



**Money Matters -
Additional Savings 2018/19 – 2020/21
(including Equality Impact Assessments)**

www.lancashire.gov.uk

	Contents	Page
1	Street Lighting Maintenance	3
2	Conservation and Collection Team	16
3	Information Centres	19
4	Advocacy Services	32
5	Extra Sheltered Care Services	52

CMTY014 – STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE

Service Name:	Street Lighting Maintenance			
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19			
Gross budget 2017/18	£5.029m			
Income 2017/18	£1.036m			
Net budget 2017/18	£3.993m			
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m
	-1.715	-0.446	0.000	-2.161
FTE implications:				
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
	<i>0.00</i>	<i>-11.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>-11.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to cease night time inspections.</p> <p>Agree to extend the routine maintenance and testing cycle on the illuminated network from 5 to 10 years.</p> <p>Agree to the capitalisation of fault repairs.</p>			
Impact upon service	<p>Less routine maintenance, testing and fault repair would be required resulting in a reduced staffing requirement.</p> <p>Likely to be changes to performance levels as the service will be more reactive to publically reported fault repairs.</p>			
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	Undertake consultation as necessary			
What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated	<p>There is a risk of increased complaints about lights out which is mitigated by the recent and ongoing installation of LED lamps, across much of the network.</p> <p>Any risks could be mitigated through consultation on the establishment of a new policy and its communication to stakeholders.</p>			

What does this service deliver?

The service provides and maintains street lighting and illuminated signs and bollards on the highway network in Lancashire. This includes the design, maintenance and installation of lighting assets. The service also manages the asset data to ensure energy efficiencies are realised.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Cash limit options CMTY014 Street
Lighting Budget
For Decision Making Items

November 2017

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To agree proposals on reducing for the County Council's Street Lighting budget.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Reduce routine maintenance and inspection by 50%
Agree to cease night time inspections.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision will affect people across Lancashire in a broadly similar way and will be kept under review.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Lighting is provided for all Highway Users and it is not anticipated that there will an adverse impact to these groups over other groups.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

No

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

A reduction in maintenance and inspection may lead to more street lighting faults or in longer times to fix faults. However, faults will continue to be repaired as they are identified. It is though acknowledged that many protected characteristics groups such as older and younger people, disabled people, those with diverse religious or ethnic backgrounds, the LGBT community and male or female residents may feel concerned about any proposals affecting street lighting due to the concerns, perceptions and fears of impacts this may have on crime, hate incidents, hate crimes or other anti-social behaviour.

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

Lighting is provided for all Highway Users and it is not anticipated that there will be an adverse impact to these groups over other groups, as the human eye naturally adapts to changes in lighting levels and the changes involved represent a very small proportion compared to the range of light the human eye can adapt to. Consequently it is not anticipated that people with protected characteristics will be adversely affected by this proposal.

It is acknowledged that many protected characteristics groups such as older and younger people, disabled people, those with diverse religious or ethnic backgrounds, the LGBT community and male or female residents may feel concerned about any proposals affecting

street lighting due to the concerns, perceptions and fears of impacts this may have on crime, hate incidents, hate crimes or other anti-social behaviour.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

There has been no engagement or consultation regarding this proposal.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps

to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities

- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

A reduction in maintenance and inspection may lead to more street lighting faults or in longer times to fix faults. However, faults will continue to be repaired as they are identified.

If faults are not reported or go unfixed this could lead to some feelings of isolation or people being more reluctant to go out, the perception of safety or concerns of crime, anti-social behaviour generally and hate crime from protected characteristics groups. If this is widespread there is a risk that some of the Public Sector Equality Duty's aims such as fostering good relations/community cohesion and advancing equality of opportunity/participating in public life might be affected in connection with this proposal.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions

within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

None identified

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Continue with the original proposal as no significant changes have been identified.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

All roads are expected to retain street lighting under this proposal and

identified faults will continue to be fixed.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

This proposal contributes towards savings needed to bridge the gap in the medium term financial strategy. Faults will continue to be fixed as they are identified and there is not expected to be any significant disproportionate impact on groups sharing protected characteristics.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Reduce routine maintenance and inspection by 50%
Agree to cease night time inspections.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The monitoring and review could be done using existing systems that monitor incidents/claims and public contacts. This data could be

analysed to inform decisions on lighting levels.

