



Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Children & Family Wellbeing Service
Outcome of Second Phase Consultation v1
For Decision Making Items

April 2019

Question 1 - What is the nature of and are the key components of the proposal being presented?

At its meeting on 8 November 2018 Cabinet approved proposals on the future delivery of the Children and Family Wellbeing Service which included an element that there would be further consideration of the future of 14 buildings. These buildings were identified as Whitegate Children Centre, Burnley; The Chair Centre, Burnley; Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Centre, Burnley; Padiham Young Peoples Centre; Willows Park Children Centre, Longridge, Ribble Valley; Longridge Young Peoples Centre, Ribble Valley; Ribblesdale Children Centre, Ribble Valley; The Zone in Ribble Valley; Star/Ashton Young Peoples Centre, Preston; Riverbank Children Centre, Preston; Walton Lane Children Centre, Pendle; The Zone in Pendle; Whitworth Children Centre, Rossendale and Whitworth Young Peoples Centre, Rossendale

Further careful consideration of the 14 settings included factors such as the local level of need for the service, its location, the accessibility , suitability to deliver services, the type and scale of service delivery, running costs, the building's condition, the time taken to travel there, what other services are provided there, the wider community impact of any proposal, the cost of building adaptations required to accommodate future service delivery, further budget option decisions and emerging priorities. The possibility of further specific and targeted consultation as to which buildings in the area should no longer be used to deliver the service was also included, if this was felt to be needed.

This Equality Analysis reflects the outcome of these further considerations.

Question 2 - Scope of the Proposal

Is the proposal 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?

The proposal will affect people who use Children and Family Wellbeing

Services in Burnley, Ribble Valley, Preston, Rossendale and Pendle as these are the Districts where the future of locations currently used for service delivery are being considered.

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service supports children, young people, parents and families, it priorities those most in need, particularly where it thinks early help will make the most difference. It does this in different ways and places like:

- One to one support between a worker and a family;
- Group based sessions held in different community buildings, like a village hall;
- Outreach in places like homes, at schools or in a local café;
- Its work with young people can even be on the street.

In proposing which settings/buildings the Service will continue to use for its service delivery further consideration has been given to:

- The local level of need in areas where these centres were situated;
- The building locations and their accessibility along with the time taken to travel to the centre from within the wider catchment area;
- Their suitability to deliver services, including the whole CFW Service offer, 0-19+;
- The type and scale of current service delivery and usage patterns;
- The operating costs of the buildings;
- Issues identified for wider community impact;
- The cost of building adaptations required to accommodate future CFW service delivery and further budget option decisions and emerging priorities;
- Site specific issues raised during the initial phase of consultation (summer 2018)

It was important to further consider these different factors to identify which locations would be best suited and sustainable to consolidate the full range of CFW service delivery, wherever possible, in a single location in the neighbourhoods where the buildings are located.

Further consideration in relation to the group of buildings also included, where necessary, detailed cost appraisals for any required adaptations/amendments to the accommodation.

Following further consideration in December 2018-January 2019 and using the above criteria the proposal identified the buildings which should continue to be used to deliver the Children and Family Wellbeing Service from and which should no longer be used. The initial outcome was to confirm the original proposals to retain CFW service delivery from:

- The Zone in Pendle (Bradley Children & Family Wellbeing service);
- Riverbank Children Centre, Preston (Preston Central Neighbourhood Centre);
- The Zone in Ribble Valley (Clitheroe Family and Wellbeing Service)

It also confirmed the original proposal to withdraw service delivery from:

- Walton Lane Children Centre, Pendle (Marsden Children & Family Wellbeing Service);
- The Star/Ashton Young Peoples Centre, Preston (Ashton Children & Family Wellbeing Service);
- Ribblesdale Children Centre, Ribble Valley (Ribblesdale Children & Family Wellbeing Service).

There are an additional two buildings where service delivery is planned to continue pending further discussions with stakeholders:

- Longridge Young People's Centre;
- Willows Park Children Centre, Longridge.

