% Jewish	Not asked in consultation
Sex (+ Additional options)	50.6% female 49.4% male	39.1% female ↓ 49.0% male ↓ 0.6% non-binary 1.4% other 5.9% prefer not to say 4.1% not answered
Sexual Orientation	89.9% straight/heterosexual 1.3% gay/lesbian 1.2% bisexual 0.3% other sexual orientation 7.4% not answered	71.9% straight/heterosexual ↓ 2.9% gay/lesbian* ↑ 1.6% bisexual* ↑ 3.5% other sexual orientation ↑ 7.1% not answered ↓ 13.0% prefer not to say

Information on the baseline wider economic context may be found in Annex 2.

**From feedback gained as part of the consultation work which has been carried out, does the proposed change have the potential to have any adverse impacts on people with any protected characteristic?**

This section seeks to fully address the feedback received, both positive and negative, in respect of protected characteristic groups across the consultation activity (questionnaire, events, letters, and focus groups) where provided. It firstly addresses the consultation results, providing a breakdown of significant differences by protected characteristic groups to the closed questions, as well as themed free-text responses. The latter sections identify the key equality, diversity and inclusion issues identified by respondents in events, letters, and focus groups.

The Consultation

Overall, consultation findings outlined in the independent consultation report produced by TONIC are largely positive, indicating broad support for the Proposal. Analysing this data creates a more nuanced picture, whilst still

servicing to evidence broad support across many groups or variable responses to different questions (highlighting the time spent and attention paid by the public in considering the different aspects of the Proposal).

A specific question was posed to respondents in respect of the impact of the devolution plans on protected characteristics. The quantitative responses to this table are noted below:

	<b>HEY</b>
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	15% (650)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	25% (1054)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	44% (1894)
Unsure	16% (697)

This quantitative data is often in contrast with that obtained from the series of questions earlier in the consultation, which depicts a more positive view of the proposal when considering protected characteristics groups.

Below is a quantitative synopsis of the responses to each of the consultation questions by protected characteristic. Also see Annex 1 of this report for detailed statistical breakdown. (Please note that Question 1 was about identifying a respondent's top 3 priorities and did not use a rating scale in respect of proposals and, therefore, has been excluded from this specific synopsis.)

#### Q2: Hull and East Yorkshire's Devolution Deal

- Age: Age groups 17-64 were more likely to agree; Age groups 65 and over were more likely to disagree.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Race/Ethnic Group: White, Other White, Asian, Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities and Black groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sex/Gender: Males and females were more likely to agree; Non-binary individuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight, Gay/Lesbian and Bisexual groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

#### Q3: Connectivity

- Age: Age groups 17-64 and 85 and over were more likely to agree; Age groups 65-84 were more likely to disagree.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Race/Ethnic Group: White, Other White, Asian, Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities and Black groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sex/Gender: Males, females and non-binary individuals were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight, Gay/Lesbian and Bisexual groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

#### Q4: Productivity

- Age: Age groups 17-54 were more likely to agree; 55-64 were evenly split; Age groups 65 and over were more likely to disagree.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Race/Ethnic Group: White, Other White, Asian, Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities and Black groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sex/Gender: Males and females were more likely to agree; Non-binary individuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight and Gay/Lesbian groups were more likely to agree; Bisexuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

#### Q5: Inclusivity

- Age: Age groups 17-54 were more likely to agree; Age groups 55-84 were more likely to disagree; 85 and over were evenly split.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Sex/Gender: Females were more likely to agree; Men, Non-binary individuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight, Gay/Lesbian and Bisexual groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

#### Q6: Sustainability

- Age: Age groups 17-54 were more likely to agree; Age groups 55 and over were more likely to disagree.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Race/Ethnic Group: White, Other White, Asian, Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities and Black groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sex/Gender: Females were more likely to agree; Men were evenly split; Non-binary individuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight, Gay/Lesbian and Bisexual groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

#### Q7: Governance Arrangements

- Age: Age groups 17-44 were more likely to agree; Age groups 45 and over were more likely to disagree.
- Disability: Disabled respondents were more likely to disagree.
- Gender Reassignment\*: Trans respondents were more likely to agree.
- Race/Ethnic Group: Other White, Asian, Mixed/Multiple Ethnicities and Black groups were more likely to agree; White groups and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sex/Gender: Females were more likely to agree; Men, Non-binary individuals and those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.
- Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual/straight, Gay/Lesbian and Bisexual groups were more likely to agree; Those who preferred not to say were more likely to disagree.

Respondents were able to provide comments in support of their rating via an open-text box at the end of every section. In addition, a further open-text box was provided at the end of the consultation questionnaire where any additional comments could be provided. Overall, there was sparse specific feedback on equality, diversity, and inclusion issues and open-text box content completed by those identifying as having protected characteristics replicated the data full respondent data set. However, issues raised of more specific concern for this analysis are noted below:

Most common potential benefits	Most common potential negative issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More accessible transport</li> <li>• Support for vulnerable people</li> <li>• Better lives for young people</li> <li>• More empowered residents with more decision-making power and skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs and wastefulness</li> <li>• Lack of evidence</li> <li>• People with protected characteristics will not benefit</li> <li>• Older people will not benefit</li> </ul>

#### Focus Groups

A series of focus groups were conducted on behalf of the local authorities by Lampada, a subsidiary of the University of Hull. Overall, the key findings of these groups reflect the comments evident in the consultation across the full respondent data set, as set out in the independent consultation report. Comments that may have an additional bearing in respect of this equality analysis are noted below:

- Many groups felt that they did not know enough about devolution, limiting their ability to engage, but desired to know more.
- Several groups viewed the current government structures as ‘faceless’ and were sceptical whether devolution could alter this perception.
  - The Under-25s groups perceived government as not taking their concerns seriously.



- The Long-term illness or disability group showed disenchantment toward political figures, with a perceived self-interest and lack of accountability. This group expressed consensus on the need for enhanced localised control and the potential benefits of increased local autonomy and decision-making power but questioned the efficacy in addressing underlying systemic issues, which (if not kept in check) could exacerbate existing inequalities and lead to further marginalisation of already disadvantaged communities.
- However, the group with English not as their first language universally supported the concept of an elected mayor.
- Several groups highlighted the need for transparency and accountability in decision-making.
  - One Under-25s group noted the need for regular evaluation and adjustment to ensure decisions taken were fit for purpose in achieving their aims.
  - Many groups noted the need for a participatory approach and the importance of community involvement in decision-making processes.
- Several groups questioned whether funding would be equitably deployed between city, town, and rural areas, as disproportionate spend could exacerbate existing issues with opportunity and access.
- The Under-25s and Women groups both expressed concerns about sustainability and liveability in the future, i.e., how decisions taken now may impact younger people in the future in terms of climate change/habitability.
- All groups highlighted the challenges to public transport systems and the provision of affordable housing.
- Many groups felt that existing public services (including those pertinent to their representative groups) required improvement or growth to meet demand.

### Consultation Events

Overall, the key findings of these events reflect the questions raised/comments evident in the consultation across the full respondent data set, as set out in the independent consultation report. Comments that may have an additional bearing in respect of this equality analysis are noted below:

- One event's attendees asked about provisions within the deal specific to disabled communities.
- One event's attendees asked whether mayoral candidates would be offering accessible options for engaging with their campaigns/manifestos (e.g., alternative formats, presentations with interpreters, etc).
- One event's attendees noted that alternative communication channels (such as TikTok) should be explored for reaching younger audiences.
- At several events, attendees made it clear that they wished to have more information at their disposal to engage with the consultation and the future HEYCA (should it be established). It was felt that in-person explanatory events in communities were effective in reaching out to groups and sharing information. Similarly, several event attendees noted their limited knowledge of devolution or disinterest.
- At several events, attendees questioned whether funding would be equitably deployed between city, town, and rural areas, as disproportionate spend could exacerbate existing issues with opportunity and access.

### **Can these impacts be mitigated or, if this is not possible, what is the justification for continuing with the change?**

As noted above, the key findings from a protected characteristics perspective reflect those identified through the consultation's full respondent data set, as set out in the independent consultation report. These are addressed separately. However, the findings noted above have been reviewed in respect of mitigation (or justification if mitigation is not possible) below:

### General Considerations

The devolution Proposal is high-level, highlighting the powers and investment that may be obtained but not the manner in which they will be exercised or applied. This remains a determination for the mayor and their Cabinet, should the combined authority come into effect. However, the proposal constitutes increased investment and local decision-making, with significant potential for creating positive impacts for communities with protected characteristics.

Projects that come under consideration within the new combined authority would be subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and assessment for impact. It is hoped that devolution will likely reduce discrimination and advance equality of opportunity for residents from protected groups by uplifting (at a macro level) the wider prosperity of the area, unlocking barriers to participation in the process.

As stated, the proposed combined authority will be a public body and, as such, will be subject to the PSED (both the general duty and the specific duties). Once established, the HEYCA will need to consider what systems, processes, and resources it will need to put in place to ensure that it complies with the PSED in the performance of its functions. The constituent councils are themselves subject to the PSED and, as such, they will need to comply with their own respective policies and procedures as they plan, prepare for, and implement the transition to a formal HEYCA. Copies of the constituent councils' equality and diversity policies and procedures are available on their respective websites.