Equality Analysis Prepared By M.DUNWELL

Position/Role Countywide Services Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head
P.Durnell

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

CMTY018 – CONSERVATION AND COLLECTION TEAM

Service Name:		Conservation and Collection Team	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2019/20	
Gross budget 2017/18		£0.707m	
Income 2017/18		£0.350m	
Net budget 2017/18		£0.357m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
0.000	-0.278	0.000	-0.278
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the conservation service within the Conservation and Collections Team is required to become cost neutral in 2019/20. 	
Impact upon service		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Conservation function already does generate external income from providing services to other museums, historic houses and private owners across the UK and competes for contracts throughout the year. There is potential to increase this area of activity and to work towards generating additional income which would support the objective of the service becoming cost neutral. • The Collections function is primarily curatorial together with the maintenance of records about the items in LCC's collection. There is very little scope for generating external income from this function as it is related primarily to the care of LCC's collections. • Adequate levels of specialist posts within the Conservation and Collections Team would need to be retained by LCC whilst museum collections and any museum buildings remain the responsibility of the County Council. • The exact number and range of posts would need to be tailored to reflect which collections and which museums remain in LCC's responsibility after the 	

	<p>completion of transfer negotiations in 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under any museum transfer arrangements, whilst ownership of collections cannot be transferred to a third party, LCC is making the borrower of each collection responsible for the care and conservation of all items included within each loan agreement, which reduces the cost to LCC with each 5 year loan agreement. • The intention is to encourage the new operators to generate grant funding for conservation work that could then be undertaken – on a paid basis – by the Conservation and Collection Team.
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conservation service will need to achieve a cost neutral position in 2019/20 by a combination of increasing external income and reducing costs. • More external work would need to be undertaken and charges would need to be raised per contract (within what the market for conservation work will bear). • Consultation with staff and trade unions
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not yet known how many museums and consequently which collections will remain the responsibility of LCC or have the responsibility and cost passed onto third parties. Consequently, it is not possible at this stage to calculate what staff numbers and areas of expertise will be required in the future. • Whilst LCC retains any collections (even in store) or entire museums, there is a requirement from Arts Council England's Museum Accreditation system for LCC to maintain care of all the items in LCC's ownership. Failure to meet the minimum standards will result in loss of accredited status and inability to apply for a range of funding streams from other bodies (such as Heritage Lottery Fund) that make accredited status a mandatory criteria. • For each museum and collection (including the items of the collections held in museum stores) retained by LCC, there will be an amount of time that different members of the team will need to spend with each museum and collection. Time spent caring for the LCC collections will both affect the opportunity to generate external income and the net budget position.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prices to external customers can be increased but not beyond what the market will stand (and that market is particularly effected by any fluctuations in Heritage Lottery Fund investment into museum projects that result in items needing to be conserved) • A skills mix is required to offer a service to external clients. If the team were to be reduced too far, there is a risk of the service become unviable.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

The Conservation and Collections Team is split into two functions:

The conservation service provides specialist support to LCC museums at 18 heritage sites across Lancashire. The service consists of three multidisciplinary sections; Technicians, Conservators, & Designers. They provide support and advice on all aspects of collections care and to ensure their preservation for the future. Conservation staff also actively treat museum exhibits for display. The service has a broad range of experience with materials including archaeological, painting and drawings, natural history, social history, ceramics, modern materials and hazardous materials.

