

# 1 Inequalities in local funding cuts to environmental and regulatory 2 service expenditure in England from 2009 to 2020

3 Lauren Murrell

4

5 Lauren Murrell<sup>1,2</sup>, Katie Fahy<sup>4</sup>, Helen. E Clough<sup>1,3</sup>, Roger Gibb<sup>1</sup>, Xingna Zhang<sup>1,4</sup>, Marie Chattaway<sup>5</sup>, Mark. A  
6 Green<sup>6</sup>, Iain Buchan<sup>1,4</sup>, Benjamin Barr<sup>1,4\*</sup>, Daniel Hungerford<sup>1,2\*</sup>

7 1. National Institute for Health and Care Research Health Protection Research Unit in Gastrointestinal  
8 Infections, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

9 2. Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and Immunology, Institute of Infection, Veterinary  
10 and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

11 3. Department of Livestock and One Health, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences,  
12 University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

13 4. Department of Public Health, Policy & Systems, Institute of Population Health, University of  
14 Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

15 5. United Kingdom Health Security Agency (UKHSA), London, UK

16 6. Department of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

17 \*Equal contributors

18

## 19 Abstract

20 Background:

21 Local authorities have been subject to substantial reductions in funding, placing strain on local services.  
22 Environmental and Regulatory (ER) services provide essential functions including infectious disease  
23 prevention and control via Food Safety and Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease Control services  
24 (APHIDC). This study investigates inequalities in local funding cuts to these services.

25 Methods:

26 We used a generalised estimating equation model to estimate the annual percent change of ER service  
27 expenditure between 2009/10 and 2020/21 in addition to Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure change  
28 overall, and as a share of total ER expenditure. Models analysed trends by deprivation level, local authority  
29 structure and population density.

30 Results:

31 Areas of higher deprivation had the largest reduction in expenditure, with ER and Food Safety and APHIDC  
32 cuts of 2% and of 23% respectively, compared to a 1% and 8% reduction in the least deprived areas. The  
33 share of ER expenditure spent on Food Safety and APHIDC decreased by 13% in the most deprived  
34 authorities compared to 6% in the least deprived areas. Environmental and Regulatory services saw the  
35 largest cuts in unitary authorities, declining by 2%. London boroughs had the greatest reductions in Food  
36 Safety and APHIDC expenditure, decreasing by 10%. Both ER and Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure  
37 decreased with increasing population density.

38 Conclusion:

39 The unequal distribution of cuts shows the need for increased and equitable investment into these services  
40 to enable resilience to emerging infectious disease threats, and to prevent widening of health inequalities.

1

## 2 Key Messages

3

### 4 What is already known on this topic

- 5 • Austerity measures have led to substantial reductions in local funding placing increased pressure on  
6 local authority services in England, research shows reductions vary by deprivation level of an area,  
7 rural - urban classification and local authority structure.
- 8 • It is unknown how local funding cuts to Environmental and Regulatory services, which provide  
9 essential services for public health protection, vary by these characteristics.

### 10 What this study adds

- 11 • We investigate inequalities in austerity-enforced changes in Environmental and Regulatory service  
12 expenditure and sub-spending lines of Food Safety and Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease  
13 Control over time by deprivation, local authority structure and population density from 2009/10 to  
14 2020/21.
- 15 • The largest cuts were in the more deprived areas and with increased population density for both  
16 Environmental and Regulatory and Food safety and Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease  
17 Control services. The largest cuts in Environmental and Regulatory services were seen in unitary  
18 authorities whereas Food safety and Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease Control saw largest  
19 cuts in London boroughs.

### 20 How this study might affect research, practice or policy

- 21 • This research provides strong evidence of inequalities in local authority service expenditure in  
22 Environmental and Regulatory services and highlights where investment should be focused, in order  
23 to protect environmental and public health.

24

## 25 Background

26 Over the past 10 years the UK has faced substantial changes to public spending at the local authority level.  
27 Following the financial crisis of 2008, austerity measures were implemented to reduce fiscal deficit and  
28 stabilise the economy (1). These measures led to significant cuts to local authority funding, which fell 77%  
29 between 2009-10 and 2020-21 (2,3). Local authorities are responsible for providing key services such as  
30 social services, housing, leisure and cultural services, and Environmental and Regulatory (ER) services  
31 (sometimes referred to as environmental health or regulatory services) (4). A growing body of literature  
32 describes the considerable impact of local funding cuts, demonstrating disproportionately grave impacts on  
33 disadvantaged areas (5–7), including increased disease burden (5).