The Proposal must demonstrate at submission that HEYCA is likely to improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of some or all of the people who live or work in the area, having regard to the need: (a) to secure effective and convenient local government, and (b) to reflect the identities and interests of local communities. In addition, should HEYCA be established, its performance will be measured as outlined in the deal text:

*The Hull and East Yorkshire Combined Authority will be required to evaluate the impact of the Hull and East Yorkshire Investment Fund. The Hull and East Yorkshire Combined Authority and the Government will jointly commission an independent assessment of the economic benefits and economic impact of the investments made under the scheme, including whether the projects have been delivered on time and to budget. This assessment will be funded by the Hull and East Yorkshire Combined Authority but will be agreed at the outset with DLUHC and HM Treasury and will take place every five years. The next five-year tranche of funding will be unlocked if the Government is satisfied that the independent assessment shows the investment to have met the objectives and contributed to economic growth. The gateway assessment should be consistent with the HM Treasury Green Book, which sets out the framework for evaluation of all policies and programmes. The assessment should also take into account the latest developments in economic evaluation methodology. The Government would expect the assessment to show that the activity funded through the scheme represents better value for money than comparable projects, defined in terms of a benefit-to-cost ratio and considered in the strategic context of local ambitions for inclusive growth across the whole geography.*

The mayor, as an elected position, is ultimately accountable to residents of Hull and East Yorkshire, who have the ability to vote in or vote out a mayor based on their performance in delivering for the area or any other criteria an individual voter deems relevant. They hold a four-year term. Some powers are held directly by the mayor whilst others are conferred upon HEYCA itself, the Cabinet of which is comprised of five voting members: the mayor and two Elected Members from each of the local authorities. HEYCA will have a Scrutiny Committee and an Audit Committee.

### Assessment

Assessment of actual or potential negative impacts are noted below with potential mitigations or justifications for change.

<b>Protected Characteristic</b>	<b>Actual or Potential Negative Impact</b>
Age	<p>There was significant variation by age as to agreement or disagreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p> <p>Under the Proposal, no specific decisions have yet been made about where investment will occur to generate employment opportunities or in education and improving skills.</p> <p>Spreading investment across all parts of the area and ensuring they are available could affect the impact upon younger and older people in some areas. The proposed HEYCA will need to establish mechanisms for considering and ensuring that investment is appropriately distributed. These mechanisms will be reinforced and bolstered by the proposed governance arrangements and decision-making processes set out in the Proposal.</p> <p>Targeted approaches may be beneficial where an evidence base exists of detriment or unequal opportunity; and HEYCA should exercise consideration of age-related impacts when introducing new programmes.</p>
Disability	<p>There was broad disagreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p>

	<p>Concerns regarding existing democratic systems, mistrust of political figures and the provision of services remain challenges faced by this protected group regardless of the Proposal, and these barriers should be of consideration to the development of programming under HEYCA.</p> <p>The Proposal will not negatively impact disabled people and should benefit and impact positively upon disabled people providing that, when more detailed decisions are taken, they are seen as a priority group within the work and include projects to support employment, skills and qualifications, transport, and housing.</p> <p>Success in tackling these barriers will be dependent upon programmes including commitments to equality, diversity, and inclusion, and may include specific programmes relating to disabled people. It is unlikely to lead to improved outcomes and improved perceptions if such steps are not taken.</p>
Gender Reassignment	<p>There was broad agreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p> <p>Trans people who have or are undergoing gender re-assignment do face barriers when seeking access to employment, services, housing and when using transport.</p> <p>Whilst negative impact is unlikely as a result of the Proposal, ensuring that investment in jobs and skills can benefit those more likely to face barriers in employment due to prejudice will need to be a principle which underpins the decisions which are made over the allocation of funds and once the HEYCA is operational.</p> <p>Success in tackling these barriers will be dependent upon programmes including commitments to equality, diversity, and inclusion, and may include specific programmes relating to trans people. It is unlikely to lead to improved outcomes if such steps are not taken.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>Respondents were not asked to define their marriage or civil partnership status as part of the consultation monitoring. No specific negative impacts were independently identified in the consultation or anticipated by earlier analysis.</p> <p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will adversely impact or result in any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic.</p>
Pregnancy and Maternity	<p>Respondents were not asked to define their pregnancy or maternity status as part of the consultation monitoring. No specific negative impacts were independently identified in the consultation or anticipated by earlier analysis.</p> <p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will adversely impact or result in any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic.</p>
Race and Ethnic Origin	<p>There was some variation by race/ethnic origin as to agreement or disagreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p> <p>The creation of the HEYCA is unlikely to negatively impact people from minority ethnic communities, and opportunities exist to positively impact those groups. The proposed priorities can help address some aspects of discrimination experienced by people with this protected characteristic, but this will be dependent upon programmes including commitments to equality, diversity, and inclusion, and may include specific programmes relating to minority ethnic peoples. It is unlikely to lead to improved outcomes if such steps are not taken.</p>
Religion/Belief	<p>Respondents were not asked to define their religion or belief as part of the consultation monitoring. No specific negative impacts were independently identified in the consultation or anticipated by earlier analysis.</p>

	It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will result in adverse impact or any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic.
Sex	<p>There was some variation as to agreement or disagreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p> <p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will result in adverse impact or any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic, although this will be dependent upon the more detailed programmes which are developed.</p>
Sexual Orientation	<p>There was a small amount variation as to agreement or disagreement as noted in the question synopsis section above. However, the specific impacts in this regard that would unfairly detriment groups were not identified by respondents.</p> <p>The proposed priorities can help address some aspects of discrimination experienced by people with this protected characteristic, but this will be dependent upon programmes including commitments to equality, diversity, and inclusion, and may include specific programmes relating to LGBTQ+ people. It is unlikely to lead to improved outcomes if such steps are not taken.</p>

### Specific Assessment

The specific considerations noted earlier do not necessarily have a direct negative impact on protected characteristic groups, as many of these concerns were shared with the full respondent data set. However, further commentary has been added below in respect of these concerns.

Limited knowledge of devolution, impacting ability to engage	<p>It is anticipated that a communications strategy will be adopted by the HEYCA, which will consider the mechanisms for effective communication, to inform and to demonstrate accountability.</p> <p>A communications-focused task and finish group, comprised of communications officers from both local authorities, will be established during the 'shadow' phase to maintain lines of communication with the public about devolution, and to set out an initial interim communications strategy.</p>
Scepticism of government and the ability of devolution to alter this; Transparency and accountability	<p>The Proposal is unlikely to be able to mitigate directly scepticism of government and negative perceptions towards political figures; to an extent, the enactment and performance of the mayor and HEYCA will be the test of this in the minds of individual residents/voters. However, the Proposal does contain provisions that specifically describe the governance arrangements and accountability measures.</p> <p>Devolution of powers/functions and investment gives greater local control over decision-making, bringing decisions nearer to the communities they reflect and impact. The mayor is accountable directly to the electorate of Hull and East Yorkshire every four years. Elected Members from both local authorities sitting on the mayoral cabinet (and holding four of the five voting roles) are also accountable to the electorate in their respective election cycles. The HEYCA will be subject to Scrutiny and Audit committees. The governance arrangements specify the ability of the cabinet and</p>

	<p>committees to ‘call in’ or scrutinise the plans of the HEYCA or the mayor. Several provisions exist that require the lead member of a respective council to approve before they can proceed should a decision directly impact on that local authority’s area.</p> <p>A five-year assessment will be conducted by Government regarding the Investment Fund, to consider whether HEYCA has been effective in meeting its obligations.</p> <p>HEYCA will take on the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>Transparency is an important factor. In addition to traditional measures for public sector transparency (publication of reports, notices, etc), it is anticipated that a communications strategy will be adopted by HEYCA, which will consider the mechanisms for effective communication to demonstrate transparency and accountability.</p> <p>A communications-focused task and finish group, comprised of communications officers from both local authorities, will be established during the ‘shadow’ phase to maintain lines of communication with the public about devolution, and to set out an initial interim communications strategy.</p>
<p>Equitable split of funding</p>	<p>The governance arrangements set out in the Proposal (and as also briefly outlined earlier and in the row above) offer specific provisions to safeguard and assure equitable deployment of funding across Hull and East Yorkshire.</p>
<p>Longer-term considerations over climate change/habitability</p>	<p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will adversely impact on this concern. In fact, it has the potential to impact positively. The ability to form a Joint Committee with Greater Lincolnshire’s combined authority (once it exists) enables strategic work on the Humber, the largest industrial emitting area in the country where decarbonisation is nationally important. The Proposal also includes provisions relating to future energy programmes, heat networks and commitment of funding to offshore wind.</p>
<p>Challenges to public transport and affordable housing; Existing public services requiring improvement or expansion to meet demand</p>	<p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will adversely impact on this concern. In fact, it has the potential to impact positively. Devolution brings new investment into the area, additional to that received by the local authorities currently. The aim is to address the challenges faced by Hull and East Yorkshire, as expressed in the Proposal. It seeks to increase economic productivity and prosperity, supporting growth of the local economy and leveraging inward investment. Additional funding (whether direct through the devolution deal or created as a result of devolution funding, e.g., an increase to the council tax base due to HEYCA brownfield funding bringing housing sites forward) can free up funds in the local authorities to be directed to other priorities, such as public service improvements or expansion of existing activities.</p>

A joined-up approach for transport (via a Shared Transport Plan) would enable improved connectivity and more equitable provision between the local authority areas. Electrification of the Hull-Leeds and Hull-Sheffield lines will increase opportunities outside the area, but it would also increase inward transport. A multi-year transport settlement would bring greater assurance of budgeting and the ability to forward plan more effectively. The ability to nominate a Key Route Network would enable the area to determine its vital connectivity routes and how these reflect the needs of public transport. A transport-focused task and finish group, comprised of transport officers from both local authorities, will be established during the 'shadow' phase to begin drafting the Shared Transport Plan, expected to be confirmed in 2025 after HEYCA is established.

Brownfield funding has been awarded (with further settlements to be confirmed at Spending Reviews) to remediate and bring forward contaminated sites for housing, increasing the provision in the area and maintaining more existing green spaces. A housing-focused task and finish group, comprised of housing officers from both local authorities, will be established during the 'shadow' phase to generate a pipeline of projects to take forward and demonstrate the efficacy of HEYCA.

It is valid to consider, for example, whether increasing housing stock could put pressure on existing services and infrastructure. However, the increased funding coming into the area through the Proposal will help to mitigate this concern, which it is believed will spur wider economic prosperity and build the case for increased service provision and the funds to enact this.

Provisions within the deal specific to disabled communities; Support for vulnerable people; People with protected characteristics will not benefit; Lack of evidence.

There are no direct provisions for protected characteristic groups within the Proposal, as this document highlights the powers and investment that may be obtained by HEYCA but not the manner in which they will be exercised or applied. The application or exercise would be subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty, however.