For the remaining buildings a further consultation was held because the proposal suggested had changed. It was now proposed to continue service delivery from:

- The Chai Centre, Burnley;
- Whitegate Children Centre, Burnley (Whitegate Children &

Family Wellbeing Service):

- * Whitworth Library which is additional to the 14 buildings indicated and was not included in original consultation proposals (summer 2018)

And to withdraw service delivery from:

- Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre, Burnley (Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Children and Family Wellbeing Service);
- Padiham Young Peoples Centre;
- Whitworth Young Peoples Centre;
- Whitworth Children Centre (Whitworth Children and Family Wellbeing Service).

Question 3 – Protected Characteristics Potentially Affected

Could the proposal 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

And what information is available about these groups in the County's population or as service users/customers?

In broad terms the protected characteristics most likely to be affected by this proposal are:

Age: particularly children and young people given the scope of the service. The proposals are that the service will no longer use 3

buildings currently designated as children centres and four buildings described as Young Peoples Centres. Of those proposed to continue to be used for service delivery most are described as Neighbourhood Centres, Zones or a Library with others sharing the title of Children Centre/Children and Family Wellbeing Service. It is possible that the greatest impact could be for users of buildings described as Young Peoples Centres as alternative provision could be in a different environment/setting.

Pregnancy/Maternity: children centres provide support services for women who are pregnant or on maternity leave so the proposal will affect some women from this protected characteristics group. The Service also provides a range of "parent to be" sessions/support for targeted pregnant mums, particularly teenage parents to be, and a range of services for parents/carers of babies and toddlers. As some children centres will no longer be used for service delivery there could be an impact on some people from this protected characteristics group.

Disability: disabled young people can use the Young Peoples service until their 25th birthday so there is the potential for a greater impact on disabled young people than young people from other protected groups. Of the buildings where it is proposed to withdraw services from the Star Centre in Ashton/Ashton Young Peoples Centre hosts a disabled young peoples' session currently

Race/Ethnicity: some centres are located in areas where there may be larger concentrations of people from different ethnic minority communities/backgrounds. Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre has particularly high usage from BME young people which is reflective of its location and withdrawal from this building may therefore have a disproportionate impact on BME young people. In contrast, the Chai Centre has developed its service by providing 1 to 1 support at home to remove barriers to service use for some members of the community, particularly BME women. More widely changes in the buildings which are used for service delivery may result in changes to the ethnicity profile of service users which may, at least initially, lead to some uncertainty about using different buildings.

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service has a long tradition of being inclusive and of supporting young people – e.g. who are LGBTQ – and of raising awareness and understanding of equality and cohesion issues across its service delivery and workforce. The Service also provides some boys only and girls only sessions for the 12-19 (25) age group which focus on health and relationships and culturally sensitive single sex groups are welcomed by some sections of the community, although it is not anticipated that these sessions will be directly affected by these proposals.

Question 4 – Engagement/Consultation

How have people/groups been involved in or engaged with in developing this proposal?

A consultation was held from 4 February until 8 March 2019 which detailed the proposal and specifically sought views about the buildings to be used for service delivery in Burnley and Rossendale in the future. As alternative options had emerged for buildings in these areas, it was considered appropriate to ensure that local stakeholders had an opportunity to comment on these new proposed changes to help inform the final outcome.

This second phase of consultation was promoted to service users at the affected buildings and in the local communities, all of which were contained in the Burnley and Rossendale areas. Consultation questionnaires could be completed on-line or in hard copy formats available from the affected buildings. 77 responses were returned of which 44 were paper questionnaire responses and 33 were on-line questionnaire responses.

As the number of responses was below 100, percentages are not used and a count of responses is used instead.

The demographic profile of respondents is summarised below based on responses to the About You questions

67 respondents identified as being Lancashire residents out of 70 responses to this question so overwhelmingly the consultation was

completed by residents of the county.

75 respondents answered the question about their gender of whom 63 were female, 10 were male and 2 preferred not to say. The proportion of females responding to the consultation is far higher than their representation in the county population. Women are often in the majority of respondents to County Council consultations but this high number also reflects the nature of the service being considered.

3 respondents identified as having identified as being transgender which given the number of responses is a higher number than might have been expected although authoritative figures for people from this protected characteristic group are not available. It does appear that potentially there was a greater proportion of respondents who have identified as transgender than is usual amongst County Council consultations responses.