34 Established in 1848, the UK Public Health Act empowers local authorities to protect the health of the  
35 population, addressing issues like infectious diseases, water safety and waste management (8).  
36 Environmental and Regulatory services align with the mandates of the Public Health Act, delivering water  
37 safety, waste collection, trading standards, food safety, and animal and infectious disease control (9). These  
38 services allow investment in the safeguarding of local public health via different routes, with ER services  
39 responsible for the notification and prevention of infectious disease (10). In 2020, ER services dealt with  
40 58,434 notifiable incidents of infectious disease, with 4,800 cases due to food poisoning (8). Food safety  
41 services within ER include enforcement, inspection, regulation and monitoring of food premises and  
42 establishments (11), and investigation of food borne disease outbreaks and illness (9). Meanwhile, service

1 expenditure under Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease Control (APHIDC) is focused on infectious  
2 disease control functions under the Public Health Act of 1984 (9).

3 Local authority funding comes from a combination of central government grants, local council tax, income  
4 from fees and charges. The distribution of these funds to services is decided by local government and differs  
5 by their structure and responsibilities. Unitary authorities, including London boroughs, are single-tier  
6 authorities and are responsible for all functions. Two-tier authorities split responsibilities between the upper  
7 (county) and lower (district) levels. Single-tier authorities can redirect funding from service budgets in order  
8 to protect statutory services such as Social Care. However, two-tier authorities are limited in their ability to  
9 redirect funding from services lower tier services, such as ER services, to upper tier services such as Social  
10 Care. Environmental and regulatory services have received substantial cuts since the introduction of  
11 austerity measures (2,12,13). These spending cuts have been accompanied by service changes, including  
12 reports of reductions in Food Safety staff by 13% between 2012/13 and 2017/18(14) a decline in food  
13 standards and hygiene sampling, and decreased waste removal (14–16). Existing research indicates that  
14 even before austerity, ER services were insufficient to meet the needs of the most deprived neighbourhoods  
15 (17,18). Furthermore, environmental health teams reported their capacity to function during the COVID-19  
16 pandemic was impacted by prior local funding cuts (19). Therefore, expenditure reductions may further  
17 exacerbate inequalities in service provision and health outcomes.

18 The study aims to describe trends in ER service expenditure since the introduction of austerity, and how  
19 these have differed by level of neighbourhood socioeconomic deprivation, local authority structure and  
20 urbanicity service need.

## 21 Methods

22 The study protocol containing further detail of study design, the analytical framework and data sources, and  
23 indicators have been previously published (20). We present a concise summary of the methods below.

## 24 Setting

25 We analysed annual expenditure data in England from 2009/10 to 2020/21 for lower tier and single-tier local  
26 authorities. The geographical boundaries used in this analysis are based on 2020 local authority boundaries.  
27 The City of London and Isles of Scilly were excluded from the study due to their small populations and local  
28 characteristics. Additionally, for the analysis of Food Safety and APHIDC a further nine local authorities were  
29 removed due to missing data, leaving 303 for analysis.

## 30 Data and measures of interest

31 The indicators of interest were total ER service expenditure, and the sub-streams of Food Safety and APHIDC  
32 expenditure. Data are provided at the lower tier local authority level each year from 2009/10 to 2020/21.  
33 These data were obtained from the Place Based Longitudinal Data Resource (PLDR) (21). Gross expenditure  
34 is defined as the total spending by local authorities, including income raised in service provision, and data  
35 are indicative of the financial year- April 1<sup>st</sup> to March 31<sup>st</sup>. The midyear population estimate for each local  
36 authority was obtained from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) to estimate per capita expenditure.

37 English Indices of multiple deprivation (IMD) were used as the measure of deprivation (22). Population  
38 density estimates, obtained from ONS (24), were originally measured in persons per square kilometre.  
39 Population density was divided by 1000, so that a unit increase corresponded to a change of 1000 persons  
40 per square kilometre. This facilitates interpretation of model estimates as a unit of one person per square  
41 kilometre is less meaningful.

42 Population density may influence infectious disease risk due to greater transmission in urban areas.  
43 Additionally, it acts as an indicator of food outlet density. Direct data on food outlet density was poor quality

1 with inconsistent reporting; in addition, there was a significant correlation between population density and  
2 the number of food establishments at the local authority level (Pearson Correlation Coefficient 0.76,  
3  $p < 0.0001$ ). Therefore, population density was used as a more robust proxy indicator for service need.

#### 4 Analysis

5 Expenditure data were adjusted for inflation prior to analysis using gross domestic product (GDP) deflator  
6 (23). Local authorities were designated to deprivation quintiles using IMD 2019 and held consistent  
7 temporally, enabling comparability, as deprivation levels in some local authorities have changed over time.  
8 The local authority IMD average score was used to produce quintiles weighted by population size, making  
9 the number of people in each quintile evenly distributed. Local authorities were also grouped into three  
10 categories, London boroughs, lower tier districts or unitary (including metropolitan) authorities, allowing  
11 comparison across local authority structure.