The collections service provides support to the museums and the collections by:

- selecting, buying or borrowing items
- organising records, catalogues and indexes
- making sure exhibits are stored under the right conditions
- arranging conservation and restoration
- helping visitors to interpret and enjoy exhibits and collections
- organising publicity and fundraising
- giving talks

CMTY027 – INFORMATION CENTRES

Service Name:	Information Centres		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.336m		
Income 2017/18	£0.138m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.198m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.099	-0.099	0.000	-0.198
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
-10.20	0.00	0.00	-10.20
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	<p>Agree to close transport information centres at Preston Bus Station, Nelson and Clitheroe interchanges and at Carnforth railway station.</p> <p>Remove funding for LCC staff working at Morecambe Visitor Centre providing transport and local tourist information.</p>		
Impact upon service	<p>Popular service providing travel information and tickets to public transport users would cease.</p> <p>Travel ticketing provision for LCC employees would cease.</p> <p>Impact on business support services and possibly greater costs to service budgets.</p>		
Actions needed to deliver the target savings	<p>Consultation with staff and users regarding reductions.</p> <p>Lease at Carnforth will need to be terminated.</p> <p>Property at Clitheroe railway station surplus to requirements. Nelson office would also become vacant and would still incur costs until disposed of/leased.</p> <p>Ensure any agreements with ticket providers are terminated within the required notice period</p>		

<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>Popular information and advice services withdrawn from the public.</p> <p>Closure of buildings will require disposal, which may be difficult to achieve in their locations therefore still a cost associated with the service.</p> <p>Loss of LCC staff ticket booking service from Carnforth.</p> <p>Empty offices require disposing off, may take time therefore still incur costs.</p> <p>Offer offices to local operators, bus/rail to take on service delivery.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

Service provides comprehensive and unbiased public transport information and ticketing service in the outlets. Also provides a ticketing service for LCC employees and Members requiring rail tickets for LCC business.

Morecambe Visitor Centre provides local visitor, tourist and transport information.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**Cash Limit Option CMTYo27: Travel
Information Centres and Morecambe
Visitor Centre**

For Decision Making Items

November 2017

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Travel Information Centres and Morecambe Visitor Centre.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Closure of remaining Travel Information Centres at Preston Bus Station, Nelson Interchange, Clitheroe Interchange and Carnforth Railway Station and withdrawal of two members of staff from Morecambe Visitor Centre.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

No, but no specific locational impacts on people with protected characteristics.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

The services are particularly popular with older people and people with disabilities.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

No specific information but we consider that the services are particularly popular with older people and people with disabilities.

The total number of employees affected is 10.2 FTE.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

Consultation with users, staff, district and parish councils and other affected stakeholders will be carried out before final decision is confirmed.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?

- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Proposal may make travel by public transport more difficult for older people and for people with disabilities because other sources of information and tickets are less understandable. Older and disabled people are less likely to use digital alternatives to obtain travel information or tickets. The proposal may be updated following consultations.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

Yes. Public Transport operators (bus and rail) are reducing face to face information and moving towards digital delivery of information and ticketing.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Consultation stage has not yet been undertaken and further work will be required if the proposals progress.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

None identified at this stage. For affected staff, the arrangements set out in the County Council's Transformation Principles will be applied.

Potential mitigations may be identified through the proposed consultation.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected

characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The council is in a position where it needs to make substantial budget savings and, whilst this proposal will have a negative impact on people with protected characteristics, it is considered necessary to make this service reduction.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Closure of remaining Travel Information Centres at Preston Bus Station, Nelson Interchange, Clitheroe Interchange and Carnforth Railway Station and withdrawal of two members of staff from Morecambe Visitor Centre.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

None identified.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Oliver Starkey

Position/Role Head of Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

ASC005 – ADVOCACY SERVICES

Service Name:	Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide)		
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21	2018/19		
Gross budget 2017/18	£0.148m		
Income 2017/18	£0.000m		
Net budget 2017/18	£0.148m		
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.074	0.000	0.000	-0.074
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings	Reduce the budget for "Lower Level" advocacy services by 50% but continue to provide the Single Point of Contact and statutory advocacy service.		
Impact upon service	<p>1. What is advocacy?</p> <p>Advocacy exists to make sure that people, particularly the most vulnerable, are able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have their voice heard on issues that are important to them. • Have their views and wishes genuinely considered when decisions are being made about their lives. • Safeguard their rights. <p>Advocacy is a process of enabling people, usually through the help of an "advocate" who can help the individual to obtain and understand the information they need, attend meetings with them in a supportive role, or who speaks up for the individual in situations where they don't feel able to speak for themselves. This can be especially important when the individual is dealing with</p>		