The age profile of respondents was that 4 were aged under 16, 1 was aged 16-19, 30 were aged between 20-34, 37 aged between 35-64 and 1 was aged 65-74 with no respondents aged over 75 and 2 who preferred not to say. Whilst this is a different demographic than many consultations it is not surprising given the nature of this Service.

6 respondents indicated that they were Deaf people or had a disability with one respondent who preferred not to say and 68 who did not have a disability. This is probably a lower proportion than in the county population but in keeping with some other consultations' demographic profiles.

75 respondents answered the question about ethnicity of whom 56 identified as being English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British, 13 identified as being Asian or Asian British Pakistani, 5 respondents identified as being Asian or Asian British Bangladeshi and 2 as being from Any Other Ethnic Group. It appears about a fifth to a quarter of respondents could be identified as being from BME groups which is in line with information for Burnley and Rossendale contained in the 2011 Census but a higher proportion than for most County Council consultations.

75 respondents completed the religion or belief question of whom 34

were Christian, 20 had no religion, 18 were Muslim, 1 indicated "Any Other Religion" and 2 preferred not to say. When compared to the Census information for Burnley and Rossendale it appears that a greater number of responses came from Muslims and people with no religion than might have been anticipated with a slightly lower level of response from those identifying as Christian.

72 respondents completed the sexual orientation question of whom 2 identified as being bisexual, 1 put "other", 2 preferred not to say and 63 identified as Heterosexual/Straight. There are no authoritative figures available from the 2011 Census for this protected characteristic but the response rate seems in line with some County Council consultations but lower than some others where there have been respondents identifying as being Gay and/or Lesbian.

The consultation also asked about the number of children in the household of respondents. Over half of respondents had children under 5 in their household which is not unexpected given the nature of the Service. 14 respondents had no children under 20 in their household, 4 respondents preferred not to say, 1 respondent was expecting whilst others had children in various age ranges between 5 and 19.

9 respondents had a disabled child or young person aged under 25 in their household, 65 did not and 2 preferred not to say, when set against other consultations this indicates a higher proportion of respondents who had a disabled child or young person in their household as this response rate is often around 2 to 6% of respondents.

The main findings of the consultation were:

More than half of respondents (44 out of 77) use a Children and Family Wellbeing Service building at least once a week, whilst 19 respondents never use a building to use the Service.

Of those respondents who had used a Children and Family Wellbeing Service building 40 had used it for activities and groups for their baby, toddler or child; 17 had used it for information, advice and support services; 15 used them for activities/groups for young people; 15

respondents had also used them for family and parenting support and 13 respondents identified using it for individual or group support around emotional, health and wellbeing for them or their child. Of the remaining responses those with a particular significance to this analysis included 8 respondents who identified help with work, education, training or welfare benefits and 4 who referenced specialist support for families with children with disabilities.

47 respondents had used buildings within the last 12 months which the County Council propose to continue to deliver CFW services from in the last 12 months and 9 respondents had not used these buildings.

25 respondents had used buildings in the last 12 months which it is proposed to no longer deliver CFW Services from and 28 had not used them.

31 respondents wished to comment about Whitegate Children and Family Wellbeing Service and Padiham Young Peoples Centre. A number of these raised specific concerns that Whitegate would not be suitable for delivering services to young people or older children and questioned what provision there would be for this group and expressed concern about the consequences of there being no alternative provision. Some spoke of 20 or 50 young people using Padiham Young Peoples Centre at present.

25 respondents commented on the Chai Centre and Stoneyhome and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre proposal. 10 comments were coded as "the Chai Centre is great".

14 respondents commented on the proposals relating to Whitworth Library, Whitworth Children and Family Wellbeing Services and Whitworth Young Peoples centre.

Respondents were asked if the proposal happened would they go to a building more or less often to use the Service. 31 respondents said they would go more often, 15 said they would go about the same, 4 said they would go less often and 14 said they would not go at all.

When asked if they agreed with the proposal or not, 34 respondents strongly agreed with the proposals and 7 tended to agree. Conversely

23 respondents strongly disagreed with the proposal and 6 tended to disagree. Reasons for these views of significance to this analysis included 9 respondents who said there are no other facilities in the area; 8 who said CYP services are important and more not less are needed; 6 said it was local; 6 said facilities were well used; 5 said it was better than hanging around on the street and its warm; 5 said the service provides social opportunities and activities for children and young people; 4 said it enables people to meet up; 3 said the proposal would have a negative social impact; 2 said services for older children needed to be kept; 2 said the proposal will increase anti-social behaviour in the area; 2 said they would struggle to access alternatives and 2 said playgroup is good for children.