12 Data were analysed at the aggregated ER service level, then explored by individual spending line. The sub-  
13 streams of Food Safety and APHDC were then explored, investigating how expenditure changed over time  
14 by deprivation, population density (classed as rural or urban), and by local authority structure in exploratory  
15 analysis.

16 To measure temporal trends in expenditure, data were stratified by deprivation, local authority structure  
17 and population density. A generalised estimating equation (GEE), with a log link function (24) was fitted to  
18 assess temporal trends in expenditure and our explanatory variables (24). The outcome was annual gross  
19 total ER expenditure, with log-transformed population size as an offset, in order to model the log of per  
20 capita spend. Financial year was specified to interact with local authority structure, population density and  
21 deprivation level. This model was then reproduced for gross Food Safety and APHDC service expenditure.  
22 The proportion of Food Safety and APHDC expenditure as a share of total gross ER expenditure was  
23 explored, with Food Safety and APHDC as the outcome variable and log transformed gross ER expenditure  
24 as the offset. We interpreted the GEE model results by calculating the linear combinations of the estimated  
25 coefficients. The results were presented as annual percentage change.

#### 26 Missing data and multiple imputation

27 Missing data were present in the Food Safety and APHDC services for 17 local authorities. Of these, nine  
28 were removed if data were missing for three consecutive years, two consecutive years at the beginning of  
29 the study period (2009 and 2010), or at the end of the study period (2019 and 2020) as specified in the logic  
30 model (online supplementary figure S4). Eight were then carried forward for multiple imputation with 10  
31 observations missing, using predictive mean matching, and a predictor matrix consisting of deprivation level,  
32 local authority type, and population data to estimate missing values. Sensitivity analysis was carried out with  
33 case wise deletion of all authorities with missing values (online supplementary table S3).

## 34 Results

### 35 Trends in expenditure

36 There was a decline in mean expenditure for ER and Food Safety and APHDC per capita between 2009/10  
37 and 2020/21, across each deprivation level, local authority type and rural and urban local authorities (table  
38 1). The most deprived local authorities, London boroughs and urban authorities saw the largest reductions in  
39 mean expenditure per capita for ER and Food Safety and APHDC expenditure.

40 Table 1, Mean expenditure in 2009/10 and 2020/21 summary table.

	Baseline ER mean expenditure per capita 2009/10, £ (SD)	Change in mean ER expenditure per capita 2009/10-2020/21, £ (%)	Baseline Food Safety + Animal Infectious Disease Control expenditure per capita 2009/10, £ (SD)	Change in mean Food Safety + Animal Infectious Disease Control expenditure per capita 2009/10-2020/21, £ (%)	Number of Local authorities	Mean population density per square kilometre (SD)
	IMD quintile					
<b>1 (Least deprived)</b>	144.35 (21.52)	-15.02 (-10.4%)	8.74 (6.04)	-5.09 (-58.2%)	88	581(820)
<b>2</b>	155.84 (21.08)	-22.74 (-14.6%)	8.41 (5.08)	-4.39 (-52.2%)	67	1338(1729)
<b>3</b>	169.24 (60.57)	-24.49 (-14.5%)	8.37 (5.39)	-5.28 (-63.2%)	68	2035(2802)
<b>4</b>	176.23 (47.17)	-37.85 (-21.5%)	10.84 (8.57)	-7.32 (-67.5%)	45	3429(3779)
<b>5 (Most deprived)</b>	179.16 (35.2)	-48.64 (-27.1%)	9.37 (6.59)	-6.67 (-71.2%)	44	2551(2435)
	Local authority structure					
<b>London Borough</b>	217.82 (83.88)	-50.37 (-23.1%)	10.75 (7.21)	-7.75 (-72.1%)	32	7344(3760)
<b>Two tier</b>	153.38 (23.92)	-17.26 (-11.3%)	9.2(6.24)	-5.24 (-57.0%)	188	769(923)
<b>Unitary (excluding London)</b>	159.34 (30.15)	-38.00 (-23.8%)	7.92 (5.78)	-5.33 (-67.35%)	92	1793(1434)
	Rural or Urban					
<b>Rural</b>	153.18 (23.52)	-13.71 (-9%)	9.35 (5.61)	-5.42 (-58%)	92	152(61)
<b>Urban</b>	165.56 (46.23)	-32.47 (-19.6%)	8.82 (6.52)	-5.56 (-63%)	220	2428(2745)

1


## 2 Environmental and regulatory service expenditure

3 There is variation in the direction and size of expenditure change between local authorities. Most local  
 4 authorities experienced an overall decline in expenditure, with the largest being 57%. However, 33 Local  
 5 authorities experienced an increase in ER expenditure in 2020/21 compared to 2009/10, with the largest  
 6 being 60% (figure 1).