Also see the table above.

At a strategic level, the additional investment into the area can offer the opportunity to grow the employment base and improve the applicability of skills training to meet the existing and future needs of that employment base. Whilst not specific to those with protected characteristics, the wider uplift in the employment market can be seen to offer increased chances of participation and greater alignment to employer needs. Investment in infrastructure and improvements to the transport system can likewise increase the accessibility of services and employment more broadly. It seems unlikely that any direct detriment would arise as a result of the Proposal.

	<p>Some respondents suggested that the Proposal would give support for people with protected characteristics, specifically in helping vulnerable people to find employment, such as those with disabilities or learning difficulties. Whilst the planning of projects underpinning strategic funding remains the purview of the combined authority and mayoral, it is worth noting that the Investment Fund is able to be applied to both capital and revenue projects, the latter of which often targets specific groups in improving labour market participations and tackling wider barriers to opportunity (such as mental health, gender barriers, age, etc).</p> <p>In terms of evidence, the investment in revenue-based programmes has existed previously in the local authorities (through programmes such as the European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund) and channelled via the Local Enterprise Partnership, which has worked across both local authorities for a number of years and evidences the effectiveness of the collaborative approach that may exist under a combined authority. Other examples may be found in the existing local authorities themselves, which are subject to the same PSED as the combined authority would be, and the decision-making, project-planning and implementation they undertake.</p>
<p>Better lives for young people; Older people will not benefit</p>	<p>Age-specific considerations are noted in the table above.</p> <p>It is believed unlikely that the Proposal will adversely impact certain age groups in favour of another.</p> <p>Certainly, the Proposal has the ability to positively impact on young people should the combined authority be established and meet its objectives over time. However, many of these benefits are equally available to older people, including skills training via the Adult Education Budget, improvements to transport leading to better service accessibility, joined-up working to decarbonise the Humber and improve air quality, and a more dynamic housing market driven by greater availability and affordability to flexibly meet changing needs over time.</p> <p>Respondents noted that older people will not see the benefits due to the expected amount of time that the proposed changes will take to show effect. In fact, Hull and East Yorkshire have been awarded upfront investment worth £24.6 million that is to be spent within 2024/25, and a pipeline of projects across the area have been provisionally planned which all residents will visibly see the impact of in the coming months/years. These initial projects will focus on transport, brownfield land remediation for housing and employment sites, coastal erosion, coastal regeneration, and flooding resilience. If the anticipated timescales are met for establishment of the combined authority, the first mayoral election will take place in 2025 with the annual award of £13.34 million to be invested in the region each year, alongside other funding pots conferred upon the combined authority.</p>

	<p>Hull and East Yorkshire must demonstrate its potential to improve the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of some or all of the people who live and work in the area. This is tested upon submission of the Proposal. If established, the combined authority will again be tested after five years to assess the efficacy and value for money achieved by the Investment Fund. Should this fail to deliver on these terms, future funding could be halted.</p> <p>Moreover, if the mayor is not meeting the distinct needs of any group (older people included), they are subject to the electorate every four years, when they could be voted out.</p>
<p>Mayoral candidates would be offering accessible options for engaging with their campaigns/manifestos (e.g., alternative formats, presentations with interpreters, etc).</p>	<p>It is the responsibility of mayoral candidates/parties to determine their specific outreach efforts through campaigning. The Leaders of both councils have been informed of these comments, however, to inform practice at the two local authorities and the potential HEYCA.</p>
<p>Alternative communication channels should be explored for reaching younger audiences.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that a communications strategy will be adopted by the HEYCA, which will consider the mechanisms for efficient and cost-effective communication, so all audiences have the opportunity to engage.</p> <p>A communications-focused task and finish group, comprised of communications officers from both local authorities, will be established during the 'shadow' phase to maintain lines of communication with the public about devolution, and to set out an initial interim communications strategy.</p>

**From feedback gained as part of the consultation work carried out, does the proposed change have the potential to make any positive impacts for people with protected characteristics?**

A question-by-question synopsis has been provided in an earlier section, noting the level of agreement or disagreement with the Proposal based on the consultation results, as well as commentary on the focus group and in-person events. Please refer to this section for feedback.

**How can this positive impact/s be maximised?**

General Considerations

As noted, the results of the consultation indicate broad support for the proposals, as supported by the independent report. However, as the Proposal offers strategic investment and powers, it remains essential that the underlying programming adopted by HEYCA considers the needs of protected groups. The decisions which are subsequently made by HEYCA could result in different impacts for different communities/protected characteristics and to examine what these might be, it is recommended that the proposed HEYCA develops its own processes for meeting the Public Sector Equality Duty, including by adopting a clear process for demonstrating that it exercises due consideration of the potential impacts when making decisions and allocating resources.

Assessment

Assessment of actual or potential positive impacts are noted below with potential mitigations or justifications for change.

Protected Characteristic	Actual or Potential Positive Impact
--------------------------	-------------------------------------



Age	<p>The Proposal has the potential to have a significant positive impact on communities and on people of all ages, but especially on younger people, older workers/longstanding workers in traditional forms of employment, and for older people. Investment in the local economy, in skills and retraining will enhance qualification levels, access and suitability for employment, result in a workforce with the right skills for the region to compete successfully with others in the future, and, in turn, attract more investment and relocation to Hull and East Yorkshire.</p> <p>The focus on improving supply and access to housing can have a direct positive impact upon those households without their own housing and/or who are more prone to homelessness, which can include younger adults and families, but also help improve the supply of suitably designed and built housing for older people.</p> <p>Improving transport and connectivity benefits many communities and can be crucial to enable people to travel for work, education and to access services. Having good access significantly impacts upon individuals and communities, with less access to their own means of transport, and who are reliant upon public transport, which can include younger people, older people, households on lower incomes and people living in rural areas.</p> <p>During the coronavirus pandemic many peoples' patterns of travel altered and this has led to reduced passenger numbers using public transport on many bus and train routes. This in turn requires greater support from transport authorities to ensure services can be retained and serve people at times when they are needed. Making it easier and more affordable to travel across different providers through integrated planning is likely to benefit many people who rely upon public transport and enable people to access employment and other opportunities.</p> <p>Sustainability ambitions which are also integrated into the proposals for economic development, housing, and transport, and which are made more affordable and accessible will benefit all communities but will need to be expanded to become more available for disadvantaged individuals and communities.</p>
Disability	<p>The Proposal's provisions of investment in economic improvement and regeneration and skills could be hugely positive for disabled people, many who are excluded from or experience greater discrimination when seeking to access jobs or training. Removing the barriers to employment and including the commitment of employers to employ disabled people is fundamental, along with access to transport and training opportunities. This could help close the employment gap between disabled people and all working-age people.</p> <p>Making transport affordable, much more accessible and timelier would benefit many disabled people, enabling access to employment, social activities and other opportunities, reducing isolation and creating more inclusion as well as allowing people to realise their goals and ambitions.</p> <p>The supply of accessible housing for disabled people remains limited. Specially built or adapted housing is more expensive, whilst many disabled people may have lower incomes or fewer resources with which to afford this more expensive housing. Within the proposals, any opportunities to increase the supply of affordable and rented accessible housing could have an important positive impact for disabled people and their carers if they have one. Accessible housing opportunities within a range of price brackets would offer much more options for disabled people's choice of home.</p>
Gender Reassignment	<p>As with other communities, trans people can experience additional barriers to employment, housing and abuse whilst using public transport or in the</p>

	<p>places where they live. Accepting that the proposals will benefit people across the area, then it should be likely that the improvements should be available to people who identify as trans/people who are or have undergone gender re-assignment.</p> <p>If the work and programmes arising out of the proposals seek to encourage inclusion and diversity in areas such as investment/employment/skills, in transport and housing, then this community can enjoy a positive impact.</p> <p>The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner as a non-voting member of the mayoral cabinet can also provide a direct line to police support in terms of any abuse being conducted against this or other protected characteristic groups.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnership	The Proposal should benefit people across the area irrespective of their marital or civil partnership status.
Pregnancy and Maternity	The Proposal's provisions in relation to investment, employment and skills may also benefit women who wish to re-enter employment after having a family. The availability of good and reliable public transport can be particularly important for families which have no access to their own vehicle or to single vehicle owning households, to enable them to access services. Likewise, control over the Adult Education Budget can ensure that local skills provision matches local employer needs, helping to create sustainable communities that keep families together by offering education and jobs that can be applied in local workplaces.
Race and Ethnic Origin	<p>The proportion of people from minority ethnic communities varies significantly across Hull and East Yorkshire, with higher proportions living in the more urban centres. These communities, as well as those with English not as their first language, are from many different backgrounds. Within these communities many people experience disadvantage and discrimination based on prejudice and racism in education, employment, housing, health, and access to services, although this is not universally the case, and some communities experience higher levels of disadvantage or discrimination than others, and there are geographical differences too.</p> <p>The Proposal has the potential to challenge this and to offer improved opportunities to people from the different communities which make up the area's population. This is especially the case with the proposals around employment and skills, support to businesses and investment, where opportunities could be generated.</p> <p>Improvements in transport would also benefit minority ethnic communities, offering greater access to areas where investment takes place and employers locate/ relocate their operations.</p> <p>The proposals may also provide support to people seeking to expand or improve their skills and qualifications, and thus progress or improve their earnings potential. This is of course dependent upon opportunities available to minority ethnic communities and individuals as investment and projects are developed.</p> <p>The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner as a non-voting member of the mayoral cabinet can also provide a direct line to police support in terms of any abuse being conducted against this or other protected characteristic groups.</p>
Religion/Belief	There are no grounds to believe that the Proposal will impact adversely on communities on grounds of religion and belief, including non-belief.