	<p>public services.</p> <p>2. The current situation</p> <p>Advocacy services in the county council area are available through a Single Point of Contact Service. The Single Point of Contact Service assesses the person's need, if any, for advocacy. This service is provided by N-compass Northwest ltd.</p> <p>If the person is eligible for statutory advocacy (i.e. advocacy that the county council must provide under the Care Act, Mental Capacity Act, Mental Health Act, etc.), the Single Point of Contact service will refer the person to the statutory element of the contract.</p> <p>The statutory element of the contract is provided by Advocacy Focus (who receive referrals directly from the Single Point of Contact Service through N-compass Northwest Ltd.) and is not affected by these proposals.</p> <p>If the person is <u>not</u> eligible for statutory advocacy, the provider of the Single Point of Contact service (N-Compass Northwest Ltd.) can offer a "lower-level" advocacy service. "Lower-level" advocacy is available to adults aged 18+ who are dealing with adult health and social care services. It is usually provided via a single, or otherwise time-limited, session of support either online, over the phone or face-to-face.</p> <p>Offering "lower-level" advocacy allows people to explore issues without needing to access statutory services. This type of advocacy has a preventative role and is intended to reduce the need for more intensive support.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three-month notice to terminate issued to current provider. • Consultation with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), service users and other partners • Review of future commissioning intentions for advocacy • An assessment of the value of the current delivery model in meeting the county council's aims and objectives.
<p>What are the risks associated with this</p>	<p>The likelihood of service changes across the county means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may</p>

<p>saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>increase in the future because vulnerable people may require support to make a complaint or access alternative services if services previously relied on to do this are reduced. Reducing this support for residents means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may manifest as unmet need and, potentially, greater sustained demand on other social care services</p> <p>The current service is open to users of a wide range of public services and reduction would likely impact on the experience of service users engaged with the health and social care system.</p> <p>Partners may have a view on reduction of the service and its contribution to their own institutional aims. The CCGs currently contribute a small portion of the overall cost of advocacy services (£180,000 per year) but these contributions are not specifically dedicated to "lower-level" or statutory advocacy and a calculation as to their precise value would be required if the budget option is approved.</p> <p>There is therefore a risk that reduction of the service will have a number of consequences related to demand for support by users of public services. Termination of the service may create new demands on other services, and may create new unmet needs.</p> <p>Engagement and consultation with service users and partners is important throughout this process.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

The current purpose of the Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide) contract is to:

- Offer a Single Point of Contact for all advocacy enquiries in the Lancashire County Council area.
- Provide all "lower-level" advocacy services.

"Lower-level" advocacy is currently offered when advocacy has been assessed as appropriate but when statutory eligibility does not apply. "Lower-level" advocacy involves information, advice, signposting, and peer-to-peer support. The types of "lower-level" advocacy provided by the service varies case by case, consisting of three levels:

- Level 1, a maximum of two sessions (telephone or online only);
- Level 2, telephony-based or online support over a limited number of sessions with a single face-to-face session and;
- Level 3, a maximum of three face-to-face contact sessions in addition to other forms of support.



Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Budget Option ASC005: Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide)

For Decision Making Items

November 2017

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget Option ASC005: Single Point of Contact Service for all Advocacy Services and Delivery of "Lower-Level" Advocacy (Countywide)

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

1. What is advocacy?

Advocacy exists to make sure that people, particularly the most vulnerable, are able to:

- Have their voice heard on issues that are important to them.
- Have their views and wishes genuinely considered when decisions are being made about their lives.
- Safeguard their rights.

Advocacy is a process of enabling people, usually through the help of an "advocate" who can help the individual to obtain and understand the information they need, attend meetings with them in a supportive role, or who speaks up for the individual in situations where they don't feel able to speak for themselves. This can be especially important when the individual is dealing with public services.

2. The current situation

Advocacy services in the county council area are available through a Single Point of Contact Service. The Single Point of Contact Service assesses the person's need, if any, for advocacy. This service is provided by N-compass Northwest Ltd.