7

8

9



1

2 *Figure 1* The percentage change in Environmental and Regulatory service expenditure between 2009 and 2020 at the  
3 local authority level.


4 The gross ER service expenditure per capita decreased by 27% in the most deprived local authorities, from  
5 2009/10 to 2020/21, compared to an 10% decrease in the least deprived local authorities (figure 2). In  
6 London boroughs and unitary authorities, expenditure experienced a larger decline compared to two-tier  
7 local authorities, which had a maximum reduction of 10% in 2020/21. By 2012, London boroughs and unitary  
8 authorities surpassed this decline, both experiencing reductions of over 23%. During this period relative cuts  
9 to gross ER service expenditure per capita in urban areas were almost double that in rural areas.

10

11

12

1



2 *Figure 2* The percentage change in mean ER expenditure per capita relative to 2009/10, stratified by deprivation, local  
 3 authority structure and rural urban.

1 Food Safety and Animal Public Health and infectious disease control expenditure

2 There was a steep decline in expenditure on Food Safety and APHIDC services, with a decrease of 71% by  
3 2020/21 in the most deprived local authorities (Figure 3). Compared to other local authority structures,  
4 London boroughs saw the largest cuts in expenditure overtime, with 2020/21 cut by 72 % relative to  
5 2009/10. Two tier local authorities saw the smallest reduction in expenditure of 57% between 2009/10 and  
6 2020/21. Rural and urban local authorities see a matched decline until 2012, from this point urban areas see  
7 a moderately larger decline in annual expenditure, decreasing by 63%, compared to 58% in rural areas.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


26

27

28

29





1

2 *Figure 3* The percentage change in mean Food Safety and APHDC expenditure per capita relative to 2009/10, stratified  
3 by deprivation, local authority structure and rural urban.

1 **Generalised estimating equation expenditure trends**

2 The estimated trends in ER service expenditure per capita from the GEE models, show annual declines in  
 3 expenditure per capita (table 2). The most deprived local authorities experienced a reduction of 2.4% (95%  
 4 CI: -3.5%, -1.3%) in expenditure annually compared to 1.2% (95% CI: -1.8%, -0.5%) in the least deprived local  
 5 authorities. Trends in expenditure also varied between local authority structure. The largest cuts were in  
 6 unitary authorities, which saw an annual decrease of 1.9% (95% CI: -2.9%, -0.8%) in expenditure, compared  
 7 to a decrease of 1% (95% CI: -3%, 1%) in London boroughs. For each additional 1000 people per square  
 8 kilometre there was decrease of 1.4% (95% CI 95% CI: -2.1% -0.7%) in expenditure annually.

9 The greatest decrease in Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure was in the most deprived local authorities (-  
 10 22.8%, 95% CI: -34.9%, -8.4%) annually compared to the least deprived (-7.5%, 95% CI: -9.1%, -5.9%). Of local  
 11 authority structures, London boroughs experienced the largest reductions with a decrease in expenditure  
 12 per capita of 9.9% (95% CI: -16.4%, -2.9%). There was a decrease in Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure of  
 13 8.1% (95%CI: -10.1%, -6%) annually for each additional 1000 people per km<sup>2</sup> increase in population density.

14 The share of expenditure spent on Food Safety and APHIDC decreased by 13.4% (95% CI: -21.1%, -5%) per  
 15 capita annually in the most deprived authorities compared to 6.3 % (95% CI: -7.9%, -4.7% in the least  
 16 deprived. The share of ER service expenditure per capita spent on Food Safety and APHIDC was cut the most  
 17 in London boroughs (-9.2% 95% CI: -16.1%, -1.7%) and decreased by 6.4% (95% CI: -8.4%, 0%) per capita  
 18 annually, per 1000 increase in population density.

19 Table 2: Estimates of annual percentage change in ER, Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure per capita from  
 20 generalised estimating equation models, between 2009/10 and 2020/21.