Respondents were asked if the proposal happened how would this affect them and the responses of relevance to this analysis included: "I could continue to access valuable services in my area" from 11 respondents; 7 respondents said there would be a rise in anti-social behaviour in young people; 6 respondents said it would be hard/impossible to access the resources they needed; 3 said social opportunities would lessen; 3 said there were other options or places for them to go to; 2 said opportunities for children would lessen and 2 said they would find it difficult to get to alternative provision and would attend less often.

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else that should be considered or that could be done differently. 5 respondents suggested more classes/sessions/groups, 5 said keep the services in the buildings, 2 suggested extending opening hours, 2 suggested more funding, 1 said there needed to be thought given to the two age ranges/younger and older children and 1 said more afternoon groups were needed.

It is not anticipated that staff will be adversely affected by this proposal and therefore formal staff consultations have not been carried out. Many of the buildings affected by this proposal are used on a sessional basis with staff often based elsewhere whilst those in buildings which the Service will withdraw from will stay in the same team and be re-allocated to a base in an alternative Centre in the District.

Question 5 – Analysing Impact

Could this proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way? This pays particular attention to the general aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment or victimisation because of protected characteristics;
- To advance equality of opportunity for those who share protected characteristics;
- To encourage people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life;
- To contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not/community cohesion;

The Service has emphasised throughout that it will continue to deliver services in areas where buildings are proposed to no longer be used, although the service may be delivered in a different way or at a different venue or time. It remains the view of the Service that there is no suggestion of, and there is no intention to, close the majority of the buildings concerned. Only a small number of the buildings are solely used by the Children and Family Wellbeing Service – e.g. Ashton Young Peoples Centre, Padiham Young Peoples Centre and Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre – and these may close if alternative uses cannot be found.

In many cases other services also use the buildings concerned. It is the Service's view that any other County Council, VCFS, or other partner services delivered in these buildings will not be unduly affected by the withdrawal of CFW service delivery.

It should also be recognised that the Service already delivers its services through outreach work in places like individuals' homes, at schools or in local cafes, etc. as alternative venues. This may allay some concerns

about having to travel to alternative settings.

However, the range of options available for delivery of young peoples' services in other locations may be less flexible as these are more likely to be provided during evenings when alternative venues could be more difficult to source. Some comments relating to Padiham Young Peoples Services and, to a lesser extent, Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre have specifically made this point.

The Service will continue to deliver 1 to 1 support, often at home, for those who live in the areas affected by this proposal who need it. In a number of cases this benefits some individuals particularly in some communities - e.g. those of Pakistani or Bangladeshi heritage in the east of Lancashire – this has been a positive way of removing barriers to accessing the service and has contributed to advancing equality of opportunity for these people. More widely the vast majority of casework for individuals is carried out on a one to one basis in the person's own home.

Potentially the greatest impact of the proposal may be on the group work element of service delivery. Although there will be an outreach service delivery offer, some parents/families, children and young people the service supports may face increased travel time to use building based group work sessions and some may be unable to use them because of the time it takes or cost of getting to an alternative venue. The Service has calculated that the maximum journey to any alternative building providing group work sessions is under 3 miles. However, it is recognised that this could present increased difficulties for some people who are heavily pregnant or have young babies, those with disabilities and some young people where they need to travel independently.

This travel difficulty could be increased where young peoples' sessions are held during the evening as there may be additional safety concerns around walking or cycling as a means of travelling to these sessions, particularly in winter when it is darker earlier in the evening. One comment relating to Padiham Young Peoples Centre illustrates this point "there is nowhere else for the youth of Padiham to attend unless you travel and have to spend money that a lot of families don't have". Another comment said that the Padiham building is ideal for "connecting

young people on very easy bus routes to a central point".

There were also concerns that a rise in anti-social behaviour could take place and this was referenced in some of the open question responses – e.g. "the closure of Padiham and Stoneyholme would increase less interests for youths in the evening and could cause potential anti-social behaviour in the area", "It's something to do. It keeps me out of trouble", "It's better than being out on the street causing trouble".