If the person is eligible for statutory advocacy (i.e. advocacy that the county council must provide under the Care Act, Mental Capacity Act, Mental Health Act, etc.), the Single Point of Contact service will refer the person to the statutory element of the contract.

The statutory element of the contract is provided by Advocacy Focus (who receive referrals directly from the Single Point of Contact Service through N-compass Northwest Ltd.) and is not affected by these

proposals.

If the person is not eligible for statutory advocacy, the provider of the Single Point of Contact service (N-Compass Northwest Ltd.) can offer a "lower-level" advocacy service. "Lower-level" advocacy is available to adults aged 18+ who are dealing with adult health and social care services. It is usually provided via a single, or otherwise time-limited, session of support either online, over the phone or face-to-face.

Offering "lower-level" advocacy allows people to explore issues without needing to access statutory services. This type of advocacy has a preventative role and is intended to reduce the need for more intensive support.

The budget option proposes to:

- Continue to provide the Single Point of Contact Service.
- Continue to provide statutory advocacy services.
- Reduce the budget for "Lower Level" advocacy services by 50%.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

The decision is likely to affect people who use the service from across the county in a similar way.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. "Lower-level advocacy" is available to all residents of the county council area who qualify under the specified service criteria. However, the service is predominantly used by client groups with some protected characteristics. Adults with disabilities with a variety of needs are likely to be the most affected.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc. to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The latest monitoring data shows that 469 people accessed the service in Q2. 2017 (July-September). Approximately half of these people received advocacy support via the service whilst the other half were referred to the statutory element of the service.

The following is a breakdown of low level advocacy by customer group:

Acquired Brain Injury	1
Mental Health	151
Learning disability	87

Parent Carer	22
Communication difficulty	97
Long term ill health	47
Older Person	8
Physical disability	43
Carer	8
Dementia (has capacity)	2
Autism	2
Stroke	1
Total	469

The client group accessing "lower level" advocacy the most are those with mental health issues at 32% followed by those with a communication difficulty at 20% and people with a learning disability at 19%.

Of the 469 customers 283 (60%) are female, 184 (39%) male and 2 (1%) intersex. There is a higher use of the service by females compared with their relative representation in the Lancashire population – 60% users compared to 51% females in the population – and consequently males are disproportionately lower amongst users – 39% of users but 49% of Lancashire's population.

93% of customers are White British with the remaining 7% from BME groups. This is broadly in line with the general Lancashire population.

The county council also receives case studies and personal "I" statements detailing how the service has assisted individuals to achieve their personal outcomes. These are referred to in Q.2.

At this time we do not have information about the workforce that may be impacted by the proposals.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No. Engagement or consultation has not taken place but if the proposal goes forward some form of consultation will be carried out. The findings of any consultation will help to finalise any mitigations if this budget option progresses.

The most recent monitoring report from the current provider contained this selection of statements from service users:

"Thank you so much for all your help. I couldn't have got through that meeting without you. It has meant so much having someone who listens to me."

"I haven't used advocacy before but it has been very useful to discuss my concerns with you."

"I didn't understand what was happening before and it made me unhappy. Thank you for attending the meetings with me."

"Thank you so much for listening to me today it has been good to get everything of my chest."

"Thanks for your help it's good to know you are there if we need you"

"I feel so relieved that I have put the complaint in, I am so glad of your support"

"It makes such a difference to me that you are supporting me with Social Services"

"Thank you so much I feel so reassured that it's all sorted."

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

Advocacy is typically sought by individuals who often struggle to have their voices heard in engaging with health and social care services. In this case, clients with physical and/or learning or cognitive disabilities and mental health issues are the predominant users of the service.

Reducing the "lower-level" advocacy service by 50% will clearly affect the users of the service as the same number of users would access a reduced service. However, the budget option does not propose to eliminate "lower level" advocacy entirely and does not affect statutory advocacy services (which the county council will continue to provide via commissioned arrangements).