Variable	Annual percentage change in ER per capita (95% Confidence Intervals)	Annual percentage change in Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure per capita (95% Confidence Intervals)	Annual percentage change in Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure per capita as a share of ER (95% Confidence Intervals)
<b>IMD quintile</b>			
<b>1 (least deprived)</b>	-1.2 (-1.8, -0.5)	-7.5 (-9.1, -5.9)	-6.3 (-7.9, -4.7)
<b>2</b>	-1.3 (-2, -0.6)	-8.6 (-12.4, -4.5)	-7.2 (-11.1, -3.2)
<b>3</b>	-0.1(-1, 0.8)	-5.8 (-9.2, -2.2)	-5.1 (-9.1, -0.9)
<b>4</b>	-1.3 (-2.2, -0.4)	-9.4 (-13.8, -4.8)	-6.7 (-11.5, -1.7)
<b>5 (most deprived)</b>	-2.4 (-3.5, -1.3)	-22.8 (-34.9, -8.4)	-13.4 (-21.1, -5)
<b>LA structure</b>			
<b>Two tier</b>	-1.2 (-1.8, -0.5)	-7.5 (-9.1, -5.9)	-6.3 (-7.9, -4.7)
<b>Unitary</b>	-1.9 (-2.9, -0.8)	-8.7 (-11.7, -5.7)	-8.4 (-11.6, -5.2)
<b>London Borough</b>	-1 (-3, 1)	-9.9(-16.4, -2.9)	-9.2 (-16.1, -1.7)
<b>Population density</b>	-1.4 (-2.1 -0.7)	-8.1(-10.1, -6)	-6.4 (-8.4, 0)

21

22

23

24 **Discussion**

25 **Summary**

26 In this longitudinal study we investigate post-austerity inequalities ER service expenditure trends and  
 27 spending lines of Food Safety and APHIDC. Our study demonstrates how austerity has exacerbated social and

1 spatial inequalities in environmental public health, which could lead to widening health inequalities.  
2 Expenditure for total ER services decreased more in the most deprived areas, unitary local authorities, and  
3 local authorities with higher population density. These inequalities in expenditure cuts are accentuated  
4 when analysing Food Safety and APHIDC, with most deprived areas experiencing the largest reductions over  
5 time and as a share of total ER service expenditure. Expenditure for Food Safety and APHIDC decreased most  
6 in London boroughs and unitary authorities compared to two-tier authorities which saw the smallest  
7 reductions, overall and as a share of ER service expenditure. Furthermore, overall Food Safety and APHIDC  
8 expenditure decreased in areas with higher population density, as did the share of ER service spent on Food  
9 Safety and APHIDC.

## 10 Interpretation

11 Reductions in expenditure across ER services and within Food Safety and APHIDC were largest in the most  
12 deprived local authorities compared to the least deprived, supporting previous findings on expenditure cuts  
13 (7,25). These reductions were larger for Food Safety and APHIDC services, annual decreases of 22.8%  
14 compared to 2.4% for overall ER. This suggests a variation between the sub-service streams, which might be  
15 missed in higher level analysis. A report by the National Audit Office describes differences in spending  
16 between ER sub-services, with community safety falling by 47.1% compared to 11% for water safety (15),  
17 highlighting the importance of sub-service level analysis. Statutory services such as those carried out by ER  
18 services have seen smaller reductions compared to other services (15,26). However, local authorities facing  
19 larger cuts are less able to protect these services from reductions (15). Therefore, with the increasing  
20 demand on social care (16), a protected service, areas with higher demands for this service may see smaller  
21 expenditure available for ER services, meaning more deprived areas could see larger cuts to statutory  
22 services such as ER. In addition, more deprived local authorities may struggle to generate income outside of  
23 central government funding (their primary source of funding), through means such council tax and business  
24 rates due to factors such as lower property values and lower business rates. So inequitable cuts to statutory  
25 service funding will result in inequitable service delivery and impact, with research showing that food  
26 establishments in the most deprived areas are 25% less likely to obtain required hygiene standards than  
27 those in the least deprived areas (28). Furthermore, individuals in more deprived areas are of greater risk of  
28 gastrointestinal infections (GI infection) (29), and experience more severe outcomes (30,31). This inequality  
29 in infection risk is particularly true for pathogens associated with person-to-person transmission and some  
30 foodborne pathogens (29). These trends may be of particular concern, as more deprived areas tend to have  
31 a higher demand for Food Safety and APHIDC services but have experienced the largest reduction in funding.

32 Our study also found the largest reductions in ER service expenditure to be in unitary authorities. Whilst  
33 London boroughs and unitary authorities saw the largest reductions in Food Safety and APHIDC expenditure,  
34 overall and as a share of ER service expenditure. This is in line with previous research by Fahy et al, 2022  
35 which describes the largest reduction to Cultural, Environmental and Planning (CEP) in unitary authorities  
36 (25). This is likely due to single-tier authorities making larger cuts to and within the ER service budget to  
37 protect higher priority services, such as Social Care and exacerbated by the different capacities to subsidise  
38 services with alternative revenues (13). For instance, in 2018/19 unitary local authorities generated 15% of  
39 spending need from fees and charges compared to 60% in district councils (27). Furthermore, in unitary  
40 authorities, council tax contributes less to total income compared to county councils (17).

