

The Brighton and Hove Fairness Consultation: an analysis of responses to the Fairness Questions

Final Version

4th May 2016

By the University of Brighton and the Community University Partnership
Programme in collaboration with Brighton and Hove City Council

Note: this report is based on a preliminary analysis of findings and is subject to ongoing review.



University of Brighton

Social Science Policy and
Research Centre



University of Brighton

**Community
University
Partnership
Programme**

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Background
2. Approach to analysing data
3. Approach to analysing responses to website, paper-based and telephone survey
4. Detailed summary of top 4 responses to question 1
5. Detailed summary of top 4 responses to question 2
6. Responses where bad feeling or antipathy were expressed
7. The environment
8. Telephone survey data and demographic analysis
9. Remaining categories of proposals for improving fairness

Executive Summary of Results: website, paper-based responses and telephone survey

As part of the public consultation on fairness, the people of Brighton and Hove responded to two questions via the local authority website, through providing paper-based responses and as part of a telephone survey. The two questions were:

1. How do you think the council and its partners can make Brighton & Hove a fairer place to live?
2. What can residents do to make Brighton & Hove a more fair and equal place to live for everyone?

Table 1. below shows how many responses were received via each format.

Website responses	207
Paper-based	125
Telephone survey	1002
Total	1334

In terms of the range of responses offered, 17 different areas of life in Brighton and Hove were identified as requiring focus if Brighton and Hove is to become a fairer place to live. It should be noted that respondents could include as many proposals for improving fairness as they wished in their responses. Therefore, 'one response' does not equate to 'one proposal' for improvement; some respondents provided multiple proposals whilst some focused on just one. In designing the analytical strategy the team responsible decided that each individual proposal should be recognised as important and included in the analysis. This gave a total of 3585 proposals which is an average of between 2 to 3 proposals per respondent. Below, Table 2. shows the areas of life in the city referred to along with the amount of times they formed part of a proposal to improve fairness.

Table 2. Fairness in Brighton and Hove: focus areas

Responses to both questions

Name	References	% of total
Housing	590	16.46
Community	546	15.23
Diversity and Inclusion	403	11.24
Participation	376	10.49
Mutual Respect - Enforcement	274	7.64
Process	221	6.16
Travel	213	5.94
Environment	179	4.99
Budget Priorities	174	4.85
Tax	130	3.63
Income	117	3.26
Health, Social Care and Wellbeing	105	2.93
Employment	86	2.40
Residency	80	2.23
Education	40	1.12
Local Economy	27	0.75
Digital	24	0.67
Total	3585	100.00

The fairness questions asked for suggestions as to how the 1.) Council and its partners could improve fairness in Brighton and Hove and 2.) how residents could improve fairness. Tables 3 and 4 below show the areas of life in the city referred to in response to each question.

Table 3. Responses by question

Question 1

Word	References	% Total
Housing	546	23.31
Diversity and Inclusion	312	13.32
Travel	188	8.03
Community	180	7.69
Budget Priorities	156	6.66
Process	152	6.49
Income	107	4.57
Tax	107	4.57
Participation	105	4.48
Mutual Respect - Enforcement	96	4.10
Environment	92	3.93
Health, Social Care and Wellbeing	82	3.50
Employment	77	3.29
Residency	65	2.78
Education	34	1.45
Digital	23	0.98
Local Economy	20	0.85
Total	2342	100.00

Question 2

Word	References	% of total
Community	366	29.44
Participation	271	21.80
Mutual Respect	178	14.32
Diversity and Inclusion	91	7.32
Environment	87	7.00
Process	69	5.55
Housing	44	3.54
Travel	25	2.01
Health	23	1.85
Tax	23	1.85
Budget Priorities	18	1.45
Residency	15	1.21
Income	10	0.80
Employment	9	0.72
Local Economy	7	0.56
Education	6	0.48
Digital	1	0.08
Total	1243	100.00

Housing, diversity and inclusion and **travel** are the three most significant areas of city life in which the public says the Council and its partners should take action to improve fairness. Fairness was strongly associated with recognising and accounting for **diversity**. Improving housing and travel in the city were therefore linked to the needs of specific groups of residents, in particular younger people and older people. This demonstrates the public's concern for targeted support to protect those who can experience the effects of unfairness most acutely. **Homelessness** was included as a sub-category of diversity and inclusion and by a considerable margin, it is this group for whom residents categorically say improvements must be made if the city is to be experienced as a fair place to live.