A reduction in the service will likely impact on service users through longer waiting times or prioritising access. There may also be an impact in the quality of provision; in some cases, the service may, for example, deliver a reduced "lower-level" advocacy service by moving away from face-to-face or over-the-phone contact and instead providing individuals with published material, web-based information or signposting to other services, peer support networks, community groups, or other forms of support.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

N/A

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

No; the intention is to continue with the current proposal.

The impact analysis indicates that, while the users of the service include individuals with protected characteristics, "lower-level" advocacy will continue in reduced form and statutory services will continue to be provided.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the "due regard" requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

"Lower-level" advocacy is currently offered when advocacy has been assessed as appropriate but when statutory eligibility does not apply. "Lower-level" advocacy involves information, advice, signposting, and peer-to-peer support. The types of "lower-level" advocacy provided by the service varies case by case, consisting of three levels:

- Level 1, a maximum of two sessions (telephone or online only);
- Level 2, telephony-based or online support over a limited number of sessions with a single face-to-face session and;
- Level 3, a maximum of three face-to-face contact sessions in addition to other forms of support.

Some of the impact of a reduced service may be mitigated by evaluating and re-allocating resources within the current offer of "lower-level" advocacy, as detailed above. For example, the service could continue to serve a similar amount of clients as it does currently, but with more clients accessing telephone and online support and a reduced offer of face-to-face contact.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The savings proposed by this budget option are set out in the Cash Limit Template and will assist in bridging the funding gap in the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The proposal is likely to disproportionately impact on people with disabilities and women.

Offering "lower-level" advocacy alongside statutory provision allows people to fully explore their options without needing to immediately access statutory services. "Lower level" advocacy has a preventative role, reducing the need for statutory, intensive support by helping

people through provision of information and advice, peer and group advocacy, limited face-to-face interventions, and through self-help resources.

The current delivery model already takes into account the budget context faced by the county council and represents a substantial reduction of "lower level" advocacy provision compared with our previous arrangements (2013-16). For example, the previous contract allowed for up to eight face-to-face sessions while the current service does not offer any more than three sessions.

The likelihood of service changes across the county in the future means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may increase because vulnerable people may require support to make a complaint or access alternative services if services previously relied on to do this are reduced. Reducing this support for residents means that demand for "lower-level" advocacy may manifest as unmet need and, potentially, greater sustained demand on other social care services.

On balance, given the need to bridge the funding gap, and the potential mitigation available, the proposal is to continue with the option.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

To continue with the current proposal:

- Continue to provide the Single Point of Contact Service.
- Continue to provide statutory advocacy services.
- Reduce the budget for "lower level" advocacy services by 50%.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Contract arrangements already in place will continue to monitor and evaluate the impact of the service, and any changes to the service. A commissioning review of all advocacy services is scheduled to take place before commencement of a re-procurement exercise in 2018 with new contracts in place for Spring 2019.

Equality Analysis Prepared by: Kieran Curran

Position/Role: Policy, Information and Commissioning Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Dave Carr: Head of Service, Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you

ASC009 – EXTRA SHELTERED CARE SERVICES

Service Name:		Extra Sheltered Care Services	
Which 'start year' does this option relate to 2018/19, 2019/20 or 2020/21		2018/19	
Gross budget 2017/18		£2.600m	
Income 2017/18		£0.100m	
Net budget 2017/18		£2.500m	
Savings Target and Profiling (discrete year):			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
£m	£m	£m	£m
-0.483	-0.161	0.000	-0.644
FTE implications:			
2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.00</i>
Decisions needed to deliver the budgeted savings		Cease Extra Sheltered Care services in the lower usage or lower risk schemes. These are likely to number 6-8 schemes out of 13 from across the county.	
Impact upon service		<p>Service users at these locations would require a reassessment of their needs and be subject to the same judgement as any community based service user. Most are likely to require a continuation of service organised via home care, roving nights service, reablement or greater use of telecare.</p> <p>A few individuals may have their needs best met in a residential care setting if they require extensive and regular night-time support or very frequent visits which cannot be provided under existing domiciliary care contracts or within Personal Budgets</p> <p>There could be increased pressure on homecare market which may or may not be able to respond easily to increased demand depending on where scheme is and other local pressures.</p> <p>This will also require significant adult social care staff time to complete 130 social care reviews and associated support planning.</p> <p>These changes may also impact on the services of the</p>	