41 Findings showed that as population density increased, so did cuts in overall ER service expenditure, Food  
42 Safety and APHIDC, and the as a share of ER service expenditure. This is in line with previous research that  
43 showed urban areas in England have faced more substantial reductions in CEP spending compared to rural  
44 (25). Budgets in areas with higher population density may see larger cuts due to larger reliance on central  
45 government funding in urban areas compared to rural areas, which have alternative means of income

1 generation (2). This is of concern as areas with higher population density are likely to have higher food  
2 establishments density, increasing the service need in these areas.

### 3 Strengths and Limitations

4 This study is the first to spatially and temporally analyse expenditure of ER services using systematic  
5 statistical methods. We utilise national data for these services, including the analysis of critical sub-services,  
6 whilst accounting for population change and deflation, thus providing a comprehensive indication of trends  
7 in expenditure overtime. This provides evidence, which may be used in informing policy and direction of  
8 needs at a larger scale. Study limitations include uncertainty surrounding sub-service reporting accuracy and  
9 the missing data within these services. It is possible that misclassification and reporting errors occurred  
10 within reporting of local authority expenditure resulting in some sub-services reporting zero expenditure for  
11 a given year. Furthermore, the difference in missingness may be due to the discretionary characteristics of a  
12 service meaning they are not prioritised, and funding may be directed elsewhere. We tried to account for  
13 this by combining sub-services of interest, in addition to using multiple imputation. Another limitation is the  
14 use of population density as a proxy of food establishment density. However, high correlation between  
15 these data and well reported population density made it a suitable measure. Finally, this study is descriptive,  
16 therefore, we cannot confirm why these trends have occurred or what the implications of these findings  
17 might be, this should be investigated in future work.

### 18 Conclusion

19 Despite the importance of ER services as a key component of local health protection systems, they have  
20 been cut substantially year-on-year since the introduction of austerity. The concerning trend that cuts to  
21 these protective services have hit more deprived, highly populated-urban areas, presents a high risk for  
22 resilience to current and future infectious disease threats. This observed decline is unsustainable and  
23 threatens the ability for this service to function, posing a potential threat to the public from infectious  
24 diseases. Further research is needed to understand the impact on health outcomes of these inequitable cuts  
25 to ER services. Additionally, increased, and equitable investment to these services is urgently needed to  
26 protect public health.

27

## 1 Data availability

2 The expenditure data included in this study are available from <https://pldr.org/> (21), further information and  
3 guidance for the data can be found here. Population demographic data can be found at  
4 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/> and <https://www.gov.uk/>.

## 5 Acknowledgements

6 We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Alexandros Alexiou, Frieda Jorgenson, Simon Melican, Nick  
7 Wellington, Samantha Walters, Valerie Decraene, Jane Muizelaar

## 8 Ethics

9 Ethics approval is not applicable, data used in this study is open access available to the public.

## 10 Contributions

11 LM, HEC, RG, XZ, MAG, MC, IB, BB, DH were involved in conceptualization of the study. LM and DH were  
12 involved in investigation, and project administration. LM, KF, DH, HEC, MAG, BB and XZ contributed to  
13 methodology. LM carried out visualisation, writing – original draft preparation. LM, KF, HEC, RG, XZ, MAG,  
14 MC, IB, BB, DH contributed to writing- reviewing and editing. HEC, RG, XZ, MAG, MC, IB, BB, DH contributed  
15 to supervision. BB was responsible for funding acquisition.

## 16 Competing interests:

17  
18 DH is currently in receipt of research grant support from the Food Standards Agency. LM, KF, RG, MC, HEC,  
19 XZ MAG, IB, BB declare no relevant competing interests.

21 **Funding:** This study is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Health  
22 Protection Research Unit in Gastrointestinal Infections, a partnership between the UK Health Security  
23 Agency, the University of Liverpool and the University of Warwick (Grant Reference Number PB-PG-NIHR-  
24 200910). BB was funded the NIHR Policy Research Programme (RESTORE; Award ID, NIHR202484) and the  
25 NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Northwest Coast (NWC ARC; Award ID: NIHR200182). HEC's  
26 participation in this research is funded by NIHR through HPRU-GI. DH is funded by a National Institute for  
27 Health Research (NIHR) Post-doctoral Fellowship (PDF-2018-11-ST2-006). The views expressed are those of  
28 the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. The  
29 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the  
30 manuscript.

## 32 Abbreviations

33 ER: Environmental and Regulatory Services

34 APHIDC: Animal and Public Health Infectious Disease Control

35 LA: Local Authority

36 NAO: National Audit Office

37 ONS: Office of National Statistics

38 IMD: Index of Multiple Deprivation

39 UK: United Kingdom

40 GEE: Generalised Estimating Equation

1 GI: Gastrointestinal

2 PLDR: Place Based Longitudinal Data Resource

### 3 References

4

5 1. GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 28]. Spending Review 2010. Available from:  
6 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spending-review-2010>

7 2. Gray M, Barford A. The depths of the cuts: the uneven geography of local government austerity.  
8 *Camb J Reg Econ Soc.* 2018 Oct 29;11(3):541–63.