Community and **participation** are the two areas in which residents felt that citizens of Brighton and Hove could improve fairness in the city. Participating in community, cultural and political life encompassed a broad spectrum of engagement from staying informed and being compassionate, respectful and supportive of each other, to volunteering, organizing and taking part in community activities and events. However, the public's recommendations on community and participation were strongly associated with recommendations on '**process**' where it was acknowledged that there is a need to create conditions through which participating in community is supported, encouraged and made possible. The voluntary and community sector was seen as vital in this regard because of its capacity to support individual residents to participate and its capacity to target support toward those who need it. Developing processes at city level and constructing budget priorities to reflect this were strongly associated with achieving fairness.

1. Background: A collaborative approach

In November 2015 the Community University Partnership Programme (Cupp) at the University of Brighton and Brighton and Hove City Council's (BHCC) Fairness Commissioner met to discuss the possibility of a joint collaboration in support of the City's public consultation on fairness. The proposal developed sought to bring academic expertise in qualitative data analysis and student interest in live policy processes together with local government expertise in order to devise and implement an analytical approach to reporting on the Fairness Commission's public consultation.

The main aim of the Fairness consultation and therefore the analytical approach adopted was to represent 'the voice of the people' such as it had been expressed and heard through the consultation process. On this basis, the partnership focused on developing an analytical strategy for reporting on two main areas of consultation activity. The first area was the formal and informal public meetings that took place. The second area was the data collected in response to the two 'fairness questions' that were responded to through the website, on paper and as part of a telephone survey.

All materials collected in relation to both areas of activity were categorised as either: 'Public Voice' or 'Supporting Materials'. For public meetings, a calendar of all formal and informal meetings held throughout the consultation period was constructed and all documents produced for and through those meetings were catalogued along with summary recommendations from each. These materials ranged from videos of citizen testimonies given at themed public meetings to drawings provided by local children depicting their idea of fairness. The calendar was used to index and catalogue materials collected at consultation meetings in order to sustain clear links between what the public said and the actions recommended.

In addition to this catalogue of documents and recommendations a collaborative approach to analysing responses to the two 'Fairness questions' was designed. This analysis identified 17 areas of life in Brighton and Hove that residents considered fundamental when seeking to improve fairness in the city. These 17 areas were cross-referenced with findings from public meetings and used to inform the development of the consultation. The findings from the analysis of responses to the fairness questions provide an overview of the range and relative weighting of priorities the public expressed with respect to making Brighton and Hove a fairer place to live.

This report focuses on this second part of the process offering an overview of responses to the two fairness questions combined with analytical findings available at this stage. It contains a 2 page summary overview of the results, information on how the analysis was conducted and further details of the analysis produced.

Whilst there is a fuller report and more detailed analysis to be carried out on the dataset and the analysis, the summary findings offered here are substantive and provide a clear statement of the range and relative importance of priorities expressed by those who participated in the consultation.

2. Approach to analysing responses to website, paper-based and telephone survey

The fairness questions and responses are characterised by their openness which, whilst both appropriate and valuable, has consequences for how the data are analysed. The questions themselves were very 'open' in the sense that Fairness as a concept was not introduced or defined and the political context of the consultation was not stated. Responses too were 'open' in the sense that there were no structured statements asking people to agree/disagree therefore respondents answered in their own words and could write or say as much or as little as they wished. **Therefore, the answers that the people of Brighton and Hove gave to these questions can be understood as offering genuine insight into what fairness means to them, in their words, in their city, at this time.**

In technical terms, the openness of concepts, questions and responses required the use of qualitative (text-based) data analysis techniques. Framework analysis^{1,2} was taken to be the most appropriate method as it could support inductive, 'open coding' of responses and facilitate a collaborative, consensus-based coding process. The source data and 'framework matrices' produced were subsequently analysed using the NVivo 10 software programme.