	<p>housing partners in whose properties these services are delivered.</p>
<p>Actions needed to deliver the target savings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define and agree criteria to identify low usage/low risk. • Communicate and give notice to current service providers and ensure current contracts cover decommissioning period. • Adult social care to consolidate the reviews. • Commissioning and Adult Social Care to prepare an accurate list of residents and care needs and corresponding hours to identify those at risk of not having their needs met in their current home. • Consult with residents, care providers, housing providers and elected members. • Adult social care to update support plan and make sure appropriate telecare/homecare is in place. • Adult social care to provide intensive input to support a small number of residents who may need to move into residential care if they have significant night time needs.
<p>What are the risks associated with this saving and how will they be mitigated</p>	<p>A proportion of service users may not have their night time care needs met and may have to move into residential care.</p> <p>The County Council could receive increased challenges and complaints as a result of this change to service provision.</p> <p>In order to mitigate the risks robust social care assessments identifying eligible social care needs and skilled support planning to meet any needs that are currently met outside of the planned care provided.</p> <p>A consultation with service users and housing providers will be undertaken in advance of implementation.</p> <p>A programme of reassessments and reviews to be phased and/or additional temporary resource established.</p> <p>It may be preferable to undertake an evolutionary</p>

	approach of a steady reduction in schemes and ceasing of the ones that are underused and encouragement to servicer users and housing providers to collectively purchase care. This will spread workloads and be an easier transition for service users.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What does this service deliver?

Extra care is a model of somewhere between sheltered housing and a care home targeted at the older people. It allows residents to continue living independently, typically in a self-contained flat or bungalow, while benefiting from personal care and support delivered in a similar manner to homecare services.

Extra Care allows individuals to live in their own accommodation in an Extra Care scheme, promoting independence with the safety net of 24/7 background support, plus additional planned care as required. The services being procured are the personal care and background support at each scheme.

However new schemes usually aim for a minimum of 60 to 70 units and a high proportion or number of tenants having eligible care needs under the Care Act to ensure the 24/7 provision is cost effective. These schemes do not have such numbers of users of the care services and so are not cost effective compared to alternative models.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

ASC009 Cash Limit Option

Physical Support

Extra Sheltered Care Services

For Decision Making Items

November 2017

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance at

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/public-sector-providers/public-sector-equality-duty>

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis and advice, support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) at

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Cessation of some of the onsite 24 x 7 Extra Care Service that is available in 13 sheltered accommodation schemes across the County.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Cease Extra Sheltered Care services in the lower usage or lower risks schemes. These are likely to number 6-8 schemes out of 13 from across the county.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

There are many sheltered accommodation schemes across the county owned and managed by various Registered Social Landlords and District or City Councils. The schemes are typically 30-50 individual rented flats, they have a visiting scheme manager and are aimed at the over 55's.

For the last 15+ years LCC has commissioned 24 x 7 onsite background (at least 1 x care worker onsite 24 x 7) and planned care for a small number of residents that live within 13 specific schemes located across Lancashire.

Over the years the number of residents using the service has fallen as people stay in their homes for longer or choose not to move to this style of accommodation. Residents have to have eligible social care needs identified through a social care assessment under the Care Act to access this service and pay for their planned care visits out of their personal budgets. The schemes, their location and the number of flats and number of residents using the service is as follows :-

Scheme Name	Location	Number of extra care users with eligible care	Number of flats in the scheme not using

		needs	service
Ainscough Brook House,	Ribbleton	10	25
Bannister Brook House	Leyland	10	24
Greenwood Court	Leyland	13	37
Marlborough Court	Skelmersdale	12	38
Kirk House,	Accrington	15	33
HyndBrook House	Accrington	12	17
Plessington Court	Longridge	14	25
St Ann's Court,	Clitheroe	14	21
Stanner Lodge	Lytham St Ann's	6	48
Croft Court	Freckleton	6	16
Torrentum Court ,	Thornton Cleveleys	7	32
Parkside Court	Lancaster	10	26
Beck View	Lancaster	9	27
	Total	130	369

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender

- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Yes. Older People, particularly those with disabilities or poor health

By the very nature of the accommodation being specifically for over the 55 years of age this decision would impact disproportionately those with the protected characteristic of disability, age and gender (women).