Sex	<p>Hull and East Yorkshire's economy is varied and dynamic but includes traditional industries or sectors where the workforce is either primarily male or female. This can mean that women especially face barriers when seeking to enter those industries. Women are also more likely to hold part-time employment than their male counterparts across the area, a problem evident during and exacerbated by the Covid pandemic, meaning that there is a gender pay gap across many areas of the local economy.</p> <p>The Proposal has the potential to address both factors. The success of HEYCA in addressing these issues will depend upon more detailed plans and decisions made around skills investment and training, and whether they support women into technical roles, for example, and older men to retrain.</p> <p>Lower earnings levels can also impact on the ability of households to access home ownership, including affordable housing and housing in the private sector.</p> <p>Improving public transport is also important in that women may be more likely to rely upon public transport if they live in a household where there is limited car ownership.</p>
Sexual Orientation	<p>LGBTQ+ people experience discrimination and disadvantage in relation to a number of life factors, including in education, employment, when accessing services, personal safety, and harassment, and in relation to health, including mental health. They can also experience higher levels of homelessness.</p> <p>The Proposal has the potential to positively impact upon LGBTQ+ people especially if within programmes additional measures are included to address the needs of our diverse communities, including LGBTQ+ people.</p> <p>The role of the Police and Crime Commissioner as a non-voting member of the mayoral cabinet can also provide a direct line to police support in terms of any abuse being conducted against this or other protected characteristic groups.</p>

**How has the outcome of the consultation and proposals for implementation been fed back to the protected characteristic groups?**

An independent report will be produced by an external consultancy in respect of the consultation results. This will be published on the consultation website, as well as through the traditional reporting mechanisms of both councils (and via the Joint Leaders Board) where a public notice is required. This is expected to be published by the end of March 2024.

**Informing the change**

*Points to consider when answering the below:*

- *Has the proposed change been rejected and if so, why?*
- *Has the proposed change been amended and if so, how and why?*
- *Will the change be introduced with no alterations and if so, why?*
- *Will the change be introduced despite adverse impacts and if so, why?*

**How has this Equality Analysis process informed or developed the proposed change?**

The process of public consultation (including the consultation questionnaire itself, in-person/remote events and focus groups) was developed in alignment to the Gunning Principles.

- The decision to submit the Proposal to Government was not pre-determined and was to be informed by public feedback.

- A period of eight weeks was supplied for the public to take part in the open consultation, with numerous channels deployed to seek engagement.
- Substantial information was made available to the public over the consultation period to enable intelligent consideration of the Proposal.
- The format of the consultation was structured to enable the maximum possibility of meaningful feedback to be obtained and analysed/assessed, allowing conscientious consideration to be undertaken of the comments.

Three broad outcomes were identified as possibilities to respondents/attendees/participants:

1. Submission of the Proposal as published at consultation.
2. Submission of a revised Proposal, amending the document based on commentary/feedback from the public during consultation.
3. A decision not to submit and stop the devolution process.

Based on the results of the consultation (as outlined in the independent consultation report) and taking onboard the specific analysis in respect of equalities, it is recommended that Outcome 2 be chosen, i.e., submission with amendments.

The amendments made to the Proposal reflect the comments provided through the full respondent data set. In respect of the assessments made above in this Stage 2 Equality Analysis, limited concerns were raised directly and specifically in respect of protected characteristic impacts likely as a result of the Proposal. Instead, these primarily reflected the wider results of the full respondent data set, addressed under separate report. Whilst this analysis also clearly identifies some possible negative implications, these will need due consideration before full implementation of the changes that arise as a result of devolution in Hull and East Yorkshire.

Considering that underlying programming/projects led by the proposed HEYCA will be subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty and must consider the impact of individual projects on protected characteristic groups, it is believed unlikely that the Proposal will result in adverse impact or any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic. However, it is acknowledged that proactive and targeted approaches at times may be necessary to reach particular groups to address specific challenges, and this active intervention should be encouraged where disadvantage exists in any respect within Hull and East Yorkshire.

#### Impact Monitoring

Actual impacts of the change must be monitored during implementation and must be reported to the Policy team 6 months after full implementation, or at an appropriate and agreed time.

<b>Proposed change implementation date</b>	<b>06/05/2025</b>
<b>Impact monitoring date (compulsory)</b>	<b>06/11/2025</b>

#### Approvals

<b>Joint Leader Board</b>	<b>27/03/2024</b>
---------------------------	-------------------

**This Equality Analysis will be made available to decision makers and published. A copy of this report has been reviewed/approved by policy team officers at both local authorities.**

<b>Policy team approval</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<b>Policy Team Reviewers</b>	<b>Martin Batstone (Senior Policy Officer - Equality and Diversity, East Riding of Yorkshire Council); Simon Heard (Equality Access Manager, Hull City Council)</b>

## Annex I

Q2: How much do you agree or disagree that the powers and investment will help to address Hull and East Yorkshire's priorities and challenges?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
17 to 24 years	49 (38.6%)	48 (37.8%)	13 (10.2%)	7 (5.5%)	9 (7.1%)	1 (0.8%)
25 to 34 years	128 (36.1%)	114 (32.1%)	29 (8.2%)	33 (9.3%)	47 (13.2%)	4 (1.1%)
35 to 44 years	240 (40.2%)	158 (26.5%)	49 (8.2%)	57 (9.5%)	86 (14.4%)	7 (1.2%)
45 to 54 years	189 (25.6%)	221 (29.9%)	64 (8.7%)	97 (13.1%)	158 (21.4%)	10 (1.4%)
55 to 64 years	220 (23.1%)	258 (27.1%)	128 (13.4%)	122 (12.8%)	212 (22.3%)	12 (1.3%)
65 to 74 years	187 (21.1%)	246 (27.7%)	101 (11.4%)	136 (15.3%)	204 (23%)	14 (1.6%)
75 to 84 years	74 (19.5%)	111 (29.3%)	52 (13.7%)	54 (14.2%)	82 (21.6%)	6 (1.6%)
85 years or over	6 (18.2%)	8 (24.2%)	5 (15.2%)	6 (18.2%)	7 (21.2%)	1 (3%)
Prefer not to say	19 (6.1%)	28 (9%)	41 (13.1%)	66 (21.2%)	146 (46.8%)	12 (3.8%)
Not answered	67 (32.8%)	46 (22.5%)	17 (8.3%)	21 (10.3%)	50 (24.5%)	3 (1.5%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	305 (18.9%)	379 (23.5%)	204 (12.7%)	256 (15.9%)	436 (27.1%)	31 (1.9%)
Not disabled	875 (29.4%)	861 (28.9%)	295 (9.9%)	343 (11.5%)	564 (18.9%)	40 (1.3%)
Not answered	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	18 (42.9%)	9 (21.4%)	0 (0%)	4 (9.5%)	7 (16.7%)	4 (9.5%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	834 (28.6%)	897 (30.8%)	300 (10.3%)	324 (11.1%)	522 (17.9%)	38 (1.3%)
Prefer not to say	57 (10.3%)	76 (13.7%)	70 (12.6%)	111 (20%)	230 (41.4%)	12 (2.2%)
Not answered	271 (25.2%)	258 (24%)	129 (12%)	160 (14.9%)	242 (22.5%)	17 (1.6%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	965 (26.2%)	1109 (30.1%)	394 (10.7%)	466 (12.7%)	698 (19%)	49 (1.3%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	18 (39.1%)	9 (19.6%)	4 (8.7%)	6 (13%)	9 (19.6%)	0 (0%)
Asian/Asian British	16 (53.3%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.3%)	5 (16.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	41 (53.2%)	15 (19.5%)	2 (2.6%)	9 (11.7%)	9 (11.7%)	1 (1.3%)
Black/Black British	25 (71.4%)	4 (11.4%)	2 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	4 (11.4%)	0 (0%)
Arab	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0%)

Prefer not to say	30 (7.2%)	40 (9.6%)	61 (14.6%)	84 (20.1%)	188 (45%)	15 (3.6%)
Other	3 (9.4%)	6 (18.8%)	10 (31.3%)	3 (9.4%)	9 (28.1%)	1 (3.1%)
Not answered	81 (30.7%)	53 (20.1%)	23 (8.7%)	29 (11%)	74 (28%)	4 (1.5%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	512 (28.5%)	586 (32.7%)	215 (12%)	197 (11%)	257 (14.3%)	27 (1.5%)
Male	580 (25.8%)	560 (24.9%)	226 (10%)	311 (13.8%)	548 (24.4%)	25 (1.1%)
Nonbinary	4 (14.8%)	8 (29.6%)	1 (3.7%)	5 (18.5%)	8 (29.6%)	1 (3.7%)
Other	3 (4.5%)	9 (13.6%)	11 (16.7%)	11 (16.7%)	29 (43.9%)	3 (4.5%)
Prefer not to say	17 (6.3%)	32 (11.9%)	34 (12.7%)	56 (20.9%)	118 (44%)	11 (4.1%)
Not answered	64 (34.6%)	45 (24.3%)	12 (6.5%)	19 (10.3%)	41 (22.2%)	4 (2.2%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	957 (29%)	987 (29.9%)	354 (10.7%)	397 (12%)	568 (17.2%)	38 (1.2%)
Gay/Lesbian	42 (31.1%)	42 (31.1%)	15 (11.1%)	8 (5.9%)	27 (20%)	1 (0.7%)
Bisexual	17 (22.7%)	29 (38.7%)	6 (8%)	9 (12%)	13 (17.3%)	1 (1.3%)
All other sexual orientations	11 (6.9%)	16 (10.1%)	20 (12.6%)	29 (18.2%)	76 (47.8%)	7 (4.4%)
Not answered	87 (26.8%)	70 (21.5%)	30 (9.2%)	42 (12.9%)	87 (26.8%)	9 (2.8%)
Prefer not to say	66 (11.1%)	96 (16.1%)	74 (12.4%)	114 (19.2%)	230 (38.7%)	15 (2.5%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	323 (49.7%)	268 (41.2%)	28 (4.3%)	5 (0.8%)	23 (3.5%)	3 (0.5%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	55 (5.2%)	102 (9.7%)	126 (12%)	253 (24%)	508 (48.2%)	9 (0.9%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	607 (32.2%)	527 (28%)	162 (8.6%)	228 (12.1%)	330 (17.5%)	30 (1.6%)
Unsure	117 (16.8%)	276 (39.7%)	148 (21.3%)	67 (9.6%)	61 (8.8%)	26 (3.7%)
Not at all	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	78 (25.4%)	67 (21.8%)	35 (11.4%)	46 (15%)	78 (25.4%)	3 (1%)
Total	1180 (25.7%)	1240 (27%)	499 (10.9%)	599 (13.1%)	1001 (21.8%)	71 (1.5%)