Differences between response formats and deleted responses

The telephone survey results were linked to demographic data so we know for certain these people came from Brighton and Hove and it is possible to consider whether certain people had certain types of ideas on fairness. In the telephone survey the two questions on fairness were inserted into a longer Council survey (the 'City Tracker' survey) and so respondents did not elect specifically to participate in the consultation. However, of the 1002 people surveyed 689 offered their views when asked. By contrast, the website and paper responses were proactively contributed through people accessing the website. However, website responses were not linked to demographic data³ and as people could write as much or as little as they wanted the length of response varies; from as little as 2 words to the longest response at close to 2000 words. Most responses offered one or two discrete proposals for improving fairness but a small number of responses were written as longer statements or personal stories. It is noteworthy that there was very little negative sentiment or antipathy expressed. Two examples were deleted on the basis that they were profane and did not relate directly to the consultation. For a discussion of antipathy please see below.

2.1 Examples of responses and differences between Question 1 and 2

Both questions posed to the public asked 'what could be done' and so typically people expressed their answers as either an individual action, or list of actions. For example, in response to question 1 '**How do you think the council and its partners can make Brighton & Hove a fairer place to live?**' the following were typical answers provided via the website:

¹ Barnard, M., Becker, S., Bryman, A., & Ferguson, H. (2012) 'Critical qualitative theory and 'framework' analysis' In *Understanding research: Themes, methods and approaches for social policy and social work*. Second Edition p.334-336

² Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (2003) *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*, London: Sage Publications

³ We and we cannot say with the same level of certainty as with the telephone data that a.) people who responded to the website are resident of Brighton and Hove or that b.) people only responded to the questions once. However, from looking at the data itself and the degree to which responses are a.) relevant to Brighton and Hove and b.) repetitious in style and content, these are not significant concerns.

Table 4. Example responses to Question 1 (expressed in respondents own words)

<p>W10143 <i>Affordable accommodation especially for younger people who are often forced to stay at home, where they cannot afford to move out. Also the services for elderly, vulnerable and people whom are struggling to survive. Keep as many of these services open as much as possible, especially food and clothing banks. Also teach people to maybe offer help to less fortunate neighbours.</i></p>
<p>W10032 <i>Help tackle the housing problem - do more for homeless communities, do something about unfair landlords (many of whom say no DSS), cap rents and agency fees.</i></p>
<p>W10052 <i>Council should be more transparent over how public consultations really affect decision-making. It is often felt that decisions are made and consultations are just to select views that support the decisions</i></p>
<p>W10086 <i>Making services for children and young people more inclusive for children with complex needs. Make the city autism friendly.</i></p>
<p>W10198 <i>People need to know what available, not have to fight for everything (sic)</i></p>
<p>W10142 <i>Rent caps</i></p>

Answers to question 2. **‘What can residents do to make Brighton & Hove a more fair and equal place to live for everyone?’** were typically shorter than answers to question 1 and there was a higher instance of people not responding (464 and 346). There was a different emphasis within the responses to this question which focused less on pragmatic aspects of city life and more on the significance of cultural, community and political participation. Respondents focused on values such as ‘being a good neighbour’, ‘being kind’ or showing tolerance and compassion. The following are typical answers to question 2 provided via the website:

Table 5. Example responses to Question 2 (expressed in respondents own words)

<p>W10052 <i>support homeless charities, report bad landlords/ letting agent, landlords invest & maintain property appropriately people encouraged to rent spare rooms. Students can volunteer on mass as part of engagement programme and contribute to local services to improve social cohesion. E.g. litter picking park etc. Public sector led cleaner, greener days across the city where all residents can contribute to making the living environment as nice as possible.</i></p>
<p>W10086 <i>• Take part in community activities • Participate in democratic processes • Be aware of privilege • Volunteer and share</i></p>
<p>W10032 <i>Be more tolerant.</i></p>
<p>W10204 <i>Vote differently at the next election, or maybe it will already be too late?</i></p>
<p>W10065 <i>get involved in more community projects - things that directly improve everyone's standard of living in Brighton and Hove. Be more involved in the future of the city.</i></p>

3. Approach to analysing responses to website, paper-based and telephone survey

As they were longer in length and written in respondents' own words, analysis of the website responses was conducted first. These responses were typically actions that referred to a particular area of life in the city. We interpreted these as being that which residents understood as 'priorities', as broadly speaking, 'necessary' for making the city 'a fairer place to live'. On this basis, each response was given a 'unique identifier' and categorised in terms of the 1.) area(s) of city life referred to 2.) action(s) proposed 3.) justification for the action(s) and 4.) the 'principle of fairness' the response was focused around. Not all responses were detailed enough to complete each category, but most website responses were. This became the 'analytical framework' and became the basis for a table or matrix and example of which is provided below.

Data identifier	Category	Action Proposed	Justification	Underlying principle	Notes
W1001Q1					

Having decided on this strategy, a one day 'Coding for Fairness' workshop was held at the University of Brighton on the 21st December 2015. At this point, 1093 responses had been received to the telephone and website consultation. The aim of the workshop was to look at the 93 website responses received by this point and arrive at a consistent way of describing the areas of city life people referred to when trying to think how the city could be fairer. This process is referred to by academic researchers as 'coding'. The coding process began by workshop attendees individually reading the same set of 10 website responses and then writing down key words and phrases from the responses together with their interpretation of them in the empty table above, called a 'framework matrix'.

The group then came back together to discuss and agree on what they had entered in their respective matrices. Through this process, key 'categories of fairness' and 'themes' or codes began to emerge. The same process was repeated but this time in pairs with each pair given a different set of 10 responses. Pairs completed individual matrices which they discussed and reached agreement on before reporting back to the group. Below is an example of a completed entry in the framework matrix including the website response to which it refers:

Table 6. Example of website response with corresponding entry in framework matrix

W1001Q1 <i>Regulate private rents and letting agent fees. A lot of money in the city is being sucked up by high private rents, leaving poorer people struggling to meet other everyday living expenses and the better off with less money to spend on other local goods and services that would support the local economy.</i>					
Data identifier	Category	Action Proposed	Justification	Underlying principle	Notes
W0001Q1	Housing -enforcement -rent control -letting agent fees Local economy Diversity and inclusion -poorer people	Regulate rents and letting agent fees.	Poorer people cannot afford rent and therefore cannot contribute to local economy	Fair housing	

The workshop coordinator began building a list of core categories on a whiteboard based on the matrices and group discussions. This list was developed and added to throughout the day as the process of working in pairs and reporting back continued. By the end of the day 'saturation' was reached a term used by qualitative researchers to describe a point whereby core categories have stabilised and no new categories are found to be necessary. This set of 'main categories' was then used on the telephone responses and was found to produce consistent findings for these also. However, it was only possible to attribute a main category for telephone responses as they were much shorter having been summarised by the telephone survey data collectors.

The overall aim of this process was that it should be democratic, consensual and open. It was the shared view of workshop attendees that the people of Brighton and Hove had contributed their views to the consultation and that these should be 'faithfully heard and accounted for'. The careful reading of all responses formed an important part of this process as did the discussion in groups and pairs.

The process was led by the university and attendees came from Brighton and Hove City Council (BHCC) and the university. Some attended in their paid capacities and others attended on a volunteer basis as students at the university and as citizens of Brighton and Hove. Preliminary meetings and advice on planning the workshop was provided by Dave Wolff (Cupp) and Carl Walker (UofB).

The 8 people who attended the workshop were:

Mary Darking	Senior Lecturer, University of Brighton (Coordinator)
Bethan Prosser	Community University Partnership (Cupp)
Lorraine Prince	Masters in Public Administration student at UoB
Kerry Dowding	Masters in Research Student, UoB
Maggie Hemill	Masters in Community Psychology student UoB
Julia Reddaway	Fairness Commission Project Manager, Brighton and Hove City Council
John Guzek	Public Health Intelligence, Brighton and Hove City Council
Barbara Hardcastle	Public Health Intelligence, Brighton and Hove City Council

Sincere thanks are extended to the student volunteers who participated.

4. Detailed Summary of top 4 responses to Question 1

The 4 most frequently cited areas of city life that respondents identified as ones where the Council and its partners could take steps to improve fairness were: housing; diversity and inclusion; community; and travel. Below we discuss each of these in more detail.

4.1 Housing

Housing was by far the most significant aspect of city life that residents saw the Council as responsible for addressing in order to improve fairness. The word most frequently used in relation to housing was '**rent**' and a clear concern that rents in the city are too high making it extremely hard for those on average or low incomes to save, stay out of debt and manage their finances on a daily basis was in evidence. 1 in 5 references to housing called for the Council to control or 'cap' rents in the city. Following rent levels, the need to **regulate landlords and letting agents** were the next two most pressing issue for residents. Examples were given of unfair charges and fees on the part of letting agents and of landlords not maintaining properties whilst raising rents without notice. After regulating rents the most commonly cited means of addressing this situation was to provide more affordable and social housing targeted towards city residents. Buy-to-let was an important area of

concern to residents particularly with regard to family housing being bought by landlords intending to let it as student accommodation. Below is a table showing the key messages that residents wanted to convey with regard to fairness and housing.

Table 7. Fairness and Housing

Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rent (control/caps) - Regulate letting agents (fees, charges) - Regulate landlords - More affordable housing (affordable to residents) - Improve availability (resident access to) housing - Create more and protect existing social housing - Address homelessness (build hostels) - Address cramped and poor quality rented housing - Regulate buy-to-let (loss of family accommodation) - Bring empty properties into use
----------------	---

4.2 Diversity and Inclusion

For residents, improving fairness in Brighton and Hove was predominantly associated with targeting support for groups they recognised as needing additional help if they are not to become vulnerable. For example, high rents were identified as particularly problematic for young people, families and those on low incomes. A broad range of people were identified as requiring recognition and targeted support. However, of all the responses that identified specific groups who require support, over half of those responses identified people experiencing homelessness as having the most pressing needs. Not having an effective strategy to address homelessness was strongly associated with resident experience of Brighton and Hove as a city that did not have its priorities in order and therefore could not be experienced as fair. Addressing homelessness also appeared under the category of ‘Budget Priorities’ with residents proposing practical solutions to addressing homelessness such as building hostels and providing facilities, but emphasising that these solutions require investment and commitment on the part of the Council and its partners. There was a strong association between unfair rents and its potential to create conditions for homelessness as well as homelessness being a measure of how fair a society is.

Below, Table 8 shows some examples of resident views on homelessness.

<p>W00147Q1: We also need to do more to tackle homelessness, obviously regulating rents would be a start but pulling together all the agencies/voluntary groups trying to address the increasing need would make a huge difference.</p> <p>W00028Q1: Help tackle the housing problem - do more for homeless communities, do something about unfair landlords (many of whom say no DSS), cap rents and agency fees.</p> <p>W00236Q1: Homelessness is a real problem, especially for those who cannot prove a local connection (they may have been sleeping rough or on someone's couch) or are refugees (internal and external). Where minority groups are disproportionately represented (for example, a disproportionate amount of homeless are LGBT) then resources should be allocated accordingly.</p> <p>W00053Q1: Demand housing for homeless people, a society is judged by how well it treats its poorest.</p>
--

4.3 Travel

Travel around the city was cited as the 3rd most important concern to address to improve fairness in Brighton and Hove. Travel was most commonly associated with diversity and inclusion where ensuring people with additional needs have the capacity to access the city was referred to as a clear means of ensuring the city remains fair. The implication was that a lack of accessibility contributed to the social isolation of specific groups and prevented those living in different areas of the city from sharing in the same benefits as other residents. The two most commonly cited means of improving fairness in relation to travel were to maintain bus routes and to lower bus fares. Alternatives to lower bus fares such as giving free bus passes to certain groups and extending the hours older people can use free bus passes were also suggested. In addition to buses, parking and lowering the cost of parking in the city for residents was also seen as an important way to improve fairness.

Beyond means of transport, the accessibility and maintenance of pedestrian routes and cycle paths was referred to most frequently as a means of improving fairness. The responsibility for ensuring clear pathways for pedestrians was seen as something that the Council could do more to enforce or encourage. Mutual respect between residents on these issues was also called upon. Awareness raising of how accessibility issues affect the lives of certain groups (such as older people, those with disabilities and those caring for babies and young children) are affected disproportionately by accessibility issues compared to others was identified as important.

The significance of communal amenities as important to accessibility was also emphasised. Once out in the city having suitable amenities to support people was also emphasised (see below).

4.4 Community

Support for communities was the fourth most commonly cited way in which the Council and its partners could improve fairness in the city. Within this, the role of the voluntary and community sector (VCS) was frequently referred to as pivotal. Support for the VCS centred on its capacity to reach and enable diverse groups who would otherwise be neglected or vulnerable which was understood by residents to be at the heart of fairness. The role that the sector plays, its capacity to reach groups and raise awareness of needs, combined with its capacity to enable other residents to take part in this work made it a focal point of proposals as to how to improve fairness in the city. In the category of 'Budget Priorities' and 'Participation' support for the VCS emerged as the most significant way in which the Council and its Partners and residents could work together to improve fairness in the city. It was the work of this sector rather than the work of the Council and its partners that was seen as making the most substantive contribution to the key issue of homelessness.

Community centres, spaces and facilities were also seen as a way to address fairness particularly in balancing out benefits to residents living in different areas of the city. For example:

W00124Q1: I live in a poorer, rather deprived part of the city - the Coombe Road Area. We have no community facilities, nowhere to meet and a very long hill to climb with just one bus an hour up Coombe Road, a bus which is very unreliable.

More communal amenities including benches, toilets, drinking fountains, community centres and libraries were described as essential to ensuring those for whom accessing the city is a challenge have places to meet their essential needs. Without these, the city becomes inaccessible to groups of people. Having benches to rest on, accessible toilets, water fountains and accessible social spaces were described as significant to older people, carers, those living with disabilities or chronic illness and pregnant mothers, babies and young children.

Community featured as a key component of responses as to how to improve fairness in Brighton and Hove with respect to what the Council and its partners can do and with respect to what residents can do. This dual recognition highlights community as a key area in which enhanced collaboration between the Council and its partners and residents is likely to have a powerful effect on improving fairness.

5. Detailed summary of top 4 responses to Question 2

The 4 most frequently cited areas of city life that respondents identified as ones where they themselves could take steps to improve fairness were: community; participation; mutual respect; and diversity and inclusion. These 4 areas for improving fairness constitute over 70% of total responses. Their importance should therefore be understood to be of tremendous significance. It should also be noted that this was the question to which there was a higher instance of people replying 'I don't know'. The relationship between knowing and not knowing what one can do to improve fairness as a resident is arguably important; an idea space that could be supported with examples of what other residents do and would like to do through participation, community and mutual respect. Responses to this question were shorter on average to responses to question 1.

5.1 Community

Community was either directly referred to by respondents or it was a 'code' or 'name' given to a particular set of proposals by those conducting the analysis. Community was agreed on as a code that grouped together references that spoke to ways of 'living collectively'. Perhaps for this reason, of all the areas for improving fairness identified, 'community' encompassed the greatest range of proposals, suggestions and ideas. Below is a list of the ways in which 'living collectively' was referred to in question 2 responses:

Table 9. Community and Fairness

Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More community spaces - Events, groups, activities - Empower disadvantaged communities - Support VCS and small groups - Support community through volunteering - Importance of art and culture (support, get involved) - Neighbourliness (be friendly) - Mutual support (be supportive) - Compassion and tolerance (be kind, be tolerant) - Help each other (lend a hand) - Look out for each other (safety) - Fair (B&H already a fair and community-oriented place to live)
------------------	--

A significant proportion of these referred to the importance of creating more means of 'coming together' through shared spaces, groups and activities. There was a strong association between these activities and the empowerment of those who may feel the effects of unfairness more strongly than others. Volunteering and involvement in the VCS was identified as an important means of addressing these issues and supporting community through engaging and 'taking part' (see also 'participation' below).

A high proportion of responses contained quite straightforward messages such as ‘be considerate toward others’ or ‘be kind’ or ‘look out for each other’. Within this was a range of different emphases on neighbourliness, helping, sharing, or safety. There were examples of respondents explaining the difference that compassion and tolerance in the community (or a lack thereof) made to them as a person experiencing isolation, hidden disability, mental health issues or prejudice.

5.2 Participation

Here again, participation was either a word that was mentioned specifically, most commonly as ‘take part in’ or ‘get involved in’, or it was a name that those analysing the data gave to a particular set of activities that described more directed or political engagements as a means of improving fairness. Below is a table showing the range of responses that were included under ‘participation’.

Table 10. Community and Fairness

Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volunteering (as participation) - Improve public understanding, be informed - Lobbying, campaigning - Openness (need for) - Engagement and representation (at meetings, in processes) - Community activities, groups, events - In democratic processes, vote - Party politics - Voice/visibility/giving feedback - Responsibilities (residents, council; rights) - Pointless (antipathy) - Less questionnaires / equal opps monitoring
----------------------	---

Here again, volunteering was described as an important means through which residents could actively participate in improving fairness in the city. Responsibility for awareness raising and improving public understanding was one that was seen as something residents could productively do for and with each other.

Responses where participation was identified as a key aspect of the proposal for fairness tended to include more references to political activity such as lobbying the council to take a position against local government funding reductions. Residents referred to the need to vote and take part in political processes which included engaging in meetings and representing the public interest wherever possible. Improving public understanding and ‘staying informed’ were related to a capacity to involve oneself and others in political processes that can improve fairness.

In some cases, there was a pointlessness or antipathy associated with participation and debate over whose responsibility improving fairness is: the Council and its partners’; or residents.

5.3 Mutual respect

Residents saw themselves as responsible for showing respect and consider in a number of respects. In responses to question 1 this category of answer also included references how the Council and its partners could support fairness through enforcing respect for certain principles. In question 2 responses, the emphasis was on residents showing respect for each other, the environment they live in and the spaces they share with each other.

Areas of fairness associated with residents and their respect of each other included noise, travel and accessibility, litter and keeping gardens and areas outside houses tidy. There were particular concerns voiced over pedestrians and cyclists being respectful of each other.

5.4 Diversity and inclusion

As with responses to question 1 the areas in which residents could improve fairness described above were often associated with the needs of particular groups, most commonly older people and younger people. Homelessness featured prominently again with residents encouraging each other to support and volunteer with community groups that aim to address homelessness.

There were 'one-off' examples that were, in many ways, no less significant for only being cited once, such as, for example the experience of being autistic, the biodiversity of specific green spaces or the particular form of social isolation experienced by older men (as opposed to women).

6. The environment

The environment formed a category of response to both question 1 and question 2 that is not captured in the detailed summaries above and is therefore included here. Respondents to the fairness questions saw the Council and its partners as responsible for protecting green spaces so that they remain accessible and available to be enjoyed by all. This was seen to be of particular importance with respect to protecting green spaces from housing or other commercial development. There was also concern that the Council should be held accountable for its performance with respect to rubbish collection and recycling and should share responsibility with residents for maintaining Brighton and Hove as a clean city.

The environment was in the top 5 of most frequently cited responses to how Brighton and Hove residents can improve fairness. The main areas of concern were with littering, keeping the city clean and equal investment in the maintenance of residential areas across the city. Looking after the city and natural environment was described as a matter of individual and shared responsibility that residents should actively observe for fairness to be improved and maintained.

7. Responses where bad feeling or antipathy was expressed

Those involved in analysing responses to the fairness questions created a separate code for describing responses where anger, criticism or resentment was expressed in relation to a specific state of affairs. There was much more antipathy expressed in response to question 1 (60 examples) compared to question 2 (24 examples).

To their credit, residents of Brighton and Hove directed very little antipathy toward specific groups with almost all answers suggesting positive and constructive ways of improving fairness and recognising diversity. As a measure of this, there were only 4 responses out of the total number that referred to immigration, migrants or refugees with antipathy. Of the antipathy that was expressed in relation to question one, 14 of these referred to students, specifically student housing and experiences of lack of mutual respect, through noise and litter. Some of this antipathy was also associated with student housing and its part in buy-to-let where private landlords were described as buying up family homes to rent to students. However, this was antipathy in relation to a need for the Council and its partners to take action with respect to a historical situation rather than students themselves.

There were 11 instances of respondents expressing antipathy toward the Council and in some of these, antipathy toward the fairness consultation itself. Others identified expensive 'wasteful projects' giving examples such as the i360 as problematic and a source of antipathy.