This decision would not affect the majority of residents in most of the schemes because they do not use the service.

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

By the very nature of the accommodation being specifically for over the 55 years of age this decision would impact disproportionately those with the protected characteristic of disability, age and gender (women). This decision would not affect the majority of residents in the accommodation because they do not use the service.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

No – if the proposal goes forward consultations in each scheme would be an essential part of any implementation plan.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?

- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The impact of the decision will be analysed in detail after a consultation but we anticipate the following:-

Some people with protected characteristics may not be able to continue to live in their homes if they have significant needs that cannot be met by visiting care workers and/or telecare/technology. Until social care reviews have been completed for the 130 people it is not known how many will be effected. All people affected will have their statutory eligible care needs met, although it is possible some individuals may have to move to a different setting that does have 24 hour x 7 day care provision on site.

There is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

This proposal may add to the cumulative effect of reducing the amount of accessible social housing that is available to people with protected characteristics

that need support over 24 x 7. It may also increase the exposure of people to the financial impact of possible future changes to the charging policy for non-residential care.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

Until the social care reviews have been completed to identify the people affected current eligible social care needs and alternative solutions explored the options remain the same. The consultation will inform the decisions also.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

There are a number of services that can be used to try and mitigate the impact on the tenants that will be affected. There is visiting domiciliary home care service, possibly employing the same care workers who currently work at the schemes, there are various rehabilitation and reablement services that can be used, there are telecare and technology solutions and statutory social care needs will always be met.

Service users at these locations would require a reassessment of their needs and

be subject to the same judgement as any community based service user: Most are likely to require a continuation of service organised via home care, roving nights service or reablement or greater use of telecare.

Where the impact of the proposal means that service users might be better supported in residential care, the wishes of the individual will be considered carefully as part of the assessment and subsequent decision.

As previously discussed there is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The reason this service is the subject of a budget option is because the cost of providing onsite care 24 x 7 at only 13 sheltered schemes meeting 130 number of residents needs is not equitable when compared to the situation of the adults and older people that live in their homes in the community or in other sheltered schemes. It represents a more generous offer than can be afforded given the financial pressures on the council, and it is not cost effective compared to alternative patterns of provision for older people

These schemes are small and do not offer the economies of scale that larger built for purpose accommodation does. The other issue is that some of the schemes are not popular with potential residents and any voids are becoming increasingly hard to fill with people who have social care needs. This means that most of the residents in the schemes do not use the service and the numbers are gradually falling even more.

As previously discussed social care reviews are required to identify if any particular resident has a need for the service, but initial estimates based on review activity indicate that there is a relatively low number of people who use the service that have social care needs for background 24 hours x 7 days a week care.

It is acknowledged that some older and disabled people living in the schemes may be particularly adversely affected but, as previously mentioned there are a number of services that can be used to try and mitigate the impact. There is visiting domiciliary home care service, possibly employing the same care workers who currently work at the schemes, there are various rehabilitation and reablement services that can be used, there are telecare and technology solutions and statutory social care needs will always be met. As previously discussed there is an opportunity for people to pool resources together to collectively purchase care to replace this service, but this is not something that any agency or group could insist upon and therefore is judged unlikely to proceed

The proposal will deliver Budget savings as set out in the cash limit template.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Cease Extra Sheltered onsite care services only in the lower usage or lower risk schemes. This will affect between 6-8 out of 13 such schemes across Lancashire and the tenants who live within the schemes now and those who may be considering moving into such schemes in the near future.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

Will monitor the admissions to residential care placements, any increase in calls to the telecare, any increase in admissions to hospital from the people affected.

The Equality Analysis will be revised once the consultation with current users has concluded

Equality Analysis Prepared By Policy, Information & Commissioning Manager – Age Well

Position/Role Policy, Information & Commissioning Manager – Age Well

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head Dave Carr, Head of Service: Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well)

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Thank you