Q3: Connectivity - How much do you agree or disagree with the proposal that Hull and East Yorkshire would benefit from a Mayoral Combined Authority taking on these responsibilities?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
17 to 24 years	58 (45.7%)	46 (36.2%)	5 (3.9%)	5 (3.9%)	11 (8.7%)	2 (1.6%)
25 to 34 years	141 (39.7%)	101 (28.5%)	37 (10.4%)	25 (7%)	48 (13.5%)	3 (0.8%)
35 to 44 years	257 (43%)	136 (22.7%)	61 (10.2%)	37 (6.2%)	100 (16.7%)	7 (1.2%)
45 to 54 years	214 (29%)	212 (28.7%)	60 (8.1%)	80 (10.8%)	164 (22.2%)	8 (1.1%)
55 to 64 years	242 (25.4%)	252 (26.5%)	98 (10.3%)	112 (11.8%)	235 (24.7%)	12 (1.3%)
65 to 74 years	195 (21.9%)	216 (24.3%)	87 (9.8%)	123 (13.8%)	253 (28.4%)	16 (1.8%)
75 to 84 years	88 (23.2%)	88 (23.2%)	45 (11.9%)	55 (14.5%)	96 (25.3%)	7 (1.8%)
85 years or over	6 (18.8%)	6 (18.8%)	7 (21.9%)	5 (15.6%)	5 (15.6%)	3 (9.4%)
Prefer not to say	26 (8.4%)	26 (8.4%)	39 (12.5%)	54 (17.4%)	156 (50.2%)	10 (3.2%)
Not answered	68 (34%)	48 (24%)	13 (6.5%)	11 (5.5%)	56 (28%)	4 (2%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	357 (22.3%)	336 (21%)	173 (10.8%)	202 (12.6%)	497 (31.1%)	35 (2.2%)
Not disabled	939 (31.5%)	796 (26.7%)	279 (9.3%)	305 (10.2%)	627 (21%)	38 (1.3%)
Not answered	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	20 (47.6%)	9 (21.4%)	2 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	7 (16.7%)	4 (9.5%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	917 (31.5%)	814 (27.9%)	279 (9.6%)	283 (9.7%)	585 (20.1%)	35 (1.2%)
Prefer not to say	68 (12.2%)	67 (12.1%)	61 (11%)	85 (15.3%)	257 (46.2%)	18 (3.2%)
Not answered	292 (27.2%)	242 (22.5%)	110 (10.2%)	139 (12.9%)	275 (25.6%)	16 (1.5%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	1063 (28.9%)	992 (26.9%)	374 (10.2%)	410 (11.1%)	791 (21.5%)	53 (1.4%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	18 (39.1%)	7 (15.2%)	6 (13%)	3 (6.5%)	12 (26.1%)	0 (0%)
Asian/Asian British	16 (55.2%)	6 (20.7%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0%)	4 (13.8%)	1 (3.4%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	44 (56.4%)	15 (19.2%)	1 (1.3%)	3 (3.8%)	13 (16.7%)	2 (2.6%)
Black/Black British	26 (74.3%)	6 (17.1%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.7%)	0 (0%)
Arab	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to say	40 (9.6%)	41 (9.8%)	45 (10.8%)	73 (17.5%)	207 (49.6%)	11 (2.6%)
Other	4 (12.5%)	7 (21.9%)	6 (18.8%)	2 (6.3%)	11 (34.4%)	2 (6.3%)

Not answered	85 (32.9%)	57 (22.1%)	17 (6.6%)	16 (6.2%)	79 (30.6%)	4 (1.6%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	542 (30.2%)	545 (30.3%)	207 (11.5%)	178 (9.9%)	293 (16.3%)	32 (1.8%)
Male	657 (29.2%)	498 (22.1%)	193 (8.6%)	265 (11.8%)	613 (27.3%)	23 (1%)
Nonbinary	9 (33.3%)	6 (22.2%)	2 (7.4%)	1 (3.7%)	8 (29.6%)	1 (3.7%)
Other	5 (7.6%)	6 (9.1%)	11 (16.7%)	7 (10.6%)	35 (53%)	2 (3%)
Prefer not to say	21 (7.9%)	27 (10.2%)	29 (10.9%)	47 (17.7%)	130 (48.9%)	12 (4.5%)
Not answered	63 (35%)	50 (27.8%)	10 (5.6%)	9 (5%)	45 (25%)	3 (1.7%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	1027 (31.1%)	897 (27.1%)	343 (10.4%)	352 (10.7%)	642 (19.4%)	44 (1.3%)
Gay/Lesbian	51 (37.8%)	39 (28.9%)	8 (5.9%)	10 (7.4%)	25 (18.5%)	2 (1.5%)
Bisexual	24 (32%)	25 (33.3%)	4 (5.3%)	6 (8%)	15 (20%)	1 (1.3%)
All other sexual orientations	17 (10.8%)	16 (10.2%)	15 (9.6%)	14 (8.9%)	89 (56.7%)	6 (3.8%)
Not answered	99 (30.9%)	69 (21.6%)	19 (5.9%)	32 (10%)	95 (29.7%)	6 (1.9%)
Prefer not to say	79 (13.3%)	86 (14.5%)	63 (10.6%)	93 (15.7%)	258 (43.5%)	14 (2.4%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	335 (51.6%)	211 (32.5%)	36 (5.5%)	8 (1.2%)	53 (8.2%)	6 (0.9%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	101 (9.6%)	88 (8.4%)	109 (10.4%)	214 (20.4%)	526 (50%)	13 (1.2%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	650 (34.4%)	484 (25.6%)	170 (9%)	194 (10.3%)	368 (19.5%)	23 (1.2%)
Unsure	133 (19.1%)	276 (39.7%)	115 (16.5%)	65 (9.3%)	81 (11.6%)	26 (3.7%)
Not at all	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	77 (25.8%)	73 (24.4%)	22 (7.4%)	26 (8.7%)	96 (32.1%)	5 (1.7%)
Total	1297 (28.3%)	1132 (24.7%)	452 (9.9%)	507 (11.1%)	1124 (24.5%)	73 (1.6%)

Q4: Productivity - How much do you agree or disagree with the proposal that Hull and East Yorkshire would benefit from a Mayoral Combined Authority taking on these responsibilities?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
17 to 24 years	51 (40.2%)	50 (39.4%)	11 (8.7%)	5 (3.9%)	6 (4.7%)	4 (3.1%)
25 to 34 years	131 (37%)	102 (28.8%)	40 (11.3%)	30 (8.5%)	44 (12.4%)	7 (2%)
35 to 44 years	249 (41.7%)	133 (22.3%)	65 (10.9%)	41 (6.9%)	95 (15.9%)	14 (2.3%)
45 to 54 years	209 (28.3%)	194 (26.3%)	95 (12.9%)	76 (10.3%)	150 (20.3%)	14 (1.9%)
55 to 64 years	216 (22.8%)	253 (26.7%)	147 (15.5%)	107 (11.3%)	212 (22.3%)	14 (1.5%)
65 to 74 years	177 (19.9%)	221 (24.9%)	130 (14.6%)	111 (12.5%)	236 (26.6%)	13 (1.5%)
75 to 84 years	69 (18.2%)	101 (26.6%)	52 (13.7%)	47 (12.4%)	105 (27.6%)	6 (1.6%)
85 years or over	5 (15.2%)	7 (21.2%)	6 (18.2%)	4 (12.1%)	9 (27.3%)	2 (6.1%)
Prefer not to say	29 (9.4%)	27 (8.7%)	41 (13.3%)	50 (16.2%)	147 (47.6%)	15 (4.9%)
Not answered	63 (31.3%)	49 (24.4%)	21 (10.4%)	8 (4%)	56 (27.9%)	4 (2%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	322 (20.1%)	340 (21.2%)	240 (15%)	184 (11.5%)	479 (29.9%)	37 (2.3%)
Not disabled	878 (29.5%)	798 (26.8%)	368 (12.4%)	296 (9.9%)	581 (19.5%)	56 (1.9%)
Not answered	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	19 (45.2%)	8 (19%)	6 (14.3%)	1 (2.4%)	5 (11.9%)	3 (7.1%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	837 (28.8%)	818 (28.1%)	385 (13.2%)	273 (9.4%)	545 (18.7%)	53 (1.8%)
Prefer not to say	73 (13.2%)	75 (13.6%)	72 (13%)	86 (15.6%)	229 (41.4%)	18 (3.3%)
Not answered	272 (25.3%)	237 (22.1%)	145 (13.5%)	120 (11.2%)	281 (26.2%)	19 (1.8%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	956 (26%)	1001 (27.2%)	503 (13.7%)	393 (10.7%)	756 (20.5%)	70 (1.9%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	21 (45.7%)	7 (15.2%)	8 (17.4%)	1 (2.2%)	8 (17.4%)	1 (2.2%)
Asian/Asian British	16 (53.3%)	6 (20%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	47 (60.3%)	11 (14.1%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (2.6%)	15 (19.2%)	1 (1.3%)
Black/Black British	25 (71.4%)	4 (11.4%)	3 (8.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (8.6%)	0 (0%)
Arab	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to say	55 (13.3%)	44 (10.6%)	53 (12.8%)	66 (15.9%)	182 (44%)	14 (3.4%)
Other	4 (12.9%)	8 (25.8%)	5 (16.1%)	2 (6.5%)	10 (32.3%)	2 (6.5%)

Not answered	77 (29.6%)	56 (21.5%)	32 (12.3%)	14 (5.4%)	77 (29.6%)	4 (1.5%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	514 (28.6%)	554 (30.9%)	225 (12.5%)	170 (9.5%)	287 (16%)	45 (2.5%)
Male	588 (26.2%)	499 (22.2%)	308 (13.7%)	254 (11.3%)	569 (25.3%)	28 (1.2%)
Nonbinary	7 (25.9%)	6 (22.2%)	4 (14.8%)	2 (7.4%)	8 (29.6%)	0 (0%)
Other	6 (9.1%)	7 (10.6%)	12 (18.2%)	5 (7.6%)	33 (50%)	3 (4.5%)
Prefer not to say	27 (10.2%)	26 (9.8%)	38 (14.3%)	47 (17.7%)	115 (43.2%)	13 (4.9%)
Not answered	59 (32.8%)	46 (25.6%)	21 (11.7%)	2 (1.1%)	48 (26.7%)	4 (2.2%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	946 (28.7%)	896 (27.1%)	450 (13.6%)	332 (10.1%)	620 (18.8%)	57 (1.7%)
Gay/Lesbian	47 (34.8%)	38 (28.1%)	16 (11.9%)	7 (5.2%)	26 (19.3%)	1 (0.7%)
Bisexual	15 (20%)	27 (36%)	10 (13.3%)	4 (5.3%)	16 (21.3%)	3 (4%)
All other sexual orientations	23 (14.6%)	13 (8.2%)	20 (12.7%)	17 (10.8%)	80 (50.6%)	5 (3.2%)
Not answered	89 (27.8%)	66 (20.6%)	43 (13.4%)	28 (8.8%)	89 (27.8%)	5 (1.6%)
Prefer not to say	81 (13.7%)	98 (16.6%)	69 (11.7%)	92 (15.6%)	229 (38.7%)	22 (3.7%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	301 (46.5%)	241 (37.2%)	46 (7.1%)	7 (1.1%)	48 (7.4%)	4 (0.6%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	103 (9.8%)	101 (9.6%)	122 (11.6%)	200 (19%)	506 (48.1%)	19 (1.8%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	613 (32.5%)	481 (25.5%)	229 (12.1%)	190 (10.1%)	340 (18%)	36 (1.9%)
Unsure	109 (15.7%)	243 (35%)	175 (25.2%)	59 (8.5%)	77 (11.1%)	31 (4.5%)
Not at all	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	74 (24.8%)	72 (24.2%)	36 (12.1%)	24 (8.1%)	89 (29.9%)	3 (1%)
Total	1201 (26.2%)	1138 (24.8%)	608 (13.3%)	480 (10.5%)	1060 (23.1%)	93 (2%)



Q5: Inclusivity - How much do you agree or disagree with the proposal that Hull and East Yorkshire would benefit from a Mayoral Combined Authority taking on these responsibilities?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
17 to 24 years	58 (45.7%)	36 (28.3%)	11 (8.7%)	6 (4.7%)	13 (10.2%)	3 (2.4%)
25 to 34 years	131 (36.9%)	93 (26.2%)	34 (9.6%)	37 (10.4%)	55 (15.5%)	5 (1.4%)
35 to 44 years	261 (43.7%)	113 (18.9%)	64 (10.7%)	49 (8.2%)	102 (17.1%)	8 (1.3%)
45 to 54 years	209 (28.5%)	185 (25.2%)	75 (10.2%)	87 (11.9%)	167 (22.8%)	11 (1.5%)
55 to 64 years	217 (22.9%)	246 (26%)	132 (14%)	102 (10.8%)	241 (25.5%)	8 (0.8%)
65 to 74 years	169 (19.1%)	214 (24.2%)	103 (11.6%)	130 (14.7%)	258 (29.2%)	11 (1.2%)
75 to 84 years	61 (16.2%)	101 (26.9%)	49 (13%)	53 (14.1%)	105 (27.9%)	7 (1.9%)
85 years or over	6 (18.2%)	6 (18.2%)	5 (15.2%)	7 (21.2%)	6 (18.2%)	3 (9.1%)
Prefer not to say	33 (10.7%)	23 (7.5%)	36 (11.7%)	47 (15.3%)	158 (51.3%)	11 (3.6%)
Not answered	56 (28.4%)	40 (20.3%)	18 (9.1%)	14 (7.1%)	68 (34.5%)	1 (0.5%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	320 (20.1%)	330 (20.7%)	198 (12.4%)	202 (12.7%)	515 (32.3%)	29 (1.8%)
Not disabled	882 (29.7%)	728 (24.5%)	330 (11.1%)	330 (11.1%)	658 (22.2%)	39 (1.3%)
Not answered	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	17 (40.5%)	10 (23.8%)	2 (4.8%)	2 (4.8%)	8 (19%)	3 (7.1%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	853 (29.3%)	764 (26.2%)	331 (11.4%)	305 (10.5%)	622 (21.4%)	37 (1.3%)
Prefer not to say	72 (13.1%)	64 (11.7%)	61 (11.1%)	87 (15.8%)	252 (45.9%)	13 (2.4%)
Not answered	260 (24.6%)	221 (20.9%)	134 (12.7%)	138 (13%)	291 (27.5%)	15 (1.4%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	971 (26.5%)	933 (25.5%)	441 (12%)	434 (11.8%)	833 (22.7%)	54 (1.5%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	20 (43.5%)	9 (19.6%)	6 (13%)	1 (2.2%)	10 (21.7%)	0 (0%)
Asian/Asian British	14 (48.3%)	6 (20.7%)	3 (10.3%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (13.8%)	0 (0%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	49 (62.8%)	9 (11.5%)	2 (2.6%)	3 (3.8%)	14 (17.9%)	1 (1.3%)
Black/Black British	25 (71.4%)	4 (11.4%)	1 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
Arab	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (85.7%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to say	55 (13.3%)	39 (9.4%)	47 (11.4%)	64 (15.5%)	199 (48.1%)	10 (2.4%)
Other	4 (12.9%)	7 (22.6%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (16.1%)	10 (32.3%)	2 (6.5%)

Not answered	64 (25%)	51 (19.9%)	25 (9.8%)	23 (9%)	92 (35.9%)	1 (0.4%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	519 (29%)	509 (28.4%)	214 (11.9%)	198 (11%)	319 (17.8%)	33 (1.8%)
Male	591 (26.4%)	480 (21.4%)	253 (11.3%)	268 (12%)	624 (27.9%)	22 (1%)
Nonbinary	7 (25.9%)	5 (18.5%)	2 (7.4%)	2 (7.4%)	10 (37%)	1 (3.7%)
Other	7 (10.8%)	5 (7.7%)	8 (12.3%)	10 (15.4%)	33 (50.8%)	2 (3.1%)
Prefer not to say	31 (11.7%)	19 (7.2%)	36 (13.6%)	43 (16.3%)	126 (47.7%)	9 (3.4%)
Not answered	47 (26.7%)	41 (23.3%)	15 (8.5%)	11 (6.3%)	61 (34.7%)	1 (0.6%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	935 (28.4%)	846 (25.7%)	395 (12%)	382 (11.6%)	692 (21%)	42 (1.3%)
Gay/Lesbian	51 (38.1%)	31 (23.1%)	8 (6%)	15 (11.2%)	25 (18.7%)	4 (3%)
Bisexual	24 (32%)	23 (30.7%)	4 (5.3%)	6 (8%)	16 (21.3%)	2 (2.7%)
All other sexual orientations	18 (11.3%)	13 (8.2%)	17 (10.7%)	18 (11.3%)	87 (54.7%)	6 (3.8%)
Not answered	81 (25.9%)	63 (20.1%)	34 (10.9%)	29 (9.3%)	104 (33.2%)	2 (0.6%)
Prefer not to say	93 (15.8%)	83 (14.1%)	70 (11.9%)	82 (13.9%)	249 (42.3%)	12 (2%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	313 (48.5%)	233 (36.1%)	41 (6.3%)	10 (1.5%)	44 (6.8%)	5 (0.8%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	95 (9%)	92 (8.8%)	101 (9.6%)	212 (20.2%)	543 (51.7%)	7 (0.7%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	617 (32.9%)	435 (23.2%)	209 (11.1%)	194 (10.3%)	393 (20.9%)	29 (1.5%)
Unsure	106 (15.3%)	240 (34.7%)	146 (21.1%)	83 (12%)	93 (13.4%)	24 (3.5%)
Not at all	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	71 (24%)	58 (19.6%)	31 (10.5%)	33 (11.1%)	100 (33.8%)	3 (1%)
Total	1202 (26.3%)	1059 (23.2%)	528 (11.6%)	532 (11.7%)	1173 (25.7%)	68 (1.5%)