9 3. The shape of things to come • Resolution Foundation [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2023 Jul 11]. Available  
10 from: <https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/publications/the-shape-of-things-to-come/>

11 4. Local government facts and figures: England [Internet]. LGiU. [cited 2023 Jul 14]. Available from:  
12 <https://lgiu.org/local-government-facts-and-figures-england/>

13 5. Stokes J, Bower P, Guthrie B, Mercer SW, Rice N, Ryan AM, et al. Cuts to local government spending,  
14 multimorbidity and health-related quality of life: A longitudinal ecological study in England. *Lancet Reg*  
15 *Health – Eur* [Internet]. 2022 Aug 1 [cited 2022 Sep 8];19. Available from:  
16 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762\(22\)00130-](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(22)00130-2/fulltext#supplementaryMaterial)  
17 [2/fulltext#supplementaryMaterial](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanep/article/PIIS2666-7762(22)00130-2/fulltext#supplementaryMaterial)

18 6. Institute for Fiscal Studies [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 16]. Changes in councils' adult social care and  
19 overall service spending in England, 2009–10 to 2017–18. Available from:  
20 [https://ifs.org.uk/publications/changes-councils-adult-social-care-and-overall-service-spending-england-](https://ifs.org.uk/publications/changes-councils-adult-social-care-and-overall-service-spending-england-2009-10-2017)  
21 [2009-10-2017](https://ifs.org.uk/publications/changes-councils-adult-social-care-and-overall-service-spending-england-2009-10-2017)

22 7. Alexiou A, Fahy K, Mason K, Bennett D, Brown H, Bamba C, et al. Local government funding and life  
23 expectancy in England: a longitudinal ecological study. *Lancet Public Health.* 2021 Jul 12;6(9):e641–7.

24 8. Public protection services: councillor handbook | Local Government Association [Internet]. 2022  
25 [cited 2023 Mar 3]. Available from: [https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/public-protection-services-](https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/public-protection-services-councillor-handbook)  
26 [councillor-handbook](https://www.local.gov.uk/publications/public-protection-services-councillor-handbook)

27 9. General fund revenue account outturn: specific guidance notes - GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul  
28 21]. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/general-fund-revenue-account-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn-specific-guidance-notes#ro5-cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services)  
29 [outturn/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn-specific-guidance-notes#ro5-cultural-environmental-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn-specific-guidance-notes#ro5-cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services)  
30 [regulatory-and-planning-services](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn/general-fund-revenue-account-outturn-specific-guidance-notes#ro5-cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services)

31 10. Rogers P. National enforcement priorities for local authority regulatory services. London: Better  
32 Regulation Executive; 2007. 184 p.


33 11. Ministry of Housing C and LG. Statutory duties placed on local government [Internet]. 2011 [cited  
34 2023 Aug 17]. Available from: [https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/01171494-e40b-463f-9967-](https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/01171494-e40b-463f-9967-56d158412321/statutory-duties-placed-on-local-government)  
35 [56d158412321/statutory-duties-placed-on-local-government](https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/01171494-e40b-463f-9967-56d158412321/statutory-duties-placed-on-local-government)

36 12. Phillips D, Hodge L, Harris T. English local government funding: trends and challenges in 2019 and  
37 beyond [Internet]. The IFS; 2019 Nov [cited 2022 Mar 29]. Available from:  
38 <https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/14563>


- 1 13. House of Lords. Local Authority Provision of Essential Services Debate on 24 January 2019 [Internet].  
2 2019. Available from: chrome-  
3 extension://efaidnbnmnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/LL  
4 N-2019-0006/LLN-2019-0006.pdf
- 5 14. National Audit Office [Internet]. [cited 2022 May 30]. Ensuring food safety and standards - National  
6 Audit Office (NAO) Report. Available from: [https://www.nao.org.uk/report/ensuring-food-safety-and-](https://www.nao.org.uk/report/ensuring-food-safety-and-standards/)  
7 [standards/](https://www.nao.org.uk/report/ensuring-food-safety-and-standards/)
- 8 15. National Audit Office. The impact of funding reductions on local authorities [Internet]. 2014 [cited  
9 2023 Oct 30]. Available from: chrome-  
10 extension://efaidnbnmnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-  
11 content/uploads/2014/11/Impact-of-funding-reductions-on-local-authorities.pdf
- 12 16. National Audit Office [Internet]. [cited 2021 Dec 28]. Financial sustainability of local authorities 2018  
13 - National Audit Office (NAO) Report. Available from: [https://www.nao.org.uk/report/financial-](https://www.nao.org.uk/report/financial-sustainability-of-local-authorities-2018/)  
14 [sustainability-of-local-authorities-2018/](https://www.nao.org.uk/report/financial-sustainability-of-local-authorities-2018/)
- 15 17. Territorial Justice and Neighbourhood Environmental Services: A Comparison of Provision to  
16 Deprived and Better-off Neighbourhoods in the UK [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 10]. Available from:  
17 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1068/c0657>
- 18 18. Poor Neighbourhoods and Poor Services: Evidence on the 'Rationing' of Environmental Service  
19 Provision to Deprived Neighbourhoods [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 16]. Available from:  
20 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/0042098009344995>
- 21 19. Rotherham S. 'A system that is struggling': Understanding health protection resilience in England  
22 during the COVID-19 pandemic through the experiences of local health protection responders. :Under  
23 review (2024).
- 24 20. Murrell L, Clough H, Gibb R, Zhang X, Green M, Chattaway M, et al. Understanding the impact  
25 funding cuts on Environmental and regulatory services and gastrointestinal infections: a longitudinal  
26 ecological study. *NIHR Open Res.* 2024 Jan 5;3:41.
- 27 21. Cultural, Environmental, Regulatory and Planning Services individual spending lines (R05)  
28 (FIN\_07\_61) | Place-based Longitudinal Data Resource [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 1]. Available from:  
29 [https://pldr.org/dataset/20mjn/cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services-individual-](https://pldr.org/dataset/20mjn/cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services-individual-spending-lines-r05-fin0761)  
30 [spending-lines-r05-fin0761](https://pldr.org/dataset/20mjn/cultural-environmental-regulatory-and-planning-services-individual-spending-lines-r05-fin0761)
- 31 22. GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 25]. English indices of deprivation 2019. Available from:  
32 <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>
- 33 23. GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 2023 Nov 20]. GDP deflators at market prices, and money GDP December  
34 2021 (Quarterly National Accounts). Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-december-2021-quarterly-national-accounts)  
35 [deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-december-2021-quarterly-national-accounts](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/gdp-deflators-at-market-prices-and-money-gdp-december-2021-quarterly-national-accounts)
- 36 24. Liang KY, Zeger SL. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika.*  
37 1986;73(1):13–22.
- 38 25. Fahy K, Alexiou A, Mason K, Bennett D, Egan M, Taylor-Robinson D, et al. Inequalities in local  
39 government spending on cultural, environmental and planning services: a time-trend analysis in England,  
40 Scotland, and Wales. *BMC Public Health.* 2023 Feb 28;23(1):408.

- 1 26. Hastings A, Bailey N, Bramley G, Gannon M, Watkins D. THE COST OF THE CUTS: THE IMPACT ON  
2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POORER COMMUNITIES. :128.
- 3 27. Local government finance and the 2019 Spending Review - Housing, Communities and Local  
4 Government Committee - House of Commons [Internet]. [cited 2022 Jun 13]. Available from:  
5 <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/2036/203605.htm>
- 6 28. Oldroyd RA, Morris MA, Birkin M. Food safety vulnerability: Neighbourhood determinants of non-  
7 compliant establishments in England and Wales. *Health Place*. 2020 May 1;63:102325.
- 8 29. Adams NL, Rose TC, Hawker J, Violato M, O'Brien SJ, Barr B, et al. Relationship between  
9 socioeconomic status and gastrointestinal infections in developed countries: A systematic review and meta-  
10 analysis. *PLoS ONE*. 2018 Jan 23;13(1):e0191633.
- 11 30. Pockett RD, Adlard N, Carroll S, Rajoriya F. Paediatric hospital admissions for rotavirus gastroenteritis  
12 and infectious gastroenteritis of all causes in England: an analysis of correlation with deprivation. *Curr Med  
13 Res Opin*. 2011 Apr 1;27(4):777–84.
- 14 31. Rose TC, Adams NL, Whitehead M, Wickham S, O'Brien SJ, Hawker J, et al. Neighbourhood  
15 unemployment and other socio-demographic predictors of emergency hospitalisation for infectious  
16 intestinal disease in England: A longitudinal ecological study. *J Infect*. 2020 Nov;81(5):736–42.
- 17







Percentage change in ER expenditure per capita (between 2009-2020)




200 km

**A**

Deprivation quintile — 1 (least deprived) — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 (most deprived)


**B**

LA structure — London borough — Two tier — Unitary


**C**

Rural or Urban — Rural — Urban


Percentage change in Environmental and Regulatory service expenditure relative to 2009/10

**A**

Deprivation quintile — 1 (least deprived) — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 (most deprived)

**B**

LA structure — London borough — Two tier — Unitary

**C**

Rural or Urban — Rural — Urban

Percentage change in Food Safety and APHDC expenditure relative to 2009/10