8. Telephone survey data and demographic analysis

Where the fairness questions were asked as part of the City Tracker telephone survey it was possible to link responses to data on gender, age, ethnicity and postcode. This enables us to understand whether those differences have an impact on which areas of concern are identified as important. It also allows us to say whether certain groups of people attribute more significance than others to specific areas of concern. This part of the analysis was conducted by Dr Carl Walker at the University of Brighton.

The City Tracker survey is undertaken by a representative sample of residents of Brighton and Hove. The quantitative analysis focused on the first 3 areas which respondents identified as significant to improving fairness in Brighton and Hove. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that respondents identified areas for improving fairness in order of priority with the area they considered most important described first.

On this basis, the quantitative analysis is consistent with the qualitative analysis in finding Housing, Community and Diversity and Inclusion to be the most significant areas where Brighton and Hove residents feel fairness could be improved.

Taking demographic information into account showed that there is no difference in relative focus on these 3 areas on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity or postcode. Housing was by far the most important category to all participants accounting for about 50% of 'first responses' for across demographic groups. Travel accounted for between 6-11% of first responses across demographic groups and diversity and inclusion between 8-10%.

Although not statistically significant, there was a slight difference in the response to two categories on the basis of gender. With respect to community, 6.8% of women compared to 3.3% of men thought that community was a key area that the council and its partners could focus on to make Brighton & Hove a fairer place to live. In relation to diversity and inclusion, 8.4% of women compared to 5.9% thought this was a key area that the council and its partners could focus on to make Brighton & Hove a fairer place to live.

9. Remaining categories of proposals for improving fairness

Overall, there were 17 areas that residents identified as significant to improving fairness in Brighton and Hove. The scope does not exist within the report to refer to all of them. Therefore a summary of the remaining categories is provided below.

It should be noted that basing analyses of a concept as complex and significant as fairness on prevalence alone is not sufficient. In this report, explicit focus has been given to those areas of improvement that were most frequently stated by respondents. This could be considered a democratic approach to deciding which should be given more focus. However, at the same time, this is not a referendum or voting process; it is a consultation and as such it is deeply undemocratic to ask people for their views and then not give them due consideration. What we can say is that as part of this analytical process all responses were read and considered individually. They were discussed by those involved in the analysis and carefully coded. Where we have not provided more

detail a summary of responses that fall into the less prevalent categories is provided in the table below.

Table 11. Remaining categories of proposals for improving fairness

Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council processes - Council worker employment and pay - Fairness commission process - Campaign to central government - Don't cut services / stop cuts - Meaning of fairness - Fewer questionnaires - Fair hearings (Council) - Transform Council - Listen, consult - Inform, public understanding
Budget priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoid unnecessary projects (e.g. i360; traffic schemes) - Prioritise spending on local Services - Focus on services for those on low incomes - Costs of traveller incursions and clean-up versus stable solution - Contracting (avoid expensive) - Priorities spending on supporting vulnerable, frail, disadvantaged, those in need - Homelessness (prioritise resources; spend on hostels) - Ensure suburbs and centre treated equally - Avoid wasting money
Tax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council tax (increase/reduce) - Bedroom tax (fair administration) - Tax property owners (business rates) - Tax the rich / fair taxes - Less tax for locals
Income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of disposable - Income inequality - Pay-day loans - Living wage (enforce) - Cannot 'afford to volunteer'
Health, care and wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support carers - Community centres, social spaces, advocates needed - More preventative services (community-based) - Promote healthy eating exercise - Address problems associated with drink and drugs - Protect the NHS - Promote self-care - Access to services (fair)
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support for disabled people and employment - Support for long terms sick and employment - Promote living wage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support self-employed - Create/take opportunities
Residency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tourism (encourage; invest in amenities) - Local people pushed out - (Put) Local people first - Local versus tourist needs
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review school admissions policy - Schools (improve) - Improve public education
Local Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage entrepreneurs, local business - Businesses (do more to help homeless) - Regulate businesses (living wage, rubbish) - Business rates (reduce) - Access to local shops
Digital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve IT provision (council, for older people) - No 'digital by default' parking - Digital exclusion (if no internet or smartphone)