Q6: Sustainability - How much do you agree or disagree with the proposal that Hull and East Yorkshire would benefit from a Mayoral Combined Authority taking on these responsibilities?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
17 to 24 years	61 (48%)	27 (21.3%)	12 (9.4%)	9 (7.1%)	12 (9.4%)	6 (4.7%)
25 to 34 years	144 (40.8%)	86 (24.4%)	35 (9.9%)	24 (6.8%)	57 (16.1%)	7 (2%)
35 to 44 years	256 (42.7%)	116 (19.4%)	63 (10.5%)	42 (7%)	104 (17.4%)	18 (3%)
45 to 54 years	187 (25.4%)	184 (25%)	124 (16.8%)	68 (9.2%)	159 (21.6%)	14 (1.9%)
55 to 64 years	206 (21.8%)	236 (24.9%)	167 (17.7%)	102 (10.8%)	220 (23.3%)	15 (1.6%)
65 to 74 years	161 (18.2%)	189 (21.4%)	139 (15.7%)	132 (14.9%)	237 (26.8%)	25 (2.8%)
75 to 84 years	63 (16.9%)	87 (23.3%)	65 (17.4%)	60 (16.1%)	85 (22.8%)	13 (3.5%)
85 years or over	3 (9.4%)	6 (18.8%)	11 (34.4%)	5 (15.6%)	6 (18.8%)	1 (3.1%)
Prefer not to say	37 (11.9%)	20 (6.5%)	44 (14.2%)	46 (14.8%)	145 (46.8%)	18 (5.8%)
Not answered	61 (31%)	43 (21.8%)	15 (7.6%)	14 (7.1%)	59 (29.9%)	5 (2.5%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	314 (19.7%)	298 (18.7%)	246 (15.5%)	199 (12.5%)	479 (30.1%)	54 (3.4%)
Not disabled	864 (29.1%)	698 (23.5%)	429 (14.4%)	304 (10.2%)	605 (20.4%)	69 (2.3%)
Not answered	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	20 (47.6%)	6 (14.3%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (2.4%)	11 (26.2%)	2 (4.8%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	818 (28.2%)	722 (24.9%)	448 (15.4%)	279 (9.6%)	562 (19.4%)	71 (2.4%)
Prefer not to say	79 (14.3%)	59 (10.7%)	81 (14.6%)	86 (15.6%)	227 (41%)	21 (3.8%)
Not answered	262 (24.6%)	209 (19.6%)	144 (13.5%)	137 (12.9%)	284 (26.7%)	29 (2.7%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	928 (25.3%)	887 (24.2%)	564 (15.4%)	405 (11.1%)	780 (21.3%)	99 (2.7%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	19 (41.3%)	8 (17.4%)	9 (19.6%)	4 (8.7%)	6 (13%)	0 (0%)
Asian/Asian British	17 (56.7%)	6 (20%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	49 (62.8%)	7 (9%)	1 (1.3%)	4 (5.1%)	16 (20.5%)	1 (1.3%)
Black/Black British	24 (68.6%)	4 (11.4%)	3 (8.6%)	0 (0%)	4 (11.4%)	0 (0%)
Arab	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to say	61 (14.7%)	33 (8%)	62 (15%)	64 (15.5%)	177 (42.8%)	17 (4.1%)
Other	5 (16.1%)	2 (6.5%)	8 (25.8%)	4 (12.9%)	10 (32.3%)	2 (6.5%)

Not answered	75 (29.3%)	47 (18.4%)	24 (9.4%)	21 (8.2%)	85 (33.2%)	4 (1.6%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	504 (28.2%)	473 (26.5%)	289 (16.2%)	162 (9.1%)	297 (16.6%)	62 (3.5%)
Male	580 (25.9%)	450 (20.1%)	322 (14.4%)	275 (12.3%)	570 (25.5%)	41 (1.8%)
Nonbinary	8 (29.6%)	4 (14.8%)	1 (3.7%)	2 (7.4%)	12 (44.4%)	0 (0%)
Other	7 (10.9%)	5 (7.8%)	10 (15.6%)	5 (7.8%)	36 (56.3%)	1 (1.6%)
Prefer not to say	27 (10.2%)	22 (8.3%)	38 (14.3%)	49 (18.4%)	117 (44%)	13 (4.9%)
Not answered	53 (29.8%)	42 (23.6%)	15 (8.4%)	10 (5.6%)	52 (29.2%)	6 (3.4%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	902 (27.4%)	796 (24.2%)	516 (15.7%)	356 (10.8%)	633 (19.3%)	85 (2.6%)
Gay/Lesbian	46 (34.3%)	33 (24.6%)	17 (12.7%)	7 (5.2%)	30 (22.4%)	1 (0.7%)
Bisexual	24 (32%)	24 (32%)	8 (10.7%)	4 (5.3%)	13 (17.3%)	2 (2.7%)
All other sexual orientations	24 (15.1%)	9 (5.7%)	25 (15.7%)	18 (11.3%)	76 (47.8%)	7 (4.4%)
Not answered	83 (26.3%)	62 (19.7%)	32 (10.2%)	33 (10.5%)	99 (31.4%)	6 (1.9%)
Prefer not to say	100 (17%)	72 (12.2%)	77 (13.1%)	85 (14.4%)	233 (39.6%)	22 (3.7%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	283 (43.7%)	211 (32.6%)	66 (10.2%)	21 (3.2%)	54 (8.3%)	13 (2%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	113 (10.8%)	84 (8%)	132 (12.6%)	194 (18.5%)	505 (48.3%)	18 (1.7%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	600 (32%)	429 (22.9%)	259 (13.8%)	190 (10.1%)	353 (18.8%)	46 (2.5%)
Unsure	113 (16.4%)	212 (30.7%)	180 (26.1%)	66 (9.6%)	80 (11.6%)	39 (5.7%)
Not at all	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	69 (23.2%)	60 (20.1%)	38 (12.8%)	32 (10.7%)	92 (30.9%)	7 (2.3%)
Total	1179 (25.9%)	996 (21.8%)	675 (14.8%)	503 (11%)	1084 (23.8%)	123 (2.7%)



Q7: How much do you agree or disagree that the proposals will support efficient and effective governance across Hull and East Yorkshire?

Age	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
11 to 16 years	0 (0%)	2 (66.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.3%)
17 to 24 years	47 (37%)	46 (36.2%)	6 (4.7%)	5 (3.9%)	17 (13.4%)	6 (4.7%)
25 to 34 years	117 (33.1%)	100 (28.3%)	38 (10.8%)	28 (7.9%)	62 (17.6%)	8 (2.3%)
35 to 44 years	207 (34.7%)	157 (26.3%)	77 (12.9%)	36 (6%)	111 (18.6%)	9 (1.5%)
45 to 54 years	167 (22.6%)	199 (26.9%)	103 (13.9%)	70 (9.5%)	189 (25.6%)	11 (1.5%)
55 to 64 years	195 (20.6%)	251 (26.5%)	132 (13.9%)	106 (11.2%)	246 (26%)	17 (1.8%)
65 to 74 years	151 (17.1%)	201 (22.8%)	112 (12.7%)	131 (14.9%)	271 (30.8%)	15 (1.7%)
75 to 84 years	45 (11.9%)	99 (26.2%)	50 (13.2%)	61 (16.1%)	114 (30.2%)	9 (2.4%)
85 years or over	2 (6.3%)	6 (18.8%)	7 (21.9%)	5 (15.6%)	10 (31.3%)	2 (6.3%)
Prefer not to say	21 (6.8%)	24 (7.7%)	27 (8.7%)	55 (17.7%)	173 (55.8%)	10 (3.2%)
Not answered	56 (28.6%)	44 (22.4%)	19 (9.7%)	17 (8.7%)	54 (27.6%)	6 (3.1%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Disability	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Disabled	262 (16.5%)	328 (20.6%)	198 (12.4%)	204 (12.8%)	553 (34.7%)	47 (3%)
Not disabled	745 (25.1%)	801 (27%)	373 (12.6%)	310 (10.4%)	694 (23.4%)	47 (1.6%)
Not answered	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Gender Identity	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Consider myself to be trans	16 (39%)	8 (19.5%)	3 (7.3%)	3 (7.3%)	9 (22%)	2 (4.9%)
Do not consider myself to be trans	689 (23.7%)	841 (29%)	377 (13%)	275 (9.5%)	670 (23.1%)	53 (1.8%)
Prefer not to say	60 (10.8%)	58 (10.5%)	58 (10.5%)	92 (16.6%)	268 (48.4%)	18 (3.2%)
Not answered	243 (22.9%)	222 (20.9%)	133 (12.5%)	144 (13.5%)	300 (28.2%)	21 (2%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Race	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
White British / English / Northern Irish / Scottish / Welsh	801 (21.9%)	986 (26.9%)	490 (13.4%)	411 (11.2%)	903 (24.6%)	74 (2%)
Other white inc. Gypsy/Irish Traveller/Roma	14 (30.4%)	14 (30.4%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)	11 (23.9%)	1 (2.2%)
Asian/Asian British	15 (50%)	8 (26.7%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)
Mixed/multiple ethnicities	39 (50.6%)	18 (23.4%)	1 (1.3%)	3 (3.9%)	16 (20.8%)	0 (0%)
Black/Black British	24 (68.6%)	5 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.9%)	5 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
Arab	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to say	39 (9.4%)	41 (9.9%)	39 (9.4%)	70 (16.9%)	215 (51.8%)	11 (2.7%)
Other	2 (6.3%)	6 (18.8%)	8 (25%)	3 (9.4%)	11 (34.4%)	2 (6.3%)

Not answered	74 (28.9%)	50 (19.5%)	25 (9.8%)	23 (9%)	78 (30.5%)	6 (2.3%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Gender	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Female	430 (24%)	550 (30.8%)	253 (14.1%)	180 (10.1%)	331 (18.5%)	44 (2.5%)
Male	493 (22%)	507 (22.6%)	259 (11.6%)	266 (11.9%)	684 (30.5%)	32 (1.4%)
Nonbinary	2 (7.4%)	5 (18.5%)	4 (14.8%)	3 (11.1%)	11 (40.7%)	2 (7.4%)
Other	5 (7.8%)	8 (12.5%)	7 (10.9%)	3 (4.7%)	40 (62.5%)	1 (1.6%)
Prefer not to say	23 (8.7%)	19 (7.2%)	30 (11.3%)	47 (17.7%)	136 (51.3%)	10 (3.8%)
Not answered	55 (30.9%)	40 (22.5%)	18 (10.1%)	15 (8.4%)	45 (25.3%)	5 (2.8%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Sexual Orientation	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Heterosexual/ Straight	770 (23.4%)	919 (27.9%)	442 (13.4%)	362 (11%)	750 (22.8%)	52 (1.6%)
Gay/Lesbian	47 (35.1%)	43 (32.1%)	9 (6.7%)	7 (5.2%)	28 (20.9%)	0 (0%)
Bisexual	23 (30.7%)	21 (28%)	7 (9.3%)	1 (1.3%)	19 (25.3%)	4 (5.3%)
All other sexual orientations	14 (9%)	10 (6.4%)	12 (7.7%)	17 (10.9%)	94 (60.3%)	9 (5.8%)
Not answered	77 (24.5%)	66 (21%)	33 (10.5%)	36 (11.5%)	93 (29.6%)	9 (2.9%)
Prefer not to say	77 (13.1%)	70 (11.9%)	68 (11.5%)	91 (15.4%)	263 (44.7%)	20 (3.4%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

Protected Characteristics	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
Yes, the devolution plans will be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	256 (39.6%)	257 (39.8%)	52 (8%)	17 (2.6%)	54 (8.4%)	10 (1.5%)
No, the devolution plans will not be beneficial to me, with regards to my protected characteristic(s)	91 (8.7%)	84 (8%)	87 (8.3%)	188 (17.9%)	584 (55.7%)	15 (1.4%)
Not applicable (no protected characteristic)	513 (27.3%)	498 (26.5%)	233 (12.4%)	190 (10.1%)	417 (22.2%)	30 (1.6%)
Unsure	78 (11.3%)	230 (33.3%)	167 (24.2%)	88 (12.8%)	96 (13.9%)	31 (4.5%)
Not at all	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Not answered	69 (23.3%)	60 (20.3%)	32 (10.8%)	31 (10.5%)	96 (32.4%)	8 (2.7%)
Total	1008 (22.1%)	1129 (24.7%)	571 (12.5%)	514 (11.3%)	1247 (27.3%)	94 (2.1%)

## Annex 2

### Wider Economic Context

#### a. Population

On census day, 21 March 2021, the population of the area was 609,274, an increase of 18,689 since the last Census in 2011. The rate of population growth for the HEY MCA was 3.2%, lower than the overall growth for England (6.6%).

Over the last ten years Hull has had a population growth of 4.1% (10,609), a greater rate of population growth compared to the East Riding at 2.4% (8,036).

The 2021 Census estimates the median average age within the HEY MCA. On average residents of Hull are aged 36, 4 years younger than the national average. Within the East Riding, the average age is 49, 9 years higher than the national average.

The latest Office for National Statistics (ONS) Sub-national population projections (2018) forecast that the HEY MCA's population is expected to increase by 2.1% (the equivalent of 12,605 people) by 2043, significantly lower than the 10.3% population increase for England. However, while the overall HEY population is projected to grow, Hull's population is projected to contract by 1.6%. East Riding's population is projected to grow by 4.9% by 2043.

The HEY MCA has an increasingly ageing population, with the 65+ population forecast to increase by 29.4% by 2043. This is likely to have significant implications for older people's services across the whole of the HEY MCA. The East Riding is projected to see the largest increase in residents aged 65+ at 34.4% compared to 18.5% in Hull. The number of residents aged 0-15 in the East Riding is projected to fall by 3.7%, with the number falling by 8% in Hull. The number of residents aged 16-64 is projected to fall by 6.2% in the East Riding, and by 4.5% in Hull.

2021 Census figures show there are 296,350 households across the HEY MCA. This represents an increase of 11.3% (30,001 more households) since 2011, significantly higher than the national average of 6.2%. Hull has seen an increase of 6,525 (5.6%) houses between 2011 and 2021, with the East Riding seeing an increase of 23,476 (15.6%) over the same time period.

#### b. Deprivation

There are stark differences in deprivation across the HEY MCA area. Overall, 23% of LSOAs are within the 10% most deprived areas in England. When this data is broken down, 6% of East Riding's LSOAs are within the 10% most deprived areas, with 45% of Hull's LSOAs being in the same category. Overall, 20% of the HEY MCA's LSOAs are within the 10% least deprived areas in England, but significantly all 42 LSOAs in this category are within the East Riding with Hull having no LSOAs that are in the 10% least deprived areas in England.

In 2022, 21.5% of children aged 0 to 19 years (11,453) were living in low-income families in the HEYMCA. This is above the overall England average of 18.5%. There is significant variation across the Area. Hull has a higher than national average of children in low-income families of 28.2% compared to the East Riding which has a lower than national average figure of 14.8%.

HEY MCA's male healthy life expectancy lags behind the national average at 59.6 compared to 63.1. The same can be said about female life expectancy at 62.9 compared to 63.9. There is a significant difference between Hull and East Riding with male healthy life expectancy in Hull at 53.8 compared to 65.3 in the East Riding. Female healthy life expectancy in Hull is 57.9 compared to 67.9 in the East Riding.

#### c. Challenges to Economic Growth

Overall, the HEY MCA lags behind national productivity with Kingston upon Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire ranked as the 320th and 225th most competitive local authorities respectively in the UK out of a total of 379.

The HEY MCA area was worth £13.4b in 2021, representing 0.7% of the total UK GVA.

Agriculture, energy, mining, and manufacturing make up almost 30% of the value of the local economy.

Carbon emissions are 34.8% higher per capita than the England average due to a high concentration of energy-intensive industries and industrial legacy.

Poor connectivity by road and rail, with many rural areas bypassed altogether, leading to lower than national average bus and rail usage.

A lower-than-average population with level 4+ qualifications at 26.4% compared to 36.9% nationally. 0.9% lower higher education enrolments (as a % of those aged 16-64) than national average at 4.1% compared to 5% nationally.

21% increase in enterprises since 2010, the lowest of any combined authority and 13% lower than the national average.

An employment rate 1.8% below the national average at 74.0%.

#### **d. Levelling Up**

On average the HEY MCA is outperformed by the national average for indicators representing the 12 levelling up missions. However, when looked at as individual local authorities the East Riding is often on par or outperforming the national average, whereas Hull is more likely to perform significantly worse than the national average. Where the trend differs is connectivity; as a rural authority the East Riding does not perform well in travel times and broadband coverage.

See Levelling Up metrics data on the following page.



# Levelling Up Missions

Missions	Metrics	Best performing geography			Worst performing geography	
		1	2	3	4	5
		East Yorkshire	Hull	HEY	Yorkshire and Humber	England
Mission 1 - Improve productivity and pay, closing the gap between regions <sup>10</sup>	GVA per hour worked	£35.40	£29.40	£32.40	£32.60	£38.90
	Gross weekly median pay (full-time, resident based)	£633.90	£537.50	£585.70	£594.10	£645.80
	Employment rate for 16-64 year olds (%)	77.6%	70.3%	74.0%	74.6%	75.8%
Mission 2 - Investment in R&D outside of SE to increase by 40% <sup>12</sup>	UK Innovate spend per person	N/A	N/A	N/A	£8.00	£24.00
	Research Councils spend per person	N/A	N/A	N/A	£41.00	£60.00
	Research England spend per person	N/A	N/A	N/A	£23.00	£27.00
Mission 3 - Local public transport to be brought closer to 'London-standard' <sup>2,4,11</sup>	Railway station usage (annual total entries/exits per head)	6.4	7.5	6.9	15.0	31.6
	Passenger journeys on local bus services per head	13.0	58.4	32.9	35.0	50.2
	% travelling to work by public transport, cycle, or walk	12%	24%	18%	16%	18%
	Avg travel time to nearest employment centre (500+ jobs)	16 mins	11 mins	14 mins	12 mins	11 mins
Mission 4 - Nationwide gigabit-capable broadband and 4G coverage <sup>9,15</sup>	% superfast broadband coverage (>=30 Mbps)	97.5%	99.7%	98.6%	97.9%	98.0%
	% of premises with access to gigabit-capable broadband	82.7%	99.7%	91.2%	80.7%	79.2%
	% 4G coverage outdoor from all operators	94.6%	100%	97.3%	94.8%	98.0%
Mission 5 - Greater numbers achieving Maths and English expected standard <sup>3</sup>	% of pupils who achieved 9-4 in GCSE Maths and English	69.3%	59.8%	64.6%	66.6%	69.0%
	Average Attainment 8 score per pupil	47.4%	44.3%	45.9%	46.9%	48.9%
Mission 6 - Increase completion of high-quality skills training <sup>1,3,6</sup>	% working-age population qualified to level 4 or above	40.2%	24.9%	31.1%	38.7%	44.0%
	Higher Education student enrolments - % of 16-64	4.6%	3.6%	4.1%	5.1%	5.0%
	Apprenticeship starts - % of working-age population	1.7%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	1.0%
Mission 7 - Increase healthy life expectancy, closing the gap between regions <sup>13</sup>	Male healthy life expectancy	65.3	53.8	59.6	61.1	63.1
	Female healthy life expectancy	67.9	57.9	62.9	62.1	63.9
Mission 8 - Improve wellbeing, closing the gap between regions <sup>10</sup>	Personal wellbeing - Anxiety	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1
	Personal wellbeing - Happiness	7.7	7.4	7.6	7.5	7.5
	Personal wellbeing - Life Satisfaction	7.7	7.3	7.5	7.6	7.6
	Personal wellbeing - Worthwhile	7.9	7.4	7.7	7.8	7.8
Mission 9 - Improve pride in place and satisfaction with town centres <sup>7,8</sup>	Satisfied with local council (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	61	63
	Average town centre vacancy rate	8.8	23.9	16.4	15.0	13.8 (GB)
Mission 10 - Increase number of first-time buyers and housing standard <sup>5,10</sup>	House price to income ratio	6.4	5.0	5.8	9.5	5.8
	New dwellings completed (% of total dwellings)	1.0%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%
	Non-decent housing stock	1.0%	4.0%	2.5%	4.0%	8.0%
Mission 11 - Reduce incidents of crime, particularly in worst-affected areas <sup>14</sup>	All crime per 1,000 population	66.6	156.5	105.9	114.0	92.0
	Anti-social behaviour per 1,000 population	7.9	13.2	10.2	15.1	17.0
Mission 12 - Every part of England that wants one will have a devolution deal	Devolution	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Sources: <sup>1</sup>APS, 2021; <sup>2</sup>Census, 2021; <sup>3</sup>DfE, 21/22; <sup>4</sup>DfT, 2019, 21/22; <sup>5</sup>DLUHC, 21/22; <sup>6</sup>HESA, 21/22; <sup>7</sup>LDO, 2023; <sup>8</sup>LGA, 21/22; <sup>9</sup>Ofcom, Q4 2023; <sup>10</sup>ONS, 2021, 21/22, 2022; <sup>11</sup>ORR 21/22; <sup>12</sup>UKRI, 20/21; <sup>13</sup>PHE, 2018-20; <sup>14</sup>Police, Sep22-Aug23; <sup>15</sup>thinkBroadband, Oct 2023