Some group work sessions are already over-subscribed so potentially increased demand on a smaller number of centres or other resources may exacerbate this difficulty and impact on some people's ability to participate in some activities. As parts of the Service assist in developing skills for parenting, employability, etc this could impact some people's equality of opportunity and ability to participate in public life adversely. A significant number of respondents did use the Service for activities/groups for their baby, toddler or child.

A reduction in the number of buildings used by the Service and any subsequent impact on access to group work sessions or similar group activity, may increase social isolation particularly for the more vulnerable service users. If there is a loss of access to peer support and reduced opportunities for mixing with people from different backgrounds, this could adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations between people from different backgrounds and communities or from different protected characteristics groups more widely.

Outreach sessions may assist people to access services in small numbers or individually but potentially this may not fully replace the larger group or peer support sessions currently available locally. Some comments in the consultation expressed concern about reduced social opportunities or chances to meet up arising from the proposal.

Where people now need to access services at a different location there may, at least initially, be concerns about building up relationships/rapport with people from different parts of the town/district, or from different ethnicities/social backgrounds. This could make some people reluctant to go to an alternative venue or feel anxious about doing so. It is also possible that staff people have worked with might also change and it

may take time to build up rapport, relationships and confidence with them. Groups being larger may also be a cause of anxiety for some service users.

Some concerns have been raised about the possible use of buildings by people from different age groups and the possible issues this might create in terms of safeguarding, etc. One specific example raised was the proposal to use Whitworth Library to deliver children centre services. The Service have confirmed that there should be no difficulties as the children centre service will be delivered when the library is closed whilst other venues will have clear distinctions between groups who use them at different times/on different days. Others felt that the alternative premises – e.g. Whitegate Children and Family Wellbeing Service – was not a suitable environment to accommodate the 12-19+ service and this was mentioned in specific comments from a number of respondents.

There was a wider concern mentioned in terms of facilities generally reducing in Padiham which was mentioned in a number of responses. Whilst this often related to the proposed withdrawal from the Padiham Young Peoples Centre, this was connected by some to a closure of the local bank and that there is a sense the town is losing its services when it has a population of over 10,000. This particular Centre was also seen as a long-established part of the community.

Question 6 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

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

Over recent years the support given by the County Council to subsidise non-commercial bus services has changed and is focussed more towards retaining support for weekday services. The reduced support for evening services which are not commercially viable could affect the ability of young people to attend alternative buildings where they are reliant on buses to travel there – e.g. if young people needed to travel from Padiham to Burnley.

This proposal could potentially be impacted by proposals emerging regarding a partnership between the Service and VCFS sector to provide a 12-19+ service offer.

Question 7 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of the analysis has the original proposal been changed/amended, if so please describe.

At this stage the proposal remains unchanged.

Question 8 - Mitigation

Will any steps be taken to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of the proposal?

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service will continue to be delivered through sessions at buildings and locations which best suits the children, young people and families it supports. This includes:

- The availability of detached, mobile and outreach services as a part of the Children and Family Wellbeing Service Offer. The outreach work the service offers takes place at individuals' homes, schools, local cafes or other venues which should mitigate concerns about travelling to alternative settings.. The vast majority of 1 to 1 casework support is already delivered in peoples' homes and for some communities the availability of this option has removed potential barriers to accessing the service.
- Group work sessions will be available at remaining buildings and, where required, the service will support individuals to attend them, such as by supporting them to travel to the new location, learning the route or helping them integrate into the new group for an agreed time, where these issues present a barrier to individuals.
- Ensuring services are accommodated in a way that meets the diverse needs of children, young people and their families which includes implementing safeguarding arrangements as

appropriate – e.g. operating the children centre at Whitworth Library on a day when the library is closed.

- Centres will be equipped to meet the needs of the service provided and will offer, where necessary, meeting rooms, areas for group work and private rooms for interviews and consultations. The feasibility and practicalities of this have been examined as part of the further considerations process which has informed the final proposals. Where alterations are required to buildings which will be used in the future, as an interim arrangement the service will seek to continue service delivery from their current venue until work is completed or where this is not possible will find a "work around" to ensure services are available.
- Any other County Council, VCFS, or other partner services delivered in these buildings will not be unduly affected by the withdrawal of CFW service delivery. Buildings where the CFW Service is the sole occupier will be considered for alternative county council service occupancy or may be considered for disposal or for surrendering of the property interest.
- In order to accommodate the change in service delivery, adaptations will be required in a small number of buildings. Detailed estimates of these works will be submitted for separate Cabinet approval and will be funded from the previously approved property review programme.

Question 9 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

This weighs 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 the analysis.

This proposal has emerged in response to the County Council's extremely challenging financial position arising from reductions in funding and increasing demand and costs of delivering services. This has required that consideration is given to how we can do things differently whilst still providing support to those who need the County Council's help.

It is acknowledged that the proposal will have an adverse impact on some people with protected characteristics including children and young people (age protected characteristic) with potentially young people more affected, some disabled children and young people, people with the pregnancy and maternity protected characteristic, women who are more likely to use baby, toddler and children's groups and members of the BME community particularly in respect of the Stoneyholme and Daneshouse and Chai Centre proposal.

Mitigation arrangements include:

- The availability of detached, mobile and outreach services as a part of the Children and Family Wellbeing Service Offer. The outreach work the service offers takes place at individuals' homes, schools, local cafes or other venues which should mitigate concerns about travelling to alternative settings.. The vast majority of 1 to 1 casework support is already delivered in peoples' homes and for some communities the availability of this option has removed potential barriers to accessing the service.
- Group work sessions will be available at remaining buildings and where required the service will support individuals to attend them, such as by supporting them to travel to the new location, learning the route or helping them integrate into the new group for an agreed time, where these issues present a barrier to individuals.
- Ensuring services are accommodated in a way that meets the diverse needs of children, young people and their families which includes implementing safeguarding arrangements as appropriate.
- Centres will be equipped to meet the needs of the service provided and will offer, where necessary, meeting rooms, areas for group work and private rooms for interviews and consultations. The feasibility and practicalities of this have been examined as part of the further considerations process which has informed the final proposals. Where alterations are required to buildings which will be used in the future, as an interim arrangement the service will seek to continue service delivery from their current venue until work is completed or where this is

not possible will find a "work around" to ensure services are available.

- Any other County Council, VCFS or other partner services delivered in these buildings will not be unduly affected by the withdrawal of CFW service delivery. Buildings where the CFW Service is the sole occupier will be considered for alternative county council service occupancy or may be considered for disposal or for surrendering of the property interest.
- In order to accommodate the change in service delivery, adaptations will be required in a small number of buildings. Detailed estimates of these works will be submitted for separate Cabinet approval and will be funded from the previously approved property review programme.

Question 10 – Final Proposal

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

It is proposed to retain Children and Family Wellbeing service delivery from:

- Bradley Children and Family Wellbeing Services (The Zone in Pendle)
- Preston Central Neighbourhood Centre (Riverbank Children Centre)
- Clitheroe Children and Family Wellbeing Services (The Zone in Ribble Valley)
- The Chai Centre, Burnley
- Whitegate Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Whitegate Children Centre)
- And to deliver Children and Family Wellbeing Services from Whitworth Library.

It is proposed to no longer deliver Children and Family Wellbeing

Services from:

- Marsden Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Walton Lane Children Centre)
- Ashton Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Ashton/Star Young Peoples Centre)
- Ribblesdale Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Ribblesdale Children's Centre)
- Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young Peoples Centre)
- Padiham Young Peoples Centre
- Whitworth Young Peoples Centre
- Whitworth Children and Family Wellbeing Services (Whitworth Children Centre)

It is anticipated that, if approved, the proposals would be implemented on a site by site basis from 1 May 2019 until around the end of August 2019.

Consideration of the future of Longridge Young Peoples Centre and Willows Park Children Centre is still ongoing and service delivery remains unchanged there

Question 11 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

What arrangements will be put in place to review and monitor the effects of this proposal?

The Children and Family Wellbeing Service has an extensive range of review and monitoring arrangements already in place which can be used to measure the impact of the changes which are implemented.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager) and Kathy Ashworth (Senior Manager, Public Health and Wellbeing: East)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head
Debbie Duffell (Children and Family Wellbeing Service Head)

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk