

| Summary of savings proposals | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| Impact of the review of costs | 18.116 | 3.883 | 3.768 | 3.708 | 29.475 |
| 10% Challenge - efficiency savings | 16.272 | 2.809 | - | - | 19.081 |
| Reducing the cost of being in business – efficiency savings | 14.522 | 1.769 | 2.313 | 6.729 | 25.333 |
| Reshaping the way Services are delivered | 7.460 | 7.970 | 9.960 | 6.960 | 32.350 |
| Policy Options | 16.567 | 11.292 | 6.258 | 1.950 | 36.067 |
| | 72.937 | 27.723 | 22.299 | 19.347 | 142.306 |

| Impact from the review of costs | 2014/15 £m | 2015/16 £m | 2016/17 £m | 2017/18 £m | Total £m |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| The full year effect of savings agreed as part of the current financial strategy but not included within the financial forecast | 4.156 | 1.900 | 1.300 | 0.800 | 8.156 |
| Review of inflation for social care providers; providing 1.75% within the 2014/15 forecast | 3.245 | - | - | - | 3.245 |
| Review of the level of demand incorporated within the forecast of costs for the concessionary travel budget | 0.645 | 0.180 | 0.197 | 0.190 | 1.212 |
| Revised forecast of the employers contribution to the local government pension fund as a result of the triennial valuation | 1.500 | 1.553 | 1.541 | 1.538 | 6.132 |
| Reflection of the government commitment to a 1% pay cap for local government in 2014/15 | 2.600 | - | - | - | 2.600 |
| Revised forecast of council tax income arising from the previously approved review of the single persons discount and the impact of the City Deal | 2.000 | 0.250 | 0.730 | 1.180 | 4.160 |
| Reflect actual level of hardship claims in relation to Local Council Tax Support Schemes | 0.500 | - | - | - | 0.500 |
| Reflect actual level of depreciation charged to Lancashire County Commercial Group | 2.500 | - | - | - | 2.500 |
| Reflect actual level of demand for Mainstream Home to School transport | 0.250 | - | - | - | 0.250 |
| Reflect actual level of demand for Lancashire Break time service | 0.250 | - | - | - | 0.250 |
| Reduce Street Lighting energy budget to reflect actual level of cost | 0.270 | - | - | - | 0.270 |
| Reduce budget for added years pensions cost to reflect actual spend | 0.200 | - | - | - | 0.200 |
| Impact of the review of costs | 18.116 | 3.883 | 3.768 | 3.708 | 29.475 |

| 10% Challenge | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| Adult Services, Health and Well-being Directorate | 6.266 | 2.005 | - | - | 8.271 |
| Children and Young Peoples Directorate | 2.931 | - | - | - | 2.931 |
| Environment Directorate | 5.156 | 0.779 | - | - | 5.935 |
| County Treasurer's Directorate | 0.307 | 0.025 | - | - | 0.332 |
| Lancashire County Commercial Group | 0.573 | - | - | - | 0.573 |
| The Office of the Chief Executive | 1.039 | - | - | - | 1.039 |
| 10% Challenge | 16.272 | 2.809 | - | - | 19.081 |

| Reducing the cost of being in Business | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| Increase Public Health Contribution to Overheads | 1.050 | - | - | - | 1.050 |
| Asset management within highways and property | - | - | - | 0.900 | 0.900 |
| Printing/Postage/Council Infrastructure | 1.000 | - | - | - | 1.000 |
| Managing Business Mileage | 1.000 | - | - | - | 1.000 |
| Accommodation | - | - | - | 5.000 | 5.000 |
| Review of business intelligence | 0.400 | 0.400 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 1.000 |
| Right Sizing the County Treasurer's Directorate | 0.335 | 0.148 | 0.707 | 0.229 | 1.419 |
| Right Sizing the Corporate Expenditure Budget | 0.210 | - | - | - | 0.210 |
| Treasury Management Strategy | 1.675 | 0.600 | - | - | 2.275 |
| Reduction in the cost of waste | | 0.500 | 0.500 | 0.500 | 1.500 |
| Energy Management (Price) | 0.885 | 0.121 | 1.006 | 0.000 | 2.012 |
| Management savings in advance of organisational restructure | 5.000 | - | - | - | 5.000 |
| Efficiencies within Social Inclusion services | 0.225 | - | - | - | 0.225 |
| Development of cross County integrated well-being service | 2.000 | - | - | - | 2.000 |
| Slimmed down partnership structure in CYP services | 0.150 | - | - | - | 0.150 |
| Merger of Early Support and Working together with Families | 0.300 | - | - | - | 0.300 |
| Allocation of 'good housekeeping' target across CYP directorate | 0.092 | - | - | - | 0.092 |
| Reduce cost of running corporate centre within the council | 0.200 | - | - | - | 0.200 |
| Reducing the cost of being in business | 14.522 | 1.769 | 2.313 | 6.729 | 25.333 |

| | Reshaping the way services are delivered | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| 401 | Reshaping and Re-commissioning of Domiciliary Care | - | 2.000 | - | - | 2.000 |
| 403 | Re-commissioning Telecare | - | 0.500 | 1.000 | 2.500 | 4.000 |
| 404 | Learning Disability Remodelling Supported Living | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | - | 12.000 |
| 405 | Re-commissioning of Mental Health Services | 0.060 | 0.970 | 0.160 | 0.160 | 1.350 |
| 407 | Integration of health and care services in Lancashire | 2.900 | - | 3.800 | 4.300 | 11.000 |
| 409 | Review of skills provision - using it differently and contributing to overheads | 0.500 | 0.500 | 1.000 | - | 2.000 |
| Reshaping the way Services are delivered | | 7.460 | 7.970 | 9.960 | 6.960 | 32.350 |

The detailed submissions in respect of reshaping the way services are delivered and related Equality Impact Assessments where required are shown below.

| Policy Option | 2014/15 £m | 2015/16 £m | 2016/17 £m | 2017/18 £m | Total £m |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Services within Adults Services, Health and Well-Being Directorate | | | | | |
| 601 Supporting People | 1.000 | 3.000 | --- | --- | 4.000 |
| 602 Fairer Charging | 1.250 | 1.500 | --- | --- | 2.750 |
| 604 Review and re-design of residential substance misuse services | 0.500 | --- | --- | --- | 0.500 |
| 605 Review of the In House Adult Disability Provider Domiciliary Service | - | 0.360 | 2.140 | 1.780 | 4.280 |
| 607 Arts Development service | 0.020 | --- | --- | --- | 0.020 |
| 609 Leisure Link (providing additional respite to Unpaid Carers) | 0.275 | --- | --- | --- | 0.275 |
| 610 Remodelling workforce in former NHS operated learning disability (LD) supported living schemes | 3.430 | 0.500 | 0.400 | --- | 4.330 |
| 611 Older people day time support | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.400 | --- | 1.000 |
| 612 Self Directed Supports | 0.100 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.550 |
| | 6.875 | 5.810 | 3.090 | 1.930 | 17.705 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Services within the Children and Young Peoples Directorate | | | | | |
| 702 Youth Services | 0.600 | 1.000 | 1.400 | --- | 3.000 |
| 703 Discretionary Mainstream Home to School Transport (including unsuitable routes) | 0.414 | 0.482 | 0.041 | 0.020 | 0.957 |
| 704 Parent participation and engagement for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and their families | 0.078 | --- | --- | --- | 0.078 |
| 705 Charging for post 16 Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport | 0.088 | 0.096 | 0.096 | --- | 0.280 |
| 707 Review of CYP traded services | 0.063 | --- | --- | --- | 0.063 |
| 708 Review of Lancashire Outdoor Education Provision | 0.039 | 0.068 | 0.050 | --- | 0.157 |
| 709 Review of Quality & Continuous Improvement - Lancashire Schools Effectiveness Service (QCI-LSES) services provided to schools | 0.025 | 0.119 | 0.088 | --- | 0.232 |
| 710 Review of school attendance responsibilities. | 0.065 | 0.099 | 0.031 | --- | 0.195 |
| 711 Virtual School Review | 0.250 | --- | --- | --- | 0.250 |
| 712 Review of Early Years services and responsibilities | 1.507 | 1.451 | --- | --- | 2.958 |
| 717 Improve efficiency of Adoption Service | 0.117 | --- | --- | --- | 0.117 |
| 719 Increase efficiency in Fostering Service | 0.150 | --- | --- | --- | 0.150 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|-----|-----|--------------|
| 722 | To develop and reshape services to children, young people and families to ensure the services are aligned efficiently and effectively | 2.800 | 0.861 | --- | --- | 3.661 |
| 723 | Right-size Childrens Trust Budget | 0.100 | --- | --- | --- | 0.100 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 6.297 | 4.176 | 1.706 | 0.020 | 12.199 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|

Services within the Environment Directorate

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|-------|-----|--------------|
| 803 | Lancashire permit scheme | 0.200 | 0.380 | --- | --- | 0.580 |
| 804 | Street Lighting Energy | 0.170 | 0.100 | 0.230 | --- | 0.500 |
| 805 | Highway infrastructure sponsorship | 0.050 | 0.050 | --- | --- | 0.100 |
| 809 | Members priority contingency | 0.220 | --- | --- | --- | 0.220 |
| 813 | Targeted Parking Enforcement | 0.050 | --- | --- | --- | 0.050 |
| 814 | Review of bus subsidies and an enhancement of community transport services | 0.647 | --- | --- | --- | 0.647 |
| 815 | Environment & Community Projects and Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty | 0.118 | --- | 0.612 | --- | 0.730 |
| 817 | Public Rights of Way & Countryside Service Reductions | 0.094 | --- | 0.454 | --- | 0.548 |
| 821 | Winter Service | 0.447 | --- | --- | --- | 0.447 |
| 822 | Close waste transfer stations and landfill sites on bank holidays | --- | 0.030 | --- | --- | 0.030 |
| 823 | Sustainable Drainage Consenting & Enforcement | 0.150 | --- | --- | --- | 0.150 |
| 824 | Joint Production of Local Transport Plan | --- | 0.030 | --- | --- | 0.030 |
| 825 | Waste third party recycling credits | 0.280 | --- | --- | --- | 0.280 |
| 828 | Withdrawal of Adult Cycle Training | 0.014 | 0.015 | 0.006 | --- | 0.035 |
| 829 | Safer Travel Unit training | 0.018 | 0.024 | 0.020 | --- | 0.062 |
| 831 | Business Travel Planning | 0.003 | --- | 0.017 | --- | 0.020 |
| 832 | Speed management provision | 0.040 | --- | --- | --- | 0.040 |
| 833 | Operational Learning and Development within Highways Services | 0.025 | 0.040 | --- | --- | 0.065 |
| 834 | New Traffic Systems Maintenance Contract | 0.100 | --- | --- | --- | 0.100 |
| 836 | Transfer of front line call handling into Parking Services | 0.075 | --- | --- | --- | 0.075 |
| 837 | District/Parish Public Realm Agreements - Highway - Green Space maintenance | 0.144 | 0.137 | 0.123 | --- | 0.404 |
| 841 | Bus Shelter Maintenance | 0.025 | --- | --- | --- | 0.025 |
| 842 | Vehicle and associated checks carried out on subsidised services | 0.025 | --- | --- | --- | 0.025 |
| 851 | Revisions to School Crossing Patrols | --- | 0.500 | --- | --- | 0.500 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | 2.895 | 1.306 | 1.462 | --- | 5.663 |
| Services within the Office of the Chief Executive | | | | | | |
| 921 | Review of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) Grants | 0.500 | --- | --- | --- | 0.500 |
| | | 0.500 | --- | --- | --- | 0.500 |
| Total Policy Options | | 16.567 | 11.292 | 6.258 | 1.950 | 36.067 |

The detailed Policy option submissions and related Equality Impact Assessments where required are shown below.

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| ACS | RSH | 401 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Reshaping and Re-commissioning of Domiciliary Care |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | To fully review and re-commission the provision of domiciliary care to older people and people with a physical disability across Lancashire. |

Scope

Four phases are identified as in scope - 1. Review, 2. Re-commission, 3. Procure, 4. Business Transition

In scope service user groups are older people and people with a physical disability.

In scope are the review of, and any changes required to processes within personal social care, finance and any other business areas as required. Senior managers from all business areas are involved to ensure completion.

Any contracts for services with domiciliary care as a main component will be tendered via the new framework e.g. crisis support, domiciliary night services etc.

Support required on an individual basis will be part of the framework call-off activity. There will be provision of an additional lot within the framework for the building based sheltered housing and an enhanced specification.

Expected Outcomes

A new domiciliary care provider scheme with a significantly reduced number of providers (there are currently 129).

What Will Be Different?

A greatly reduced list of domiciliary care providers who LCC will commission with.

A system with a set number of providers working in predefined zones across the county

Potentially flexible pricing between providers and zones.

New quality standards and a new, more focussed monitoring system - this will include the ability to more effectively remove poorly performing providers from the framework.

What Savings can be achieved?

There is potential for savings to be delivered in a number of ways, including changes to the rates paid for services as a result of greater economies of scale, potential reduction in travel time due to better market management through zoning and work allocation and reduced transactional costs as there will be fewer suppliers.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this

link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

yes

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | | 2.000 | | | 2.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | --- | 2.000 | --- | --- | 2.000 |

Equality Analysis

401 – Reshaping and Re-commissioning of Domiciliary Care

Name/Nature of the Decision

Commissioning and Procurement Arrangements for the Home Care Market for Older Adults and people with a Physical Disability in Lancashire

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

A review of the home care market for older people in Lancashire was undertaken during 2012/13. It was overseen by a Steering Group chaired by the then ACS Director of Commissioning, and included staff from Adult and Community Services, OCL's Lancashire Procurement Centre of Excellence, and Finance alongside a number of provider representatives drawn from the Lancashire Care Association (LCA) and Lancashire Home Care Providers Forum (LDCPF).

The review document contained baseline data, analysis and a description of how the Home care market works in Lancashire. It considers areas such as quality, finance, commissioning / procurement arrangements, geographical variations, work force development and provider perspective.

The findings from the review formed the basis for a fuller option appraisal and a further report containing robust and detailed recommendations for ensuring the effective commissioning and procurement of good quality and affordable home care in Lancashire over the next five years from April 2014.

In particular this work will need to determine the procurement arrangements which should be established from April 2014 to replace the current Preferred Provider scheme for Home care for older people and people with a physical disability which ends in March 2014.

Three broad options were considered for the future management of the Council's directly commissioned older people and people with physical disabilities business with home care providers. The option selected was:

Option c)

The findings and the consensus within the Steering Group suggests that a new Home care preferred provider scheme should be devised which aims for Lancashire to have a sustainable and high quality Home care market for those seeking a service contracted on their behalf by the County Council. The size and structure of this scheme would need determining in detail, but in general it would involve far fewer providers, with whom the Council could foster a closer strategic relationship with an emphasis on trust, collaboration and continuous improvement in the delivery of good quality and safe services, ensuring the delivery of outcomes rather than output, and driving efficiencies via economies of scale. However the phrase 'preferred provider scheme' was considered an outmoded label and it may be more useful to refer to a 'Framework Scheme' onto which providers who meet well defined and high quality standards can be placed. The notion of a 'Framework' scheme has a number of elements that service users, commissioners and government would expect to see in an effective care model It can support a mature and sensible relationship between the local authority as a bulk buyer and the provider sector that can facilitate local strategic planning for quality and capacity. A core issue is workforce development and capacity which would benefit from the strategic and coherent joint approach that would be easier under this model.

A project board was established to oversee work the work of the project team and ensure it has necessary resources to deliver its work; to determine scope and depth of analysis, communication and consultation regarding the project and to endorse final recommendations for new arrangements before they go to SMT / Cabinet.

A range of communication/consultation was undertaken with both Providers, current Service Users and citizens.

Options were considered and the following recommendations were made:

Zoning

The project board propose that the new contracting arrangements are made on a geographic basis across seven zoned areas in Lancashire.

Allocation of Work

Initially people will be offered the option of a direct payment to choose any home care provider operating in Lancashire.

Where work is allocated by Lancashire County Council's Care Navigation function, the project board propose that work is allocated firstly by individual choice between providers with contracts in that particular zone and secondly on a rotational basis.

Pricing

The project board propose that initially a breakdown of costs is submitted by providers for each zone that they would like to work in. Lancashire County Council will then scrutinise the range of costs submitted and establish an hourly rate for each zone prior to contracts being awarded.

Quality

The project board propose a range of key performance indicators is set for home care, providers will have their performance monitored/measured against these to ensure quality of service delivery.

Additional information:

The Resource Allocation System (RAS) falls out of scope of this project.

The Project Board are considering the use of block contracts to mitigate the potential financial risks for Providers of introducing set hours for staff within employment contracts.

The Project Board propose that subcontracting is not permitted but consortia bids will be provided the consortia is a single legal entity at the time of tender submission.

A new project group will be established with appropriate representation to manage the transition from current to new arrangements

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.

This review and re-commissioning process will apply to all service users in the Older People and Physical Disability groups who receive Home care funded by Lancashire County Council – self funders and those with direct payments will not be affected.

Approximately 6000 people fall into this category along with approximately 4500 staff, the number of these directly affected will depend on which providers are successful in tendering for the new scheme and in which zone they are awarded a contract. The current 12 largest providers account for a high percentage of the market and should they be successful there will be fewer service users needing to be moved to new providers and fewer staff needing to 'follow the work' by moving to a new employer.

Each geographic zone may have a different hourly rate, however all providers contracted to work within a zone will be paid the same hourly rate and be expected to meet the same quality standards in delivery of care and support.

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.

There is a risk that smaller BME focussed providers may choose not to submit a bid due to the volume of work required in each zone and their small size and local basis – if this is the case there may be a disproportionate effect on BME service users in certain areas. This side effect of awarded contracts has occurred in other areas across the country, in some cases this has been mitigated by providers creating dedicated BME teams to serve areas of need. This model has been adopted by providers in Salford and makes good business sense so we would hope to see something similar adopted in areas of the County where there are large BME populations.

The home care market employs approximately 4500 staff across the county 80% of which are female, subsequently any negative effects on the workforce will disproportionately affect women.

The labour market is currently very fluid and staff move between employers quite frequently and we would expect this to continue (albeit on a larger scale) once the new contracts are awarded. We do not foresee any large scale loss of jobs as the amount of work will remain constant but will potentially be delivered by different organisations.

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

See below.

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.)

N/A

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 demographic split of home care service users is as follows (snapshot data taken on 21/11/2013):

| Group | Total | % | County |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | |
| Male | 2800 | 37.16% | 49% |
| Female | 4735 | 62.84% | 51% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| White | 7240 | 96.08% | 92.26% |
| Asian or Asian British | 218 | 2.89% | 6.07% |
| Black or black British | 22 | 0.29% | 0.35% |
| Mixed race | 20 | 0.27% | 1.09% |
| Unknown / not recorded | 35 | 0.46% | |
| Total | 7535 | 100% | 100% |

These figures do mask regional variation most notably in the East of the county. In both Burnley and Pendle the Asian or Asian British component of home care service users is approximately 11%; this is in line with the demographics of the area as the population of East Lancashire is approximately 10.3% Asian or Asian British.

Around 85% of service users are over the age of 65

Around 13% of service users have a disability or sensory impairment

Each service users individual needs are assessed by professionals and appropriate packages of care are put in place to meet these needs, taking all of the protected characteristics into account. This situation will not change as a result of the proposed changes to the homecare providers scheme.

Note – The above statistics contain service users that have mental health issues and learning difficulties which are not part of this project. The statistics will be amended

to only show physical disabilities and older people in a later version.

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)

Providers

Two sets of events have been held for providers in June and October 2013. The June events were attended by 104 providers and the October events were attended by 84. All providers on the current scheme were sent detailed proposals about options being considered and given the opportunity to feedback and ask questions. Providers were also sent feedback questionnaires after both events giving them time to review the information and provide an informed opinion.

Service Users

Letters and questionnaires were sent to all older people and people with a physical disability currently receiving home care services through Lancashire County Council.

Employees

A briefing note was sent to all providers to be cascaded to care workers about the changes to existing arrangements for home care

Citizens

Focus groups were held with citizens representatives to discuss quality proposals.

Personal Social Care

Information is being sent to all social work staff about the changes to current arrangements through a staff briefing.

Members

Members have been informed of the proposed changes and of the communications with home care providers, their staff, service users and our staff.

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.

Given the nature of the service in question (home care) there is very little scope for addressing areas such as fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic or involvement in public life, there are however some risks to service users' wellbeing that must be acknowledged and managed;

As noted above there is the potential for a negative impact on some BME groups which are served by small community based providers currently on the Preferred Provider list who may decide not to bid.

There are two mitigating factors, firstly all service users will have the option of moving onto direct payments and remaining with their current provider (we expect to see a significant increase in direct payments and are working with the direct payments team to plan for this), secondly the newly contracted providers may be in a position to employ sufficient numbers of BME staff to meet the needs of all service users. This has been a business model pursued by organisations in other areas such as Salford.

There is a risk of a negative impact on service users in rural areas if the zoning process is not completed accurately and the allocated zones are not commercially appealing or viable, this could potentially lead to less choice for service users in isolated areas.

By combining low value rural areas with high value, high density urban areas within zones this risk should be mitigated.

The transition process may be stressful for some service users, especially those who are particularly frail or vulnerable and for whom stress may be highly detrimental to health. We will need to communicate with service users as to our intentions and the process of transfer between providers, these communications need to be clearly worded and as reassuring as possible.

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.

We are not aware of any other factors that would create a cumulative negative effect on service users.

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

The original proposal for a framework contract has been reviewed and consideration is being given to block contract arrangements to enable providers to commit to employment contracts offering staff guaranteed hours per week.

On reflection, to ensure a more seamless transition process, Lancashire County Council will facilitate as far as possible the TUPE transfer of existing care workers to providers with contracts under the new arrangements.

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.

See question 5

We are considering the inclusion of a specific question as part of the selection process as to how providers will ensure they deliver culturally appropriate support that reflects the needs of the population within each zone.

To mitigate the danger of workforce loss within the sector because of potential turbulence within the market, Lancashire County Council will require providers evidence improved employee conditions to promote stability of the workforce.

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.

Legally, the Council has to complete a re-tender of existing arrangements.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal remains unchanged and risks to affected groups have been mitigated as far as possible.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

A comprehensive set of performance indicators has been established to understand the impact of both the transition from current arrangements to new and the ongoing quality of the service.

Equality Analysis Prepared By E Ince

Position/Role Locality

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer T Pounder

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | RSH | 403 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Re-commissioning Telecare |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | To establish new Telecare infrastructure in Lancashire and deliver it as a major component of the offer to service users. |

Scope

Re-commissioning and procurement of the infrastructure for Telecare in Lancashire including:

Alert monitoring
Equipment - purchase, supply and installation
Assessment
Home response

The service will benefit a number of user groups numbering in the thousands including:

People with learning disabilities.
People coming out of reablement.
People with dementia.
People who are at risk of falling.
Older people perceived as at risk because of age (e.g. 85+), household status (e.g. living alone), long terms conditions, or whose service needs may intensify.

Expected Outcomes

Reduced admissions into residential / nursing care.
Lower cost home care packages.
Reduced presentations at Accident & Emergency and admissions into hospital.
Improvements in independence for individuals.
Reduced stress for carers.

What Will Be Different?

The current Telecare infrastructure is sub optimal, very costly and needs to be reshaped. Improvements in the way the system operates will make for a more cost effective service. It will work better and therefore be a more credible offer for frontline workers, support brokers and for people with individual budgets. Training and marketing will aim to change the culture of expectations surrounding telecare so that it becomes a cost effective substitute for other more costly or intensive services

What Savings can be achieved?

The new service could contribute a minimum of £2m in annual savings for social care budgets whilst some suggest larger savings are possible and so £4m is proposed as the most optimistic and achievable scenario for LCC

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

| | |
|--|-----|
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |
|--|-----|

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | | 0.500 | 1.000 | 2.500 | 4.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | --- | 0.500 | 1.000 | 2.500 | 4.000 |

Equality Analysis

403 – Re-commissioning Telecare

Name/Nature of the Decision

Re-commissioning Telecare in Lancashire.

Cabinet will be asked:

- i. To endorse the fuller development of a new operating model for Telecare and associated procurement
- ii. To endorse the further development of a policy framework for service eligibility, pricing, charging and use of personal budgets which will be subject of future Cabinet report.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

An important element of the County Council's financial strategy is to commission a range of services which are intended to prevent, delay or reduce the need for more intensive or costly adult social care services.

As one strand of this strategy, work began in 2010/11 to re-commission Lancashire's Telecare service.

In line with Adult and Community Services' Commissioning Intentions, approved by Cabinet in September 2012, the intentions are to fund the countywide redesign and growth of Telecare services. The level of savings achieved will depend upon the actual number of people receiving Telecare and the impact on ongoing reductions in domiciliary care packages and length of delays in residential care admissions.

However, it is important to note whilst there is a growing body of case studies to support investment in this area, the totality of research evidence remains inconclusive regarding Telecare's strategic and operational success in helping people to retain their independence and achieve cost savings. It is therefore proposed that Lancashire's expansion of Telecare is tightly managed and controlled, having regard to ongoing national and local evaluations of effectiveness and impact.

Finally the report will seek approval of a programme of further policy and service redesign to underpin the effective implementation of the re-commissioned Telecare service. These will include proposals on eligibility, charging, service pricing and the role of personal budgets.

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 telecare proposal is expected to affect people equally across Lancashire. The new service will continue to be provided across the county, albeit on a larger scale, and the same telecare offer will be available regardless of a person's home environment and location.

The delivery of the core components of the telecare service (i.e. assessment, installation, call monitoring, home response) will take place in the service user's home.

Some variations in practice have inadvertently emerged over time due to inconsistencies in operational practice and with having four separate providers working across different areas. It is expected that that the implementation of a robust operational procedures, will promote consistency and equity of provision across the county.

This can, to some extent, be demonstrated by the irregular pattern of current telecare service users in some districts e.g. Pendle and Wyre: (snapshot April 2013)

| District | Current telecare users | Aged 65+ with limiting long term illness as a % of county total | Difference |
|---------------|------------------------|---|------------|
| Pendle | 14% | 7% | 7% |
| Burnley | 10% | 7% | 3% |
| Preston | 11% | 9% | 2% |
| Lancaster | 13% | 12% | 1% |
| Hyndburn | 7% | 6% | 1% |
| South Ribble | 9% | 9% | 0% |
| Ribble Valley | 5% | 5% | 0% |
| Rossendale | 5% | 5% | 0% |
| Chorley | 8% | 9% | -1% |
| West Lancs | 7% | 10% | -3% |
| Fylde | 5% | 8% | -3% |
| Wyre | 6% | 13% | -7% |

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 telecare proposal is expected to have a positive impact on equality of access for individuals. It is expected the redesign of the service will enable many more eligible adult service users to receive telecare as part of their support network, and the same telecare offer will be made to all those assessed as being entitled to receive it irrespective of their protected characteristics.

In the spirit of 'personalisation', service users will ultimately make the decision about whether to accept it or not as a way of helping to meet their support needs and, where they choose to, it will be tailored to their individual requirements and wishes e.g. additional technology solutions for the sensory impaired and the availability of translation services.

It is expected that, as a minimum, those assessed as having 'substantial' or 'critical' needs, under Fair Access to Care Services (FACS), will be entitled to receive telecare as an integral part of to their support plan. Where a service user's FACS banding is pending because they are receiving the council's reablement service, telecare may be provided alongside reablement where it is considered appropriate under predetermined criteria.

In terms of charging, at this stage it is presumed the council's fairer charging policy for non-residential care services will continue to apply to those assessed as being eligible under FACS and, as a minimum, nobody in that group will be asked to pay more than the current telecare charges. Additionally, if a decision is made to provide telecare to certain people receiving reablement, no charges could be applied during that period.

However, it must be acknowledged that the policy framework for telecare – including eligibility, pricing, charging and the use of personal budgets – is still to be developed and finalised. Therefore, a further equality impact assessment may be subsequently required to analyse the potential consequences of the specific policy options.

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

See below.

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.

An analysis of available data in April 2013 in relation to existing telecare service users has been considered and is shown in the following tables:

Table A: Gender

| Description | % |
|-------------|----|
| Female | 69 |
| Male | 31 |

Table B: Age Profile

| Age range | % |
|-----------|------|
| Under 25 | 0.4 |
| 25 – 34 | 2.8 |
| 35 – 44 | 3.7 |
| 45 – 54 | 9.9 |
| 55 – 64 | 9.1 |
| 65 – 74 | 13.2 |
| 75 – 84 | 27.2 |
| 85 – 94 | 31.1 |
| Over 95 | 2.5 |

Table C: Primary Category

| Description | % |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Advice Only | 0.1 |
| Alcohol Misuse | 0.2 |
| Blind/Partially Sighted | 2.8 |
| Carer | 2.8 |
| Child/Family Issues | 0.2 |
| Chronically Sick | 0.9 |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing | 1.1 |
| Dual Sensory Loss | 0.1 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Frailty | 31.5 |
| Learning Disabilities | 3.9 |
| Mental Health – Functional | 2.2 |
| Mental Health – Organic | 4.7 |
| Mental Health Problems | 0.4 |
| Other | 1.0 |
| Physical Disabilities | 44.2 |
| Substance Abuse | 0.1 |
| Temporary Incapacity/Acute Medical | 3.5 |
| Unknown | 0.3 |

Table D: Ethnicity

| Description | % |
|-------------------------|------|
| Asian or Asian British | 1.9 |
| Black or Black British | 0.6 |
| Chinese or Other Ethnic | 0.3 |
| White | 97.2 |

Table E: Religion

| Description | % |
|-------------------|------|
| Christian | 6.6 |
| Church of England | 32.4 |
| Hindu | 0.3 |
| Jehovah's Witness | 0.4 |
| Jewish | 0.3 |
| Mormon | 0.2 |
| Muslim | 1.8 |
| Non-Conformist | 2.0 |
| None | 4.6 |

| | |
|----------------|------|
| Other | 2.9 |
| Roman Catholic | 15.0 |
| Sikh | 0.1 |
| Undisclosed | 33.4 |

It is reasonable to expect a degree of under representation of some of these groups, both now and in the future, due to telecare not always being suitable, or indeed chosen by the service user, as an appropriate way of meeting their support needs.

However, the telecare service will be designed in a way that enables inclusivity and is support option to eligible service users regardless of their backgrounds. In time, it is expected that the protected characteristics of the cohort of telecare service users will more closely align with those receiving long term social care services.

It is intended that a higher proportion of telecare service users will have a primary category of learning disabilities or mental health organic (e.g. dementia), as telecare may be of particular benefit to many in those categories.

Telecare management information and reporting will be significantly improved, which may include the monitoring of take-up in relation to the relevant protected characteristics.

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 formal consultation has taken place in relation to the telecare proposal. The existing telecare providers i.e. Progress Housing Group, Together Housing, Lancaster City Council, West Lancashire District Council are fully aware of the recommissioning intentions, although further engagement will be required.

If approval is given to proceed, engagement with all existing telecare service users will be required to inform them of the changes and transfer arrangements in a timely manner. A communication and marketing plan will also be developed to connect with key stakeholders and potential telecare service users, to compliment and align with agreed expansion plans.

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 telecare proposal is expected to be positive to all groups regardless of their protected characteristics. The new service should enable significantly more eligible service users to benefit from the provision of telecare and as part of the development of their person centred support or reablement plan. Whilst service users who may benefit from telecare will be encouraged to accept it as a suitable support option and an effective way of helping to meet their needs, the service user will have choice and control over decisions to accept telecare, or indeed have it removed where it is already in place.

The clear intention is that telecare will help individuals maximise their independence, achieve their outcomes and goals, feel safer and more secure, and provide peace of mind to their family and informal carers, which will ultimately lead to efficiency savings and a more sustainable social care system.

During the development of the policy framework for telecare further analysis will be required to identify any elements that could potentially disadvantage particular groups and how they may be mitigated. For example, there is a belief that telecare could increase social isolation through the reduction of face to face contact in some situations. Therefore, when the new service is being developed this will need to be considered and designed in way that reduces the possibility of this happening to the lowest possible level through effective call monitoring, support planning, assessment, review and reporting.

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.

The national economic climate and recent or intended policy changes including welfare benefit reforms could exacerbate the impact on individuals outside of the control of Lancashire County Council.

However, for telecare it is expected that, as a minimum, the council's fairer charging policy for non-residential care services will continue to apply to eligible telecare services users. Under these charging arrangements, individuals are assessed to contribute towards the cost of their care based on their ability to pay rather than the type or amount of support they receive. To determine a person's charge, a financial assessment is undertaken to work out their net disposable income by taking account of their income, savings and outgoings, including any disability related expenditure.

As already outlined, the policy framework around telecare is still to be developed, however it is expected that no single service user assessed as having 'substantial' or 'critical' needs under FACS will be charged more for telecare than they pay now. In fact, some service users may actually pay less e.g. those assessed to pay the maximum cost. The payment arrangements for those who are no longer eligible for telecare under FACS are still to be determined.

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

There have been no changes to the proposal as a result of this analysis. The proposal remains as the best way of redesigning telecare services in Lancashire and ensuring more people may benefit from the service.

However, a further equality impact assessment is likely to be required during the

development of the the policy framework for telecare.

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.

A project management approach will be adopted to implement the changes, which will mean that we can proactively tackle any potential adverse effects on current and future service users.

Although the policy proposal around telecare is subject to further detailed work, it is expected that those entitled to receive telecare will be fully involved in deciding whether to accept it as a way of helping to meet their support needs. Therefore, the telecare proposal will support the development of our social care offer in line with local and national guidance around 'personalisation', and the service model itself will be developed in a way that enables those assessed as being eligible to receive it irrespective of their protected characteristics.

Further consideration will need to be given to mitigate any potential adverse effects of further proposals as the detail of those are developed.

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 telecare proposal is intended to result in improved quality of life, better outcomes and improved independence for a greater number of individuals across Lancashire provided with assistive technology. In turn, the expansion of the service is expected to result in efficiency savings for the council and this is a key driver for the proposal. It is envisaged that this will be achieved through the procurement of a more affordable telecare service initially and, more crucially, by reducing or delaying the need for higher cost interventions, for example home care and residential care, in the longer term. The research evidence around telecare is inconclusive about its ability to deliver efficiency savings, therefore it is proposed that the expansion of the

service is tightly managed and controlled.

There are also significant risks associated with not implementing the telecare proposal. Given the demographic pressures we face, financial constraints that local authorities are working under, the demands of individuals for choice and the ability to access services that enable them to live independently for longer and severe pressures on the care workforce in delivering care services we are all required to seek more costs effective, flexible and innovative solutions. Telecare and associated assistive technologies should be able to contribute to this. Furthermore, the council will fall further behind in the development and roll out of Telecare services compared to other councils, which is against the Department of Health's strong support for greater use of telecare and other assistive technologies.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal remains as originally set out in this equality analysis.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Upon implementation of a new telecare service, specific performance targets will be applied to capture achievement of expected outcomes as well as contracted outputs.

Output measurements could include:

- Number of referrals
- Number of assessments undertaken
- Number of telecare packages delivered
- Number of reviews undertaken
- Average response time
- Number of staff trained
- Average time to assessment
- Average time to installation
- Minimum response time to an emergency.

Outcome measures could include:

- Length of delay in admittance to residential care
- Reduction in implementation of more expensive forms of care
- Reduction in home check visits
- Reduction in waking night cover
- Reduction in night sleepover care.

There may be additional benefits to other stakeholders, e.g. health, through:

- Hospital bed days saved due to reduction in delayed discharge

- Hospital bed days saved due to reduction in unplanned hospital admissions.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Craig Frost

Position/Role Locality Commissioning Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer Tony Pounder

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | RSH | 404 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Learning Disability Remodelling Supported Living |
| Sponsor | Terry Mears |
| Objective | <p>The activity includes a collaborative approach, with personal social care, providers, citizens and family members and has achieved a financial saving of £2.3 million to date and will achieve a £6million saving by March 2014.</p> <p>The activity to date has resulted in a cash saving whilst maintaining the same and in many cases improved life opportunities and outcomes.</p> <p>To date the activity has been restricted to a smaller number of providers, due to capacity and there has been some risk of duplication with our statutory review activity.</p> <p>There is therefore a need to accelerate the remodelling work and widen the impact on the County council's statutory duty to review services. The proposed impact of the activity will be;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A further £12 million saving, by March 2017 • Maintain the commitment to Personalisation and self directed supports • Achieve our statutory duty for review activity, achieving at least 95% review activity threshold. • Develop a new and safe provider review model, that will reduce the demand on Social work capacity. <p>This proposal requires £1.9m invest to save in order to save the proposed £12m.</p> |

Scope

Lancashire County Council currently supports approximately 1800 people within a range of 24 hour Domiciliary Support Services, with each person having a tenancy agreement with a housing provider and support. The schemes are referred to as 'Supported Living'. The total cost of supported living is in the region of £69million.

Work commenced in 2011 to remodel the supported living schemes in light of Personalisation and self directed supports and to achieve a cash saving of £6million by April 2014. A small team was established to undertake the work.

Activity to date has focussed on several work streams, including:

- Maximising opportunities to utilise assistive technology (Telecare) which can reduce the need for night time and 1:1 support within a supported living model whilst increasing individual's independence.
- Applying a Review of current household hours by using a review of background hours and specific 1:1 hours within a household, with a focus on current vacancies and applying the Guidance on dealing with Change in Shared Supported Living – Shared Support Supplement.
- Applying a 'Just Enough Support Model' to deliver Person Centred Supports at or below the level of the Learning Disability Resource Allocation System (RAS)
- Working with providers to apply the Shared Hours Template (now titled Tenancy Hours Calculator (THC) within their organisation
- Remodelling Work - Developing and utilising existing housing options & development of new initiatives.

The approach taken has included working with providers and the Voluntary and Community Faith Sector (VCFS) to develop community capacity and alternatives to paid support that will support existing providers to deliver the changes collaboratively.

The activity includes a collaborative approach, with Personal Social Care, providers. Citizens and family members and has achieved a financial saving of £2.3 million to date and will achieve a £6million saving by March 2014.

The activity to date has resulted in a cash saving whilst maintaining the same and in many cases improved life opportunities and outcomes.

To date the activity has been restricted to a smaller number of providers, due to capacity and there has been some risk of duplication with our statutory review activity.

There is therefore a need to accelerate the remodelling work and widen the impact on the County council's statutory duty to review services. The proposed impact of the activity will be;

- A further £12 million saving, by March 2017
- Maintain the commitment to Personalisation and self directed supports
- Achieve our statutory duty for review activity, achieving at least 95% review activity threshold.
- Develop a new and safe provider review model, that will reduce the demand on Social work capacity

There are some key interdependencies that are vital to the success of delivering the intended impact and outcomes. These are:

- A revised Learning Disability Preferred Provider Scheme, offering increased capacity for providers to support and take the lead on specific work streams and achieve savings. In place by September 2014.
- Developing and utilising existing generic housing options including over 55yrs extra care, new extra care and opportunities within existing housing developments and housing provider initiatives
- Working with providers and housing providers to effect the changes; and
- Working with district housing partners to effect strategic housing options for the long term.
- Linking the work to asset based community development and effective support planning that harnesses informal support alongside paid support.

The remodelling work will also link with the Winterbourne View Concordat Action Plan, to ensure there is a consistent approach to commissioning housing and support right across a spectrum of needs and ensuring a consistent approach across the County.

The project will cover all existing Learning Disability Supported living schemes, fully funded by LCC Adult and Community Services, for Adults 18 years and over and those with a part health contribution. It will not at this stage cover other citizen user groups such as Mental Health , Older People, PDSI or substance misuse.

Expected Outcomes

- All Learning Disability (LD) supported Living Schemes will have a new base line of support identified, including revised personal budgets for tenants and agreed core shared support elements.
- All tenants will have a revised RAS, Personal Budget and support plan
- All tenants will have agreements in place on how future vacancies will be supported, with Housing management agreements reflecting those arrangements.
- All Tenants within LD supported Living will have had a scheduled review, supporting a 95% scheduled review rate.
- A new safe provider review toolkit and review model will be implemented with 50% of providers undertaking scheduled review activity.
- There will be a £12 million pound cash saving by March 2017

What Will Be Different?

Review of current household hours by review of background hours and specific 1.1 hours.
Maximising use of assistive technology reducing the need for night time support and 1.1 support.
Applying a just enough support model to deliver person centred supports.
Working with providers to apply a tenancy hours calculator within their organisation.
Remodelling work developing and utilising existing housing options and development of new initiatives.

What Savings can be achieved?

Savings of £12 million through specific work streams, with a £1.9m invest to save investment;

- Maximising opportunities to utilise assistive technology (Telecare) which can reduce the need for night time and 1:1 support within a supported living model whilst increasing individual's independence.
- Applying a Review of current household hours by using a review of background hours and specific 1:1 hours within a household, with a focus on current vacancies and applying the Guidance on dealing with Change in Shared Supported Living – Shared Support Supplement.
- Applying a 'Just Enough Support Model' to deliver Person Centred Supports at or below the LD RAS.
- Working with providers to apply the Tenancy Hours Calculator (THC) within their organisation.
- Remodelling Work - Developing and utilising existing housing options & development of new initiatives.

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|---|---|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | Yes | |
| Amount of funding required? | 1.900 | |
| What is the funding required for? | To extend remodelling team to carry out required activity | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | | 12.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 4.000 | 4.000 | 4.000 | --- | 12.000 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | RSH | 405 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Re-commissioning of Mental Health Services |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a new Contract Framework for Mental Health Home Support securing better value for money. • Establish a new recovery and rehabilitation focussed contract framework for nursing / residential care. • Develop implementation plans for improvement and expansion of rehabilitation services. • Restrain and ultimately reduce expenditure from existing budgets. • Increase numbers of people supported via supported accommodation and home care services and using Personal Budgets. • Reduce the numbers of long term nursing / residential home admissions and concurrent placements. • Improve outcomes for people with mental health problems in the system including the components which are commissioned and funded by LCC. • Establish effective arrangements for joint funding of complex cases / Continuing Health Care with Commissioning Support Unit. <p>Targets will need to be set for these areas for delivery over next 4 years.</p> |

Scope

We are currently spending too much money at the wrong end of the spectrum of services with insufficient cost control.

Current position for Home Support:

The current cost of Mental Health Home Support is c£76k per week which is an annual spend in the region of £3.95m.

There are 76 providers across Lancashire providing approximately 6,500 hours of support per week.

Hourly rates for support vary from £11.00 to £22.89 and there are 18 different rates currently being used.

There are 394 people being supported:

- 213 packages - £11 - £12.50 (vast majority at £11.96)
- 123 packages - £13 - £15 (vast majority £13.15)
- 15 packages - £15 - £22.89
- 44 packages had no hourly rate recorded

Caveats:

- provider brokered packages do not state weekly hours delivered.
- some packages contain sleep-ins.
- these figures exclude direct payments and include provider brokered and LCC commissioned support.
- provider numbers include different branches of the same provider as a single provider.

Action: Establish a new framework contract for mental health home support securing better value for money.

Impact is Potential to reduce and rationalise costs per hour for support

- A reduction of 3%* would reduce the annual cost of home support by £118K per year
- A reduction of 5%* would reduce the annual cost of home support by £197K per year

*assumes no transfer of business to direct payments

Current position for Residential/Nursing Home Placements

The current cost of Residential and Nursing Home placements across Lancashire is an annual spend in excess of £15.59m. This cost figure is inclusive of £0.5m of Registered Nursing Care Contribution (RNCC) funding that is paid directly to the providers, but still forms part of the total support package cost.

There are 398 current placements, 304 residential and 94 nursing.

Lancashire County Council funds placements ranging from c£295 per week to c£3610 per week.

There are 264 placements that cost LCC £525 per week or less, 60 placements in excess of £1,200 per week and 74 placements costing between £525 and £1,200 per week.

Lancashire County Council's position against comparator authorities (44.3% of Mental Health spend on residential and nursing home placements) includes costs for those people aged 65 and over – without this data the position is 42.1%. To reduce this to in the region of 35% would mean reducing residential spend to in the region of £11m and increasing Home Support to £7.5m.

Action:

Establish a new recovery and rehabilitation focussed framework contract for nursing / residential care.

Impact:

A 5% reduction in all fee rates for residential and nursing placements would reduce the cost to LCC by c£780k per year. A 5% reduction on placements up to £1,200 and a £10% reduction on placements over £1,200 would reduce the residential and nursing spend by £1.04m per year.

Self Directed Support (SDS)

The analysis for East Lancashire shows that of the 37* people whose support was transferred to SDS there is a recurrent FYE** saving of c£171k of which c£82k is supporting people funding.

*Further packages of support have been transferred to SDS

**This is based on 2011/12 data

Expected Outcomes

Establish list of providers, prices and specification for services who we will contract with.

A plan to resettle number of existing residents into ordinary housing with personal budgets because Lancashire has well above benchmark numbers of people in long term placements.

Joint Funding Panel with NHS Structure and process are defined and documented and operating to control unnecessary expenditure, and ensure commissioning bodies are securing value for money.

Rehabilitation and Supported Accommodation system – phase 2 development, elements and principles are already somewhat defined – need to complete and expand capacity.

What Will Be Different?

The "whole system" of Mental Health services in Lancashire and some of its key components will start working more effectively to deliver cost effective and affordable outcomes for many of the target individuals who use the services. LCC Mental Health spend will become far more balanced with less spent on nursing / residential care bringing it more into line with the nationally benchmarked averages.

What Savings can be achieved?

The savings will be mainly attained through the reduction in placements leading to a reduction in spend

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.060 | 0.970 | 0.160 | 0.160 | 1.350 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.060 | 0.970 | 0.160 | 0.160 | 1.350 |

Equality Analysis

405 – Re-commissioning of Mental Health Services

Name/Nature of the Decision

Recommissioning Mental Health Services in Lancashire

Mental Health services for adults 18 – 65 yrs in Lancashire are delivered through various arrangements, many of which involve partnerships with NHS bodies both at a service level and certainly at a whole system level.

However, most local stakeholders would share a common analysis that the "whole system" of MH services in Lancashire and some of its key components are not working effectively to deliver cost effective and affordable outcomes either for many of the target individuals who use the services or for the mental health commissioners and providers of services. Budget pressures are bringing many of these concerns to a head and certainly for the council there is an imperative to get to the budget under control and reduce it alongside other ACS & PH budgets – the current budget likely to be unaffordable to sustain over the next few years unless there are further significant transfers from the NHS.

The pressures are undoubtedly increasing further due to the impact of changes in the CJ and penal system, the LCFT hospital inpatient reconfiguration and - at a neighbourhood and individual level - challenges to the resilience of many vulnerable people whose mental health may be at greater risk during these difficult economic times. It's also widely recognised that LCC MH spend is unbalanced with far more spent on nursing / residential care than nationally benchmarked averages, and this reflects a lack of commissioning and procurement capacity devoted to achieving the right balance of services in each area. Since Residential and nursing home placements can easily default to "homes for life" for relatively young adults (ie the under 50s), it can lead to institutionalisation, over dependence and an indeterminate spending commitment for the Council for an individual extending potentially over decades.

This piece of work follows on from the (nearly completed) work to reshape the s75 MH rehabilitation and supported living services which are subject of a different Project which will hopefully end when they are transferred to NHS LCFT later this year. It is also included in the ACS Commissioning Business Plan 2013 – 15.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

- Establish a new Contract Framework for Mental Health Home Support securing better VFM
- Establish a new recovery and rehabilitation focussed contract framework for nursing / residential care
- Develop implementation plans for improvement and expansion of rehabilitation services
- Restrain and ultimately reduce expenditure from existing budgets

- Increase numbers of people supported via supported accommodation and home care services and using Personal Budgets.
- Reduce the numbers of long term nursing / residential home admissions and concurrent placements
- Improve outcomes for people with mental health problems in the system including the components which are commissioned and funded by LCC
- Establish effective arrangements for joint funding of complex cases / Continuing Health Care with Commissioning Support Unit
- Targets will to be set for these areas for delivery over next 4 years.

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 the residents of Lancashire in similar ways as the frameworks developed will ensure a consistent approach in all geographical areas.

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

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.

It is widely accepted that between 1 in 4 and 1 in 3 people will suffer from some form of mental health problem during their lifetime. For Lancashire this means that between approximately 300000 and 450000 people will experience such and as this will also affect their families and carers it is unlikely that anyone will remain untouched by mental health problems.

The Lancashire Mental Health Joint Strategic Needs Assessment provides an overview of mental health in Lancashire. It presents data on prevalence, hospitalisation and mortality and data relating to some important risk factors for mental ill health.

Prevalence

- In Burnley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle and Preston the prevalence of mental health is significantly higher than England

- In Chorley, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre, the prevalence of mental health is significantly lower than England
- In Fylde, Hyndburn, Hyndburn Lancaster Pendle, Preston, West Lancashire and Wyre the prevalence of dementia is significantly higher than England
- In all Lancashire districts the prevalence of 18+ depression is significantly higher than England
- In Burnley, Chorley, Hyndburn, Lancaster and Preston, the prevalence of 18+ learning disabilities is significantly higher than England
- In Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre, the prevalence of 18+ learning disabilities is significantly lower than England
- In 11 out of 12 districts there is a positive correlation between mental health prevalence and practice deprivation; strongest in Chorley, Fylde, Ribble Valley & Wyre district
- In 9 out of 12 districts there is a negative correlation between dementia prevalence and practice deprivation; this correlation highest in Burnley, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire & Wyre
- In 6 out of 12 districts there is a negative correlation between 18+ depression prevalence and practice deprivation
- In Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre there is a moderate positive correlation between 18+ depression prevalence and practice deprivation
- In all districts there is a positive correlation between 18+ Learning disabilities prevalence and practice deprivation; strongest in Ribble Valley and West Lancashire

Hospitalisation & Mortality

- Apart from Ribble Valley & South Ribble, in all other Lancashire districts emergency hospital admissions for intentional self-harm are significantly higher than England
- Apart from Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle and Ribble Valley in all other Lancashire districts, the rate of emergency hospital admissions from neurosis is significantly higher than England
- In Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston and West Lancashire the rate of emergency hospital admissions as a result of schizophrenia is significantly higher than England's rate
- In Preston mortality from suicide and injury undetermined (15-44 year olds) is significantly higher than England.

Risk factors

A risk factor is any attribute, characteristic or exposure of an individual that increases the likelihood of developing a disease, injury or mental health problem. Some examples of the more important risk factors in mental health are under and overweight, low levels of physical activity, drug abuse, tobacco and alcohol consumption, and homelessness (www.nepho.org.uk/cmhp, Lancashire mental health profile).

Deprivation

According to the rank of average Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2010 score, Burnley, Pendle, Hyndburn, Preston and Rossendale are the five most deprived

| Indicator | Reporting Period | England | Lancashire |
|-----------|------------------|---------|------------|
|-----------|------------------|---------|------------|

districts in Lancashire, respectively. According to the rank of employment, Preston is most deprived and Lancaster is second most deprived.

Unemployment

Out of all Lancashire districts, in Burnley, the percentage of 16-64 year olds claiming Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) is considerably higher than England percentage. Although Burnley has the highest proportion of 16-64 year old JSA claimants, it should be noted that within most Lancashire districts (apart from Ribble Valley) there are wards with higher than England percentage of JSA claimants.

Ethnicity

In Pendle and Preston the percentage of BME populations is significantly higher than the England percentage.

Asian and British Asian populations form a higher proportion of the BME populations and therefore figure 14 presents the percentage of Asian and British Asian populations in each district. In Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle and Preston the percentage of Asian/British Asian populations is significantly higher than the England percentage.

Long-term health problems

Apart from Ribble Valley, in all other Lancashire districts the percentage of population stating that day to day activities limited a little or a lot by a long term health problem or disability, is significantly higher than the England percentage.

Alcohol related self-harm

In Burnley, Chorley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble and West Lancashire the rate of hospital stays for alcohol related harm is significantly higher (worse) than the England rate. In Ribble Valley and Wyre the rate of hospital stays for alcohol related harm is significantly lower (better) than the England rate.

Drug Misuse

In Burnley, Hyndburn, Lancaster, Pendle and Preston the rate of drug misuse is significantly higher than the England rate. In Chorley, Fylde, Ribble Valley, Rosendale, South Ribble and West Lancashire rate of drug misuse is significantly lower than the England rate.

Prevalence Data by group

Detailed prevalence data is available across the above and age and ethnicity groups based upon geographical locations within the county. This will be used to identify how project activity should be shaped and targeted and also to give baselines of prevalence so that the effect of actions to reduce the impact of inequalities on mental health in communities can be measured and monitored.

The table below gives an overall mental health profile for the county

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|------|------|
| Directly standardised rate for hospital admissions for mental health | 2009/10 to 2011/12 | 243 | 243 |
| Directly standardised rate for hospital admissions for unipolar depressive disorders | 2009/10 to 2011/12 | 32.1 | 42.6 |
| Directly standardised rate for hospital admissions for Alzheimer's and other related dementia, | 2009/10 to 2011/12 | 80 | 107 |
| Directly standardised rate for hospital admissions for schizophrenia, schizotypal and delusional disorders | 2009/10 to 2011/12 | 57 | 73 |
| Allocated average spend for mental health per head, | 2011/12 | 183 | 192 |
| Numbers of people using adult & elderly NHS secondary mental health services, rate per 1000 population | 2011/12 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Numbers of people on a Care Programme Approach, rate per 1,000 population | 2010/11 | 6.4 | 6.3 |
| In-year bed days for mental health, rate per 1,000 population, | 2010/11 | 193 | 182 |
| People with mental illness and or disability in settled accommodation, | 2011/12 | 66.8 | 65.5 |

Mental Health Profile of Lancashire

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 not as yet been any specific consultation in connection with this project. However ongoing engagement with a number of service user and carer groups supports the direction of this project.

An early action within the project is to communicate effectively with

- Citizens, people who experience long term mental illness, carers / families
- Lancashire Care Foundation Trust... management and community staff
- NHS commissioners and NHS Commissioning Support Unit
- Lancashire County Council staff who work in s75 services
- Councillors, MPs
- Care Quality Commission
- Residential care providers
- Home Care providers
- Housing providers
- Personal social care.
- Lancashire County Council – finance, Business Intelligence, property
- One Connect Limited – Care Connect, Procurement

Communication with services users will be undertaken using a "Working together for change" approach where people are asked to say what isn't working, what things should look like and how they would be different.

Consultation will be tailored in such a way that groups such as the deaf community

are enabled to participate fully e.g. through the provision of communication resources.

Similarly those from ethnic minority backgrounds will be provided with different language information as required.

Another example will be the provision of easy read versions for those with learning disabilities as appropriate.

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.

It is not envisaged that the project will discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics. It will seek to promote the rights of individuals and groups.

It is expected that this work will enable individuals to play a greater part in community life. For example through moving away from residential care provision to community alternatives individuals will be automatically less isolated and able to participate in and contribute to, with the right level of support, their community.

The stigmatisation of those with mental health problems reinforces negative stereotypes and consequently further isolates those individuals. This work will enable and empower individuals to become greater participants in their communities, become more visible and make communication and understanding across the mental "illness" boundary more achievable. Where services are to be developed in new settings, and perhaps in new communities, work will be undertaken to allay fears and improve understanding.

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.

It is not envisaged that this work will combine with other elsewhere to result in a negative effect upon any individual or groups. Through working through joint commissioning plans both of the County Council(including both social care and public health) and Clinical Commissioning Groups and also with other key partners such as District councils it is expected that aligning this work will result in overall greater effectiveness through greater coordination and economies of scale. Wherever possible services for people with mental health problems will be mainstream not "specialist" so this requires this project to be part of a whole system approach.

Examples of complimentary work streams are those for developing the whole Transitional Acre Pathway , Hospital Discharge, Reablement Services, Integrated Wellness and Supported Housing options

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

As a result of this analysis it is intended to continue with the original proposal but with a strengthening around the consultation with service users and their families. This is because the core elements of the proposal are strong around anticipating and responding to the potential for negative impacts upon groups and individuals including those with relevant protected characteristics.

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.

As there have not been any adverse impacts identified as yet there are no mitigating actions required at this time. The monitoring arrangements referred to below will identify if there is any change in this and trigger appropriate mitigation.

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 proposal has at its core a desire to enhance to outcomes for individuals while also achieving value for money and savings. While there is some tension in this there is evidence that moving to more community based alternatives that look to recovery and rehabilitation rather than maintaining and accommodating are more cost effective. Addition they result in a much more person centred and empowering approach. There are not seen to be any negative effects for individuals or groups as a result .

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

It is proposed that the project continues as originally set out with strengthening of the engagement and consultation framework .

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The project has in place a proper project management structure and governance arrangements.

The project board meets monthly and will consider the equality impact of the work as part of its standing agenda as reported to it by its sub groups.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Paul Robinson

Position/Role Area Commissioning Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| ACS | RSH | 407 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Integration of health and care services in Lancashire |
| Sponsor | Sakthi Karunanithi |
| Objective | <p>This project focuses primarily on the "Ageing Well" population; as such it is mainly aimed at vulnerable older people, aged 65 and above. Whilst the integrated wellness service elements are applied to all age groups, and asset-based approaches are not only aimed at reducing demand, the project draws on those elements of the various work streams that address the needs of this cohort.</p> <p>There are four main objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce demand and the need for health and care services 2. Reduce demand by developing resilience and capacity of Individuals and local communities to proactively self care 3. Support people with long term conditions to live safe and well by reducing the impact of ill health 4. Improve access to and effectiveness of intermediate care services to maximise independence and reduce demand for on-going services |

| Scope |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joined up intermediate care services with improved access and care management to prevent admissions/readmissions, support safe discharge, and prevent/ prevent admission to long term care e.g. through a clear falls prevention strategy. 2. Establish Neighbourhood care teams offering direct access and focussed support for people with long-term conditions (LTC's) living in the community. Working closely with GPs to identify risk. 3. Establish and expand Connect 4 Life who connect, sustain and link people to have a good life in their local community, accessing a range of universal and asset-based resources. 4. Establish a robust and effective programme of Health Checks, risk stratification and integrated health and wellbeing services to ensure early identification of needs and preventative interventions. <p>This programme should be seen as part of the wider integration agenda between LCC and the NHS. The scope includes Integrated wellness service, particularly NHS health checks, home improvement, lifestyle and falls prevention service. This also includes many community based services commissioned by the NHS which might be covered by other directorate level savings – clear exclusions to be drawn after we are able to see all project briefs. The review of Help Direct will also form part of this brief in view of the opportunities connected with the review of Health and Wellbeing services. The review of the Transitional Care Pathway for Older People with Mental Health needs, particularly Dementia and their Carers in Lancashire North, and Designing Urgent Care Services across Greater Preston and Chorley and South Ribble CCG are outside the scope of this project, but there will need to be clear links.</p> |

Expected Outcomes

Those in crisis / with acute exacerbation of needs

- Reduced demand to NHS and LCC services
- Integrated working practice for health and social care teams through co-location, pulling in existing resources from current disparate functions across health and social care.
- Single assessment process with common documentation, to ensure systems that deliver timely discharge planning processes and effective allocation response
- A reduction in residential and nursing care home admissions and high cost support packages
- An increase in 'step-up' access to intermediate care
- A reduction in delayed discharges and 'lost bed days'
- A reduction in avoidable hospital admissions

Those at risk of crisis / acute exacerbation

- Holistic, person centred care plans that promote self care and maximise the utilisation of community assets
- Individual with multiple risk factors will be more easily supported.
- Reduced demand to NHS and LCC services
- Integrated working practice for health and social care teams through co-location, pulling in existing resources from current disparate functions across health and social care.
- A reduction in residential and nursing care home admissions and high cost support packages
- An increase in 'step-up' access to intermediate care
- A reduction in delayed admissions and 'lost bed days'
- A reduction in avoidable hospital admissions

Those with low level needs

- Early diagnosis and interventions with improved access and uptake to prevention and wellbeing services
- Reduction in long term conditions e.g. diabetes
- Individual with multiple risk factors will be more easily supported.
- Better outcomes for patients/customers with an increased sense of community resilience.

General population

- Holistic, person centred care plans that promote self care and maximise the utilisation of community assets leading to reduced long term conditions e.g. diabetes.
- Early diagnosis and interventions with improved access and uptake to prevention and wellbeing services.
- Increased sense of community resilience and a reduction in inequalities.

What Will Be Different?

See expected outcomes

What Savings can be achieved?

Joined up intermediate care services = £600,000

Establish Neighbourhood Care Teams / Establish and expand Connect 4 Life = £8m less £750,000 (3x£250k CL estimate, non-current, Central Lancashire savings being applied across North and East Lancashire, most of the people will need reablement.

Establish a robust and effective programme of health checks, risk stratification and integrated health and wellbeing service = £2.4m

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | Yes | |
| Amount of funding required? | 0.750 | |
| What is the funding required for? | CL estimate (non-recurrent) Central Lancashire savings being applied across North and East Lancashire Most of the people will need reablement | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | 2.900 | --- | 3.800 | 4.300 | 11.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 2.900 | --- | 3.800 | 4.300 | 11.000 |

Equality Analysis

407 - Integration of health and care services in Lancashire

Name/Nature of the Decision

- Integrated Health and Social Care Services through the development of:-
- Joined up Intermediate Care Services and Safer transfers of Care
 - Local Area Co-ordination
 - An Integrated Wellness Service

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

This project forms part of corporate savings plans as part of the medium term financial strategy within Lancashire County Council by refocusing activity and using existing resources and non-recurrent additional funds the project will reduce the demand on statutory services by reducing duplication and waste, shifting investment to prevention and developing community asset approaches any non recurrent investment will be aligned to the expected reductions in acute and residential bed based care. By managing the demand for longer term high cost care it is anticipated the savings to the County Council will be £11 million by March 2018.

There is a National Long Term Conditions (LTC) agenda being implemented across the country. The LTC framework is based on three core principles; risk stratification, neighbourhood Teams and self management. The Integration of Health and Social Care Services addresses the three core principles through the development of three service areas:-

Joined up step up / down intermediate care services with improved access and

Integrated case management and case finding to prevent admissions and readmissions to hospital, support safe discharge, and prevent admission to long term care

The development of Local Area Co-ordination (LAC) and community asset based approaches that have a focus on wellness and developing the resilience and capacity of individuals, families and communities. LAC supports case finding as part of the joined up step /down activity.

Establishment of a robust and effective programme of Health Checks, risk stratification and integrated health and wellbeing services to ensure early identification of needs and preventative interventions

There are specific programmes of work in East, North and Central, that reflect the local market factor forces and Health structures. The main principles are though consistent across the County, including, the development of integrated step up/down community based services, single / main points of access, integrated case management and case finding (virtual wards) and self care.

There are common principles aimed at securing a consistent outcome for citizens regardless of which part of the County they live, so ensuring the right support, in the right place, at the right time with the right outcome. In each locality there is a focus on reducing hand offs in the system and arranging resources around the needs and safety of patients / citizens.

There are specific collaborative work streams in North, East and Central, aiming to achieve this consistent approach, even though some of the delivery may be different to reflect local market factor forces and local health Primary, secondary and community care arrangements.

A key element of the work is to integrate the reablement and rehabilitation capacity, within each locality, to support a safe, efficient and dynamic step up / down integrated model, that reduces admissions to acute and residential care and enables early supported safe discharge.

Local Area Co-ordination will deliver three core functions, including; GP liaison and case finding, community connecting and linking, community asset mapping and development. The activity undertaken to date, in Central Lancashire has been a combination of 'Help Direct' and 'Connect 4 Life', building on the success of Help Direct, with 'Connect 4 Life' being the wider social care offer to support integrated neighbourhood teams, supporting a more targeted approach to case finding and asset development.

The three key elements of this proposal will identify patients and citizens at risk of acute admission or at tipping points, wrap resources around the local GP practice, including Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) and community assets, which will then be deployed to support those identified with a strong emphasis on self management, wellness and prevention. So the focus will go beyond just those at most risk of an acute admission, it will focus on whole population.

This will require integrated working across partners at a local community level, to a

scale never achieved before. The focus is on wellbeing and prevention, harnessing all of the resources in the community, which focus on wellness and self management, as part of a wider health and social care integrated offer, through neighbourhood teams.

The Integrated Wellness Service will create a new system to co-ordinate interventions around lifestyle and health related behaviours such as exercise, diet, and substance misuse. This system will connect people with support and positive influences and will reduce the long term demand on acute services by improving people's ability to achieve and maintain healthy lifestyles.

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 proposals are expected to have a positive impact on equality of access for individuals in terms of age, gender, disability. The development of the services will enable more people across the county to be supported and will not impact on any specific locality that will risk access and or uptake from specific community groups.

The service developments will be a mix of universal services and targeted services based on local population. As part of the project a number of existing services will be re-designed and re-commissioned and this may result in a balancing of universal and targeted services based on local population need.

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.

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.

Although the step up / down activity will be for Adults in Lancashire in the first instance, the service will focus on older population with long term conditions, who currently account for the highest % admissions. There is currently some level of

under representation of people with a learning disability due to their presenting needs often not requiring an intermediate care response .However, the expansion of the combined approach of the three elements of the project and the reshaping of community based services will ensure that all individuals will be referred regardless of any protected characteristics.

The activity to date in the early GP implementer sites of Local Area Co-ordination has involved contact with a adults and families, of all ages, gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation. There has been focussed activity with community groups and activity with specific elements of the community such as older people. There has been contact with over 800 citizens to date, with no reported negative impact.

The specific detail around patterns and levels of health inequalities within groups with protected status will inform the development of the Integrated Wellness Service.

People who still require residential care or formal social care packages will still be support under our statutory duty however it is intended that by investing in the 3 service areas we will see less people needing to access residential care and formal care packages as their needs will be addressed sooner

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)

-A formal consultation plan and communication plan has yet to be developed. Any outcomes of the formal consultation process will be used in conjunction with the findings of the 15 Local Area Coordination and other engagement events that have already taken place to shape the 3 service areas.

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 current system results in unnecessary admissions to acute hospitals and residential care which creates pressure across both the health and social care system. Therefore Integrating Health and Social Care will transform the system on 3 levels

- Remove waste – through integrating health and social care assessment and allocation functions
- Reduce cost - integrated service re-designs and co-ordinated/case managed care
- Improve individual and carer experience – right place, right care, right time, every time

The activity to date has fostered good relationships within communities, with significant linking and connecting of vulnerable groups and intergenerational activity. There is strong evidence of increased awareness and support for citizens with a disability and those socially isolated to reconnect, share, contribute and mutual support across communities, with individual community members offering support to others as part of an emerging community asset development. The project is therefore likely to advance equality of opportunity for groups with protected status rather than discriminate against them

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.

Those services classified as Intermediate Care Services are currently free of charge for 6 weeks and are not subject to FACs. To enable elements of the project to deliver the expected outcomes and to expand the offer of access to short term services and one off offers such as equipment that are currently FACs eligible or chargeable there will need to be a review of the current charging policy and FACs criteria for a range of services.

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

There have been no changes to the proposal as a result of the analysis. However key issues discovered as a result of the planned consultation will be reflected in the final proposal.

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.

We will continue to monitor the activity and impact through measuring outcomes and analysing activity across the 3 service developments to ensure activity is representative of the local community profile. We will engage directly with communities and check back to see what improvements happen. We will use working together for change to check actual experience and can use specific themes to ensure equality of access is the experience for all.

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.

Integrating Health and Social Care Services is expected to result in improved quality of life, better outcomes and improved independence for a greater number of individuals across Lancashire. The programme is intended to deliver budget savings through reducing the impact of disability, ageing, long term conditions and health and social inequalities, which in turn will reduce demand on the health and social care economy by shifting resources from long term care packages to communities to promote wellness, prevention and increased capacity self care

The project is dependent on realigning existing resources to deliver more efficient and effective provision. It will promote service re-design across primary care, secondary care, social care and voluntary sector services as citizens are supported to be well and self manage, which in turn will promote self determination and positive decision making. The risk of adverse impact is therefore minimal

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal remains to implement the Integration of Health and Social Care Services programme through the development of three service areas.

There have already been significant investments in services that support LTC, but further additional investment to add to the existing teams and services that form the integrated service offer may be required to deliver a system that will offer consistent and timely access to community services with a focus on wellness and prevention, this in turn will reduce the demand on statutory services any non recurrent investment needs to be aligned to the expected reductions in acute and residential bed based care it is anticipated the savings to the County Council will be £11 million by March 2018.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The proposal will be reviewed through a range of governance arrangements including;

Adult Services Health & wellbeing directorate programme Board

Health and Wellbeing Board and local HWB Partnerships

Clinical Commissioning Groups (Clinical Senates and Transformation Boards)

Local Area Governance structures

Specific service reviews through activity analysis

Specific service review using themed working together for change.

Feedback from service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Ann Smith, Acting Area Commissioning Manager (East)

Terry Mears, Head of Commissioning Central Lancashire

Tom Woodcock, Head of Commissioning Substance Misuse and Partnerships

Position/Role Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | RSH | 409 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Review of skills provision - using it differently and contributing to overheads |
| Sponsor | Bob Stott |
| Objective | To review the operations and methods of service delivery for Adult Learning Service (LALS) in Lancashire. |

Scope

This activity will be carried out alongside the Review of Adult, Community, Young People, Learning and Skills Development being undertaken by the Assistant Chief Executive. It will focus on the services delivered by Lancashire Adult Learning Service (LALS) but will be necessarily influenced by the wider review.

This project is subject to cross working between Children and Young People (CYP) and Adult Services, Health and Wellbeing (ASHW).

Expected Outcomes

A review of all traded and grant funded services provided by LALS, in relation to full cost recovery.
 A complete review of Adult Education delivery models across the county council alongside other reviews.
 A review of property disposals within the overall Review of Adult, Community, Young People, Learning and Skills Development being undertaken by the Assistant Chief Executive.

What Will Be Different?

All traded and grant funded services operated by LALs will cover their full costs including service overheads. There will be a revised staffing model to reflect new delivery models and any changes required by the wider review.

What Savings can be achieved?

The aim of this project is to achieve savings of £2M by March 2018 at the latest point. At this point these are target but this will be finalised and more clearly defined in terms of achievable savings following stage 1 of the project.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
 Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| CYP | | | 0.500 | 0.500 | 1.000 | | 2.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.500 | 0.500 | 1.000 | --- | 2.000 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 601 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Supporting People |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | To achieve £4m savings in Supporting People funded services (supported housing/housing related support) |

Scope

The Supporting People budget funds supported housing/housing related support services for most vulnerable client groups across Lancashire. Around 20,000 people receive a service on an annual basis. In order to achieve the savings, spend in all of the following areas will be reviewed: older people's sheltered housing - staff support; community alarm services in sheltered housing and out of hours response; floating support services and family intervention projects; home improvement agencies (HIA's); long term supported accommodation for people with mental health problems; short term supported accommodation for all client groups (including young people, people at risk of domestic violence, offenders, people who are homeless, people with substance misuse issues). The project will be led by ACS and will be managed through the Supporting People Partnership which also includes CYP and Community Safety.

Expected Outcomes

Until we have reviewed all the areas identified above, it is difficult to be specific. The reconfiguration of services will focus on removing any duplication in funding; potential efficiencies will be identified and opportunities for operating in a more joined up way explored.

What Will Be Different?

A reduction in the capacity of the floating support service; major or minor reconfiguration in older people's services; more consistent number of hours of support commissioned in supported accommodation and a rationalisation of supported accommodation services across localities. Some areas of work will be joined up with other LCC activity.

What Savings can be achieved?

Older people - around £4.5 million is currently committed to older people's sheltered housing and community alarm services across the County. A range of possible options are currently being explored; however confusion around the exempt accommodation element of the welfare reforms means that there is a lack of clarity around the future financial landscape. Whilst it is impossible to give an accurate savings figure at this stage, it is possible that savings in sheltered housing/community alarms could be up to £2 million. This could be delivered through changes to hourly rates, reduced number of hours of support or changes to charging/eligibility for financial assistance. Mitigation would be through re-configuring of services by providers and utilisation of asset based approaches/volunteering. Floating support services - a review is being undertaken to consider potential overlaps with Help Direct and Public Health commissioned services. It is envisaged that up to £1.5million savings (out of a £3.5m spend) may be required though a reduction in the number of hours commissioned/people supported. The outstanding savings will need to be generated through reviewing short term supported accommodation, supported accommodation for people with mental health problems and HIAs. This will be achieved through reviewing number of hours being commissioned and exploring opportunities to rationalise some services across areas.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 1.000 | 3.000 | | | 4.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 1.000 | 3.000 | --- | --- | 4.000 |

Equality Analysis

601 - Supporting People

Name/Nature of the Decision

Supporting People Budget Savings

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to reduce the Supporting People budget by £4m, from £16 million to £12million. Detailed plans are being developed to achieve the £4m savings which will be subject to further EIAs. Whilst some indicative figures have been provided with regard to individual sector reductions (sheltered housing, floating support), amendments may be required to these figures following the detailed planning and the consultation responses. The indicative figures quoted were: up to £2m million in sheltered; up to £1.5 million in relation to floating support and the remaining services achieving the outstanding savings.

Specific EAs are being undertaken in relation to the following individual sectors.

Sheltered housing and community alarm services

Proposals regarding sheltered accommodation cannot be fully developed until the approach to be adopted by LCC to telecare is defined.

Floating support

The future shape of floating support services is being considered as part of a wider review of well being services commissioned by Social Care and Public Health (including Help Direct).

Specialist Floating Support Services

A review of the Family Intervention Projects funded by SP is being undertaken

Supported Lodgings

A review of the Supported Lodgings provision is being undertaken

Supported Accommodation for People with Mental Health

The hourly rates and the appropriateness of the current level of support is being reviewed

Short term supported accommodation for a range vulnerable groups (e.g. domestic violence, young people at risk, homeless families)

In order to achieve greater parity between services in terms of the number of support hours being commissioned, a support hours modelling tool has been developed. The tool will be subject to consultation with providers. In addition, where there are large reductions in support hours for individual scheme, consultation will be undertaken with service users as appropriate.

Home Improvement Agencies

A review of HIAs is being undertaken in conjunction with social care commissioners and public health

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.

People across the county are likely to be affected 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.

Given that Supporting People funding is targeted at vulnerable people, there will be an impact on people with all of the above protected characteristics. There is likely to be a disproportionate impact on 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.

Sheltered Accommodation

In the region of 13,000 people receive financial assistance to pay for their sheltered housing support charge. There is likely to be less support available for older people. A breakdown of the protected characteristics of people who have accessed sheltered housing is not currently available

The following data has been provided for people moving into all other services during 2012-13

Sex

| Service Type | Missing | Female | Male |
|--------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Supported Housing | | 807 | 633 |
| Floating Support | | 1401 | 744 |
| Supported lodgings | 0 | 17 | 32 |
| Total: | 5 | 2225 | 1409 |

Disability

| Service Type | Missing | Yes | No | Don't Know |
|--------------------|----------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Supported Housing | | 218 | 1213 | 10 |
| Floating Support | | 716 | 1423 | 8 |
| Supported lodgings | 0 | 6 | 42 | 1 |
| Total: | 2 | 940 | 2678 | 19 |

Age

| Service Type | Nov -15 | 16-17 | 18-24 | 25-31 | 32-38 | 39-45 | 46-52 | 53-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80+ |
|--------------------|----------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Supported Housing | | 270 | 642 | 167 | 153 | 107 | 64 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Floating Support | | 37 | 550 | 433 | 368 | 298 | 253 | 109 | 40 | 24 | 11 | 13 | 7 |
| Supported lodgings | 0 | 25 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total: | 1 | 332 | 1216 | 600 | 521 | 405 | 317 | 135 | 45 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 10 |

Ethnic Origin

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)

Background - Principles

Consultation was undertaken with service users and stakeholders when developing the Supporting People Commissioning Plans (2011-2015) (young people at risk, offenders, homelessness, mental health, domestic violence, substance misuse). The results of the consultation lead to the following section being included in all the plans:

"Initially it was intended that the commissioning plans would include a priority score for each service. However, as a result of feedback regarding the need for a wide range of services, but with a varying level of units to reflect the available funding, a set of criteria has now being developed to facilitate the development of the housing support system.

The Commissioning Board has agreed that the following criteria will be used to assist with the prioritisation process. The overall housing support system for the client group should:

- *reflect the level of need in each area (i.e. the proportion of funding allocated will be in line with local assessments of need);*
- *enable the local authority to meet its statutory duty to people who are homeless;*
- *balance the requirement for services amongst people with an urgent need for a housing support service and those requiring a preventative service in order to ensure that, where possible, there is an early intervention rather than a crisis response;*
- *be able to respond to the needs of people who present a risk to themselves or the local community;*
- *ensure that there is not duplicate funding for services and that commissioners work together to find the most cost effective method of delivering services which are the responsibility of one or more agencies.*

In making decisions, commissioners will take into account the availability of general needs properties in an area as this will influence how quickly individuals can be re-housed and the likely availability of dispersed units of temporary accommodation. In addition, the long term implications of any proposal to close accommodation based services must be considered".

Moving Forward – Applying the above Principles

When identifying potential savings these general principles have informed the draft proposals around the general splits in savings between the service sectors (sheltered accommodation, floating support etc).

The commitments in relation to people who are homeless have led us to initially

identify less savings for the short term supported housing sector

In order to ensure that early intervention and prevention services are also available in relation to avoiding homelessness and minimising admission to residential care, we are committed to continuing to fund floating support, HIAs, supported housing for people with mental health problems and sheltered housing services.

The significant savings to floating support are due, in part, to the assumption that there are more opportunities for jointly funding services with other commissioners and maximising the use of asset based approaches. It is also easier to flex this type of provision.

There is concern that given the housing market and the difficulty in securing suitable buildings that any decision to lose supported accommodation would need to be considered very carefully. Utilisation levels are being reviewed and where there does not appear to be appropriate levels of occupancy the appropriateness of de-commissioning will be investigated. Whilst in most parts of Lancashire there is a limited supply of short term supported accommodation, we will ensure that all services are a strategic priority for commissioners. In addition, we will explore, with OCL, any potential opportunities to procure services in a different way.

Planned Consultation

Providers were made aware of the level of savings being proposed following the Cabinet Meeting of 7th November 2013. Districts were advised of the total level of savings being proposed a few months ago.

At this stage no consultation has been undertaken with service users regarding any of the specific sector proposals (sheltered accommodation, floating support etc outlined above). Consultation plans will be developed for each of the following sector proposals which are appropriate to the length of service (some are very short term with high turnover rates whilst others are long term services):

Sheltered Housing

Consultation was undertaken with sheltered housing providers early in October 2013 about the best approach to be adopted in the event that significant reductions are required to the sector. Some outline proposals are being developed, although elements of the model are dependent on other projects e.g. telecare. Given the long term nature of the service and the complexity of the tenancy related issues, consultation with tenants will probably need to be undertaken through the landlord

Floating Support

Options are currently being explored. Consultation will take place with providers once a proposed model has been agreed. The approach to be adopted to consulting with service users is still to agreed given that the service is short term in nature (average of four months)

Supported accommodation for people with mental health problems

Consultation with mental health providers is due to commence immediately which

will focus on hourly rates and the level of hours being commissioned for the service

Supported lodgings

Recommendations have been formulated by LCC commissioners and district councils. Consultation with providers will take place early in the new year.

Short term supported accommodation – support hours modelling tool

Consultation will primarily be with providers as the focus of the support hours modelling tool is on ensuring that the level of hours enables the service to be safe but not over staffed.

Home Improvement Agencies

A new model has been proposed. Consultation with district councils and providers will be undertaken early in the new year

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 full impact will not be known until the detailed planning, consultation and analysis has been undertaken. However, it is possible that overall there will be less hours of floating/visiting support delivered. This will impact on people with all protected characteristics as it is a generic service

The impact on sheltered housing residents could potentially, although not necessarily, be affected the Council's approach to telecare. It will be also be affected by individual landlord's decisions on re-modelling services. Owing to the lack of clarity about the future impact of the welfare reforms on supported housing and the uncertain wider financial context, landlords will have to make individual business decisions about the most appropriate approach to take in the future to re-modelling their service with less funding for support (e.g. seeking to re-configure with a greater emphasis on housing management where funding may be able to be accessed via housing benefits)

The impact on mental health services and short supported housing will potentially be less as initially plans will focus on providing a level of funding which better reflects needs and is more equitable across the sector

As stated above the full impact will be known once more detailed planning has been completed and the consultation has been undertaken

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.

The welfare reforms may exacerbate the impact on a range of groups

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

Following completion of detailed planning and consideration of the consultation results, the original proposal will be reviewed.

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.

Mitigation factors will be considered fully in the more detailed EAs. However there are some influencing factors are outlined below:

SHELTERED HOUSING

Many older people's housing providers are considering how to remodel services with less reliance on SP funding

We are proposing to change the nature of the contract to enable more flexibility and targeting

FLOATING SUPPORT

Supporting People Team is working with social care and public health to consider how we can commission services more effectively by reducing any duplication, understanding the interface between services and aligning funding where appropriate

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.

Whilst the detailed EAs (regarding different elements of the sector) may lead to adjustments to the reductions in different types of SP funded services, it is recognised that owing to the level of savings which LCC is required to fund, there needs to be an overall reduction in the amount of SP funding.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is to proceed with the target of £4million savings; however the level of savings to be achieved by the individual sectors (sheltered, floating support etc) may need to be re-balanced following detailed planning, analysis and consultation

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The Supporting People Partnership Board will be responsible for monitoring the impact of the proposals

Equality Analysis Prepared By Sarah McCarthy

Position/Role Head of Supporting People

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 602 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Fairer Charging |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | 1. To deliver additional income from revising the non-residential care charging policy so that up to 5,000 service users will contribute more towards the cost of the non-residential care that they receive in line with their ability to pay which is determined by way of a financial assessment undertaken by the County Benefits Service. This includes introducing a charge for service users in receipt of respite care to support their carers. 2. Introduce a charge of £10 for the administration of blue badges. |

Scope

The main proposal is to make changes to the Council's current charging policy for social care services received by adults living at home, in line with what is permissible under 'fairer charging guidance'. Unlike most other local authorities Lancashire does not currently make a charge for the issuing of blue badges and it is also proposed that this is addressed as part of the consultation process that will be required to cover the proposed increase to social care charges.

Expected Outcomes

The current charging policy was introduced in July 2011 in line with the current budget cycle as a contribution to the savings required. This increased charges on the basis of full cost recovery of the services provided, abolishing the maximum charge of £60 per week for assessed users and increasing the maximum charge for maximum cost payers and for those people assessed as being unable to meet the full cost of their care increasing the proportion of their net disposable income (NDI) that they are asked to contribute from 60% to 85%. The new proposal involves increasing NDI to 100%, introducing an annual uplift on non-residential charges reflecting the annual percentage increase in pensions and other benefits without the need for a new financial assessment and removing the current £655 maximum weekly charge for full cost payers, along with introducing new charges for respite care and blue badges.

What Will Be Different?

The most significant element of the proposal in financial value terms represents a revision of the current non-residential care charging policy, and is predicated on a proportion of service users contributing more towards the cost of their care and therefore reducing the net cost of non-residential care provision. The proposals should have no direct impact on services themselves, however implementation of the current policy did result in a number of service users choosing to cancel services leading to the possibility of increased personal risk, along with an increase in the scale of service users defaulting on their charges.

What Savings can be achieved?

The estimated savings are c£2m from revisions to the current policy, c£0.5m from introducing charging for respite care and £0.25 from introducing a charge for blue badges.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 1.250 | 1.500 | | | 2.750 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 1.250 | 1.500 | --- | --- | 2.750 |

Equality Analysis

602 – Fairer Charging

Name/Nature of the Decision

Increasing the level of charges for non-residential care services in line with DH fairer charging guidance and introduction of a £10 administration charge for blue badges.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The Directorate for Adult Services, Health and Wellbeing Services is obliged to assess the social care needs of people who are referred as having a disability of any kind. That disability may be as a result of age, illness, learning disability, physical disability, sensory impairment, or mental health issues.

If a person is assessed as having community care needs, the level of that need is determined and considered against the County Council's eligibility criteria. In appropriate circumstances the care needs of that person will be met either by the direct provision of services or increasingly through the allocation of a personal budget.

Where services are provided to people continuing to live in their own homes (non-residential care services), then the County Council may require the customer to make a contribution towards the cost of the services provided. Charges are not levied on everyone, and the charges do not always equate to the cost to the County Council of providing the service.

The current charging policy was last changed in 2011 reflecting the move towards personal budgets and self directed support which carries with it an increase in the number of people using other, non-traditional services. Given the overall financial position of the County Council, the revised charging policy will be required to deliver increased income to assist in meeting the costs of the projected increase in demand for social care services.

The only people eligible for social care services are those who are assessed by the authority as having needs which meet the eligibility criteria set by the authority. These services are not a universally available service and so are qualitatively different in nature to universal services, as the only people using the service are by nature and definition assessed as in need and therefore disadvantaged in comparison to the majority of society.

Under the existing charging policy, if the customer has savings in excess of £23,250, they will have to pay the maximum charge. The maximum charge can be the full cost of the service, or a fixed weekly charge, whichever is the lower.

If the customer has less than £23,250 in savings, then a full financial assessment is carried out in order to determine their Net Disposable Income (NDI). The customer is currently required to contribute 85% of their NDI towards the cost of services, subject again to maximum limits.

Table 1: Analysis of basis of charging for customers

| Basis of Charge | Total numbers currently paying on this basis | Proportion of customers paying on this basis % |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Nil Charge | 4829 | 47.26 |
| Charge based on net disposable income | 4520 | 44.23 |
| Maximum charge payers | 870 | 8.51 |

The major proposals within the revised charging policy are that:

- Increase NDI to a maximum of 100% from the current 85%
- Introduce an annual uplift on the Non-Res care charges without needing to undertake a new financial assessment, reflecting the annual percentage increase in pensions / benefits. This would adopt the approach currently in place on residential care charging.
- Removal totally (or increase) the current £655 maximum charge for full cost payers.
- Introducing consistent charging arrangements for respite care

The increase in cost to the customer will vary from £0.22 to £410.74 per week, with an average weekly increase of £8.26. The impact of these proposals is that those customers who currently make no contribution towards the cost of their services will continue to receive them free of charge. 4,360 of those customers who are assessed on the basis of their net disposable income will see an increase in their charge but the majority of these will still benefit from some level of subsidy from the County Council. The largest impact will be on those customers with significant savings (over £23,250) who will be required to meet the full cost of their services in future and 673 of the current 870 maximum charge payers would see an increase in their level of charge. Customers who are currently paying maximum charges will be offered a financial assessment and may possibly move onto a charge based on their net disposable income.

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.

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

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

See below.

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.)

N/A

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.

Potential effect on service user groups

Age: around c56% of the people receiving non-residential care services are over 65 years old. However, the average age of older people being referred and assessed is between 80 and 82, and the average age of people that LCC supports with formal community care services is slightly higher. Of the over 65 population just over a quarter are not required to contribute towards the cost of their services. However of the c44% of customers who are aged 18-64, almost 2 out of every 3 are not charged. Older people are more likely to have generated savings through their working lives or be in receipt of occupational pensions than their younger counterparts.

The impact of the charging proposals is therefore likely to have a greater impact on the savings and net disposable income of older people than working age adults. However this is wholly due to the fact that the majority of working age adults do not currently have savings or disposable incomes above benefit support levels.

Gender: 63% of people in receipt of chargeable non-residential care services are likely to be female and of these just over one third will not be subject to charges. Of the 37% of male service users, almost half will make no contribution. The proportion of customers assessed based on their net disposable income and those who currently pay the maximum charge are all broadly in line with the overall proportion of female to male service users.

There is a considerable literature about the disproportionate use by older women of health care and adult social care and why that should be; for the purposes of the EIA it is enough to state that women will be disproportionately affected by the changes in charges as they make up a greater proportion of the cohort subject to charging.

Ethnicity: Black and minority ethnic (BME) communities represent 7.7% of the population of Lancashire. The profile of service users receiving non-residential care services indicates that c4% are from BME communities. This is in line with the overall underrepresentation of such communities in receipt of adult social care services. Additionally two thirds of BME service users receiving non-residential services are exempt from charges compared with around 40% of the white British/Irish community.

Based on this analysis it appears that people from a BME background will be less

affected by the proposed revisions to the charging policy than their proportion in the population.

Disability: By definition virtually all those people receiving a social care service have a disability. However the proposed changes to the charging policy have the greatest impact on those people who have acquired savings or have higher levels of income, and certainly above income support levels. In general people with severe and life limiting disabilities are less likely to be earning or acquiring savings. The average contribution made by an older person towards the cost of their non-residential care services is over 3 times greater than an adult of working age with a disability reflecting the greater incidence of income and savings in this group.

Consequently the numbers of people with physical and learning disabilities affected by any revisions to the charging policy are likely to be both small and proportionately low. However both the current and proposed charging policies link charges to the cost of services provided and those with the greatest level of disability and therefore need, tend to require the more expensive packages of care. Consequently within the group of those with access to savings or higher levels of income the charging policy will impact most on those with a greater level of disability

Poverty/Low income: People accessing non residential care services who have limited savings and whose incomes are at or just above income support levels are required to make no contribution towards the cost of their services. This group of people will not be affected by the proposed changes. People with limited savings (i.e. less than £23,250) but with incomes above income support levels will continue to be subject to a financial assessment and the vast majority will continue to pay significantly less than the full cost of their services.

However all of this group will be subject to an increase in their charges with those with lower incomes seeing a lower increase in cash (but not percentage) terms. The greatest impact will be felt by those with savings above £23,250 or with high levels of income.

Religion: We do not consistently collect data on the religion of people who use our services and so are unable to assess the impact of this proposal on people with different religious beliefs or with no religious belief.

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)

A detailed consultation ("Changing Charges") was undertaken as part of the 2011/12 budget process which sought the views of customers, via questionnaires and face to face events, regarding the proposed changes to the charging policy at that time. A further consultation exercise involving customers and other affected parties will be undertaken around the current proposals.

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.

Given the nature of the services in question (non-residential care) which the proposed increase in charges relates to, there is very little scope for addressing areas such as fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic or involvement in public life.

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.

We are not aware of any other factors that would create a cumulative negative effect on service users. As charges are based on ability to pay via a financial assessment, where a customer's financial circumstances change a new financial assessment can be requested which may reduce the charge. Nationally, future care funding reform,

including the cost of care cap which will limit the total level of contribution an individual is required to make towards their cost of care during their lifetime, is likely to limit the length of time some customers are charged for.

Other budget proposals which may impact on the individuals affected by this proposal, e.g. health and social care integration, are primarily intended to put preventative measures in place to reduce the currently predicted overall demand for ongoing care and / or reduce the ongoing cost of care for some people. Any reduction in the cost of care for a customer would reduce the charge for a maximum charge payer and also potentially reduce the charge for some individuals who pay their charge on the basis of their net disposable income.

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

The original proposal has not changed with the proposed changes bringing Lancashire's charging arrangements more consistent with many comparator authorities. Any significant issues discovered as a result of the planned consultation will be reflected in the final revisions to the charging policy.

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.

The revisions to the charging policy will impact to significant increases in charges for some existing customers. In order to mitigate this, affected customers will be offered a further financial assessment to ensure they have the ability to meet the new charges, along with an appeals process for those customers who can evidence that the changes have not treated them equitably.

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 financial savings that need to be delivered by the Authority are significant and an increased contribution towards the cost of their care for some customers, based on a financial assessment confirming their ability to pay, is appropriate given the scale of the current financial challenge and the mitigation factors referred to in question 6.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal remains unchanged and risks to affected groups have been mitigated as far as possible.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

A comprehensive set of performance indicators has been established to understand the impact of both the transition from current arrangements to new and the ongoing quality of the service.

Equality Analysis Prepared By E Ince

Position/Role Locality

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer T Pounder

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 604 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Review and re-design of residential substance misuse services |
| Sponsor | Mike Leaf |
| Objective | To re-design residential substance misuse services to create more efficient pathways for service users and to make financial savings across the three budgets which currently fund these services within the Adult Service, Health and Well-being Directorate |

Scope

Within the Adult Services, Health and Wellbeing Directorate there are three separate commissioning arrangements for in-patient and residential services for adults with substance misuse problems. The total budget for this provision is around £4m. There is an opportunity to review the existing arrangements and undertake a re-design of the Tier 4 (i.e. residential) pathway to improve the continuity of treatment for service users by streamlining the assessment processes and commissioning more integrated packages of care. The re-design of the operational delivery will create the opportunity to reduce some of the infrastructure costs around these services and will allow for economies of scale for the commissioners to drive improved tariffs. The review will involve service commissioners as outlined above as well as providers of community substance misuse services and residential providers.

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes will be: financial savings in the region of £0.5m over three years; improved care pathways for people with substance misuse problems; improved outcomes for people sustaining long term recovery from addiction

What Will Be Different?

The commissioning arrangements will change as will the efficiency of service delivery

What Savings can be achieved?

In year 1 £100k, year 2 £150k, year 3 £250k, Total £500k

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.500 | | | | 0.500 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | 0.500 | --- | --- | --- | 0.500 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 605 | 1 |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Project | Review of the In House Adult Disability Provider Domiciliary Service |
| Sponsor | M Lawrenson - Head of In House Provider Service |
| Objective | The project will concentrate on reducing the size of the In House Countywide Domiciliary Service which currently supports 320 service users in 112 houses. The project will review the existing supported living arrangements within the in house Domiciliary Service and make proposals to reduce the size of the service, over the next four years by exploring more cost effective supported living arrangements for some tenants |
| Staff Input Involved | A Project Team will need to be established drawn from staff within the Service and also containing staff from other areas of PSC, Commissioning, Finance, HR and Communications |

Scope

All 320 tenants will be reviewed and all 10 Domiciliary Schemes within the in house service will be within the scope of this project.

Expected Outcomes

Fewer tenants will be in receipt of in house support generating savings for the council.

What Will Be Different?

END TARGET by 2017-18 – to have reduced the size of the in house domiciliary service by around two thirds (i.e. from 320 tenants down to around 120 or below) and that the remaining tenants are those with higher level support needs, thus generating savings of a prudent estimate of approximately £4.2m by reducing the size of the workforce and securing more cost effective support arrangements for approximately 200 tenants

What Savings can be achieved?

By the end of project it is expected that approximately £4.2m of savings will be achieved by reducing the size of the workforce and securing more cost effective arrangements for approximately 200 tenants.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| In-House Service | Transfer tenants to external | --- | --- | 0.360 | 0.730 | 0.370 | 1.460 |
| Reconfigured Tenancies | 0 | --- | --- | --- | 1.410 | 1.410 | 2.820 |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total net incremental savings | | --- | --- | 0.360 | 2.140 | 1.780 | 4.280 |

Equality Analysis

605 – In House Domiciliary Services

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

In House Savings – Domiciliary Services (Supported Accommodation)

The project will concentrate on reducing the size of the In House Countywide Domiciliary Service which currently supports 320 service users in 112 houses. The project will review the existing supported living arrangements within the in house Domiciliary Service and make proposals to reduce the size of the service, over the next four years by exploring the availability of more cost effective supported living arrangements for some tenants

Following the completion of the review, the service may reduce in size over the next 4 years by approximately 2/3rds (from 320 tenants to around 120).

Savings will be generated for the Council as a result of the service reduction in the region of £4.280 million

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.

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.

People with learning disabilities who may also have some physical 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.

People with a learning disability living in shared supported tenancies throughout the whole of Lancashire.

Lancashire county Council supports over 3200 adults with a learning disability including around 360 people who live in residential or nursing care. Over 2700 people are helped to live at home with over 1800 of those living in supported living within Lancashire. There are 794 individual or shared living schemes. 591 of these that have some form of night time support.

No one is supported in a house with more than 6 tenants sharing and the most frequent size of tenancies is three and four person schemes.

Approximately 25 % of those people in supported living fall into the age band of 45-54 with the next highest (Approx 20%) falling into the 34-44 age group. Both the 25-54 and 55-54 age groups have approximately 18% each of the population living in supported living. Approximately 11% of the population in supported living are over the age of 65. Approximately 2.5% of Supported Living tenants are of BME origin.

There are as twice as many men in supported living than women.

The current level of vacancies at June 2012 was 125 accounting for about 7% of the overall capacity.

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)

The scope, actions, targets & outcomes of the project have yet to be determined however consultation with service users, their families, other providers and internal colleagues e.g Commissionign, PSC & Contracts, will be undertaken within an appropriate timescale to ensure that feedback will influence the direction of the project as necessary.

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.

| |
|--|
| Further consideration of the potential impact will be assessed and added to this document later. |
|--|

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.

The Remodelling of Learning Disability Support Accommodation within the independent sector is running in parallel and the number of providers may reduce as a result of this programme, leading to a reduced choice to those service users seeking alternative provision

The programme of activity to be undertaken by the Remodelling Team is not intended to heighten disadvantages amongst any of the above groups and have used the following reference in support of this aim.

Commissioning Intention 5 states that we will 'Work with District Councils and housing partners to develop alternative types of accommodation which provide choice, enables people to retain their independence and whenever possible provides a home for life'.

Included in the actions to achieve this are :

To ensure that those people with learning disabilities who live in supported living schemes are supported in the most appropriate, flexible and cost effective way based on the principles of self directed support, maximising the use of personal budgets and universal services.

To remodel current supported living situations for people with learning disabilities to ensure that there will be a range of housing options available for people to choose from.

The Remodelling activity was commenced to support;

1. The County Council's response to Personalisation, now identified within future legislation - Care and Support Bill.
2. The development of self directed supports in Lancashire
3. Citizens living in existing supported living fully understand the impact of self directed supports and what their choices and options may be.
4. Achieve a range of affordable housing and support options that maintain the integrity of self directed supports.

The remodelling activity will aim to improve life opportunities and maintain a range of affordable models of support and the review of the

in house Supported Living provision will reflect these intentions.

The Remodelling Team have however noted that there are risks within the existing model of supported living that impact on choice, particularly in relation to vacancies and voids.

The planned activity however will aim to address these risks and seek to minimise the impact of the model on choice and control, thus reducing the impact of any perceived inequality.

Consideration will also need to be given to any changes to housing benefit and how this may influence the way vacancies will be looked at by district councils.

Other proposals which will impact on this proposal include the review of Supporting People, Telecare and the integration of health & social 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

Continuing with the Original Proposal as this will identify any issues which arise as a result of the review, these will then be considered.

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.

1. Families and individual tenants who have been in receipt of support from the in house ADS Domiciliary Service (for over 20 years in some cases, when they were resettlement from the long stay hospitals) may not wish to move their support over to an external provider. Removing their choice to stay with the in house provider may prove problematic for some families.
2. The savings can only be made following the successful re-tendering of identified tenancies, which is dependent upon external providers being willing and able to deliver the required support within the level of the individual budgets of the tenants.

The above factors identified in 1. will be addressed in each tenancy with tenants and their relatives during the review process when their choices regarding future care and support will be discussed in detail. In regards to 2. detailed discussions will take place with all potential providers facilitated by LCC Commissioners and Contracts

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 context of this project is that it will run in parallel to the Supported Accommodation Review led by Commissioners and PSC, the Review of the LD Provider Framework and the work to generate FACE assessments of all 320 individual tenants, under the direction of PSC. This project will be very complicated as it will impact on 320 tenants, their families and approximately 820 overall staff within the current provider service, as well as several Housing Associations.

The level of financial savings required by the Council means that consideration must be given to reducing in house supports for people with more moderate needs, especially as there are other external providers who can offer a similar quality service at a more competitive rate. It is essential that this review of in house Supported Living is

undertaken in parallel with a similar review of external provision under the 'Remodelling of Supported Accommodation Proposal', as there will be common issues raised within both projects which need to be considered together in order to develop a cohesive overall strategy for the future of all people with learning disabilities who live in supported accommodation across Lancashire.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

To continue to review the needs of all 320 tenants within the in house Domiciliary Service in order to determine their social care needs and the level of individual budget to be made available to meet these needs. This will then lead to a review of the current supported living arrangements and whether the tenants can be supported by other providers who can offer a good quality service at a more competitive rate

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Project Board
Customer Feedback
Person Centred Reviews
Feedback from:
 PSC Review Team
 Commissioners
 Contracts
 External Providers
 LCC Shared Lives Service

Equality Analysis Prepared By Heather Bryan
Position/Role Service Improvement & Modernisation Officer
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer Mary Lawrenson
Decision Signed Off By Steve Gross
Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

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.

Where specific actions are identified as part of the Analysis please ensure that an EAP001 form is completed and forwarded to your Directorate's contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Directorate contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are:

Karen Beaumont – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Karen.beaumont@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Adult & Community Services Directorate

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Environment Directorate, Lancashire County Commercial Group and One Connect Limited

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Children & Young Peoples Directorate

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Office of the Chief Executive and the County Treasurer's Directorate

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 607 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Arts Development Service |
| Sponsor | Ian Watson |
| Objective | Reduction in the Arts Development Service budget |

Scope

The directorate has undertaken a detailed review of all the services currently delivered or commissioned. This has included identifying those services, which include Arts Development, that are non-statutory and for which there is therefore discretion as to whether they should continue given the scale of the current financial challenge. The proposal is to initially reduce the level of grant funding available to Arts Organisations by £20k in 2014/15, with the intention of further significant reduction in the level of funding over the following three years.

Expected Outcomes

The initial £20k saving represents a c4% reduction in the level of grant funding available in 2014/15 and will be managed through the Arts grants allocation process. The Arts Development Team will work with arts organisations to help them to identify alternative sources of funding or to develop strategies to manage future reductions in LCC funding.

What Will Be Different?

LCC support for arts organisations within Lancashire will reduce significantly over the coming years.

What Savings can be achieved?

Initial savings of £20k in 2014/15 through reductions to the level of grant funding available to arts organisations in Lancashire, with further savings in subsequent years to be achieved through plans yet to be developed.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.020 | | | | 0.020 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | --- | 0.020 | | | | 0.020 |

Equality Analysis

607 - Arts Development Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction of £20k in the amount of arts funding available to up to 16 arts organisations in Lancashire as a result of the 10% challenge

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

A reduction of £20k arts budget available to arts organisations in grant funding 2014 – 2015 – a description of the organisations that will be affected is provided in the following section.

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 organisations which potentially could be affected are those which receive grant funding at the moment. All of these organisations contribute to the health and community/social cohesion agendas in differing amounts:

Burnley Youth Theatre (Burnley)

BYT has key ambitions relating to its capital programme and an increasing touring theatre. Based in an area of high deprivation in Burnley, it is a key community resource for young people in the area

Dukes Theatre (Lancaster)

The Dukes commissions and creates its own professional theatre productions, presents visiting work, is an independent cinema and acts as a creative centre for young people. Without LCC funding, the Dukes will find it difficult to survive

Folkus

Folkus help fund folk music education sessions and a variety of folk inspired entertainment for communities in Lancashire

Green Close Studios

Green Close Studios engage with local communities and visitors to create performance and participatory cultural events

Horse and Bamboo (Rossendale)

Horse and Bamboo produce and present quality theatre in East Lancashire venues and beyond. They are working with the Asian heritage community in Haslingden at the moment on a project named "Different Moons"

In Certain Places (Preston)

This is a partnership between UCLAN and Preston City Council – it explores the roles of artists within regeneration schemes and how they can contribute to the creation of vibrant and engaging places

In Situ (Pendle)

Based in Brierfield Library – their vision is to bring art into the mix of the existing culture and environment of Pendle

Lancaster Arts Partnership

This has been the driving force behind "Light Up Lancaster" – important to the aim of the City to be a tourist destination

LICA (Lancaster)

Located on the campus of Lancaster University, Live at LICA, develop and deliver high quality contemporary dance, theatre, music and visual art for the city and the region

Litfest (Lancaster)

Showcases international, emerging and local authors

Ludus Dance (Lancaster)

A leading dance development organisation offering an inclusive approach to inspiring and engaging people through dance

Mid pennine Arts (Burnley)

A commissioning agency underpinned by community engagement and creative learning activities.

More Music (Morecambe)

More Music is a music and educational charity based in Morecambe – delivering a mix of workshops, training, performances and festivals.

Spot On Rural Touring

Rural touring network which enables isolated and rural communities enjoy cultural activity on their doorstep

They Eat Culture (Preston)

TEC main aim is to develop the city of Preston as an open to all cultural venue

This is a range of organisations which cover geographically Lancashire as a whole

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 – some of the organisations affected represent groups from the list of protected characteristics

The work of the organisations listed needs to fulfil a number of criteria in order to be awarded grant funding from the County Council. This includes

Social impact - New work commissioned; Number of participants
/workshops/audience

Economic impact – artists employed; artists days employed; volunteers; employment development sessions

The risks to the County Council have been identified as follows:

1. Implementation of the proposal may affect the reputation of LCC and relationships with the Arts Council and other arts organisations and funders.
2. Reduction of grant funding to arts organisations in Lancashire may increasingly jeopardise their ability to draw down funding from other bodies, particularly the Arts Council
3. The reduction of LCC support for arts organisations may jeopardise the delivery of the existing level of arts provision
4. The Arts Development team is not a direct delivery team. The risk to performance and delivery will be the loss of advocacy skills on behalf of arts

organisations within Lancashire.

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 number of people reached with protected characteristics in 2012 were:

Age 65+ - 72,947

BME – 4,421

Disability – 1,990

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)

As the delivery is via third party organisations and their allocation of funds will not be decided until Spring 2014 it is difficult to consult on proposals when they are unknown at the moment. Discussions with the Arts organisations are ongoing

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.

Proposals could potentially have a negative impact on access to positive activities that have a beneficial effect on people's health and well being

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.

Difficult to say as proportion is not yet decided /agreed/proposed, however LCC are also proposing a reduction in total of £500,000 in 2014/15 in the Central Gateway Grants Scheme, Local Initiative Fund and Local Member Grants Scheme budgets. The proposed cuts would mean a reduction of funds by 35% to the three schemes which provide much needed support to voluntary, community and faith organisations all across Lancashire.

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 changes planned apart from those identified in question 6.

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.

We will prioritise applications from arts organisations which specifically include proposals to work with people with protected characteristics

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.

£20k is a small proportion of the arts budget (5%) and so with the above mitigation should have limited effect

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Arts funding to be reduced by £20k in 2014 - 2015

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Collect and analyse figures at the end of the year – June 2015 with specific attention to the protected characteristic groups

Equality Analysis Prepared By Ann Marsh
Position/Role Cultural Services Development Manager
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 609 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Leisure Link (providing additional respite to Unpaid Carers) |
| Sponsor | Mary Lawrenson |
| Objective | To cease delivering the Leisure Link Service |

Scope

To cease delivering staff supported leisure sessions to adults with learning disabilities and physical disabilities. It is proposed that the service will cease acceptance of new referrals and current arrangements will naturally cease at the end of each individual agreement.

Expected Outcomes

Leisure Link sessions will no longer be offered to people who are FACS eligible or for those who are non FACS eligible. All current support will cease by an agreed date.

What Will Be Different?

The type and variety of respite/short break options for people who are not FACS eligible and live with unpaid carers will reduce.

What Savings can be achieved?

If the Leisure Link Service is ceased then £275,000 can be saved. There are currently 61 people who are not FACS eligible receiving support from the Leisure Link Service and 73 people who are FACS eligible (who are currently being phased out). The total number of families currently supported is 134 & the sessions delivered to all people in July 2013 was 452 (i.e. 1,299 hours of support). The Leisure Link Service receives approx 14 new referrals per month.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|--------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Leisure Link CSWs, | | | 0.275 | | | | 0.275 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.275 | --- | --- | --- | 0.275 |

Equality Analysis

609 - Leisure Link (providing additional respite to Unpaid Carers)

Name/Nature of the Decision

To cease the Leisure Link Services to meet the identified savings plan under the Critical Challenge Programme

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To cease the Leisure Link Service

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 new referrals from adults with disabilities and their family carers for those who do not meet Lancashire's FACS criteria.

The service provides short term support for a maximum of 6 months 3 hrs per week (on average).

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 – new referrals from adults with disabilities and their family carers who wish to access the service for short term support.

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

See 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.)

N/A

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 decision will impact on people with disabilities and their family carers who wish to access the service but who fall outside of Lancashire's FACS criteria. This

proposal will only affect new referral to 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)

As part of the Critical Challenge Savings Programme, public consultation will take place in January 2014.

For people currently supported by the service it is anticipated that their package of support will not be affected as our commitment to support will have ended naturally before the service is required to cease.

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 this proposal will only affect people with disabilities and their family carers who wish to self refer to the service for short term supports (non FACS eligible).

Consideration has been given to the possible impact on the caring relationship as ceasing the Leisure Link Service will mean that there is a reduction in the availability of non residential respite options for people who do not meet Lancashire's FACS criteria.

The cessation of the service may also impact on wellbeing of individuals with disabilities within a 'cared for' relationship with a family member in cases where the support offered minimises an escalation of need. However the service will offer advice and guidance as to alternative offers within the local community including Help Direct and Carers Centres.

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 – there is also a proposal to reduce the capacity of support within the in-house provider Volunteer Service which also supports people with a disability who do not meet Lancashire's FACS criteria.

This may have a detrimental impact on the overall range of offers available to people within this group but it is anticipated that this will be minimal.

Alternative Volunteer Services are also available across the county as part of the VCF Sector.

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:

The service will not have a detrimental impact on any current customers and their family carers as their packages of support will not be affected & are due to cease by 31st March 2014

Whilst the service will no longer be available to new customers as of November 2013, the service will offer assistance to families by seeking alternative offers of support from across the 3rd Sector by directing people to Help Direct and the Carers Centres.

The Critical Challenge programme will need to seek alternative sources of savings if this proposal is disregarded

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.

New referrals to the service wef November 2013 will no longer be accepted and people will be advised of alternative supports available from across the 3rd and VFC Sectors with the additional support from Help Direct and Carers Centres.

For customers currently on the waiting list to be matched with a support worker, the service will continue to work with these customers but supports will only be available for a maximum of 3 months rather than the current 6 months. This will ensure that no one's support package will be terminated early should this proposal be accepted.

People currently with an active support package will be supported until the end of their agreement at which point their support package will naturally cease.

All current packages of support will cease naturally and timescales will be monitored to achieve the final cessation of the service to customers.

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 proposal to cease the Leisure Link service will generate savings for the authority in the region of £275,000

Consideration would need to be given to alternative sources of savings from within the Social Inclusion Service should this proposal not be accepted.

There will be no detrimental impact on current customers.

The impact on people seeking to access the service will be minimal as alternative support options are available from services within the 3rd and VCF Sectors across the county.

There is a risk to reputation for the authority which seeks to support carers in their role, however this is not a statutory service nor does it support people who are in most need of the Local Authorities services as customers of Leisure Link fall outside of the FACS eligibility criteria.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

It is proposed that the Leisure Link Service is ceased.

Current customers will not be detrimentally impacted by this decision and their packages of support will be maintained until they naturally come to a close.

People with disabilities and their family carers who wish to access the service will no longer be accepted as a new referral and they will be re-directed to alternative supports available from across the 3rd Sector with the support of Help Direct and Carers Centres

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Feedback from the public consultation

Customer feedback

Equality Analysis Prepared By Heather Bryan
Position/Role Service Improvement & Modernisation Officer
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager Mary Lawrenson
Decision Signed Off By Steve Gross
Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 610 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Remodelling workforce in former NHS operated learning disability (LD) supported living schemes |
| Sponsor | Steve Gross |
| Objective | A more affordable and flexible workforce delivering services on behalf of four providers. |

Scope

Four providers are involved delivering services to adults with Learning Disabilities who have inherited staff from NHS whose terms and conditions are not competitive with labour market rates.

Expected Outcomes

More flexible workforce enabling response to personalisation.
Lower unit costs.

What Will Be Different?

Terms and conditions of staff affected.

What Savings can be achieved?

Financial modelling suggests approx £4.3m.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Provider 1 | underway | | 3.200 | | | | 3.200 |
| Provider 2 | underway | | 0.080 | 0.100 | | | 0.180 |
| Provider 3 | negotiation | | 0.150 | | | | 0.150 |
| Provider 4 | approval & negotiations | | | 0.400 | 0.400 | | 0.800 |
| | | --- | 3.430 | 0.500 | 0.400 | --- | 4.330 |

Equality Analysis

610-Remodelling workforce in former NHS operated learning disability (LD) supported living schemes

Name/Nature of the Decision

Creative Support – Extension of North Lancashire Contract and Agreement to Principles of variations for North and East contracts

The Cabinet Member for Adult and Community Services is recommended to:

- (i) Note the report and agree to the recommended action;
- (ii) Recommend that the Deputy Leader of the County Council approves a waiver of Procurement Rule 6.1 of the County Council's procurement rules to enable the County Council to extend this contract for an initial two year period with the option for the County Council to extend for a further period of up to one year at the end of that period without advertising.
- (iii) Endorse negotiating principles to allow revision of the terms of the contracts between the County Council and Creative Support which will:
 - reduce the effective hourly contract price towards the local benchmark levels for Learning Disability supporting living services;
 - provide a degree of transitional funding for affected former NHS employees faced with reductions in take home pay; and
 - continue to provide funding for Creative Support's former NHS employees to retain membership of the NHS Pension Scheme,

Subject to the approval of recommendations (i) and (ii), the Deputy Leader of the County Council is asked to approve the waiving of Procurement Rule 6.1 and approve the extension of the existing contract with Creative Support for an initial two year period with the option for the County Council to extend for a further period of up to one year at the end of that period on the terms as set out in the report.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The County Council has had talks with Creative Support to see how it could reduce the effective hourly contract price towards the local benchmark levels for Learning Disability supporting living services in Lancashire. For Creative Support this means addressing the costly terms and conditions associated with former NHS employees who were Tupe transferred to Creative Support at the point they began to run the service.

To enable this to be managed it is proposed to extend the existing North Lancashire contract for an initial two year period, extending to January 2016 with the option for the Council to extend for a further period of up to one year at the end of that period

until January 2017. This extension will enable Creative Support to progress its modernisation programme.

Creative Support is likely to take a similar approach in its consultations and negotiations with staff and trade unions as it has done previously in other local authority areas and indeed other organisations have made comparable workforce changes in Lancashire in the last 2 years. The report therefore seeks endorsement for the County Council to take a similar line as it has done so before in supporting such workforce modernisations but looking to mitigate its impact by offering some transitional funding on pay and longer term funding in support of NHS Pensions membership.

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.

Service users

There are 30 people with learning disabilities supported by Creative Support in 7 households and 2 people with non 24hr supports in North Lancashire and another 13 people supported in East Lancashire affected by this decision.

It is the current users of these specific services that could experience impact, and those staff who are employed in the services.

It is anticipated that the impact of changes on existing services users will remain broadly neutral the same but with continued improvements in quality, value for money and personalisation of services in line with good practice.

Staff

It will also impact on the staff who work in these services.

The total number of staff affected is now is 77, this can be expected to reduce to 75 over the next six months with planned retirements

- Lancaster District - there are 48 former NHS staff still working in this service
- Hyndburn and Ribble Valley - there are 29 former NHS staff still working in this service

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.

Age

Age group affected will be people aged between i.e. 18 – 85 years approx. Within individual (small) services average age varies, but overall there is an increasingly aging population of people living in these services.

Staff will also be in this age range 18 to 65 years.

Disability

The people who use these services will all have learning disabilities in addition some people also have mental health difficulties and physical disabilities, typically these will be long term conditions.

Gender

All the services are open to both men and women. The support is delivered in shared households with the majority of people supported being male.

There are more females than males working in these former NHS posts

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

yes

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.

Service Users

There are 43 people within a range of 24 hour domiciliary support services, with each person having a tenancy agreement with a housing provider and direct care support commissioned through Adult and Community Services from this care provider. The support services are referred to as 'supported living'.

The current service delivery is for people with a learning disability and a number of people also have a physical disability and or one or more long term conditions.

For people with a learning disability there is a disproportionately higher number of men assessed and receiving a service – reflecting the relative proportion of conditions leading to a learning disability which affect men more than women.

The remodelling of the service is unlikely to have a significantly disproportionate impact on either gender.

In relation to people with physical disabilities and mental health problems under 65 who seek or receive social care services there is a tendency for a greater proportion of men to be offered assessments but for a more or less equal proportion of men and women to receive services.

Table 1: Percentage by gender and disability of people offered an assessment and those receiving a service.

| Service user group | Male % | Female % |
|---|--------|----------|
| Learning disability offered assessment | 60.5 | 39.5 |
| Learning disability receiving a service | 53.3 | 46.7 |
| Physical disability offered an assessment | 51.4 | 48.6 |
| Physical disability receiving a service | 49.5 | 50.5 |
| Mental health offered an assessment | 56.2 | 43.8 |
| Mental health receiving a service | 51.4 | 48.6 |

Staff

The total number of staff affected is now is 77, this can be expected to reduce to 75 over the next six months with planned retirements

- Lancaster District - there are 48 ex-NHS staff still working in this service
- Hyndburn and Ribble Valley - there are 29 staff still working in this 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)

On the specifics of the recommendations in this report there has been no engagement with staff or service users. This will occur and be lead by Creative Support if the report is approved

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.

Service Users

The intention is that services will be strengthened by improved governance and contracting. Individuals supported by the service will have clarity regarding the real cost associated with meeting their needs. Improved participation and integration into community life is a key goal of this support service. Within that overall change process, some individuals may experience the prospect of changes to the services they use as a source of anxiety and so consultation and communication must be sensitive and effective to avoid. However it should be noted that people currently supported will not experience any significant remodelling to service delivery and therefore no adverse impact is anticipated.

Staff

For the staff affected, changes to their employment will only occur after appropriate consultation with trade unions and will follow agreed workforce agreements and legal frameworks. Any particular adverse impact that is identified for any individual or groups will be considered at that stage. However the end point of any consultation and negotiation process on this matter is likely to be reduced take home pay for staff who were formerly working for the NHS and were transferred across to Creative Support under TUPE. The potential reductions are very significant and so time and financial support to adjust will be important. For older employees in particular the commitment to ensure their NHS pensions will be protected will be important.

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.

Service Users

Will be supported to develop a better understanding of the cost of their care with support plans breaking down the costs of share and individual support. If the cabinet item is approved people supported in the service will be able to compare the cost and quality of supports available across Lancashire. This should be positive overall

Staff

Staff affected will be faced with reduction in their take home pay at a time when other economic and welfare benefit pressures are impacting very negatively on many people's household budgets

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

Overall the proposals will maintain agreed levels of support for individuals service users i.e. people with learning disabilities. The agreed levels of support are determined by the individual assessments of need.

For staff, consultations about the proposals will go ahead if the cabinet report is approved. This will share openly the proposed changes to the cost of support for individual service users and the changes to the take home pay for staff. These consultations and negotiations will be lead by Creative Support, but the report's recommendations leaves some flexibility for the County Council as to how it responds to the request for transitional financial support in the light of representations from the workforce.

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.

For staff affected by the changes at these two services following the normal workforce agreements on consultation etc should help identify any further mitigating factors to assist individuals affected. The negotiating principles that are being suggested should leave room to respond to concerns about the scale of the reductions by agreeing timescales for implementation and securing continued NHS Pensions membership.

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.

Service Users

Overall the current service users of these services should continue to experience improvements in their support plans. However a small number of people currently using the two services may experience some anxiety about the proposals and how it will affect them.

Staff

Staff are very likely to be anxious and unhappy about the prospects of changes. For almost all of them this will mean adjusting to a new set of terms and conditions which will significantly reduce take home pay and offer less generous conditions than those that they have inherited from their previous NHS employment.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal remains the same as originally stated

People affected will be those who are supported by the service and those will be people with learning disabilities, but adverse impact will not be significant.

Former NHS staff will be very affected by the proposals and for them the impact will be significant and detrimental in terms of their terms and conditions.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

If this item is approved, it will lead to further consultations with staff and service users and other stakeholders to be lead by Creative Support.

Final agreement to any final proposals will be subject to sign off via contract variations between Creative Support and the County Council, so we will have a clear understanding of the final position before any deal is struck.

Equality Analysis Prepared By **Tony Pounder**

Position/Role **Head of Commissioning**

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 611 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Older People day Time Support |
| Sponsor | Terry Mears |
| Objective | To remodel, re-commission and re-shape a range of traditional older people day centres and services, within the context of self directed support and personal budgets. Working with providers to shift activity from block contract arrangements to spot purchase from personal budget holders. To shift activity from traditional day centres to more natural community locations and in turn maximise local assets and universal services and reduce impact on personal budget thresholds. |

Scope

All existing older peoples day services across the County, including those run by Lancashire County Commercial Group (LCCG), independent and Voluntary and Community Faith Sector (VCFS) sector.

Expected Outcomes

Improved life opportunities and reduce impact of long term conditions and ageing which will in turn reduce demand and delay demand on long term support needs.

What Will Be Different?

There will be fewer building based services, more community assets utilised, a small number of block contract arrangements for enhanced dementia day care

What Savings can be achieved?

There will be savings of £1 million over the three year period through specific procurement and remodelling activity, identified in the three locality plans, to reflect local need.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.400 | | 1.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.300 | 0.300 | 0.400 | --- | 1.000 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ACS | DPO | 612 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Self Directed Supports |
| Sponsor | Terry Mears Barbara Lewis |
| Objective | Implement new customer journey for self directed supports. The key elements have been co-produced through a series of workshops and focus on advice and information, reablement, assessment and resource allocation, support planning, sign off, direct payments, provider review and time to think. The pathway will streamline and remove unnecessary assessment, paperwork and hand offs. The new process will be more efficient for the County council and be easier and more accessible for citizens to navigate. The new pathway will also have an intended impact of reducing and delaying long term support needs directly and indirectly, linking to other key savings initiatives. |

Scope

All adult citizens who are fair access to care (FACS) eligible and access non residential and nursing support.

Expected Outcomes

Improved life opportunities and reduce impact of long term conditions and ageing which will in turn reduce demand and delay demand on long term support needs. Efficient and simple self directed supports process, increased uptake of direct payments

What Will Be Different?

Non residential / nursing care (FACS eligible) will be delivered through personal budgets, with the option to take a personal budget as a direct payment safe and simple.

What Savings can be achieved?

There will be savings of £0.5 million over the three year period, through delaying and reducing impact on long term support needs, through early and effective advice, information, reablement and support planning.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.100 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.550 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.100 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.150 | 0.550 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 702 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Youth Services |
| Sponsor | Bob Stott |
| Objective | To review the management, support and operational arrangements of the Service in the light of the forthcoming budgetary pressures. |

Scope

The review will focus on all aspects of the Service including:

- Senior and Operational Management arrangements;
- Young People's Service (YPS) policy development and fieldwork support;
- Service delivery with young people and families;
- Premises utilisation;
- Fleet arrangements;
- Operational support from central teams;
- Support to and collaborative working with outside agencies.

Expected Outcomes

Alternative Service management, support and delivery arrangements.
Identification of budget headings for savings.

What Will Be Different?

Restructured service delivery, both locations and number of days/evenings.
Revised staffing structure and establishment, both posts and Full Time Equivalents.
Changed arrangements with outside agencies and partners.

What Savings can be achieved?

The project aims to achieve £3m savings, by April 2017 at the latest. Whilst the total savings figure has been agreed, it is difficult at this stage to predict the balance to be achieved in years 2 and 3. An estimate however is provided in the following table; these figures will be confirmed in the autumn.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| CYP | Gross project saving | | 0.600 | 1.000 | 1.400 | | 3.000 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.600 | 1.000 | 1.400 | --- | 3.000 |

Equality Analysis

702 – Youth Services

Name/Nature of the Decision

The restructuring of the Young People's Service, in order to achieve its Budget Savings targets

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The county council proposes to reduce the Young People's Service core budget by £3m to £9m over the next 3 financial years; this will require a complete restructuring of the Service.

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.

Although Service provision in all Districts will be reduced, this will be based on comparative need, so some areas will be affected more than others.

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

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

Young People aged 13-19 (25 for those with additional support needs)

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.)

N/A

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 Service's age range is 13-19 (25 for those with additional support needs) – reductions in provision will therefore impact on younger people.

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 has taken place as yet. The Service is in the process of drawing up principles to underpin outline proposals, for consideration by senior officers and elected members. When the budget saving total is confirmed, including by how much in each of the three financial years, detailed proposals will be drawn up.

A full consultation process will then be undertaken, incorporating the views of young people, Service staff, other Directorate Services and partner agencies, Trade Unions, District and local communities likely to be affected by premises withdrawals.

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 level of budget savings to be met will require a withdrawal of service provision.

The Service will not be able to maintain current levels in the Districts. However, as retained provision will be focussed on groups and individuals most in need of support and access to activities/programmes, the proportion of work with targeted young people will increase.

Care will be taken to ensure that proposals and in due course decisions do not discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly.

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 is not known at this stage – we will undertake this analysis when the full impact of the forthcoming budget reductions across the county council is known.

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

We are still at the initial proposals development stage.

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.

In drawing up initial and in due course final proposals, targeted groups (such as BME young people, those with additional needs) and communities (such as high ranked Super Output Areas in Districts) will be prioritised, as far as it is practicable.

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 need for budget savings will require a full Service restructure, with wide spread withdrawal of provision.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Final proposals will be drawn up and circulated once the feedback from the planned consultation process has been analysed.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The process will be monitored during the restructuring process and at the end of the financial year following the conclusion of the process.

Equality Analysis Prepared By John Gordon

Position/Role Head of Integrated and Targeted Support for Young People

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 703 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Discretionary Mainstream Home to School Transport (including unsuitable routes) |
| Sponsor | Mike Hart |
| Objective | Review and develop options for the reshaping of the Council's Discretionary Home to School Transport Policies. |

Scope

All aspects of mainstream home to school transport where the Council exercises discretion beyond the statutory requirements. The areas of discretion are:

- Discretionary Denominational Transport
- Discretionary Assistance for pupils in Years 6, 10 & 11
- Discretionary Assistance based on Admissions Geographical Priority Areas (GPAs) and shared parish arrangements
- Temporary Discretions for Special Cases e.g. Medical Needs, Rehousing
- Fair Access
- Managed Moves

Other areas of scope within mainstream home to school transport policy

- Charge for replacement / amended passes
- Increase fares for non statutory passengers
- Provide minimum capacities on subsidised services
- Review mode of transport provision for all entitled pupils (e.g. use of collector taxi's)
- Review of unsuitable routes

Specialist Transport for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) is dealt with separately as part of the accessible transport review

Expected Outcomes

25% increase in contributory charge for denominational transport and an annual increase thereafter in line with RPI + 2% (90% of expenditure on discretionary transport is on denominational transport); removal of other areas of discretionary transport (other than in very limited areas that explicitly support broader Council objectives or Educational attainment for vulnerable pupils, such as low income families); increased fares for non statutory passengers; reviewing modes of transport provision for all entitled pupils; and charge increases for replacement/ amended passes. All effective from September 2014 except for discretionary assistance based on GPAs and shared parish arrangements which will be effective from September 2015.

Reviews of unsuitable routes and the provision of minimum capacities on subsidised services will be the subject of a further work with Environment Directorate, to be complete during the current financial year and effective from September 2014.

What Will Be Different?

A significant increase in fares pertaining to denominational transport; and increase in fares for non - statutory passengers and no transport assistance in other areas of discretion unless from low income family or special (restricted) discretion is applied.

Reduction in transport capacities will impact on non -statutory passengers and parents will need to find alternative means of transport in future. Individual schools could be impacted upon as a result of a reduction in capacities, as with removal of assistance associated with GPAs and shared parishes.

What Savings can be achieved?

Savings as a result of the measures being considered are as follows (built up each year):

Year 1 (2014/15) – £616,377
Year 2 (2015/16) – £1,098,070
Year 3 (2016/17) – £1,139,326
Year 4 (2017/18) – £1,159,326
Year 5 (2018/19) – £1,179,326
Year 6 (2019/20) – £1,199,326
Year 7 (2020/21) – £1,207,660

Estimates of savings as a result of reducing capacities and a review of unsafe routes cannot be made until the detailed work is completed.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this

link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.414 | 0.482 | 0.041 | 0.020 | 1.159 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.414 | 0.482 | 0.041 | 0.020 | 1.159 |

Equality Analysis

703-Discretionary Mainstream Home to School Transport (including unsuitable routes)

Name/Nature of the Decision

Review of Home to Mainstream School Transport Policy

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

There are a number of elements to the proposed policy changes in relation to the discretionary (non-statutory) elements of home to mainstream school transport provision. It is proposed that the changes will impact on all pupils that fall within the categories below apart from those from families on low income:

- To increase the costs of **discretionary** transport to faith schools from £380 to £475 per year;

- To increase the fares and season ticket costs by up to 25% for other groups of **non-statutory** travellers that use capacity on local authority contracted vehicles;
- To introduce/increase the charge for amended/replacement bus passes;
- To alter modes of transport for getting children to the nearest bus stops in rural areas; and
- To cease to provide other **discretionary** elements of home to mainstream school transport apart from in very specific circumstances.

The changes will impact from September 2014 except where the change may impact on parental preference for schools, in which cases the change will be effective from September 2015. The Cabinet Member Report entitled ' Review of Home to Mainstream School Transport Policy' dated 10 October 2013 provides more details.

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 proposal is County wide. Certain families with school age children will be affected.

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

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 proposals will impact on families with school age children who are not entitled to statutory transport provision to school but would receive discretionary transport assistance under current policy. It is estimated that this will impact on around 8,750 children out of 153,300 school age children when fully implemented i.e. 5.7% of the school age population. One of the largest of the above groups is those children that attend a faith school where there is no statutory entitlement to school transport assistance. Not all children that attend faith schools do so because of their parents' religion or belief. It is estimated that around 2,700 secondary age children will be impacted and a small number of primary age children, once the proposal is fully implemented. The 2,700 children referred to are those children that attend faith schools with no statutory entitlement to travel because there is a nearer school to where they live. It will include both children who have accessed the provision under the faith criterion in the admission arrangements and other children that have been admitted under other criterion (siblings or distance usually) but not on faith grounds.

The religions affected are Church of England and Catholic, with very few children from other faiths.

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)

An on-line questionnaire via the LCC web site was made available between 21 October and 29 November 2013. Head teachers were sent a letter via the portal advising them of the consultation and asking them to refer to the consultation in any planned newsletters to parents. A total of 1,023 responses were received, 439 (43%) of which were from parents/ carers of two faith secondary schools. Given that around 8,750 children may be impacted and there are 153,300 statutory age school children in mainstream schools, the response rate was relatively low. The results of the consultation will be reported in full when the Cabinet Member makes the final decision in the February cycle (including where the responses have come from, how many, and what they said as part of the report).

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 proposals are lawful as they relate only to the discretionary elements of transport provision which the LA is not required by statute to provide. The vast majority of individuals affected by the policy change (6,590 of the 8,750) will be impacted in financial terms. In other words, there will still be a bus service to school but it will cost considerably more than it currently does. However, fares will still be heavily subsidised by LCC and low income families are not impacted by the increased costs (or cessation of other discretions). In addition, individuals will still be able to appeal to the Student Support Appeals Committee which allows parents to make complaints; request a review of a decision around eligibility for transport assistance, or to request discretion on the grounds of special personal circumstances.

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.

The proposals will impact on hard pressed families that are not defined as 'low income' families, but nevertheless are experiencing financial difficulties as a result of the recession and rising prices. This may be keenly felt if they have more than one child that is affected by the proposal. However, evidence shows that the introduction of a £380 per annum flat rate contributory charge for denominational transport in September 2011 has not had any overall impact on parental preference patterns for schools and Church schools have generally maintained, and even improved, their share of pupils even with the current downturn in the amount of pupils presenting for secondary education.

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

Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Schools will make the decision on each aspect of the proposed policy changes. However, it will be recommended that the proposals should stand unchanged because:

- the County Council will still be heavily subsidising the costs of discretionary transport and, therefore, shielding parents from the full costs (many other LAs have removed discretionary transport assistance altogether);
- when charges to denominational transport were introduced it had no impact on parental preferences for faith schools, indicating that parents were prepared to pay the charge or find an alternative means of travelling to school rather than select a school closer to home;
- there is the right to appeal to Student Support Appeals Committee to hear individual cases.

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.

Children from low income families are not impacted by the proposed changes. There is the right to appeal to Student Support Appeals Committee to hear individual cases.

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.

There is a need to make significant savings to the County Council's revenue budget and a range of policy saving measures is currently being considered across all

Directorates. The proposed changes to home to mainstream school transport only affect discretionary elements and low income families are protected from the impacts. If the proposal is not implemented, savings will need to be made in other policy areas, and the negative impacts on groups of individuals sharing protective characteristics may be far greater than those identified in this area.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal remains the same as identified in the Cabinet Member Report dated 10 October 2013 and throughout this report.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Parental preferences for admission to schools are monitored on an annual basis. Appeals to Student Support Appeals Committee are monitored regularly.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Lynn Mappin

Position/Role Head of Service: Pupil Places and Access

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 704 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Parent participation and engagement for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and their families |
| Sponsor | Sally Riley |
| Objective | <p>To disestablish the current Parent Partnership Service in Business Support Service and the five Parent Carer Liaison Officer (PCLO) posts and establish under Inclusion and Disability Support Service (IDSS) a 'Parent Representation and Engagement' team bringing Special Educational Needs (SEN) and disability together. The changes under the SEN Reforms will require all staff in the new team to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide advice, support and guidance to parent/carers of children and young people with SEND in line with the requirements of the Children and Families Bill SEND reforms and the revised SEN Code of Practice (due to receive Royal Assent in early 2014); • navigate parents through the Education Health and Care plan. EHC plans cover from 0 - 25 years of age with responsibility for 19+ being with ACS. For CYP the new team must address both education and care elements; • assist with representation at Parent Carer Forums (currently 7, possible increase to 12); • link to the Lancashire Carer Forum in ACS; • update the Lancashire Local Offer, informing the relevant level of district provision and help to maintain the IT platform; and • support parent/carers with disagreement resolution meetings and where appropriate, SEND Tribunals |

Scope

The Parent Partnership Service is currently located within the Business Support and Efficiency Service and formed part of a parent representation service which was originally established within Children's Integrated Services in Lancashire around 2005. The Parent Partnership Service's stated aim is;
 "To inform, assist and enable parents or carers, of children with additional needs or disabilities, to obtain the best possible educational outcomes for their child. This can be achieved by assisting parents and carers in making links between home, school, early years settings and Lancashire County Council."

The Special Educational Needs (SEN) Code of Practice requires local authorities to provide arms-length support to parents/carers where their child has an identified special educational need but the range and type of support offered is determined by the local authority. There are a number of Parent Partnership Officers (PPOs) and Choice Advisers who play an important role in helping parents 'navigate' through the SEN Code of Practice which, can be both challenging and distressing for parents coming to terms with their child's special educational needs. PPOs have also established four parent groups who meet regularly and one of the PPOs has some responsibility for providing training which has been well regarded by those who have participated.

Since 2009/10, the Inclusion and Disability Support Service (IDSS) was established to provide a coherent, seamless approach to identifying and assessing CYP with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and disability which includes staff with a wide range of skills to specify needs, intervention strategies, outcome-based programmes/targets, monitoring and evaluating that needs are met, outcome-based commissioning of services to support the child, their parent/carers and family. Staff within the Service work closely with parent/carers once needs are identified requiring special education provision. Similarly, IDSS provides support to parents where their child is eligible for children with disabilities social care support and to this end, the Service established (as required within the Children Act and Children and Families Bill) the Lancashire Parent/Carer Forum (LPCF) and its seven area/locality fora. This has proved highly successful with over 3,000 parent/carers registered with the Family Information Network Directory (FIND) and a very high level of representation at local fora and the county LPCF. The parent/carers fora are supported by 5 Parent Carer Liaison Officers who arrange and support meetings, provide training, act as information sources or sign posters to service provision and organise events as part of the Lancashire Break Time provision. LPCF is the medium through which the County Council senior officers and Elected Members have met with parent/carers to discuss policy developments, agree funding support through parents leading commissioning for the short break programme and as the main vehicle for parent/carers consultation relating to SEN and disability matters.

Early support to parents should be carried out by IDSS staff across the service who have those links with parents already. However the lines have become blurred as to the role carried out by IDSS staff, PPOs and Parent Carer Liaison Officers (PCLO) has led to duplication of case management. Additionally, the current role carried out by

Choice Advisors has moved away from the intended function.

The new SEND Reforms have also signalled a significant change in the way that support and advice is given to parent/carers through the establishment of key working within the entire range of special educational needs but also social care and health support. Thus none of the current roles (PPOs, PCLOs nor Choice advisers), possess the full range of requisite skills to cover the new reforms and expectations. Thus it is proposed to dis-establish the current Parent Partnership Service roles and the Parent Carer Liaison Officer roles and their associated infrastructure and establish a single system of support and advice to parent carers on the full range of SEN and disability issues.

Expected Outcomes

- Consistent and coherent advice and support to parent/carers of children and young people with SEND within a single line management structure
- Remove duplication between two groups of staff covering similar functions
- Savings
- Compliance with the SEND reforms outlined in the Children and families Bill and revised (0-25 years) SEN Code of Practice

What Will Be Different?

- Consistent and coherent advice and support to parent/carers of children and young people with SEND within a single line management structure
- Remove duplication between two groups of staff covering similar functions
- Compliance with the SEND reforms outlined in the Children and families Bill and revised (0-25 years) SEN Code of Practice

What Savings can be achieved?

The Service is awaiting the details of SEND Reform legislative changes to review the impact on statutory requirements which is not due to receive Royal Assent until spring 2014. An estimate of £79k savings is anticipated at this stage.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Gross Project Savings | | 0.078 | | | | 0.078 |
| | Staff | | | | | | --- |
| | Consultancy | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.078 | --- | --- | --- | 0.078 |

Equality Analysis

704 - Parent Participation and Engagement for children and young people with special educational needs and disability (SEND) and their families

Name/Nature of the Decision

Parent participation and engagement for children and young people with SEND and their families

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To dis-establish the current Parent Partnership Service in Business Support Service and the five Parent Carer Liaison Officer posts and establish under Inclusion and Disability Support Service a 'Parent Representation and Engagement' team bringing SEN and disability together. The changes under the SEND Reforms will require all staff in the new team to:

- provide advice, support and guidance to parent/carers of children and young people with SEND in line with the requirements of the Children and Families Bill SEND reforms and the revised SEN Code of Practice (due to receive Royal Assent in early 2014);
- navigate parents through the Education Health and Care plan. EHC plans cover from 0 - 25 years of age with responsibility for 19+ being with ACS. For CYP the new team must address both education and care elements;
- assist with representation at Parent Carer Forums (currently 7, possible increase to 12);
- link to the Lancashire Carer Forum in ACS;
- update the Lancashire Local Offer, informing the relevant level of district provision and help to maintain the IT platform; and
- support parent/carers with disagreement resolution meetings and where appropriate, SEND Tribunals

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.

Affects all districts.

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.

Disability

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

Yes

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 group of people who will be affected by this decision can be identified by two specific protected characteristics; disability and age.

- **Children and young people with SEN do less well than their peers at school and college;**

- 1.55 million pupils in England have special educational needs (18.7%) whereas 26,669 pupils aged 5-16 (16.1%) or 28,010 (16.3%) pupils aged 3-19 in Lancashire have special educational needs.
- Boys are just over two and a half times (2.64) more likely to have statements of special education needs at primary school in Lancashire; and nearly three times (2.92) more likely to have statements at secondary school in Lancashire compared to girls.
- Lancashire pupils with SEN are more likely to have higher levels of absence from school. In 2011-12, persistent absence rates for pupils with statements of SEN were 11.5% (13% Eng), compared to 3.3% (4% Eng) for pupils with no SEN.
- Lancashire pupils with SEN are more likely to be excluded from school. In 2011-12, rates of fixed rate exclusions were 6.6% of pupils with statements of SEN (8.2% Eng), compared to 1.3% for pupils with no SEN (1.4% Eng).
- At Key Stage 4, 7.7% of Lancashire pupils with statements achieved a level 2 qualification including English and maths (8.4% Eng), compared to 68.3% of pupils with no SEN in 2012 (69.2% Eng).
- At Key Stage 2, 20% of Lancashire pupils with statements achieved the expected level in both English and maths (17% Eng), compared to 92% of pupils with no SEN (91% Eng).
- In the early years, the gap in levels of development between children with SEN and those without has widened from 43 percentage points in 2008 (39 Eng) to 49 percentage points in 2012 (46 Eng).

- **Employment outcomes for people with SEN and disabilities are very poor**

- In 2011, 48% of disabled people in Lancashire were in employment, compared to 78% of non-disabled people. If 78% of disabled people were employed, this would represent 130,000 more people in employment.

- **Young people with SEN are more likely to be out of education, training and employment**

- Young people in Lancashire with SEN are more than twice as likely not to be in education, employment or training (NEET). 13% of 16 – 18 year olds with LDD were NEET between April–October 2013, compared with 6.3% of all young people. The same study also found that disabled young people are more likely to be NEET at 18 than others.
- In Lancashire, 68% of looked after children in the school population have

special educational needs (71% Eng).

- Looked after children in Lancashire are two times more likely to have special educational needs in comparison to their peers. Latest data from 2013 show that 33% of Lancashire CLA have a statement of SEN and a further 35% have SEN without a statement. Only 32% of CLA do not have any SEN of any level. At present CLA numbers are increasing which would suggest that the number of CLA with SEN is also increasing.
- **Costs to the public purse of poor outcomes for people with SEN and disabilities**
 - The National Audit Office estimated that the cost to the public purse of supporting a person with a moderate learning disability through adult life (16–64) is £2–3 million. Equipping a young person with the skills to live in semi-independent rather than fully supported housing could, in addition to quality-of-life improvements, reduce these lifetime support costs by around £1 million. Supporting one person with a learning disability into employment could, in addition to improving their independence and self-esteem, reduce lifetime costs to the public purse by around £170,000.
 - Nationally, adult care costs for those with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are second only to the costs of supporting the elderly (£5.19bn compared to £8.79bn, 2011-12).

Race/ethnicity/nationality

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic. 81% of children with special educational needs or disabilities aged 5-16 in January 2011 were White British. Monitoring information would suggest that people from an ethnic minority background tend to be part of communities showing higher rates of deprivation.

Sex/Gender

Monitoring information from the school census of children and young people aged 5-16 taken in January 2011 illustrates that 71% of pupils with a statement of special educational need are male compared to 29% female. This may suggest that there could be a disproportionately negative affect on the long term prospects of male children and young people with a special educational need and thereby the type of support parents may seek through this approach.

The service does not anticipate any negative impact on the grounds of this protected characteristic in relation to the introduction of the transport banding system.

Religion/belief

We do not consistently collect data on the religion of parents who attend parent events or seek support and so are unable to assess the impact of these proposals on persons with this protected characteristic. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on people with different religious beliefs or with no religious belief.

Sexual orientation

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB) communities likely to be affected by revisions to the parent participation and engagement approach. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Gender Reassignment

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Trans communities likely to

be affected by revisions to the parent participation and engagement approach. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Marriage or civil partnership status

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave

Information on numbers of learners who are pregnant is not collected. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic

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)

This document relates to the initial proposals outlined above and as such, the service is at the beginning of the engagement process.

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.

Population figures imply that there is a higher level of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities in the known areas of deprivation across Lancashire; Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Rossendale and Wyre. The areas with least deprivation, Ribble Valley and Fylde have the lowest levels of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities. This supports national statistics that children and young people with SEND tend to come from low income families.

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.

The Welfare Reform Bill proposes a series of changes to the benefits system that include the introduction of universal credit and an overall benefit cap. This could result in changes or reductions in the amount of benefit that families receive increasing the financial difficulty that would be faced by families in having the capacity and means to seek parental support for their child or to access parent events/meetings.

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

The service is currently at the beginning of the process and, as such, is continuing with the original proposal. A meeting has already taken place with staff affected by the potential changes and work has commenced on identifying what we MUST-SHOULD-COULD and WONT do in relation to parent support and engagement in

future and in line with the major SEND legislative changes. Discussions are ongoing.

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.

The service is currently at the beginning of this process and consultation with staff and parents of CYP with SEND attending Lancashire Parent carer Forum or in receipt of Parent Partnership support will be consulted as part of this process.

Feedback from the consultation in general will help to inform additional mitigating actions that can be introduced to lessen any adverse impact of these proposals.

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.

There is a need to take some efficiency savings in this area upto £78k.

The new SEND Reforms have also signalled a significant change in the way that support and advice is given to parent/carers through the establishment of key working within the entire range of special educational needs but also social care and health support. Thus none of the current roles (PPOs, PCLOs nor Choice advisers), possess the full range of requisite skills to cover the new reforms and expectations.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

As we are at the beginning of this process there have been no changes to the initial proposals. However, there is the possibility of changes to the proposals following evidence gathered as part of the consultation process. This analysis will be reviewed during and at the conclusion of the proposed consultation.

The working proposal however is to dis-establish the current Parent Partnership Service roles and the Parent Carer Liaison Officer roles and their associated infrastructure and establish a single system of support and advice to parent carers on the full range of SEN and disability issues.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

We are at the very early stages of this work and consultation will be required with staff affected and also with parent/carers to ensure their views are included in co-designing and co-producing the new approach to parent participation and engagement.

During this time the service will be seeking to identify the full effects of the proposals through a series of consultation exercises. The outcomes of the consultation will be recorded and the equality analysis will be updated with the appropriate evidence which will help to inform the final proposals

Equality Analysis Prepared By Sally Riley

Position/Role – Head of Inclusion and Disability Support Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 705 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Charging for post 16 Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport |
| Sponsor | Sally Riley |
| Objective | <p>To amend the current Transport Policy for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) to include the introduction of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a flat rate charge of £475 for Post 16 students for transport to school and college. • an annual charge increase of inflation plus 2%. |

Scope

This policy option affects the CYP directorate which is currently responsible for transport arrangements for eligible SEND CYP up to the age of 19. Adult Services are responsible for post-19 SEND transport.

Financial support for post-16 transport is a discretionary policy area.

Requests for post-16 SEND transport assessments have increased three-fold since the policy was amended in 2008 in favour of free transport for all eligible SEND learners aged 16 to 24 attending further education which increased the home to school/college transport costs for children and young people with SEND for over 16's to c£2m per annum.

The current Transport Policy for Children and Young People with SEND provides free door to door transport for post 16 SEND students at an average cost of over £5,000 per student per year. During 2012/13, 515 post 16 SEND students received transport support.

Mainstream post-16 students in Lancashire attending school sixth forms and further education colleges do not receive any financial support from the Council to fund their transport costs.

Where a student is eligible to receive transport support to attend post-16 learning it is proposed to implement a flat rate charge of £475 per annum with an annual increase of inflation plus 2%.

The points to note within the charging policy are that;

- Where young people with SEND are from low income families, it is proposed that the charge would not apply. In addition, and to provide additional support to those working families on low incomes, it is proposed to extend the qualifying benefits, for this purpose, to those used to assess for free school meals together with maximum Working Tax Credit.
- Arrangements would be made for charges to be made as a one off annual payment at the time when transport is commissioned, or pay over monthly instalments by direct debit to help spread the cost over the year.
- On average, over 90% of the cost of transport support for Post 16 students with SEND would continue to be met by the Council.

To reduce the impact of these proposals on existing students the intention would be to phase in the charges over three years starting with new entrants in September 2014.

Expected Outcomes

A reduction in SEND transport costs.

What Will Be Different?

The County Council would provide home to school/college transport to eligible children and young people with SEND only and thereby all discretionary transport provision would cease.

What Savings can be achieved?

There are currently 515 students over the age of 16 in receipt of transport support. 15.1% of pre 16 pupils are eligible for free school meals as they meet the low income criteria. If it was assumed that the same percentage would apply to post 16 learners then the number of students who would be exempt from the charge would be 78.

If the proposed charges were introduced and phased in over three years, this would accrue estimated annual revenue of:

| Academic Year | Total Students | No of potential Low income @15.1% | No of students eligible for charge | Plus previous years students | Potential revenue |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Year 1 2014/15 | 277 | 42 | 235 | | £109,625 |
| Year 2 2015/16 | 258 | 39 | 219 | 235 | £217,963* |
| Year 3 2016/17 | 255 | 38 | 217 | 454 | £329,474* |

*Based on all current 2013/14 students continuing into Further Education.

* These figures are based upon a theoretical model and therefore precise savings cannot be determined at this time

As a result of the handling of the charges there will be additional administration costs. As the number of students paying the charge increases incrementally, the cost of the administration will increase also. It is anticipated that £2000 per year should be added for additional administration costs. The costs of the administration has been deducted from the income listed above.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this

link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Gross Project Savings | | 0.088 | 0.096 | 0.096 | | 0.280 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.088 | 0.096 | 0.096 | --- | 0.280 |

Equality Analysis

705 - Charging for post 16 Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) transport

Name/Nature of the Decision

Changes to the Home to School Transport Policy for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

It is proposed to amend the Home to School Transport Policy for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) to include;

- A contributory charge for post 16 SEND transport to be introduced at £475
- thereafter, from September 2015 onwards, the contributory charge to be increased at a rate reflective of the Retail Price Index plus 2%.

1.

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.

Affects all districts.

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.

Disability

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

Yes

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 group of people who will be affected by this decision can be identified by two specific protected characteristics; disability and age.

Typically, the transport policy for children and young people with SEND affects

people aged 5 to 21 who have special educational needs and/or disabilities and are entitled to receive transport support.

Although the pupils are referred to as SEND there are two distinct groups; special educational needs (SEN) and disability (D) and a pupil who has special educational needs may, or may not, also have a disability.

Those learners who will be affected by the proposal to introduce a flat rate charge for post 16 SEND transport support average between 450 to 520 students at any one time. All of this group will be subject to a charge for receipt of transport support to school or college.

Statistics illustrate a large gap between the attainment of pupils with Statement of Special Educational Need and other pupils. In 2009 Lancashire had a slightly smaller gap than that seen nationally at Key Stage 4 but this was still a significant 45.6%. During 2010 this gap widened in Lancashire to 47%.

This contributes to the fact that young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are twice as likely to be not in education, training or employment (NEET) as those without. In the current economic climate the opportunities in the employment market for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are likely to reduce further.

Often parents are on benefits due to full time carer responsibilities so the impact of these proposals is mitigated by the introduction of an exemption for families with low incomes.

Individuals who share other protected characteristics have been considered as follows;

Race/ethnicity/nationality

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic. 81% of children with special educational needs or disabilities aged 5-16 in January 2011 were White British. Monitoring information would suggest that people from an ethnic minority background tend to be part of communities showing higher rates of deprivation. Consequently, post 16 learners from an ethnic minority background may be more likely to incur the reduced charge applicable to learners from families on qualifying benefits.

Sex/Gender

Monitoring information from the school census of children and young people aged 5-16 taken in January 2011 illustrates that 71% of pupils with a statement of special educational need are male compared to 29% female. This may suggest that there could be a disproportionately negative affect on the long term prospects of male children and young people with a special educational need who may be discouraged from attending post 16 learning due to the associated transport costs.

The service does not anticipate any negative impact on the grounds of this protected characteristic in relation to the introduction of the transport banding system.

Religion/belief

We do not consistently collect data on the religion of learners who access SEND transport support and so are unable to assess the impact of these proposals on persons with this protected characteristic. There is no evidence to suggest that there

may be a disproportionately negative impact on people with different religious beliefs or with no religious belief.

Sexual orientation

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB) communities likely to be affected by revisions to the SEND Home to School Transport Policy. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Gender Reassignment

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Trans communities likely to be affected by revisions to the SEND Home to School Transport Policy. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Marriage or civil partnership status

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic. The proposed changes to the banding framework applies to all learners aged 5-24, with the vast majority aged pre 16. Those learners aged 16+ in receipt of transport support account for approximately 450 to 520 of the young people in receipt of transport support at any one time.

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave

Information on numbers of learners who are pregnant is not collected. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic

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)

This document relates to the initial proposals outlined above and as such, the service is at the beginning of the engagement process. The consultation to be held from 03 February to 25 April 2014 will produce significant further evidence of the impact of these proposals.

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 proposals for change apply to the transport policy for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities thus affecting those children and young people with SEND aged 5 to 24.

The proposal to introduce a flat rate charge for post 16 SEND learners will affect all those young people aged 16 to 19 who opt to continue in education.

The number of post 16 SEND learners who receive transport support is between 450 to 520 at any one time, all of whom, under the new proposals will be subject to a charge for receipt of transport support.

A benchmarking exercise with other local authorities has also been conducted to review the charging policies of other local authorities for this group of learners.

In addition to the impact felt by the young person any impact will also be felt across the family who, in the majority of cases, will be financially supporting the young person at this stage of their education.

Some families will struggle financially to meet the charge, juggling limited family finances to ensure that their child can attend further education. In the current economic climate many families have been affected by job losses and/or a general reduction in household income which will exacerbate their ability to find the money to meet the proposed charge.

Population figures imply that there is a higher level of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities in the known areas of deprivation across Lancashire; Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Rossendale and Wyre. The areas with least deprivation, Ribble Valley and Fylde have the lowest levels of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities. This supports national statistics that children and young people with SEND tend to come from low income families.

Often the parents are on benefits due to full time carer responsibilities so the impact of these proposals is mitigated by the proposal to apply an exemption for families on

qualifying benefits.

For those families where the young person continues to enter the further education system families may choose to utilise the public transport network rather than pay the required contribution, particularly where the young person has moderate learning difficulties.

This would result in a young person having to walk to a local bus stop and develop the skills required to navigate the public transport network.

Learners in possession of a Blind and Disabled Person Nowcard who are able to access the local bus network would fall under the concessionary scheme and would be eligible to travel free after 9.30am on weekdays, and for a heavily subsidised flat rate before 9.30am. However, they may not be able to access public transport vehicles, particularly if low floor vehicles are not used or are used inconsistently.

Whilst a developing independence is encouraged it is noted that there is evidence of harassment of SEND young people when travelling on public transport. The Council mitigates this impact through a range of safer travel initiatives delivered through the safer travel unit in conjunction with local bus operators.

There is the possibility that the introduction of charges could deter learners from participating in further education altogether.

There is a large gap between the attainment of pupils with a statement of special educational need and other pupils. In 2011 the gap between achievement of 5 GCSE's A* - C between these two groups was 52.2%.

Young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are twice as likely to be not in education, training or employment (NEET) as those without. In the current economic climate youth unemployment is expected to rise which can intensify the lack of employment prospects for young people with SEND, particularly if they have not progressed through the further education system.

The ability to access further education can lead to positive outcomes for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities supporting them to develop skills and aptitudes to go into sustainable employment and participate in their community.

Failure to achieve a positive outcome can result in isolation, depression and longer term poor health leading to a long term dependency on the benefit system.

If some SEND learners are deterred from entering into further post 16 learning as a result of the proposal to introduce charges this may have a significant long term impact on their health, wellbeing and quality of life.

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.

The Welfare Reform Bill proposes a series of changes to the benefits system that include the introduction of universal credit and an overall benefit cap. This could result in changes or reductions in the amount of benefit that families receive increasing the financial difficulty that would be faced by families incurring the charge for transport support.

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

The service is currently at the beginning of the process and, as such, is continuing with the original proposal. However, a comprehensive consultation will be held between 03 February and 25 April 2014 which will produce significant further evidence. Following a review of the consultation findings there is the possibility of change to the initial proposals.

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.

It is considered that the adverse effects of the proposed changes will be most keenly felt by those young people with SEND, and their families, who wish to enter further education and require transport support. Under these proposals this group of people will be required to pay a charge as a contribution to their transport support.

In mitigation the proposals take into account the impact of these charges on lower income families and include an exemption for families who are in receipt of qualifying benefits.

It is acknowledged that some families may still find it difficult to pay the charge upfront and therefore arrangements will be made to enable families to spread the

costs over the year and pay by monthly instalments.

The service will proactively promote the Blind and Disabled Persons Nowcard where a learner is able to access the local bus network and is eligible for free travel after 9.30am on weekdays and for a flat rate before 9.30am. The service will also enter into discussions with local further education providers to influence the impact of the disjointed nature of college timetables on the individual learner and their transport needs. All too frequently, local colleges provide courses for limited hourly sessions over the course of a week resulting in personalised taxi transport on each separate occasion. The Council will work to influence colleges to develop timetables that take transport issues into consideration.

As previously noted, families just above the threshold for qualifying benefits may not be able to afford the charges introduced by these proposals. To mitigate against this, we will work closely with the County Council's welfare rights service to develop strategies around ensuring that such families are fully aware of the welfare benefits for which they are eligible and to maximise the take up of benefits.

The service is currently at the beginning of this process and a comprehensive consultation is due to be held from 03 February to 25 April 2014. As part of this consultation an exercise will be conducted to identify the impact of the proposals on a sample group of families. Feedback from this exercise and from the consultation in general will help to inform additional mitigating actions that can be introduced to lessen any adverse impact of these proposals.

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 proposal to introduce a contribution towards the transport support provided to post 16 SEND students will produce annual budget savings of approximately £329,000 compared against a current annual expenditure of c£2.7 million.

The introduction of charges will have a negative impact on all the post 16 learners and their families who currently benefit from free transport to and from school/college who will be required to find the funds to meet the necessary contribution.

This impact will be felt, more specifically, by those families with a low income for whom the charge may not be affordable.

The introduction of the charges may result in some young people with SEND accessing the public bus network to travel to school or college which has its benefits in relation to developing a greater sense of independence and participation in public life. It can, however, also result in a young person with SEND being the subject of harassment and victimisation.

Further education has been proven to improve the outcomes for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities, supporting them to develop the skills and aptitudes to go into sustainable employment and participate in their community. Most significantly, the introduction of means tested charges for post 16 SEND students may deter families from encouraging participation in further education impacting on the long term opportunities and life chances of these young people.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

As we are at the beginning of this process there have been no changes to the initial proposals. However, there is the possibility of changes to the proposals following evidence gathered as part of the consultation process. This analysis will be reviewed during and at the conclusion of the proposed consultation.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The service will be conducting a comprehensive consultation with children and young people with SEND, their families and with the Parent/Carer forum from 03 February to 25 April 2014.

During that time the service will be seeking to identify the full effects of the proposals through a series of consultation exercises including direct contact with the families affected. The outcomes of the consultation will be recorded and the equality analysis will be updated with the appropriate evidence which will help to inform the final proposals.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Helen Green

Position/Role Service Compliance Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer Sally Riley

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| CYP | DPO | 707 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Review of CYP traded services |
| Sponsor | Stan Johnson |
| Objective | To consider methods through which to increase trading with new customers and partners. |

Scope

This option will identify opportunities for increased income through trading from 2014/15 and will incorporate a broader review of the approach to trading in the following service areas and to include other school facing traded services. The review will assess sufficiency, suitability and sustainability and the achievement of full cost recovery within each team.

The project will be closely linked to the development of a single traded services branding of Lancashire Learning Excellence (LLE). The project will be led by the Head of Development and Innovation and the Commercial Support Manager supported by the Heads of Service from the following teams:

- Governor Services
- Graduate Teacher Programme
- Lancashire Music Service
- Lancashire Professional Development Service
- PE, Sport and Outdoor Education Service

Expected Outcomes

Learning Excellence will expand markets and its provision to schools, Local Authorities, families and customers external to Lancashire schools to increase income and efficiencies to facilitate of full cost recovery on all trading within the service.

What Will Be Different?

Lancashire Learning Excellence already markets training courses to a significant number of Local Authorities and schools in Local Authorities outside of the Lancashire borders and will continue to do so. The difference will come from expanding existing and new services/markets as follows.

Continue to monitor and analyse creative charging models and practices to ensure the viability of work external to Lancashire to increase income generation.

Production of a brochure advertising the four Outdoor Education Centres in terms of the building and programme facilities they can offer to schools, youth groups and organisations, adults and families both in and outside of the Lancashire borders who are not using our services.

The School Development Service Programme will continue to seek opportunities to work with schools and clusters of schools outside of Lancashire.

Appropriate Body Services for Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) Induction are from September 2013 provided on a marketed basis to all schools in Lancashire. The Service continues to be offered to all Academies, Independent Schools and Further Education Colleges, both in and outside of the county boundaries.

Governor Services will continue to market its services and respond to requests from schools outside of Lancashire and Academies in Lancashire to provide clerking services.

The Music Service will target those schools who do not use its services in order to offer music tuition to all pupils in Lancashire schools.

What Savings can be achieved?

This policy option is concerned with income generation.

Significant efficiencies have been made in recent years including:

- amendments to service software to allow electronic bookings and confirmations
- the introduction of software system to enable more efficient tracking of instruments, customers, billing and pupil progression
- differentiated Service Level Agreements in Governor Services dependent upon the production of electronic or paper based Governing Body meeting support.

which maximise the opportunities to generate income from a service.

However, there are related costs in continuing to streamline and make processes more efficient including ICT development work to service software and the Lancashire Learning Excellence website and marketing costs to increase the profile of all Services.

Music Service from undertaking the 10% challenge have identified charging for demonstrations £5.5k, instrumental rental scheme £4k, early years resource materials £6k, ensemble at music centres £7k, grant applications for grant funded projects £9k and for e learning platform £15k.

Governor Services from undertaking the 10% challenge have identified income generation by charging for work currently undertaken for advice to Headteachers /Chairs of Governors for Option 1 schools £7k, for complaint investigation on behalf of chairs of governors £5k and Children's Centre governance advice, guidance and clerking £5k.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|--|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Music Service | Increased charges | | 0.046 | | | | 0.046 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Governor Services | Income Generation | | 0.017 | | | | 0.017 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | 0.063 | --- | --- | --- | 0.063 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 708 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Review of Lancashire Outdoor Education Provision |
| Sponsor | Mick Waplinton (Delegated by Stan Johnson) |
| Objective | Lancashire Outdoor Education (LOE) to target both income generation and efficiency savings. |

Scope

This option identifies opportunities for savings from 2014/15 through Lancashire Outdoor Education targeting both income generation and efficiency savings.

The core provision at the four Lancashire Outdoor Education centres is the delivery of programmes of Outdoor and Adventurous activities to the young people of Lancashire.

These outdoor learning packages are based on either a residential experience or Day visit and are accessed by young people via their school, Young People's service or other agency such as those in partnership with Lancashire Break Time.

The service also provides conferencing facilities, self-catering accommodation, camp sites, and individual and team/skill development courses.

The addition of the new building at Tower Wood to be operational by April 2014 will allow expansion and growth of core provision. The flexible accommodation will allow a diverse range of user groups to access the centre facilities – specifically children with disabilities and their families, larger young people's groups, separate schools at the same time whilst retaining the original house and its facilities.

A review of staffing requirements will be undertaken to ensure that the service meets business requirements whilst making savings on the current establishment.

Self Catering Provision coupled with the refurbishment of each sites Bungalows/ lodges will provide additional facilities to extend services to provide greater opportunities to increase income and an alternative income stream.

Instructor Training Scheme to be established to run over the winter months to provide training to aspirant instructors.

Review the remitted fees scheme to better target the available funding at eligible pupils recognising the additional income streams available to schools through the pupil premium.

Review course fees across the four centres and ensure comparability with local competitors.

New courses offered over winter 2012/13 to match provision offered by local competitors as identified on the visit approval system employed by Lancashire County Council (LCC).

Summer schools and Year 6/Year 7 transition courses utilising targeted pupil premium funds.

Increase marketing to distribute a brochure to market the Centre's services in relation to Adventurous and Outdoor learning activities, residential accommodation and conferencing facilities to other Local Authority Respite providers, schools and Young People's Services. The Service continues to develop its use of the Centre's Facebook and Twitter pages to advertise their presence directly to parents and other adults.

Expected Outcomes

It is expected that due to the significant investment in infrastructure that has expanded the capacity in each centre will generate a increase in bookings and numbers through each centre which will increase the efficiencies within the service.

Each of the four centres to develop their accommodation available to potential visitors with the Tower Wood new build offering an increase of 60 beds from the centre's current level of 48 beds, while Whitehough, Hothersall Lodge and Borwick Hall will each have refurbished self-catering units available for visitors.

New courses and fee increases to add to income generation.

Reduced remitted fees.

What Will Be Different?

Continue the current review of delivery staff to ensure the appropriate mix of permanent staff and freelance instructors required to maintain both quality of provision, breadth of service offer and required activity-based qualifications, whilst enhancing the match of staffing availability to customer needs. The service Senior Management team is comprised almost exclusively of qualified teachers and this will remain in place to ensure the quality of teaching and learning is maintained at its present high standard.

Each of the four centres to develop their accommodation available to potential visitors with the Tower Wood new build offering an increase of 60 beds from the centre's current level of 48 beds, while Whitehough, Hothersall Lodge and Borwick Hall will each have refurbished self-catering units available for visitors.

At Whitehough, the establishment of 'camping pods' will allow an increase in capacity of 12 beds designed to attract Duke of Edinburgh Scheme and early years groups amongst others. The proposed letting rate would be £40 per Pod / per night with a potential £120 per night income.

Instructor Training Scheme 10-12 week duration and current commercial fees charged by other providers are in the region of £5000 - £6000. Expectation is that up to 5 individuals would enrol on the scheme generating up to £25,000 income.

Remitted Fees. The current 'subsidy' to eligible pupils of 80% reduction on standard fees resulted in a cost to LCC of £109,000. It is proposed that with the introduction of Pupil Premium funding allocated to schools that a gradual reduction in remitted fees could be achieved without jeopardising pupil access to the centres. It is proposed that the reduction reduces to 70% in 2014/15 and then to 60% in 2015/16 the saving to LCC would ultimately be £27,000p.a.

Consistency in course fees between the centres and increased charges to market levels for day visits, conferencing and minibus usage.

3 day/ 2 night residential packages offered to all but targeted to LCC schools currently booking residential with non LCC centres during periods of spare capacity within LOE.

Summer schools and Y6/Y7 transition courses utilising targeted pupil premium funds.

What Savings can be achieved?

We will improve efficiency by increasing our residential capacity and restructuring two key staff elements – through greater flexibility in delivery staff and administrative efficiencies.

Reducing remitted fee subsidy to Free School Meal (FSM) pupils from the current 80% subsidy to 60% over 2 years will have direct financial savings to LCC.

The addition of the new building at Tower Wood to be operational by April 2014 will allow expansion and growth of core provision this could generate a saving of £25k in 2014/15 which is expected to increase savings to £100k+ over subsequent years.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|--|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| LOE | Remitted Fees | | 0.014 | 0.027 | | | 0.041 |
| LOE | Staff | | | 0.016 | | | 0.016 |
| LOE | Income | | 0.025 | 0.025 | 0.050 | | 0.100 |
| | | --- | 0.039 | 0.068 | 0.050 | --- | 0.157 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 709 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Review of Quality & Continuous Improvement - Lancashire Schools Effectiveness Service (QCI-LSES) services provided to schools |
| Sponsor | Alison Gradwell (Delegated by Johnathan Hewitt) |
| Objective | Review of services provided to schools to ensure the correct attribution of responsibilities between the local authority and schools. |

Scope

Analysis of school improvement service – what schools fund, what Forum funds and what the Local Authority (LA) funds.

Review methods of delivery for example Education Welfare Officers (EWO) devolution to primaries can it be provided via a different route, charge schools for Court Officer time.

Prioritise resources.

2013/14 Work with schools to prepare for the movement of a large number of school improvement support activities to a traded offer.

2014/15 The great majority of activities to support schools and raise achievement become traded : support for behaviour in schools is reduced : the development of IT solutions to improve traded products are met from the traded income.

2015/16 Behaviour support is further reduced and racist incident monitoring ceases.

2016/17 Behaviour Support services cease.

Expected Outcomes

Services will continue to provide services but at a reduced level and cash limit.

What Will Be Different?

Certain functions will be reduced with a increases in trading in a few areas.

What Savings can be achieved?

Savings total of £0.33m over a 3 year period and relate to a combination of increased income and reduced service delivery costs.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Project Delivery Costs | | 0.025 | 0.119 | 0.088 | | 0.232 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.025 | 0.119 | 0.088 | --- | 0.232 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 710 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Review of school attendance responsibilities. |
| Sponsor | Jonathan Hewitt |
| Objective | Refine service provision on the support offered by the School Attendance Service |

| Scope |
|---|
| <p>Strand 1: Remove or offer as a traded service some non-statutory functions. This could include current training courses offered free of charge, and participation in partnership meetings, school meetings such as governor meetings, new parents' evenings etc. This could be delivered without significant impact on functions we must provide as these reduced commitments would allow the remaining staff to cover those functions adequately.</p> <p>Strand 2: Reorganise/restructure service to reduce staffing costs. This saving would require staff to move to term time only and a restructure. For this reason this saving is initially projected over two years but work is underway to see if it can be advanced.</p> <p>Strand 3: Reduction in overall budget.</p> |

| Expected Outcomes |
|---|
| Some non compulsory activity will cease, unless a traded service is viable. Other functions will continue but delivered by the majority of staff on a Term Time Only basis, ensuring capacity is there during term time but enabling savings to be made during holiday periods when service delivery needs are lower. |

| What Will Be Different? |
|--|
| An increase in the amount of trading and reduced level of annual staffing hours. |

| What Savings can be achieved? |
|---|
| Savings will be achieved by a combination of income generating measures such as the appropriate use of fines and through staffing restructures. |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|--|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Gross Project Savings | | 0.065 | 0.099 | 0.031 | | 0.195 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.065 | 0.099 | 0.031 | --- | 0.195 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number |
|-------------|------|--------|
| CYP | DPO | 711 |

| Live/Active |
|-------------|
| 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Virtual School Review |
| Sponsor | Audrey Swann |
| Objective | Review of Virtual School for looked after Children. |

Scope

Review of Virtual School for Children Looked After (CLA)

- Reduction in discretionary functions which to date have led to increased and improved educational progress for Children Looked After

This could be compensated by:

* From April 2013 all schools will receive £900 Pupil Premium for every CLA (increasing to £1900 from April 2014). New OFSTED criteria indicate that schools will be accountable for how this funding is utilised to improve education for CLA

* Lancashire schools receive £1200-£1500 within the school funding formula for every CLA

* All schools are responsible for providing support (the first £10,000) for any pupil with identified Special Educational Needs (SEN)

However :

- The Local Authority (LA) via the Virtual School for CLA must provide bursaries for all CLA accepted on Higher Education Courses

- We are committed to the Children in Care Council for next 2 years

* Review of Virtual School / Local Authority Roles and Responsibilities: - Possible saving of the role or number of Educational Consultants (currently 4) i.e. monitoring and tracking, training for schools, foster carers etc. - could be undertaken by Advisers. The LA is responsible for collecting and monitoring educational data in relation to CLA. This is an area of responsibility which could fit with an adviser's role, and is being trialled to some extent at present.

* Quality and Continuous Improvement (QCI)/Adviser support would be essential to continue to develop effective monitoring of the educational progress of all Lancashire's CLA, in the event of the reduction/removal of Educational Consultant posts and to challenge schools via their designated teachers for CLA, to effectively promote aspirational educational targets and outcomes for Lancashire's CLA accommodated within and outside of the LA. Initially (2013-2014) an enhanced service level agreement would be beneficial. This service by the advisors would have cost and capacity implications. This cost is difficult to estimate as it would have to be based on a commission to include the monitoring and training (if included) from the advisory service, which will take longer to acquire.

* Possible risk factor is that Advisory service is traded and this could potentially impact on the level of challenge to schools- the Educational Consultants are independent.

- Central system for collection of data.

This could support the reduction in consultants by reducing work/time required to collect a range of data. Specialist analysis of the data would still be required –i.e. Virtual School Head, consultants.

Expected Outcomes

Savings implemented from April 2014

Some impact on work of advisory service.

Reduced specialist training to groups such as foster cares/social workers – but with possibility of developing traded training to these groups.

Possible increase on proactive use of Pupil Premium within schools.

What Will Be Different?

Reduction in Virtual Team staff with impact on operational delivery. Elements such as monitoring and data analysis will need to be supported by other services –such as school advisory service as would training for Senior Designated Persons in schools.(responsibility of LA)
 Reduction in Care Matters Grant- impact on grants available to CLA- this could/should be compensated for by increase in Pupil Premium to schools and more targeted use of this funding. This would need to be monitored by advisers/Virtual school team/ Social Workers through PEPS. (Personal Education Plans).
 If focus on targeted use of PP within schools is successful further reductions in Care Matters funding could be considered (except for statutory ie Bursaries for Higher Education and Children in Care Council).

What Savings can be achieved?

Reduction in staff team: 2 Full Time consultants- one qualified teacher on leadership = £96,000.00
 Reduction in Care Matters funding - support funding for activities/grants for CLA = £90,000.00
 Remove funding for literacy/ICT/education equipment - as above = £64,000.00

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?
 Amount of funding required?
 What is the funding required for?

No

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
 Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | Gross Project Savings | | 0.250 | | | | 0.250 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.250 | --- | --- | --- | 0.250 |

Equality Analysis

711 – Virtual School Review

Name/Nature of the Decision

The Restructure of Virtual School for Children looked After

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To reduce the number of Educational Consultants employed by ACERS Virtual School for Children Looked After Team from 4 to 2 (50% reduction)

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.

Currently 3 Educational Consultants each support the Children looked after and their schools within an area of Lancashire ; North, South, East and one consultant tracks Lancashire Looked After Children who are educated out of Lancashire. Currently this does not always provide equality of access as each area varies in the number of CLA.

The restructure proposal, despite a reduction in one area post, will ensure equality of access to support across the county as each consultant will cover a similar size of cohort and area. Monitoring of the education of children looked after is now sustainable via the implementation of new, effective, monitoring systems managed by upgraded Business Support Officer , and most importantly , effective support from other services to schools Therefore, targeted group will not be affected.(See below)

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.

No -This decision will not impact adversely on the support available to above groups or sub groups :
Some of the responsibilities of the Virtual School Educational Consultants have been more effectively undertaken by other services :-
-All schools have a Designated Teacher for CLA promoting the education of CLA , and the Virtual School will continue to provide training for Designated Teachers for CLA in their role
-School Advisers are now monitoring the educational progress of all CLA in schools at every adviser visit, and report to the Virtual School Head teacher if required.
- Although 62% of all CLA have identified Special Educational Needs or Disability at some point in their education , all schools have now specific funding (Pupil Premium) for CLA , to ensure these

needs are met (Pupil Premium) .

-In Lancashire, the Educational Psychologist for the school ensures that any CLA's Special Educational Needs or Disability are being effectively met.

OFSTED Inspectors also monitor how the CLA Pupil Premium is effectively used within every school.

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.)

(See above) All Lancashire children looked after, regardless all protected characteristics above, will continue to access support from the Virtual school, and other services.

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 proposal for restructure of the Virtual school for Children Looked After will not impact negatively upon any employees /service users of the above group or sub groups due to reasons below.

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 has taken place with ACERS Head of Service and All staff on Virtual School Team for Children Looked After

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 proposal will not impact adversely on any of the above groups or sub groups. All CLA including CLA with identified SEND, are given numerous opportunities to participate in public life and to participate in any educational activity via Children in Care Council , Membership on Corporate Parenting Board .

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.

No- as CLA support is the remit of other services and schools. However, this remit has been highlighted and prioritised across other Services, and protocols have been piloted . The decision will not have any adverse effects to other services, but will ensure accountability from all services and schools as Corporate Parents for Lancashire's Children Looked After

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal? NO

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

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Our analysis indicates that the original proposal will not impact adversely on any of the above groups or sub groups, and will improve the support available to CLA in school, and impact positively on CLA achievements and attainments. This proposal will also improve intelligence re schools accountability for providing educational support for CLA

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 required

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.

Need for budget savings will not be counter productive to any of the above groups. However the involvement , training and support of other services working with schools is a positive step to ensuring schools provide effective educational provision for all CLA

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Proposal is for the Restructure of the Virtual School for Children looked After
None of the above groups will be detrimentally affected

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

- The proposal has been risk assessed, and piloted, to ensure the effectiveness of the restructure, and to ensure elimination of discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct; 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.
- Virtual School will arrange monthly reviews with all other services .e.g. IDSS, CIS, and individual professionals , to monitor CLA progress
- An full restructure action plan is in place , which will be implemented monitored and reviewed on a monthly basis
- Impact and progress will be reported to DLT, DELT and the Corporate Parenting Board.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Sue Parr

Position/Role : Head of Virtual School for Children Looked After

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 712 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Review of Early Years services and responsibilities |
| Sponsor | Jonathan Hewitt |
| Objective | <p>Review of services offered in Early Years Service focusing on how services are delivered charges made and focusing on elements of customer self-service of information.</p> <p>Analysis of Early Years funding, including allocations to children's centres</p> |

Scope

£1m of these savings relates to the final phase of the tapering of the pump priming funding for Best Start. From September 2014 as agreed by Cabinet this will be fully funded by schools.

2014/15 Best Start funding ceases and the activity is funded by schools who wish to use their Pupil Premium for this purpose: The majority of universally offered training and support for Early Years providers is traded but the monitoring and targeted support function is retained: Support for developing Healthy Lifestyles moves into Public Health: support for pre school children to enhance their readiness for schools ceases.

2015/16 The great majority of the monitoring and targeted support function relating to Early Years providers is traded; The online headcount system for Free Early Years Education (FEYE) entitlement is fully implemented.

Expected Outcomes

2014/15 Most existing services will continue. Support for children aged 5-7 including parenting and family support is funded largely through the pupil premium. Training and support for early years providers is offered on a marketed basis and the subsidy is withdrawn. Health related services are delivered through public health. The school readiness programme is operated on a marketed basis. It is likely that the great majority of schools will not continue this work. 2015/16 FEYE entitlement will be administered through a online headcount system which is being well received through the current rollout. The great majority of Early Years improvement work will be marketed on a full cost recovery basis, with a small quality assurance held centrally. It is not clear whether improvement support will be purchased by the majority of settings.

What Will Be Different?

There will be an increase in traded services e.g. training courses will be fully traded. Some Family support for ages 5-7 will be reliant on schools purchasing this support and therefore it will not be available to all free school meal pupils. Schools will make decisions about School Readiness programmes.

What Savings can be achieved?

The £1.507m saving within 2014/15 includes Best Start which schools will in the future buy in, School Readiness will cease and a number of services becoming traded including: Bump Birth and Beyond, Seven Stars Professional Development Centre, Business Advice for the Private, Voluntary and Independant (PVI) sector and Parenting Programme which will either cease or become traded. A number of sustainability grants to the PVI sector will be funded from trading.

The £1.451m saving in 2015/16 includes: administration savings through FEYE online services, monitoring the quality of provision for PVI including training which will become traded, support to childminders that are graded satisfactory or inadequate by Ofsted which may become traded. Children's Centre support to maintain good and outstanding childminders which will cease or become traded and Children's Centre support to improve quality in PVI settings will become traded or cease.

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | Staff | | 0.025 | 1.137 | | | 1.162 |
| | Other | | 1.482 | 0.314 | | | 1.796 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 1.507 | 1.451 | --- | --- | 2.958 |

Equality Analysis

712 – Review of Early Years Services and Responsibilities

Name/Nature of the Decision

Review of Early Years services and responsibilities

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

This proposal includes:

- 1.The cessation of Best Start funding for schools to support pupils aged 5-7 who are eligible for Free School Meals
- 2.Offering the great majority of training support and monitoring for childminders, PVI Early Years settings on a marketed basis and through self help clusters of settings as proposed by central government.
- 3.Reducing the support for Health led initiatives in Children's Centres and marketing support for Healthy Eating.
- 4.Ceasing the additional funding for Children's Centres to establish effective joint working with schools on preparing young children for school.
- 5.Cessation of the Sustainability Grant to maintain early years settings which are struggling financially on a temporary basis.

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.

Number 5 Cessation of the Sustainability Grant to maintain early years settings

which are struggling financially on a temporary basis.

This decision is likely to affect early years provision in some rural areas. See response from Question 1 – 9.

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

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.)

Proposals 1-4.

1. The cessation of Best Start funding for schools to support pupils aged 5-7 who are eligible for Free School Meals

It is not anticipated that the proposal will impact adversely on those with protected characteristics as the pupil premium grant will more than cover the cost of the services offered through Best Start. Through Best Start schools have developed effective relationships with schools and the service offer is known to schools so they can commission support where required. Responsibility for supporting individual pupils eligible for Free School Meals to raise achievement sits with schools. The

achievement of pupil groups with protected characteristics will be monitored by the local authority and OfSTED and where there are serious concerns the local authority has powers of intervention.

2. Offering the great majority of training support and monitoring for childminders, PVI Early Years settings on a marketed basis and through self help clusters of settings as proposed by central government.

It is not anticipated that the proposal will impact adversely on those with protected characteristics as all settings will be able to access marketed support, training and cluster support. The quality of settings is monitored by OfSTED and the local authority will monitor the OfSTED inspections and ensure that Free Early Years funding is not given to settings which are judged inadequate. Any concerns raised by OfSTED relating to safeguarding will be passed to the LSCB.

3. Reducing the support for Health led initiatives in Children's Centres and marketing support for Healthy Eating.

It is expected that the services will be delivered or commissioned by Public Health with support from the Children's Centres so no impact on those with protected characteristics is anticipated. Healthy eating support will be provided on a marketed basis but many settings have already accessed this support.

4. Ceasing the additional funding for Children's Centres to establish effective joint working with schools on preparing young children for school.

It is not anticipated that this proposal will impact adversely on those with protected characteristics as the pupil premium grant will more than cover the cost of many of the services offered through the School Readiness grant for pupils in the Reception Year in school. Children's Centres will continue to link with schools in supporting vulnerable children and families and those links have been strengthened through the School Readiness programme. Responsibility for supporting individual pupils who are in Reception and eligible for Free School Meals sits with schools. The requirements of the new Early Years Foundation Stage curriculum, the clearer focus on pre-school settings preparing children for school, improved assessment and the higher expectations of OfSTED inspections are also expected to improve school readiness.

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.

Some small rural communities do not have sufficient numbers of young children to make early years provision viable so they are more likely to be affected by the cessation of this grant.

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)

We have carried out a Childcare Sufficiency review and we believe that it is possible to provide childcare for the vast majority of families seeking it in rural and urban settings by using a range of provision including PVI settings and childminders.

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.

We do not believe that families living in rural communities will be unable to find childcare as this has not been a problem in the past and the Childcare Sufficiency review does not suggest this is the case.

This year the sustainability grant has not been fully allocated and was already reduced substantially in 2012.

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.

There is a concern that the new tougher OfSTED requirements will lead to more settings being judged inadequate and if these were clustered in a locality it could create a sufficiency problem.

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

We have not amended the proposal as our current monitoring indicates that current provision will meet the requirements of all communities.

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.

We will monitor the impact of this decision on families through the Family Information Service and consider the implications of any negative indications.

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 decision has been taken in the light of the evidence that there are currently sufficient childcare places available and no evidence that rural communities have been badly hit to date by the new OfSTED inspection framework. We also noted that the demand for sustainability funding has been significantly underspent in the last two years.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal is to cease to offer sustainability funding for Early Years settings.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The impact of this proposal will be monitored by:

The Family Information Service monitoring the number of families who cannot find local childcare

The annual childcare sufficiency review

Feedback from Children's centres

Equality Analysis Prepared By A Gradwell

Position/Role Learning Improvement support lead

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer J Hewitt Head of QCI

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 717 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Improve efficiency of Adoption Service |
| Sponsor | Ann-Marie Ranson |
| Objective | Generate efficiencies within the Adoption Service |

Scope

This project will review allowances already agreed with a view to amending the commitment previously confirmed to ensure they are in line with current the current policy. The impact on families will be closely examined.

Additional savings will be achieved with the expectation that adopters will meet the costs for some of the adoption process.

Care will be required to ensure that any changes in allowances does not result in a fall in future adoptions as this would result in increased residency costs.

Expected Outcomes

Changes to the levels of allowances being paid to some adoptive families

What Will Be Different?

The allowances provided for historical cases will be reduced enabling an equitable approach in line with the current policy.

What Savings can be achieved?

Options include:

Revisit adoption allowances and obtain further legal advice to assess the risk that would be involved in terminating payments to adopters receiving the allowance on the basis of historic arrangements and who have children placed with them who would not meet the present criteria for an adoption allowance. Further work would be required in this area. Potential savings of £70k per annum.

Cease paying settling in grant to adopters and cease to pay expenses to adopters during bridging and introduction meetings. Saving of £30k per annum.

Prospective adopters to pay for their own checks and also pay an administrative fee to cover the costs incurred by the service in obtaining statutory checks and references. Saving of £10k per annum.

Cease to pay court fees for adopters when they lodge their adoption application with the court. Saving of £2K per annum.

Review of the contract with the Independent Fostering and Adoption Panel Chair. Saving of £5K per annum.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Adoption - various | Gross project saving | | 0.117 | | | | 0.117 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.117 | --- | --- | --- | 0.117 |

Equality Analysis

717 - Improve efficiency of Adoption Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Adoption Service/Adopters taking on additional financial responsibility and addressing the balance in allocation of financial support via the adoption allowance scheme.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

- Prospective adopters pay for own DBS checks and may in the future be required to pay an admin fee to cover the cost incurred by the service in obtaining statutory checks and references.
- The directorate will no longer pay expenses to adopters during bridging, introductions and settling in. However there is an exemptions clause for extenuating circumstances.
- The directorate will cease to pay the court lodging fee when adopters submit their application to the court.
- The service will identify areas where it may be possible statutorily for a charge to be levied.
- The service will obtain legal advice to assess the risk that would be involved in terminating payments to adopters receiving the adoption allowance on the basis of historic arrangements that would no longer be granted.

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.

All people across the county will be affected in a similar way there are no specific

areas likely to be affected. Service manager discretion can be used in exceptional circumstances.

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.

No.

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.)

Impact of this decision will affect equally and without discrimination all service users, as previously noted, in exceptional circumstances service manager discretion can be employed to ensure none of the protected characteristics are adversely affected by this decision.

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.

NA

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)

The service did not consider the need to implement a formal consultation process. This is because the decision is not considered to adversely impact on service users.

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.

No.

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.

No

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

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.

NA

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 proposal is put forward to ensure the adoption services manages its finances in a more cost effective manner. Whilst overall this will generate significant savings for the service there will be limited impact on an individual basis for adopters and children.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal remains the same, the measures the service has put in place with regards to discretion will ensure that no groups are disadvantaged.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Monitoring will take place through the following:

- The number of assessments refused because financial assistance during bridging,

introductions and settling in will not be provided.

- The number of complaints with regards to this issue received from adopters and/or other adoption agencies.
- Monitoring of children's needs being met through CLA reviews.
- Any subsequent action taken against the local authority on the basis of us not continuing to make payments within the adoption allowance scheme as had previously been agreed.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Anne-Marie Ranson

Position/Role Adoption Service Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer Stasia Osiowy

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 719 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Increase efficiency in Fostering Service |
| Sponsor | Barbara Bath |
| Objective | Achieve efficiencies within the Fostering Service |

Scope

Following a review of the Fostering Service budgets a number of efficiencies have been identified which are detailed within the savings section.

Expected Outcomes

A more efficient and lower cost service.

What Will Be Different?

What Savings can be achieved?

Savings include:

Re-evaluate the level of equipment that is currently provided to Foster Carers. Saving of £84k per annum.

Panel papers etc to go online, achieving savings in postage & printing costs. Saving of £31k per annum.

Change in venues for Foster Carer support groups. Saving of £20k per annum.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Fostering - various | - | | 0.150 | | | | 0.150 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.150 | --- | --- | --- | 0.150 |

Equality Analysis

719 - Increase efficiency in Fostering Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Fostering Service/Decision to review payments to foster carers in order for the service to operate more efficiently.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

- Foster carer equipment will no longer be provided to new applicants. Existing foster carers will be responsible for replacement of foster carer equipment through their boarding out allowance. In exceptional circumstances some equipment may be provided by service manager discretion on a case by case basis.

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.

All people across the county will be affected in a similar way there are no specific areas likely to be affected. Service manger discretion can be used in exceptional circumstances.

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

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.

Children with disabilities occupy a small proportion of foster placements, less than 5%. Some but not all of these children will require specialist equipment, which in some cases will be provided by the health service. The impact of a foster carer being responsible for the provision of specialist equipment could potentially limit the number of foster carers prepared to look after these young people. In order to protect against this specialist equipment can still be provided by the authority at no additional cost to the carer by the service manager's authorisation.

No other group with protected characteristics would be affected.

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)

The service did not consider the need to implement a formal consultation process as there will be limited impact to the service users.

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.

Yes, the decision could impact on people with disabilities. Children with disabilities may need more specific or costly equipment than non disabled children and therefore this decision could impact on the provision of foster care for children with disabilities. In order to ensure these children are not adversely affected there is service manager discretion to be used in exceptional circumstances to still provide

equipment. This would be applied in the case of a child with a disability needing specific or more costly equipment.

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.

No

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.

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.

To reiterate, service manager discretion can be applied in respect of providing equipment where necessary for children with disabilities.

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 proposal is put forward to ensure the fostering services manages its finances in a more cost effective manner. Whilst overall this will generate significant savings for the service there will be limited impact on an individual basis for foster carers and children. The most significant impact would be for children with disabilities requiring specific equipment the impact of which has been minimised by the provision for discretion to be used on a case by case basis.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal remains the same, the measures the service has put in place with regards to discretion will ensure that no groups are disadvantaged.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Monitoring will take place through the following:

- The number of assessments refused because equipment will not be provided.
- The number of foster carers resignations due to equipment not being provided.
- The number of complaints with regards to this issue.
- Feedback from foster carers through the fostering forum.
- Monitoring of children's needs being met through CLA reviews and foster carer reviews.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Barbara Bath

Position/Role Fostering Service Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer Stasia Osiowy

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 722 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Children and Young People Prevention offer |
| Sponsor | Ann Pennell |
| Objective | <p>To develop and reshape services to children, young people and families to ensure the services are aligned efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>This seeks to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the number of cases escalating to a statutory service are reduced - intervention is as early as possible to prevent children requiring the need to come into care and - to focus resources on supporting children and families in their communities |

Scope

During 2013/14 the Directorate has implemented a number of projects to respond to the rising demand for Social Care statutory services and to changes in legislation. The following developments are within the scope of the project:

- an in-house residential outreach service to support young people at home and prevent the need for costly residential placements;
- an Edge of Care Support Service, commissioned from the third sector to provide support to families to build resilience and prevent children and young people becoming looked after;
- a Family Group Conferencing Service, a decision and planning making process whereby the wider family network makes plans for a child or young person who has been identified as being in need of a plan to safeguard their welfare;
- a Central Care Proceedings Team to focus on reducing the length of care proceedings and speed up the adoption process;
- a pool of foster carers established to work with children and young people, their families and partner agencies to return these children who can safely return to their families in a timely manner; so avoiding more costly longer term care;
- a team of foster carers trained to look after children and young people displaying high risk behaviours; so reducing the need for high cost agency or residential placements;
- the integration of the Contact & Referral Team, Multi-agency Safeguarding Hub and the Emergency Duty Team to provide a single point of contact for referrals into Childrens Social Care.

The proposals respond to conclusions from research including the Munro Review, from legal judgements and from internal review of best practice.

Clear guidance will signpost professionals to the service most appropriate to the needs of the child or family to prevent duplication and minimise the number of professionals in direct contact.

Expected Outcomes

Services that will promote resilience and empower families to build capacity & capability to manage challenging situations within the home environment reducing the need for support and referral to statutory agencies.

Measurable outcomes are the reduction in:

- the number of cases escalating to a more intensive statutory service;
- the number of children looked after;
- the length and number of care proceedings;
- the number of children and young people waiting to be adopted.

Improved mechanisms to support children and young people going home from statutory services with appropriate support.

What Will Be Different?

The services offered by the Directorate will be different as a result of this project. This will include some services ceasing to be offered, some offered in a different format and existing structures being different.

What Savings can be achieved?

A number of the projects have been funded in the short term on an invest to save basis. The monitoring of outcomes has been introduced and projects are at the early stage of implementation.

Savings will arise from three areas:

- improved efficiency in the delivery of statutory processes;
- strengthened services to support families on the edge of care to reduce the need for statutory intervention;
- expediting the achievement of permanent placements for young people.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 2.800 | 0.861 | | | 3.661 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 2.800 | 0.861 | --- | --- | 3.661 |

Equality Analysis

722 – Children and young people prevention offer

Name/Nature of the Decision

System Design Project

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The purpose of this project is to reshape the offer and services for the prevention, protection and permanence of our most vulnerable children and young people.

This project is a constituent part (but not the whole) of policy option 722:- “To develop and reshape services to children, young people and families to ensure the services are aligned efficiently and effectively”

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 project is currently in its formative stages and is focused on engaging with key stakeholders in order to gauge views and opinions to inform the development of a reshaped offer and reshaped services for the prevention, protection and permanence of our most vulnerable children and young people.

No proposals have been developed to date and as such it is not appropriate to provide a definitive assertion regarding how any groups are likely to be affected.

The principles for the project are strongly founded on a need for equity and efficiency and as such it is expected that no specific areas are likely to be disproportionately affected.

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 outcomes of the project are likely to have an impact on the following protected group: "AGE". This is because the services and offer relate to children and young people. The Project Group have already recognised this and are seeking to ensure effective and robust engagement with children and young people is an integral aspect of the project. This will serve to identify and address any issues that may arise in relation to this protected group.

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.

There is a range of information available about the children and young people to whom services are provided.

This information includes individual case files, performance information produced within the directorate and data that is captured and shared by statutory partners (eg: health). This list is not exhaustive.

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)

The project is currently in its formative stages and is focused on engaging with key stakeholders in order to gauge views and opinions to inform the development of a reshaped offer and reshaped services for the prevention, protection and permanence of our most vulnerable children and young people.

This includes staff across CYP and Children and Young People and their Families.

Some engagement activity commenced in November 2013. It is due to continue as part of the project process until the project concludes in March 2014.

Details of engagement activity is captured within the Project Group Plan and is available for scrutiny/inspection at any time.

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 project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

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.

The project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point

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

The project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

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.

The project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

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 project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The project is currently in its formative stages it is not possible or appropriate to seek to answer this question at this point.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Alison Moore

Position/Role Project Manager, Targeted and Assessment Services

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| CYP | DPO | 723 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Right-size Children's Trust Budget |
| Sponsor | Dave Carr |
| Objective | A review of the Children's Trust budget has identified a recurrent underspend. |

| |
|--|
| Scope |
| A review of the Children's Trust budget has identified a recurrent underspend. |

| |
|---|
| Expected Outcomes |
| Budget reduced to reflect actual spending patterns. |

| |
|--------------------------------|
| What Will Be Different? |
| |

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| What Savings can be achieved? |
| |

| | |
|---|--|
| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | |
| Access required to downsize reserve? | |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | 0.100 | | | | 0.100 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.100 | --- | --- | --- | 0.100 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number |
|-------------|------|--------|
| ENV | DPO | 803 |

| Live/Active |
|-------------|
| 1 |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Project | Lancashire Permit Scheme |
| Sponsor | Ray Worthington |
| Objective | Introduce a Permit Scheme for road and street works in Lancashire. |
| Staff Input Involved | Asset group staff will develop the proposal with support from a consultant with experience in other authorities successful permit schemes. |

Scope

Works on the highway network cause disruption, delays and potential risks both to highway users and the highway asset. The majority of these works are undertaken by the utility companies and the Highway Authority. To try and reduce the impact these works have on road users, business and the local/national economy the Government introduced the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004. The aim of the TMA is to encourage highway authorities and utility companies to put greater emphasis on co-ordination of works, including the authority's own works, with a view to minimise disruption and protect the highway infrastructure. One of the key mechanisms provided within the TMA is to allow highway authorities to introduce a Permit Scheme for authorising and controlling utility and highway works.

Currently utility companies working on the highway network are legally required by the New Roads & Street Works Act 1991 to serve notice on the Highway Authority before starting works. The NRSWA defines amongst many other things the notification process, timescales and actions required by the utility companies and the highway authority. The Highway Authority is not legally obliged but highly recommended to serve the same notices for its own works.

A Permit Scheme would replace the current noticing arrangements. This would give LCC much greater control over the works undertaken by the utility companies especially in regards to the timing of works, the type of traffic management used and how these works are carried out. It would also be mandatory for LCC's own works and those generated by other 3rd parties such as Developers and District Authorities.

Expected Outcomes

A permit scheme should reduce delays to road users caused by road and street works and minimise the impact these works have on local businesses, residents and bus passengers. This would be achieved by a reduction in the number of works, minimising road space occupied, reducing duration by encouraging better work planning and better communication of works. A permit scheme will allow the authority to scrutinise the work of the utility companies much more than under the current noticing regime. This will enable officers to challenge the 'how and when' aspects of the works and give the authority more control over what is happening on its highway network.

What Will Be Different?

The fundamental difference between notices and permits are:-

- Under the current noticing regime the utility companies tell us when, how and why they are working on the highway free of charge
- Under a permit scheme they have to ask us before working and we can apply conditions to the when and how elements of the works and charge them for each permit application.
- Anyone carrying out road and street works will need to apply for a Permit in advance of works (excluding emergencies). This includes works undertaken by and on behalf of Lancashire County Council. The application timescales will vary dependent on the type of work and the type of road.
- A fee is payable for each permit application and each amendment. The fee would not be payable for the authority's own works. The fee would vary dependent on the level of scrutiny required. For example small scales works on a quiet residential road may require less checking than large scale works on busy roads or routes.
- A permit scheme will allow us to set conditions on each permit with the aim of minimising disruption and protecting the highway asset. For example we would have more control over the timing and duration of works, the way in which they are undertaken and greater opportunity to publicise works. We could also specify the amount of road space to be left available to road users and pedestrians therefore keeping works much more compact.
- A permit scheme carries with it much bigger penalties for non-compliance than the current noticing regime. For example working without a permit carries a maximum fine of £5,000 (£2,500 under a noticing regime); and a £2,500 fine for not complying with a condition (not applicable under a noticing regime). All of these offences can be dealt with by Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) as under the current noticing regime but carry a significantly higher charge. For example an FPN for working without a permit would cost the utility company £300 (currently it is £120); not complying with a permit condition would be a £120 FPN. The FPN charges are paid directly to the authority and used for the administration of the process.

What Savings can be achieved?

The estimated permit fee income for Lancashire based on current levels of utility works and permits required for all activities on all streets is estimated at £1.2 million per year. This income will be used to fund 19 staff at DfT approved overhead rates. It is anticipated that 5 staff currently employed with asset group will transfer to jobs in the permit scheme. If staff are transferred from other areas of work within the directorate this will enable savings to be realised across the directorate. A more accurate breakdown of all associated costs, income and subsequent permit fees will be produced as part of the detailed preparation of the permit scheme and the Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA). The estimated net income from the introduction of a permit scheme is £780,000. The income in year one will be reduced as the full year is unlikely to be achieved.

The cost of operating a Permit Scheme is borne by the utility companies. This is the additional costs of staffing, IT and other resources over and above the current costs of operating under the current Noticing Regime. As part of the permit scheme a fee matrix will be produced and this will give the charges for each permit application. The fee covers the costs and overheads of setting up and administering the permit scheme. The cost of preparing a permit scheme cannot be passed on to the utility companies.

Adjustments to the permit fees may be made in subsequent years to offset any surplus or deficit. It is not intended that permit schemes should produce surplus revenue, taking one year with another.

It is proposed to implement this proposal from 1st February 2015. This deadline is extremely tight and to achieve any savings in 2014/15 some investment in staff and specialist advice of £100,000 will be necessary.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | Yes | |
| Amount of funding required? | 0.100 | |
| What is the funding required for? | Data gathering resource and specialist advisers | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Highway Network | Works Permit | --- | 0.200 | 0.380 | --- | --- | 0.580 |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total net incremental savings | | --- | 0.200 | 0.380 | --- | --- | 0.580 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 804 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Street Lighting Energy |
| Sponsor | Ray Worthington |
| Objective | Cost effective reductions in street lighting energy with low levels of investment and fast pay back from energy reductions |

| Scope |
|---|
| A detailed review will categorise the street lighting into groups that can be assessed for the different options available for that type of equipment on a type of road. (e.g. residential, rural, main route etc) The different options will be assessed for each category and approval sought for new policies to take forward cost effective changes to reduce energy use. Options include further dimming on the network between 7pm - 6am, all night and total switch off from midnight until 6am. |

| Expected Outcomes |
|--|
| Reduced Lighting provision leading to reduced energy use, reduced costs of electricity and reduced carbon tax. |

| What Will Be Different? |
|---|
| The measures proposed are likely to involve a reduction in the street lighting service provided such as part night lighting or permanently reduced lighting levels. |

| What Savings can be achieved? |
|---|
| <p>An initial target of £500K has been included in this policy option with a further detailed analysis underway looking at all options based upon the current lighting equipment and the best low cost options available for that equipment bearing in mind the type of road. This analysis ranges from those savings that might be achieved from day one on the centrally managed lighting (10% of the network) through low cost measures to those that need significant invest in reprogramming and refurbishment of the fixed dimming lights to give greater flexibility over the lighting network.</p> <p>To achieve a saving of £500k a minimum investment of £450K is likely to be required. At this minimum level of investment only 34% of the lighting network would be affected by the changes but, in order to generate the required saving, would necessitate switching off the lights during the night time.</p> <p>Increasing the level of investment above the minimum £450k would provide greater flexibility, including the option to dim rather than fully turn off streetlights, but would affect a larger percentage of the lighting network. Investments up to £3m could be envisaged, affecting 44% of street lights, but even at this level of investment some switching off during periods of the night would be inevitable to achieve the saving proposed.</p> |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | Yes | |
| Amount of funding required? | 0.450 | |
| What is the funding required for? | Capital investment to adapt lighting fixtures to switch off or dimming on a controlled basis | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|---|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Street Lighting | Energy | | 0.170 | 0.100 | 0.230 | | 0.500 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.170 | 0.100 | 0.230 | --- | 0.500 |

Equality Analysis

804 Street Lighting Energy

Name/Nature of the Decision

Street Lighting Energy Reduction

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The reduction in lighting levels and the turning off street lights during hours when the highway usage is lower. The areas most likely to be impacted by these decisions have not yet been identified.

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

The decisions will impact groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010.

- Age – Vision deteriorates with age, consequently older people are more likely to be involved in traffic incidents, crime or fear of crime than other groups as a result of these changes. Possibly young people may be adversely affected too as they are more likely to be out during hours when lighting is reduced or turned off and are more often the victims of street crime.
- Disability including Deaf people – People with poor vision and people who rely more on their own or on other peoples vision to keep them safe on the highway (such as deaf people) are more likely to be impacted by these decisions than other groups. In addition people with 'Low Luminance Myopia' (LLM) resulting in poor night vision are more greatly impacted by these decisions. LLM is suffered by between 10% and 50% of the population depending on the severity being measured. People with other disabilities may also feel more vulnerable due to reduced street lighting as disabled people fear and are victims of hate crimes and other incidents.

Groups that are more concerned about crime and fear of crime will be more greatly impacted by these decisions there is particular concern amongst women about the potential personal safety consequences of reductions in street lighting.

Question 1 – Background Evidence

This proposal would particularly impact some age, disability, gender and other groups, especially where vulnerable to crimes or accidents. Lancashire's particular profiles could be explored in more detail if the proposal were to go forward.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

Views have not yet been sought with the Living in Lancashire Panel or similar groups regarding the proposed decisions. If the proposal goes further then wider consultation will be carried out – e.g. using the third tier forums, priority neighbourhood or other channels.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

This can be completed more usefully when some consultation/engagement evidence is available.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

There will be some impacts –

e.g. if some of the evening subsidised bus services are withdrawn then it may be expected that more travel will occur on foot during evenings when lights levels will be lower or lights will be switched off.

They also may be cumulative effects–

e.g. if winter gritting is reduced then black ice and other hazards will be more difficult to see, increasing the risks of accidents for the increased number of travellers on foot.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

To be completed later.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Reduced lighting will be more effective than no lighting in mitigating the impacts of these decisions.

Reduced as opposed to no lighting, in particular areas or times, may mitigate the impacts of these decisions on some equality groups.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

To be completed later.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

To be completed later.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

The impacts of accidents, crime and fear of crime could be monitored for different equality/protected characteristic groups; however it would be essential that pre-implementation data was collected in the same format/criteria as post-implementation data for results to be meaningful. For example certain types of street crime data would be relevant e.g. 'mugging'. Surveys around how safe people feel in their neighbourhood could also be useful tools here and may give that "before and after" perspective.

Equality Analysis Prepared By M.Dunwell

Position/Role Head of Street Lighting

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer S.Procter

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 805 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Highway infrastructure sponsorship |
| Sponsor | Martin Galloway |
| Objective | Deliver a more cost effective and flexible highway sponsorship scheme. |

| Scope | |
|--|--|
| To deliver highway sponsorship across Lancashire in house without the need for third party contractor. | |

| Expected Outcomes | |
|---|--|
| <p>The current scheme generates an income stream of around £100K which is then used to fund Public Realm activities in the following year, benefiting the Districts which host the advertisement space. The additional income would result from the advertising space being sold directly to businesses by the Council who would therefore retain all revenue generated after costs are covered rather than a third party taking any commission. This additional income would not be passed on to spend on Public Realm activities and would therefore support the councils overall funding need.</p> | |

| What Will Be Different? | |
|---|--|
| <p>The function would be administered internally, as a result it is unlikely to have a proactive approach to businesses but all income will come directly to authority. Only part of the income generated would be reinvested in Public Realm revenue activity inline with current contributions with the remaining supporting the Councils funding requirements.</p> | |

| What Savings can be achieved? | |
|---|--|
| <p>The current £100k income could realistically be doubled. Therefore £100K could be offered as a savings with income above this net target continuing to be spent on Public Realm activities in the appropriate areas as is currently the case. The contract renewal date is July 14 so part savings could be achieved in 14/15.</p> | |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|---|----|
| <p>Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e</p> | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Roundabout sponsorship | Income | | 0.050 | 0.050 | | | 0.100 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | 0.050 | 0.050 | | | 0.100 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 809 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Members' priority contingency |
| Sponsor | Joanne Reed |
| Objective | To reduce the members revenue contingency budget |

| Scope | |
|---|--|
| Reduce members' specific funding allocation which is presently used to respond to requests for minor works on the highway | |

| Expected Outcomes | |
|---|--|
| Reduced expenditure on highways revenue maintenance | |

| What Will Be Different? | |
|---|--|
| Less highway maintenance revenue activity than at present | |

| What Savings can be achieved? | |
|--|--|
| £220k which represents just over half of the current budget. £200k will remain for future Member priorities. | |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Members Contingency | | | 0.220 | | | | 0.220 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.220 | --- | -- | -- | 0.220 |

Equality Analysis

809 - Members priority Contingency

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction in Members Revenue Contingency Fund

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The revenue budget that is identified for reduction is the Members Revenue Contingency Fund. The proposal is to reduce the annual revenue budget amount from its current level of £420,000 to £200,000.

This budget is used primarily to respond to member requests for minor revenue works that the County Council would ordinarily undertake but for which no other revenue funding source is available.

The proposed reduction in the budget will impact on the Environment Directorate's ability to respond to member requests for minor revenue works in their area.

There is no defined programme of works for this budget therefore it is not possible to carry out a full EIA. The reduction is not considered to adversely impact on any particular group.

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.

This decision will affect all residents of Lancashire in the same 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.

The reduction will not impact adversely on any particular group to a disproportionate extent.

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.)

All Lancashire residents will be affected in the same way and the reduction in funding will not have an adverse impact on any particular group.

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.

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)

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Equality Analysis Prepared By Daniel Herbert

Position/Role Head of Local Network Management

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-----------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Direct orate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 813 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Targeted Parking Enforcement |
| Sponsor | M Galloway |
| Objective | Secure more effective targeting of parking enforcement |

Scope

Secure cost reductions through a reduction in overall enforcement hours, but implement targeting of enforcement officers to be more effective in detecting and enforcing parking transgressions, with observation periods removed.

Expected Outcomes

Costs of the service will reduce, enforcement interventions will be maintained or increased. There will be no deployment of enforcement officers to schools or remote locations where parking transgressions are too occasional or fleeting to warrant the issuing of penalty charge notices. Areas where parking offences are more prevalent will see an increase in the level of enforcement, and a more immediate issuing of penalty charge notices in response to transgressions. This may result in more appeals.

What Will Be Different?

Enforcement will target areas where the prevalence of parking offences has greatest consequences for the safe and efficient functioning of the highway. In particular, penalty charge notices will be issued immediately on identification of the offence, rather than allowing a number of minutes to pass before issuing the penalty, which to some extent condones the offence. Removal of this waiting time would save 1000 hours per annum of enforcement officer time.

What Savings can be achieved?

Anticipate a saving in enforcement costs of £50k with no consequential loss of income.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | No |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Parking | Enforcement | | 0.050 | | | | 0.050 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.050 | --- | --- | --- | 0.050 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 814 | 1 |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Project | Review of bus subsidies |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton |
| Objective | To reduce the cost of bus subsidies to a sustainable level. |
| Staff Input Involved | Public Transport staff. |

Scope

To adopt the following policy with respect to the ongoing subsidy of public transport:

To work with local communities and bus companies to reconfigure services. In doing so to review services on a local network basis rather than an individual service basis. The aim will be to establish a network that is sustainable in the context of affordability, value for money and community benefit.

Upon termination of existing contracts, temporary extensions of current services will be considered until the overall future pattern of services has been determined.

To take account of the part year savings in relation to the changes to bus subsidies which have already taken place in 2013/14.

Expected Outcomes

To provide a reconfigured and sustainable public transport system in Lancashire.

What Will Be Different?

It is difficult to say at this stage what will be different moving forward as the discussions with the bus operators have not yet taken place.

What Savings can be achieved?

Consolidation of the 2013/14 budget savings which would normally have been used to fund additional subsidised services during the year - £0.647m.

Future savings yet to be determined.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | --- | |
| What is the funding required for? | | --- |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Bus services | No additional subsidies from 1st Nov 2013 | --- | 0.647 | --- | --- | --- | 0.647 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total Net Incremental Saving | | --- | 0.647 | --- | --- | --- | 0.647 |

| | | |
|-----------------|------|------------|
| Director ate | Type | Numb er |
| ENV | DPO | 815 |

| |
|-------------|
| Live/Active |
| 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Environment & Community Projects and Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty |
| Sponsor | Andy Mullaney |
| Objective | Reduce service costs (staff and operational costs) |

| Scope | |
|--|--|
| <p>Reduction in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the level of support provided by the County Council for local environment and community projects; and strategic environment and community projects. the level of support provided by the County Council for projects and activities in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), subject to meeting statutory minimum duties. <p>Projects and support will be prioritised towards the County's most deprived communities.</p> | |

| Expected Outcomes | |
|--|--|
| Reduction in costs and the number of environment and community projects supported. | |

| What Will Be Different? | |
|---|--|
| Reduction in number of projects supported annually from 200 to less than 50 by 2016/17. | |

| What Savings can be achieved? | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| £730,000 by 2016/17. | |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | | |
|---|--|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | | |
| Amount of funding required? | | |
| What is the funding required for? | | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|--|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | 0.118 | | 0.612 | | 0.730 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.118 | --- | 0.612 | --- | 0.730 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 817 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Public Rights of Way & Countryside Service |
| Sponsor | Andy Mullaney |
| Objective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce spending on the level of maintenance on Public Rights of Way (PROW) and LCC Countryside Sites. Improve the efficiency of operational practices. |

Scope

All Public Rights of Way and countryside sites.

Expected Outcomes

- Currently, resource limitations mean that maintenance of the network is largely restricted to problems on the network where there is safety risk (eg unsecure wall or surface); or where the problem has a high impact on public use (eg, severe surface damage). The primary network will continue to receive this level of maintenance. The non-primary network will receive maintenance for safety risks only.
- Changes to the approach to the enforcement of obstructions and other infringements on PROW. The new approach will involve handing a notice to the landowner under S.143. The landowner then has 4 weeks to remedy. If not remedied after this, LCC can implement the change and recover costs. This will be a more efficient use of officer time. It is expected that most problems will be resolved by the landowner in the 4 week period.
- LCC currently administers applications for diversions of PROW that are substantially for private benefit. Under the new approach, private applicants can undertake much of the legal work themselves (using a specialist consultant).
- The inspection of countryside sites will reduce from once a year to once every two years.
- The countryside events programme will be reduced substantially, with the focus being on engagement with children and adults in Priority Neighbourhoods and the nearest sites.
- Introduce a booking system for all terrain mobility scooters.
- Toilet cleaning frequency at LCC's countryside sites will be reduced to peak times only.

What Will Be Different?

The PROW role and the Countryside Ranger role will merge into a new post entitled 'Area Countryside Officer'. The role will include PROW duties, site maintenance duties, and some limited countryside education activities.

What Savings can be achieved?

£548,000 by 2016/17.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this

link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| | | | 0.094 | | 0.454 | | 0.548 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.094 | --- | 0.454 | --- | 0.548 |

Equality Analysis

817- Public Rights of Way & Countryside Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction in Public Rights of Way Services

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Introduction of a 2-tier network of public paths for the purposes of maintenance standards; reduction or cessation of pre-emptive seasonal vegetation clearance; termination of agency agreements with district councils for public rights of way maintenance; more direct enforcement procedure;

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.

Countywide for most proposals but specifically Pendle and Ribble Valley for ending agency agreements

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. The reduction in maintenance standards across the County generally and on the (to be designated) non-priority network countywide in particular and across Pendle and Ribble Valley if agency agreements are terminated, are likely to make public paths more difficult underfoot and structures less convenient to use. This will affect users with a disability to a greater extent than able-bodied users because greater agility or strength will be required to use some of the paths. Furthermore if vegetation isn't cut back this could reduce the path width which might impact adversely on wheelchair users or families with prams and produce height or other obstacles which could be a hazard to sight impaired users (overhanging branches, white canes being less effective in vegetation). However, any reduction in standards will have this effect and the identification and promotion of a priority network will mitigate this disbenefit.

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 direct evidence but the MENE survey by Natural England indicates that a significant proportion of users of public rights of way have a disability. Further more significant proportion are older people.

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)

Not as yet. However if a 2 tier network is to be implemented there will be widespread consultation to help identify the primary network.

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 reduction in maintenance standards across the County generally and on the (to be designated) non-priority network countywide in particular and across Pendle and Ribble Valley if agency agreements are terminated, are likely to make public paths more difficult underfoot and structures less convenient to use. This will affect users with a disability to a greater extent than able-bodied users because greater agility or strength will be required to use some of the paths and older or mobility-impaired users may be more likely to suffer falls. Furthermore if vegetation isn't cut back this could reduce the path width which might impact adversely on wheelchair users or families with prams and produce height or other obstacles which could be a hazard to sight impaired users (overhanging branches, white canes being less effective in vegetation).

However, any reduction in standards will have this effect and the identification and promotion of a priority network will mitigate this disbenefit, perhaps to a significant degree.

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.

Potentially a person with a disability affected by cuts to public transport or by fare increases might then have greater cause to use public paths which might be less usable if not designated as priority network.

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

Continuing – because the mitigation measure of promoting a priority network should enable users who would be otherwise excluded to have an available alternative. It is envisaged that the priority network will include routes which form important links in the network or to specific destinations and which can be maintained in the medium term to a good standard at a reasonable cost).

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.

Identification and promotion of a priority network (perhaps 10% of the statutory public rights of way network in length i.e. about 550km, but focussed on the most popular routes which form important links in the network or to specific destinations and which can be maintained in the medium term to a good standard at a reasonable cost) which would be maintained in as easy-to-use condition as possible within budget.

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.

Significant resource cuts have to be made and this will have a very significant effect on the condition and hence usability of public rights of way, especially in the countryside. This will make it harder to use or even impossible to use many paths especially for users with a disability. Public rights of way vary considerably and identification of a primary network would help to make those paths used by less experienced walkers/riders, or those likely to be less robustly clothed/shod, to be better maintained than the wider network.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Introduction of a 2-tier network of public paths for the purposes of maintenance standards; reduction or cessation of pre-emptive seasonal vegetation clearance; termination of agency agreements with district councils for public rights of way maintenance; more direct enforcement procedure.

All users and potential users of the public rights of way network will be affected but on any particular path which is not well maintained older users and those with a disability will feel the affect more keenly as they may be unable to use the path or to proceed without difficulty. However, introducing a 2-tier network and promoting the priority paths within the overall network will allow users to find the better paths although this may mean having to take a longer route in some cases.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Annual sample survey of the quality of the network

Equality Analysis Prepared By David Goode

Position/Role Public Rights of Way Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Equality Analysis

817- Public Rights of Way & Countryside Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget Options – Public Rights of Way and Countryside Service reductions

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The impact of reduced resources on the provision of Trampler off road mobility vehicles at Countryside sites

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 Trampers are available for use at Beacon Fell nr Preston and Wycoller Country Park nr Colne, and at tramper friendly countryside events across the county.

The database of users suggests that they come from across the county – and indeed the north west!

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

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 service is provided specifically for people who have difficulties with mobility and as such any reductions in the service will impact directly on disabled and elderly people.

We have contact details for the 700+ people who have had the induction training to allow them to use the trampers along with feedback forms relating to the induction training and use.

We have contact details for organisations representing disabled and elderly people.

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 existing users and representative organisations will be conducted.

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 proposals may impact on the availability of the trampers and the timescales involved in booking for anyone with mobility problems who want to explore the parks.

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.

The loan of trampers will remain free at the point of use. There is no public transport available to either of the Country Parks so any other factors that reduce the ability of disabled and elderly people to use private transport will have an impact on their ability to take advantage of the scheme. We are however unaware of other proposals that will limit the use of private transport.

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

Written procedures for the booking of, and access to, Trampers will be published following the consultation process.

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.

To be assessed following 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 Trumper service is highly valued by those who use it and anecdotal evidence suggests that it contributes to the improved health and wellbeing of the individuals who take advantage of it.

The County Council has to make substantial savings in its running costs over the next few years and the Countryside Service will have to play its part in that. As a result the availability of staff to support tramper use will be more limited.

We have always encouraged users to book in advance to ensure that a Trumper will be available for them. This will not change but it will be more difficult to confirm

bookings at short notice and the occasions when we cannot accept a booking may be more frequent.

With fewer countryside staff available there may be occasions when the team e-mail box cannot be viewed on a daily basis or contact cannot be made with staff by telephone.

There are some basic requirements that we have to meet before we can confirm a booking. The most obvious of which is the requirement that there is a member of staff on site to meet the customer, hand over the tramper, and if necessary carry out an induction. There is also a requirement that a member of staff with access to a vehicle is available on the site for the duration of the booking in case of breakdown or accident.

Field based staff will be on a rota to ensure that there is somebody available field every day of the week including weekends. Staff will have a broad range of duties and other demands on their time will mean that it may not always be possible to ensure that an appropriate member of staff is available.

With this in mind we are proposing to set out some clear, published, guidelines about how the service will work in the future and consultation will be carried out on those guidelines. Previously no guidelines existed and the service operated on informal arrangements. With reduced resources, the time is right to set out formally what the customer can expect.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

To be confirmed following consultation.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Continue to gather feedback from users following bookings and by occasional wider consultation.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Nick Osborne
Position/Role Site Access and AONB Manager
Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer
Decision Signed Off By
Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number |
|-------------|------|--------|
| ENV | DPO | 821 |

| |
|---|
| 1 |
|---|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Winter Service |
| Sponsor | Sue Procter |
| Objective | Delivery of an adequate/ compliant countywide winter service which provides effective and appropriate treatment of roads in ice and snow conditions. |

Scope

Countywide winter service

Expected Outcomes

Effective Winter Service aligned to the services provided across the UK – focussed on a reviewed priority network. Delivery of a service which ensures, as is reasonably practicable, that safe passage along the highway is not endangered by snow and ice.

What Will Be Different?

Reduction in the size of network treated
 No secondary routes
 Fewer routes = fewer gritter vehicles and crews
 Closer alignment between operational and decision making process with a greater consistency in the decisions being made across the county.
 Stopped or restricted use of treated salt

What Savings can be achieved?

10% reduction in priority network - £125,000
 No secondary routes - £222,000
 No treated salt - £100,000 (this estimate does not take account of a potential need to increase the spread rate of untreated salt)

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Descr | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | option | | | | | 8 | |
| | | | 0.447 | | | | 0.447 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | --- | 0.447 | --- | --- | --- | 0.447 |

Equality Analysis

821 Winter Service

Name/Nature of the Decision

Budget reduction proposal 821 – Winter Maintenance

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

A reduction in the size and extent of the precautionary gritting network within the winter service by 10%. The removal of a secondary network for gritting and the reduction in the use of treated salt.

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 no recommendations as yet on which elements of the network will be selected to achieve a 10% reduction. It is therefore difficult to identify any specific areas that may be more adversely affected than others. A decision will be needed to agree the criteria by which any new network would be determined; this should take account of any particular areas that may be more adversely affected by this proposed service reduction.

Some rural areas of the county are particularly dependent upon the service and the consequence of service removal may impact on the residents of these areas more significantly than less isolated locations.

This extract from the Winter Maintenance Plan (Winter Service Policy 3 (WS3)) outlines how the current policy identifies the priority road network for precautionary salting:

Policy WS 3

Priority Road Network Hierarchy for Precautionary Salting

| Category | Definition |
|----------|--|
| 1 | Non-trunk Motorways and Primary Route Network ¹ |
| 2 | Remaining Principal ('A' class) roads |

¹ The Primary Route Network (PRN) comprises all-purpose trunk roads and the more important local authority principal ('A' importance throughout Great Britain. Primary Routes are identifiable by direction signs with a green background.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | <p>All 'B' class roads and other roads open to all classes of traffic:</p> <p>between or through large centres of population</p> <p>serving Category One emergency service responders as defined by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Police, Fire, Ambulance, Maritime and Coastguard Agency and British Transport Police)</p> <p>serving hospitals and the key facilities of critical infrastructure providers</p> <p>leading to strategic and key employment centres, major distribution depots and transport interchanges, and important commuter routes</p> <p>important public transport routes with a service frequency of at least one bus per ten minutes and bus stations</p> <p>serving industrial sites listed under the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999 and the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001</p> <p>military establishments</p> <p>crematoria</p> |
|---|---|

The Priority Road Network includes all non-trunk Motorways and Primary Routes, all principal ('A' class) roads and 'B' class roads and in Category 3, varying proportions of the remaining un-numbered highway network maintainable at the public expense dependant on the topography and climate of the area in question.

Secondary road network - the County Council will consider other roads for post-salting treatment and snow clearance in periods of continuous icing and snow. Continuous icing may arise due to excessive surface moisture, usually following heavy precipitation or compacted/melting snow. Decision-making will take account of all relevant factors such as weather forecast data, topography, experience and local knowledge and the availability of salt. When salt is not available the County Council will consider using grit sand to aid traction.

Policy WS 8

Secondary Road Network Treatment

Once the defined Priority Road Network is maintained clear, where persistent ice and/or snow are present or forecast to be present on the defined Secondary Road Network during the current 24 hour period (midnight to midnight) and are forecast to remain for the succeeding 24 hour period (midnight to midnight), treatment of the Secondary Road Network will commence as soon as possible using all available resources, but only during daylight hours.

prolonged periods of cold weather. This will have an impact on all road users using the roads affected. It is not envisaged that this impact will be any more significant for any specific area within Lancashire. However further work will be required to determine the extent of the roads affected and their location, and whether or not this leads to any equality issues for the areas affected. One potential area for this would be the areas of East Lancashire with a greater percentage of BME residents, rural locations and areas with a higher percentage of older residents.

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.

As mentioned above, it is difficult to comment on the particular impacts of any decision to reduce the priority network as no recommendations have been made as yet on which sections of the network would be identified to achieve the proposed 10% reduction. The proposal is to reduce the priority network of carriageways which will have a potential impact on cars, public transport and other road users. Further research will be required to establish if such impacts on road users will be any more significant for any people in any of the identified protected characteristics or other groups.

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

Further work required should this policy option proceed.

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.

There has been some recent consultation carried out to assess satisfaction levels within Lancashire for the Winter Services provided by Lancashire Highway Services. This survey work carried out through the Living in Lancashire survey has shown a steady increase in satisfaction levels over recent years. However, until there is clearer information about the areas affected it is difficult to assess the impact on communities and particularly those with protected characteristics.

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 specific consultation has taken place on the issue of reducing the primary network, removing the secondary network or changing the type of salt used. The consultation that has been carried out has been undertaken on more general issues such as satisfaction levels with the service and effectiveness of communication channels for winter service information and updates. Should the proposal progress further consultation/engagement will be required.

As part of the lead in to each winter season the Environment directorate provide a series of briefing sessions providing information to County Councillors, District Councillors, Parish Councils, Public Transport providers, Emergency Services and other principal stakeholders. These sessions provide the opportunity for the Environment Directorate to update stakeholders on the service provision for the upcoming season, and to get feedback from stakeholders from the previous season. This informal consultation has contributed to the development of the Winter Service Plan and the policies it contains.

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.

Accessibility of employment, education, medical, retail and other sensitive or key resources/facilities will need to be considered when criteria are set to determine any revised network.

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.

Potentially – there could be cumulative impacts for people if they become more isolated from work/school/hospitals etc through the reduction of the network as this could also impact on the availability of public transport/ refuse collection services/district nurses/postal services etc.

Again – further work will be required to identify a new priority network and consideration will need to be given to specific areas once this has been done.

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

Work to follow

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.

The focus for this budget reduction is to manage the service within a 'normal' winter scenario. This is not an exact science and the severity and nature of the winter will have a major influence on the actual level of service provided, as has always been the case. In times of exceptional conditions, either in the severity of the weather, or in the location of snow and ice incidence, the service will respond to these needs.

The intention is to reduce the resource available to the service by removing a number of gritting vehicles from the fleet. This will result in less resources being available in times of severe weather as well, but these resources will still be significant and will be used as effectively and efficiently as possible to address issues affecting the highways.

It is not possible to assess any particular impacts on those with protected characteristics and further work will be required to determine this.

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.

Further consideration required – it may be possible to limit the impacts

through the selection of the network affected, or by amending the extent to which the reduction is made. If this were the case the budget reduction would also be reduced.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

To be completed later.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Look to review after the first winter of operation.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Sue Procter

Position/Role Assistant Director Highway Operations

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 822 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Close waste transfer stations and landfill sites during bank holidays |
| Sponsor | Steve Scott |
| Objective | To close waste transfer stations and landfill sites during bank holidays |

Scope

To implement the policy of not providing waste facilities on bank holidays. The facilities to close on bank holidays would be Whinney Hill Landfill Site, Roman Road Transfer Station and Pendle Transfer Station. Whinney Hill landfill would be closed for residual waste and Roman Road Transfer Station/Pendle Transfer Station would no longer be open to deal with green waste.

Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) would not be affected by this proposal and so would remain open during bank holidays.

Expected Outcomes

Reduction in the waste budget

What Will Be Different?

District Council's will no longer be able to collect waste on bank holidays unless they themselves fund the opening of the facilities.

What Savings can be achieved?

In the region of £30,000 per annum from 2015/16.

Staff time involved is minimal and as such there is no tangible saving in staffing.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Waste | Transfer Stations | | | 0.030 | | | 0.030 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | --- | 0.030 | --- | --- | 0.030 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 823 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Sustainable Drainage Consenting & Enforcement |
| Sponsor | Ian Welsby |
| Objective | To introduce a fee to developers for this statutory function |

Scope

To introduce a fee to developers for the statutory planning role in determining the surface water systems & discharge requirements (SuDs) for planning applications of more than 10 dwellings or development on land over 0.5 hectare.

Expected Outcomes

There should be no reduction in the number of development applications as a result of this minimal fee passed onto developers. These applications will be processed by the existing Flood Risk Management Group, however the Government have also announced that from 2017/18 the threshold for applications is likely to include any new development over a single property; this is likely to generate 1500+ applications for LCC to process across the County. It should be noted that the staff requirement to support the SuDs applications from April 2017 will potentially require a further 9 FTE's, and new service delivery options would need developing to cater for this.

What Will Be Different?

Developers will now be charged an additional fee during planning stages to cover costs of the Councils statutory planning role in determining the surface water systems & discharge requirements (SuDs) ensuring major development will be based on more sustainable drainage systems rather than the current norm of relying on piped water disposal systems.

What Savings can be achieved?

The fees generated from processing the initial 420 applications. The projected workload for LCC is based on the numbers of planning applications received through the district planning authorities in 2011/12. This number of applications will generate a minimum of £150K based on the standard £350 rate per application. However there may be opportunities to charge staff time against developers for pre application Flood Risk Assessment work and also recoup costs in checking applications (designs, ecology, geotechnics, run off rates, permeability testing etc) by charging a higher rate for such applications the fees to up a maximum of £7K.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Flood Risk | SUDs income | | 0.150 | | | | 0.150 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.150 | --- | --- | --- | 0.150 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 824 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Joint Production of Local Transport Plan |
| Sponsor | Marcus Hudson |
| Objective | To align transport priorities and investment between LCC, Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Councils under the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) footprint |

Scope

Explore joint working arrangements and governance of production and approval of single Local Transport Plan (LTP) for Lancashire LEP area.

Expected Outcomes

Fully aligned transport strategy and programme to joint economic priorities, to direct combined LTP/LEP/Growth Fund spending priorities.

What Will Be Different?

Single strategy and programme covering transport investment priorities across the LEP area.

What Savings can be achieved?

Staff (Non LCC FTE savings) and production (technical and publication) savings.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?
 Amount of funding required?
 What is the funding required for?

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
 Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

No

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|----------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Planning | Income | | | 0.030 | | | 0.030 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | --- | 0.030 | --- | --- | 0.030 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | |
|-----|-----|-----|
| ENV | DPO | 825 |
|-----|-----|-----|

| |
|---|
| 1 |
|---|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Project | Waste - Third party recycling credits |
| Sponsor | Steve Scott |
| Objective | To achieve a saving by withdrawing discretionary recycling credit payments to third sector organisations. |
| Staff Input Involved | Waste Management Group Corporate Communications |

Scope

To implement the policy of not paying discretionary recycling credits to third sector and charitable organisations. These organisations will still be able to receive financial benefit through the sale of any recycled waste they collect but would not in future receive the added financial income through recycling credits paid by the County Council.

Expected Outcomes

Reduction in the Waste budget

What Will Be Different?

The payment of recycling credits to organisations will cease from 1st April 2014.

The County Council have historically paid 'Third Party Recycling Credits' to third sector groups and community organisations. The rate of payment in 2013/14 is £51.18 per tonne and increases annually by 3%.

The principle of Third Party Recycling Credits is that by collection of materials that may otherwise end up in the residual waste stream the third parties are saving the Council disposal costs. However, the recycling credits were introduced at a time when there was only limited collection at doorstep and at that time the third parties were actively assisting the Council in recycling.

Over the last 10 years the County Council has supported Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) financially in order that they could implement robust systems for collecting recyclables separated by the householder. Furthermore, the Council has invested heavily into facilities for processing the recyclable materials collected.

As such, the original principle of paying Third Party Recycling Credits is no longer valid as waste collected by third parties would now otherwise be collected by the WCAs. In addition, the income from the materials collected by third parties would otherwise be received by the County Council. Whilst recognising the social benefits that the third parties provide in conducting recycling activities the County Council is financially supporting the WCAs to collect the same waste, paying the third parties recycling credits when they collect it instead and losing income on the materials that they collect (it should be noted that it is not the intent to increase income to the Authority as a result of the policy but it is the case that if it were not collected by the third parties the Council would receive income).

The most significant example of this is textiles. The WCAs are required to collect textiles as part of cost sharing arrangements and the County Council funds the WCAs to collect this waste. In 2012/13 textiles made up almost 70% of all Third Party Recycling Credit claims. The current market value of textiles is anywhere between £230 and £730 per tonne depending on the quality of the material.

The organisations affected by the proposed policy are as followed (the figure in brackets shows the amount paid to these groups in 2012/13);

5 x Uniformed Groups (£5,636)
 24 x Charity Shops (£66,056)
 25 x Schools (£7,272)
 1 x Club (£149)
 11 x Churches (£7,382)
 2 x Charity Bring Banks (£9,270)

8 x Community Groups (£6,277)
 5 x Hospices (£14,903)
 5 x Reuse Groups (£9,574)

The amounts paid by material in 2012/13 were;

Paper - £24,018
 Textiles - £85,238
 Shoes - £2,599
 Books - £8,147
 Plastics - £453
 Card - £642
 Glass - £1,136
 Mixed Recyclables - £4,144
 Composting - £141

The third parties will receive income from the recyclable materials that they collect. It is not anticipated that the majority would stop collecting the recyclables they currently do. In the case of textiles in particular the income received from the value of the textiles would be sufficient to support their continued collection.

What Savings can be achieved?

The anticipated cost in 2014/15 is £134,237 although the actual payments will be wholly dependant on tonnages collected.

Due to the uncertain nature of the amounts claimed the waste budget contains a contingency to allow for variations. In essence therefore the saving is the full amount allowed for in the waste budget which in 2014/15 is £280,000.

Staff time involved is minimal and as such there are no tangible savings in staffing.

Whilst there is the potential for additional income from recyclables collected at the doorstep it is not anticipated that the third sector collections would cease as a result of the policy and therefore this is likely to be negligible.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No | |
| Amount of funding required? | --- | |
| What is the funding required for? | | --- |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 |
|-------|-------------------|-----|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Waste | Recycling Credits | --- | --- | 0.280 | --- | --- | 0.280 |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | --- | --- | 0.280 | --- | --- | 0.280 |

Equality Analysis

825- Waste Third Party Recycling Credits

Name/Nature of the Decision

To withdraw the payment of discretionary third party recycling credits.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Recycling credits are an optional payment (a discretionary power under the Environmental Protection Act 1990) made to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups. Before the introduction of cost sharing, third party recycling made a positive contribution towards the removal of recyclable materials from landfill, saving the county council disposal costs.

The payment of recycling credits began in 1992, prior to the widespread kerbside recycling collections that are now in place across the County. The introduction of the cost sharing agreements between the County Council and Lancashire's District Waste Collection Authorities has resulted in 98.24% of households receiving a fortnightly kerbside collection of recyclables. Waste collection authorities who are part of the cost sharing agreement receive a payment per property to deliver services in this way. As part of the cost sharing policy the County Council receives income from the recyclables collected which, in some part, offsets these payments.

The success of kerbside recycling collections is such that the original principal upon which recycling credit payments were introduced is no longer valid. It is highly likely that the majority of the materials for which credits are paid would now be captured by District Council waste collections should third party recycling collections of these materials cease. As such, the County Council is effectively paying third parties to collect material which alternatively would be collected by district waste collection authorities and for which we would also receive an income.

It is not suggested that the organisations to which recycling credits are paid do not provide a valuable service to the community or assist recycling efforts. It is more that the County Council is essentially paying twice for the same service. Similarly, whilst the possibility has been considered (for the purpose of providing a complete picture), it is not anticipated that the withdrawal of recycling credits would prevent groups from continuing to collect these materials. The withdrawal of the credits would reduce some of the income they receive, but groups will still retain any additional income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

Recycling levels may be affected although the impacts on Lancashire's overall waste diverted from landfill will be negligible.

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.

Various groups will be affected ranging from large national charities to small charitable community groups and schemes across the County.

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 proposal will affect all community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups who claim recycling credits, and therefore it is likely that these groups will have members that share protected characteristics namely: people of different ages, people with a disability, people of different races/ethnicities/nationalities and people of different religions/beliefs.

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.

In 2012/13 there were 110 community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups registered to claim recycling credits. The following table illustrates who these groups are, what quantity of materials they collected for recycling in 2012/13, and how much money was received by each group as a result of the County Council paying a recycling credit, which in 2012/13 was paid at the rate of £49.69 per tonne of material recycled.

| | Material Collected | Tonnage (Annual 2012/13) | Value of Credit Paid (£49.69/Tonne in 2012/13) |
|---|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Uniformed Groups (5) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £5,636.33 | | | |
| 1st Church Boys Brigade | Paper | 9.86 | £489.94 |
| 1st Halton Scout group | Paper | 22.24 | £1,105.11 |
| 1st Upholland | Paper | 2.93 | £145.59 |
| 9th Penwortham | Paper, Textiles | 21.98 | £1,092.19 |
| Chorley Healey Scouts | Paper, Textiles | 56.42 | £2,803.50 |
| Charity Shops (28) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £66,112.07 | | | |
| ADHD North West | - | 0 | 0 |
| Age Concern | Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed Recyclables | 76.22 | £3,787.37 |

| | | | |
|---|---|--------|------------|
| Age UK | Textiles, Books, Shoes, Card, Mixed Recyclables, Mixed Metals | 294.43 | £14,630.23 |
| Age UK Lancashire | Textiles, Books | 44.07 | £2,189.84 |
| Barnados | - | 0 | 0 |
| British Heart Foundation | Textiles, Shoes | 378.75 | £18,820.09 |
| British Red Cross | - | 0 | 0 |
| Cancer Help | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 18.65 | £926.72 |
| Cancer Research | Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed | 102.55 | £5,095.71 |
| Caritas Care | Textiles | 4.94 | £245.47 |
| Debra | Textiles | 1.65 | £81.99 |
| Marie Curie | Textiles | 19.86 | £986.84 |
| National Blind Childrens Society | - | 0 | 0 |
| North West Air Ambulance | Textiles | 11.27 | £560.01 |
| Oxfam | Textiles | 139.29 | £6,921.32 |
| PDSA | Textiles | 0.74 | £36.77 |
| Rosendale Hospice Shop | Textiles | 4.48 | £222.61 |
| RSPCA Lancashire East | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 11.16 | £554.54 |
| Rwanda groups trust | Textiles | 5.45 | £270.81 |
| Samaritans | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 3.86 | £191.80 |
| Save the Children | Textiles, Books | 20.72 | £1,029.58 |
| Scope | Textiles | 20.56 | £1,021.63 |
| Sense Trading | Textiles, Shoes | 17.03 | £846.22 |
| Shaw Trust | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 1.27 | £63.11 |
| Shelter | Textiles, Mixed Recyclables | 10.59 | £526.22 |
| St Johns Hospice shops | Textiles, Books | 80.91 | £4,020.42 |
| Sue Ryder | Textiles, Shoes | 44.98 | £2,235.06 |
| Extracare Charitable Trust | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 17.06 | £847.71 |
| Schools (31) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £7,272.15 | | | |
| Alston Lane Catholic Primary | Paper | 10.65 | £529.20 |
| Altham St James CE Primary | Paper | 2.5 | £124.23 |
| Bowland High | Paper | 4.17 | £207.20 |
| Bolton by Bowland Primary | Paper | 1.53 | £76.03 |
| Brabins Endowed | Paper, Textiles | 3.91 | £194.29 |
| Carnforth High | - | 0 | 0 |
| Cottam Primary | Paper, Textiles | 1.29 | £64.10 |
| Dolphinholme Primary | Paper, Textiles | 5.01 | £248.95 |
| Focus School - Hornby campus | Paper | 6.56 | £325.97 |
| Forton Primary | Paper | 1.8 | £89.44 |
| Fleetwood High School | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 3.66 | £181.87 |
| Friends of Cloughton School | Paper | 15.02 | £746.34 |
| Friends of Scorton School | Paper, Textiles | 1.02 | £50.68 |
| Nether Kellet Primary | - | 0 | 0 |
| Our Lady of Lourdes | Paper, Textiles | 3.42 | £169.94 |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------|-----------|
| Sandylands CP | Paper | 15.56 | £773.18 |
| Silverdale St Johns CE School | Paper, Textiles | 1.52 | £75.53 |
| St Bede's school | Paper | 3.33 | £165.47 |
| St Bernards Catholic Primary | Paper | 1.58 | £78.51 |
| St Josephs Catholic primary | - | 0 | 0 |
| Scotforth St Pauls CE | - | 0 | 0 |
| St Pauls | - | 0 | 0 |
| St Mary RC Primary | Paper, Textiles, Card | 6.47 | £321.50 |
| St Therasas Upholland J+P | Paper | 13.04 | £647.96 |
| St Wilfrids C of E School | Paper | 11.18 | £555.53 |
| St Leonards School, Whalley | Paper | 16.66 | £827.84 |
| St Nicholas CE Primary | Paper | 2.51 | £124.72 |
| Thorneyholme RC Primary | Paper | 0.74 | £36.77 |
| Westbourne House Day Nursery | - | 0 | 0 |
| Whalley CE Primary | Paper | 10.22 | £507.83 |
| Willows Catholic Primary | Paper | 3 | £149.07 |
| Clubs (1) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £149.07 | | | |
| Appley Bridge FC | Paper | 3 | £149.07 |
| Churches (12) – TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £7,382.95 | | | |
| Bacup F'ship of Churches | Textiles, Shoes | 6.46 | £321 |
| Edenfield Methodist | Paper | 14.1 | £700.63 |
| Mellor Parish Church | Mixed Recyclables | 3.04 | £151.06 |
| Shawforth Methodist | Paper | 42.46 | £2,109.84 |
| St John the Evangelist | Paper | 11.81 | £586.84 |
| St Johns - Hurst Green | Paper | 5.54 | £275.28 |
| St Lukes - Brierfield | Paper | 15.98 | £794.05 |
| St Mary Magdalen's Church | Paper | 1.44 | £71.55 |
| St Marys RC | Paper | 25.46 | £1,265.11 |
| St Marys Church Leyland | - | 0 | 0 |
| St Thomas Parish - Garstang | Paper | 11.46 | £569.45 |
| St Thersas Church | Paper | 10.83 | £538.14 |
| Bring Banks (2) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £8,831.40 | | | |
| Clothes Aid -Great Ormond Street Hospital | Textiles | 177.73 | £8,831.40 |
| Traid | Textiles | 8.84 | £439.26 |
| Environmental Groups (1) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £0 | | | |
| Wildlife Trust - Penwortham | - | 0 | 0 |
| Community Groups (12) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £6,277.35 | | | |
| Brothers of Charity | Paper | 41.27 | £2,050.71 |
| Crag Bank Village Hall | Paper | 7.64 | £379.63 |
| Crossways Comm. Centre | - | 0 | 0 |
| Dolphinholme Village Hall | Paper | 9.1 | £452.18 |
| Funds for you | Textiles | 16.98 | £843.74 |
| Grindleton Womens Institute | - | 0 | 0 |
| Longridge bottle bank appeal | Glass | 15.98 | £794.05 |
| Marsh Community Centre | Paper, Glass | 9.46 | £470.07 |
| Phil the Box | - | 0 | 0 |
| Piccadily Garden | - | 0 | 0 |
| Rimington Womens Institute | Paper | 4.16 | £206.71 |
| Villages in Partnership | Textiles | 21.74 | £1,080.26 |
| Hospices (5) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £14,934.32 | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------|------------|
| East Lancashire Hospice | Textiles, Books, Shoes, Mixed Recyclables | 18.05 | £896.90 |
| Hospice Care for Burnley/Pendle | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 95.34 | £4,737.44 |
| Queenscourt Hospice | Textiles, Shoes | 23.02 | £1,143.86 |
| Springhill Hopsice | Textiles, Shoes | 9.64 | £479.01 |
| St Catherines Hospice | Paper, Textiles, Books, Shoes | 154.53 | £7,678.60 |
| Reuse Groups (13) - TOTAL RECYCLING CREDIT PAID £27,602.35 | | | |
| Furniture Matters | Composting, Wood, Metals | 120.59 | £5,992.61 |
| Gift 92 | Metals | 8.19 | £496.96 |
| Help the Homeless | Paper, Textiles, Metals | 1.19 | £59.13 |
| Helping Hand | - | 0 | 0 |
| Homeless Action CiC | - | 0 | 0 |
| HUFS | Textiles, Card, Metals, Wood | 225.13 | £11,185.22 |
| Integrate | Textiles, Books, Shoes | 7.31 | £363.23 |
| International Aid | Paper, Textiles, Books, Shoes, Plastics, Paint, Metals, Wood | 190.60 | £9,470.91 |
| Open Door | - | 0 | 0 |
| Recycling Lives | - | 0 | 0 |
| Refurb | Paint | 0.69 | £34.29 |
| Tawd Vale Lions | - | 0 | 0 |
| West Lancs Community Recycling | - | 0 | 0 |

As the proposal will affect all community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups who are registered to claim recycling credits, it is likely that these groups could have members that share protected characteristics.

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)

Any potential decision will be subject to consultation.

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.

Recycling credits are an optional payment (a discretionary power under the Environmental Protection Act 1990) made to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups. It is not anticipated that the withdrawal of recycling credits would prevent or discriminate against groups from continuing to collect materials for recycling. The proposal would reduce the funding groups receive from recycling credits, but these groups will still retain some income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

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.

Should other decisions within the County Council result in the withdrawal or reduction of income or funding to community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups the groups, the decision to stop paying third party discretionary recycling credits could have a cumulative effect. The effect would involve a reduction in income received by such groups if the groups are also involved in recycling activities.

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

The original proposal remains unchanged. Due to the introduction of cost sharing, the District Councils in Lancashire receive funds from the County Council to collect the majority of recycled materials that third parties are collecting and claiming recycling credits for, so in effect if the current proposal was rejected the County Council would be double funding the collection of some materials for recycling.

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.

In September 2011 [Best Value statutory guidance](#) was published by the Communities and Local Government department. The guidance stated that local authorities should avoid making "disproportionate" funding cuts to the voluntary sector (disproportionate in relation to the county councils overall budget cuts).

The report states that "Under the Duty of Best Value, authorities should consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value, when reviewing

service provision" and that "Authorities should be responsive to the benefits and needs of voluntary and community sector organisations of all sizes.

The report also states that where an authority is seeking to reduce or end funding to community and voluntary groups, that these groups shall be given three months notice prior to the cuts, and that the authority actively engages with the groups as early as possible.

We will provide affected groups with due notice of the withdrawal of third party recycling credits to enable them to adjust their anticipated income streams.

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.

In Lancashire recycling credit payments to third parties were introduced in 1992 following the introduction of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Act introduced a mechanism for the discretionary payment of recycling credits to organisations that collect and retain household waste material for recycling rather than it being sent for disposal. The value of a third party recycling credit is based on waste disposal savings made by the County Council as the County Waste Disposal Authority and is equal to a monetary saving in landfill costs per tonne.

Currently in 2013/14 the recycling credit rate paid to third parties in Lancashire is £51.18 per tonne of material recycled. Since the introduction of Cost Sharing in 2006 the district waste collection authorities have introduced separate kerbside recycling collections for glass, paper & cardboard, metals, plastics bottles, textiles and green garden waste, and these services now cover over 90% of households in Lancashire.

This improved kerbside recycling network means that there is less need at a local level for third party recycling activities to divert recyclable materials from landfill. Withdrawal of recycling credits may slightly affect recycling levels although the impacts on Lancashire's overall waste diverted from landfill will be negligible.

The withdrawal of the credits would reduce some of the income community, charity, voluntary and not-for-profit groups receive, but groups will still retain any additional income from the sale of collected material for recycling via recycling merchants.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is unchanged.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The impact will be reviewed and monitored annually in relation to any decrease in tonnage of recyclate collected by third parties and any changes in tonnage of recyclate collected by district waste collection authorities. This will be a good indicator in any shift change in activity by organisations.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Steve Scott

Position/Role: Head of Waste Management

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 828 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Withdrawal of Adult Cycle Training |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton |
| Objective | To withdraw the provision for cycle training to adults |

| Scope | |
|---|--|
| To withdraw the provision of adult cycle training and encourage third sector and other potential providers to take over this work and introduce fees. | |

| Expected Outcomes | |
|--|--|
| Reduction in the number of adults accessing cycle training | |

| What Will Be Different? | |
|---|--|
| At the present time the County Council provides cycling training to 500 adults a year. A significant reduction is expected in the availability of adult cycle training around the County as the County Council withdraws its provision. More emphasis will be placed on provision from the third sector and other interested parties unless a charging policy was introduced to deal with demand. | |

| What Savings can be achieved? | |
|---|--|
| It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £14k in 2014/15, £15k in 2015/16 and £6k in 2016/17. A total reduction of £35k. | |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | Yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Road Safety | Cycle training | | 0.014 | 0.015 | 0.006 | | 0.035 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.014 | 0.015 | 0.006 | --- | 0.035 |

Equality Analysis

828- Withdrawal of Adult Cycle Training

Name/Nature of the Decision

Withdrawal of Adult Cycle Training

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To withdraw the provision of adult cycle training in Lancashire

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 all adults in Lancashire

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.

It is not considered to impact adversely on any particular group

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 data had been gathered as to the usage of the current service in terms of the groups listed below. Proposal is to stop provision of cycle training specifically aimed at adults and promote it along with child cycle training

It is anticipated that the proposal should not have a disproportionate negative impact on anyone or groups of people with a protected characteristic.

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, we have not consulted with any service user or group

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 effects of withdrawing adult cycle training will fall upon all adults so it should not be considered discriminatory.

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.

No

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

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.

It is not considered that any mitigation effects could be made.

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.

It is not envisaged that the effects of this proposal will have a significant impact on any particular people with protected characteristics

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is to proceed with the withdrawal of adult cycle training.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

We will monitor the impacts of this proposal once implemented.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Paul Binks

Position/Role: Road and Safety Transport Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 829 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Safer Travel Unit training |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton |
| Objective | To reduce the amount of direct road safety training provided to schools and young people by the Safer Travel Unit |

Scope

Direct road safety training provided to schools and young people by the Safer Travel Unit to enhance self service delivery through the Moodle and target staff and operational resources in areas of highest need.

Expected Outcomes

2014/15 - We will cease to undertake Theatre in Education workshops, provided by a theatre education company and will redirect education through engagement with schools through self servicing via the Moodle using web based educational material - expected outcome would be greater number of pupils accessed by through less direct methods than the current approach.- possible drop in the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured (KSIs) due to wider spread. By deploying the staff and operational resources to the areas of highest need we will reduce the delivery of Big Safe Green Challenge and In Car Safety Training with an expected outcome of less people trained/engaged but a more targeted approach to areas of highest need – possible less engagement will mean less KSI reduction, but reduction in areas of highest need.

In Years 2&3, there is increasing reliance on self service by schools across Lancashire on areas such as Right Start/Wasted Lives with more targeted deployment of staff and operational resources in areas of highest need – expected outcome is standard road safety delivery at discretion of schools (requiring teachers to access and deliver resources) across Lancashire with direct, more intense engagement with schools resulting in schools and partners delivering resources in areas of highest need – reducing KSIs

What Will Be Different?

Two week tour of The Price Theatre in Education product, delivered to 20 schools will cease and all schools will access resources through the Moodle.

Change in the delivery of in-car safety training and reducing the use of consultants from 5 days to a maximum of 2 days

Big Safe Green Challenge will be delivered in 3 not 5 districts

In Years 2&3 there is more reliance on self service by schools across Lancashire with more targeted deployment of staff and operational resources in areas of highest need

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £18k in 2014/15 relating to Theatre in Education Workshops / Big Safe Green Challenge / In Car Safety Training. The £24k in 2015/16 and £20k in 2016/17 is an estimate of potential transfer of delivery to self serve and uptake of Moodle products. A total of £62k in the three year period.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

No

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

NO

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Road Safety | Education | | 0.018 | 0.024 | 0.020 | | 0.062 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.018 | 0.024 | 0.020 | --- | 0.062 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 831 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Business Travel Planning |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton |
| Objective | To withdraw the business travel planning service |

Scope

Advice, support and provision to businesses of business travel planning. Businesses currently being supported are in Burnley, Skelmersdale, Lancaster and Preston. Where existing external funding is in place, for projects under S106 or for government funded projects, these will be completed.

Expected Outcomes

There will be no support to businesses to undertake business travel planning and likelihood that companies will no longer undertake the work or reduce the amount of work being done.

What Will Be Different?

No business travel planning support from the County Council

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £2.5k in 2014/15 and £17.5k in 2016/17 in terms of operational spend as well as staffing costs included as part of the wider service restructure.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Sustainable Travel | Business Travel Planning | | 0.003 | | 0.017 | | 0.020 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.003 | --- | 0.017 | --- | 0.020 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 832 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Speed management provision |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton |
| Objective | To reduce the level of speed management activity including motorcycle engagement and awareness |

Scope

To focus the provision of speed management on speed tasking, Speed Indicator Devices (SpiDs) and young drivers and to reduce the level of motorcycle engagement/awareness with a corresponding reduction in the purchase of hardware.

Expected Outcomes

A much more targeted approach towards speed management and a greater reliance on web based information and education as opposed to direct learning through direct Motorcycle Training and Lancashire Road Watch Project.

What Will Be Different?

Less speed management activity through more targeted approaches and a greater reliance on web based information and education as opposed to direct learning.

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £40k in 2014/15. This is broken down into £10k from Motorcycle Training and £30k from the Lancashire Road Watch budgets due to new ways of working with the police.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

No

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.040 | | | | 0.040 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.040 | --- | --- | --- | 0.040 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 833 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | Operational Learning and Development within Highways Services |
| Sponsor | Sue Procter |
| Objective | Provide all operational training and operative compliance management within Lancashire Highway Services, whilst generating an income through the provision of high quality training and packages to external customers. |

Scope

Co-ordinate and deliver all training required by the operational and management staff within Lancashire Highway Services (LHS), except where this is highly specialised or covered through corporate provision such as manager development, premises management etc. This is specifically related to the operational needs within the service and the training matrices that have been developed and agreed within LHS.
There is a known opportunity to extend the scope of provision to include external customers as a number of approaches have been made to the group to provide training.

Expected Outcomes

More responsive training provision within service, opportunity to extend training programmes.
Potential cost savings by developing a more skilled workforce that can undertake works currently let to external contractors. Income generation

What Will Be Different?

Increased number (frequency and range) of training programmes provided and increase in number of people put through training
Actively pursue external customers and deliver services to them
Expansion of training resources – rooms/equipment etc

What Savings can be achieved?

Initial savings through the delivery of increased training in-house £30,000 per year. These saving will benefit equally both capital and revenue.

On-going service development with a target of £10,000 income generation 2014/15, increasing by a further £40,000 2015/16. Marketing the training service externally.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?

Further information is available at this

link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| L&D | training | | 0.025 | 0.040 | | | 0.065 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.025 | 0.040 | --- | --- | 0.065 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 834 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | New Traffic Systems Maintenance Contract |
| Sponsor | M Galloway |
| Objective | Deliver a traffic systems maintenance service at reduced cost by making aspects of the service specification less onerous |

Scope

Procuring the new contract for maintaining traffic systems should provide opportunity to secure financial savings through less frequent but adequate inspection, replacement and fault rectification activities, location of depot facilities, and contract duration

Expected Outcomes

Traffic system regular maintenance processes and fault responses will be made within tolerances identified in national guidance documents and practised by some other highway authorities.

What Will Be Different?

The successful contractor will not be tied to establishing an operational depot within the geographical boundary of the county, but will have to meet response times to faults of 4 hours for an urgent fault (currently 2 hours), and 8 hours for a non urgent fault (currently 4 hours). As stated above these are still within tolerances referred to in national guidance. Regular maintenance practices such as the bulk changing of lamps, and site inspections will take place once, rather than twice a year. This is likely to increase fault rates. The contract will run for 5 years, providing greater security of investment by the contractor, and will include equipment supply options which should further reduce procurement costs

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the £100K reduction could be achieved by the renewal of the traffic management contract in April 2014 through a reduce specification of the contract requirements as set out above. The cost benefits of these contract changes will be determined once the tenders are returned in the new year.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|---|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Traffic Systems | maintenance | | 0.100 | | | | 0.100 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.100 | --- | --- | --- | 0.100 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 836 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Transfer of front line call handling into Parking Services |
| Sponsor | M Galloway |
| Objective | To deliver parking services in a more efficient manner for the customer, and at less cost. |

| Scope | |
|--|--|
| The cessation of funding of the equivalent of 2.85 FTE's at the Customer Contact Centre (CCC) delivering front line customer access on behalf of Parking Services, amongst other CCC duties. This service to be transferred back to Parking Services (Environment Directorate) from April 2014 and delivered within existing staffing resources. | |

| Expected Outcomes | |
|--|--|
| Customers with Parking Services related queries will be dealt with at a single point of contact. Currently the CCC transfer a number of callers on to Parking Services in the Environment Directorate when they feel unable to answer the query. | |

| What Will Be Different? | |
|---|--|
| Customers will receive comprehensive responses to their queries at a single point of contact across the full range of Parking Service related activity. | |

| What Savings can be achieved? | |
|---|--|
| Saving of the £75k payment to One Connect Ltd for the provision of the current service. | |

| Invest to Save: Downsize reserve | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|--|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Parking Services | Call handling | | 0.075 | | | | 0.075 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.075 | --- | --- | --- | 0.075 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 837 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Project | District/Parish Public Realm Agreements - Highway - Green Space maintenance |
| Sponsor | Daniel Herbert |
| Objective | Review the current arrangements for green space maintenance in order to reduce costs through efficiencies or reduced service specification. |

Scope

Working with the district councils to deliver the public realm green space maintenance within a reducing budget over a 3year time frame, to further explore if efficiencies can be realised by delivering the service through the Operations team or by renegotiating with the district councils. In addition, a review of the service standards will be undertaken.

Expected Outcomes

- Establish minimum standards consistent with road safety requirements.
- All green space maintenance will be undertaken in accordance with our standard as a minimum.
- Asset information to be gathered
- Districts may or may not enhance the standard with their money as is the current situation

What Will Be Different?

- District/parish councils will no longer undertake this work.
- Service standard is likely to be reduced to comply with road safety requirements only.
- Service standard will be applied consistently across the county.
- Grass is likely to be longer before it gets cut.

What Savings can be achieved?

Anticipate £404k through economies of scale and reduced services

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

| |
|--|
| |
| |

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

No

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

NO

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| LNM | District payments | | 0.144 | 0.137 | 0.123 | | 0.404 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.144 | 0.137 | 0.123 | --- | 0.404 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 841 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Bus Shelter Maintenance |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton, Assistant Director Sustainable Transport |
| Objective | To reduce the costs associated with the maintenance of County Council owned bus shelters on quality bus routes |

Scope

To implement a reduced maintenance regime with an overall reduction of 25% in maintenance costs and the non-replacement of sites where vandalism is prevalent or where shelters have been knocked down by uninsured drivers

Expected Outcomes

A decline in the quality of appearance of bus shelters on Quality Bus routes and a reduction in the number of shelters provided.

What Will Be Different?

A decline in the quality of appearance of bus shelters on Quality Bus routes and a reduction in the number of bus shelters provided.

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £15k in 2014/15 and £10k in 2015/16.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

No

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Public bus | Bus shelters | | 0.025 | | | | 0.025 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.025 | --- | --- | --- | 0.025 |

Equality Analysis

841- Bus Shelter Maintenance

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reducing the annual maintenance of LCC owned bus shelters

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To lower the annual budget for maintenance of quality bus route and other LCC owned bus shelters from the current £65,000 pa in 2013/4 to £50,000 in 2014/5 and £40,000 in 2015/6.

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 travel on certain high frequency bus routes that were improved as part of a partnership between this authority, borough and city councils and the bus operators. These were labelled quality bus routes. In some cases the maintenance of the new shelters this authority installed remained with us rather than being taken on by the borough or city council. On these routes the effects of the budget reduction will apply equally.

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 maintenance of shelters may lead to lights not operating, vandalised seating being removed and not replaced. The breaking of glazing panels would reduce the shelter's effectiveness in shielding people from inclement weather.

The lack of shelter lighting would impact on partially sighted passengers trying to read information held in the timetable case after dusk. Very often an adjacent streetlight will alleviate this problem but not always.

A lack of seating would impact on the elderly, ambient disabled and pregnant women.

A vandalised bus shelter is both a crime scene and evidence of anti social behaviour. This would impact on bus passengers who have a fear of anti-social behaviour from these two groups either because of their physical frailty or because they are members of a group which has been the target of such behaviour in the past. Their anxiety and disaffection would rise.

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 only demographic information we hold on bus passengers comes from the use of concessionary travel cards. These are held by persons over 61 years and six months and by the blind and disabled.

In the past, as part of the quality bus route development, we carried out satisfaction surveys amongst bus passengers travelling on these routes. In addition to recording their age and gender, respondents were asked to self identify as one of a list of ethnic groups. The satisfaction surveys were discontinued in 2008.

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, we have not consulted with any service user or group.

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 effects of the reduced spending on bus shelter maintenance will fall upon all bus passengers so it should not be considered discriminatory. However, the impact may be felt more adversely by some groups eg. women/pregnant women, disabled people and lgbt people

The shelters increased opportunity by making journeys more pleasant and also by providing seating for the elderly, ambient disabled and pregnant women it encouraged travel by bus amongst these groups. It therefore encouraged persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low. Although this was dependant on bus access to the activity.

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. The lack of maintenance in the shelters would exacerbate any withdrawal of evening and Sunday bus services that were previously financially supported by this authority by making bus travel less amenable. Conversely this withdrawal would also increase the hours where the shelter was not in use. Therefore giving vandals more hours of opportunity for anti social behaviour without interruption by waiting passengers or watchful bus drivers with radio contact to the police.

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

Continuing with the original proposal. In previous financial years we have consistently under spent the budget allocation. The proposed reduction in 2014/15 would see it reduced to the approximate amount spent in previous years. However, the proposed reduction in 2015/16 would see the budget reduced to below the annual average spend. This would not provide contingency for severe weather, damage or inflation.

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.

The remaining shelter budget could be allocated between different types of repair subject to virement between headings during the financial year. The repair of seating and lights could be prioritised. Also we could prioritise repair of shelters at those stops with a high use by people sharing the relevant protected characteristics, eg. age, disability

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.

In previous financial years we have consistently under spent the budget allocation.

The proposed reduction would see it reduced to the approximate amount spent in previous years. However this would not provide contingency for severe weather, damage or inflation. Further budget cuts would have an adverse impact on the travelling public, particularly the elderly and disabled.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is to proceed with the budget reduction as planned. We should be able to mitigate the effect on certain groups by prioritising repairs of damage that impact on them and careful monitoring of spending.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

A database is to be set up with details of all LCC owned bus shelters. Amongst the information this will contain, there will be records of vandal attacks, damage, graffiti, complaints and repairs at each stop. Note can be made of the likely demographic or shared characteristic of passengers boarding there and priority given to repairs.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Michael Haughey

Position/Role Technical Services Officer

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager Chris Anslow

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| ENV | DPO | 842 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Vehicle and associated checks carried out on subsidised services |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton, Assistant Director Sustainable Transport |
| Objective | To reduce the level of checks carried out on subsidised services at schools and at bus stations/interchanges and to reduce the amount of input from Lancashire County Commercial Group (LCCG). |

Scope

A programme of spot checks is carried out throughout the year on vehicles operating County Council contracts. These checks mainly take place at schools but also include checks at bus stations and other bus termini in the County. In addition to these checks, we also undertake operator compliance, on bus revenue checks and checks on drivers to ensure that they have been given clearance to operate County Council contracts. It is proposed that this level of checking is reduce as follows:

- Reduce the number of operator compliance checks from 30 to 22 per annum. These are visits to operator premises to check that their procedures are compliant with LCCs contractual requirements;
- Reduce the number of gateway checks from 50 to 38 per annum. These checks take place on commercial and subsidised services and are aimed at maintaining safety and appropriate passenger conduct;
- Reduce number of vehicle checks from 463 to 400 per annum. These checks are on subsidised services to ensure that vehicles comply with legal and contractual requirements;
- Reduce number of revenue checks from 360 to 270 per annum. These checks are on subsidised services and ensure that all passengers travel with a valid ticket and have paid the appropriate fare.

The vehicle checks are carried out in conjunction with LCCG staff who are qualified mechanics. In future we will make use of qualified staff within the Public Transport team to undertake vehicle maintenance checks and thereby reduce the need to pay fees to LCCG.

Also looking into the possibility of building a charge into the contract to cover costs of inspections that result in faults identified over a certain threshold i.e. several minors or one major fault identified would result in a penalty payment charged to operator which could self fund the activity.

Expected Outcomes

A reduction in the level and costs associated with vehicle and associated checks. Reliance on bus operators to adhere to safety standards as part of their service contract without an external check by LCC.

What Will Be Different?

Outlined above.

What Savings can be achieved?

It is estimated that the full year savings based on the proposals above will be £25k in 2014/15.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | |
| What is the funding required for? | |

Public Sector Equality Duty

| | |
|--|----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | No |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | |

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Public bus | Vehicle checks | | 0.025 | | | | 0.025 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.025 | --- | --- | --- | 0.025 |

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| ENV | DPO | 851 | 1 |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Project | Revisions to School Crossing Patrols |
| Sponsor | Tony Moreton, Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport |
| Objective | To introduce a grant system available to primary schools towards the cost of funding a school crossing patrol. |
| Staff Input Involved | Road Safety Staff LCCG staff and school crossing patrol personnel |

Scope

Make available a fixed grant of £2,000 to each primary school as a contribution towards the full cost of providing a school crossing patrol. The total county council funding available would be limited to £1m per annum. The grant would be tied to the use of LCCG trained and employed school crossing patrol personnel and schools would be required to make up any difference in costs. The cost of a school crossing patrol is estimated to be between £4,000 and £4,500 per annum.

This grant system would apply from the financial year 2015/2016

Expected Outcomes

A potential overall increase in the number of school crossing patrols provided, although some existing patrols may no longer be provided.

What Will Be Different?

Schools will have a much greater input into the provision of school crossing patrols including their location.

Schools will be required to make a financial contribution towards the cost of provision.

What Savings can be achieved?

It is proposed that the budget for school crossing patrols be reduced from £1.5m to £1m per annum, a saving of £0.5m per annum.

There are 485 primary schools in the County and it is estimated that the current cost of a school crossing patrol is between £4,000 and £4,500 per annum. There are 357 established patrols although currently there are 341 that are active as some are vacant due to recruitment issues or they no longer meet criteria but have not been formally disestablished. Schools which currently do not have a school crossing patrol because it does not presently meet existing criteria will also be able to take up the offer of funding. If we assume a 20% increase in the take-up from schools there could potentially be 410 sites in future. A fund of £2,000 per school would give a take-up of £820,000 per annum which would then give some funding for crossing patrols that are not located for any particular school.

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Access required to downsize reserve? | No |
| Amount of funding required? | --- |
| What is the funding required for? | --- |

| Public Sector Equality Duty | |
|--|-----|
| Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic? Further information is available at this link: http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e | Yes |
| If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available | yes |

| Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
| Road Safety | School Crossing Patrols | --- | --- | 0.500 | --- | --- | 0.500 |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total net incremental savings | | --- | --- | 0.500 | --- | --- | 0.500 |

Equality Analysis

851- Revisions to School Crossing Patrols

Name/Nature of the Decision

To introduce a grant system available to primary schools towards the cost of funding a school crossing patrol tied to the use of LCCG staff

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

To make available a fixed grant to each primary school as a contribution towards the cost of a crossing patrol. The total funding available would be £1m per annum and schools would be able to apply for a grant of £2,000 per annum towards the costs of the school crossing patrol. The grant would be tied to the use of LCCG trained and employed school crossing patrol personnel and schools would make up any difference in costs. The cost of a school crossing patrol is between £4,000 and £4,500 per annum.

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 school children using school crossing patrols in Lancashire

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.

- People of different races/ethnicities/nationalities – Not known but large urban areas may see less provision than current. These tend to be areas of higher deprivation and also areas where there are high proportions of people from BME backgrounds.

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.

- At this stage it is felt unlikely that the decision would impact on any specific sub-groups

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, we have not consulted with any service user or group.

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.

- At this stage it is felt unlikely that the decision would impact on any specific sub-groups although large urban areas may see less provision than current. These tend to be areas of higher deprivation and also areas where there are high proportions of people from BME backgrounds.

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.

No

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

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.

It is not considered that any mitigation effects could be made to this proposal

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.

It is not envisaged that the effects of this proposal will have a significant impact on any particular people with protected characteristics other than those outlined above.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is to proceed with the proposed grant system for school crossing patrols.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

We will monitor the impacts of this proposal once implemented.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Paul Binks

Position/Role : Road and Safety Transport Manager

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2017/18 - Project Brief

| | | | |
|-------------|------|--------|-------------|
| Directorate | Type | Number | Live/Active |
| OCE | DPO | 921 | 1 |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Project | Review of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) Grants |
| Sponsor | Bernard Noblett |
| Objective | To identify the scale and scope of VCFS grants made and the associated administration costs, and to produce recommendations to reduce the overall level of expenditure |

Scope

This activity will be carried out as a single exercise across all County Council services and will cover all areas of activity for which VCFS grants are given.

Expected Outcomes

A standardised policy framework for making decisions about how VCFS grants are made, the elimination of any current duplication of grants and recommendations for reductions in the level of grants and associated administration costs where appropriate.

What Will Be Different?

There will be a standardised approach with a clear set of rules and decision making framework, and transparency around the level of grants made.

What Savings can be achieved?

Invest to Save: Downsize reserve

Access required to downsize reserve?

Amount of funding required?

What is the funding required for?

Public Sector Equality Duty

Is there any potential negative impact on any person with a protected characteristic?
Further information is available at this link:

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e>

Yes

If 'Yes' has the Equality Impact Assessment documentation been completed and available

Yes

Financial Analysis: (discrete annual savings)

| Area | Description | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | Total |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| | | | 0.500 | | | | 0.500 |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | | | | | | --- |
| | | --- | 0.500 | --- | --- | --- | 0.500 |

Equality Analysis

921 - Review of Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) Grants

Name/Nature of the Decision

Grants to the Third Sector

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

A reduction in total of £500,000 in 2014/15 in the Central Gateway Grants Scheme, Local Initiative Fund and Local Member Grants Scheme budgets. The proposed cuts would mean a reduction of funds by 35% to the three schemes which provide much needed support to voluntary, community and faith organisations all across Lancashire.

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 three grant streams are available to all 12 Districts across Lancashire, however the demographics across the districts can vary quite considerably and therefore it is likely that the impact across the 12 districts will vary and some districts will be more severely affected than others.

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, the decision could impact a number of the protected characteristics under the Equality Act. The types of organisations that benefit from the grant funding are extremely varied and they help the County Council deliver vital services, without which an additional burden could well be placed on the County Council. All characteristics will be impacted, but in particular the following characteristics would see a significant impact:

Age

A considerable amount of funding is aimed at young people, for example places to go, things to do, funding for NEET individuals etc across the county and over the years this has been identified as a priority for the people of Lancashire as highlighted in the Lancashire Living Surveys which consulted with the residents of Lancashire to identify what was important to them.

A significant number of organisations currently funded through the grant programmes cater for older people and help Lancashire County Council to meet its priorities by delivering services and support to meet the needs of local older people.

Disability

There are currently a number of organisations that are funded to help aid Disabled people across Lancashire. These services provide vital support to people who really need it by providing access to independent information and advice, helping to remove barriers to disabled people's participation in society, raise disability awareness amongst the general public, promoting equality standards and advancing equality between disabled people and others, etc. without the support of these services there would be additional pressure put on the services delivered by the county council. Many of these organisations have been supporting the council to meet its aims and objectives for over 20 years now.

Race/ethnicity/nationality

A number of organisations currently funded through the grant programmes provide the county council with support in meeting the following services to the people of Lancashire:

- Offering direct support to those suffering any form of discrimination, prejudice and inequality;
- Support to BME groups and organisations across the county;
- Capacity building for BME people – particularly women – and the BME community sector

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.

Third Sector organisations provide a wide range of services and support to the sector, including support to smaller organisations within the county. In addition to funding for specific projects, a number of these organisations rely on funding from, for example, the Central Gateway Grants Scheme, for core running costs such as employee salaries and day to day ongoing costs.

Information on the protected characteristics above will be available in the applications that are submitted by organisations, the details of the assessments undertaken by the Grants Team and subsequent monitoring of organisations which have been awarded grant funding. In addition to this a number of surveys conducted by Lancashire County Council over the years have aided to build up a picture of the

specific needs of the county.

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 formal consultation with the Third Sector has yet taken place. However initial discussions with One Lancashire, the main Third Sector infrastructure support body in Lancashire have taken place and it is envisaged that they would assist in further consultation with the sector. In line with national principles under the Compact (an agreement between the government and voluntary and community organisations) sufficient time should be allowed to permit meaningful engagement and consultation with the sector if cuts are proposed with a recommendation of at least a 3 month notice period. Lancashire County Council is currently in the process of reviewing its own Compact with the Sector.

It should be noted that under normal circumstances the county council would at this time of year be getting ready to launch funding rounds for the next financial year(s), the sector is eagerly awaiting information on future funding rounds and a number of enquires have already been made as to when the rounds will open. Delay in funding will also have a significant impact on organisations, for example many Central Gateway applications where support core running costs such as salaries, or rent, delayed payments can have an adverse affect such as redundancy notices being served.

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 funding may result in some of the smaller and possibly medium sized third sector organisations no longer being viable if they cannot access funding previously available. Many of these organisations will primarily support particular groups of persons with the protected characteristics and this may be seen as contrary to the statements made above and exacerbating the adverse impact on people with protected characteristics.

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, quite possibly – e.g. changes to adult social care at a Lancashire level, changes to funding arrangements at the National Arts Council, changes in services for younger people – post 16 year olds, youth unemployment, hostility towards people with protected characteristics e.g. disabled people, Lgbt people, etc.

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 changes to the proposals have been identified to date.

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.

Initial discussions have been held with "One Lancashire" as the main third sector support body within the county to look at ways in which the adverse effects of this decision could be reduced. However as the funds affected by this decision represent the sum of the main sources of funding for VCFS organisations across the county it is inevitable that there will be some adverse effects. One Lancashire tend to operate at an intermediate level in terms of VCFS organisations and have not as yet developed a similar relationship with smaller / "grass roots" VCFS organisations and as such it may be here that the most impact is felt.

Officers will also be meeting with representatives of Big Lottery in the New Year to explore the potential for maximising alternative sources of funding for smaller VCFS groups across the county..

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.

These proposals would result in a reduction of £500,000, i.e. approximately a third, of the current total budget for the three grant streams and this will have an adverse impact on the Third Sector, including groups which represent and support people with protected characteristics. Larger infrastructure organisations may be able to continue but some medium and smaller organisations may have to cease/reduce services and support all together. We have already seen a significant number of closures to organisations across the County over the past 4 years as organisations struggle to survive in the current climate. Over the years changes to the grant programmes, tighter criteria and greater scrutiny of applications has had an impact on funding availability for many organisations, but external factors such as national cuts and less voluntary donations, etc have also played a role.

The impact of possible closures or reduction in services from third sector

organisations, its effects on individuals including those with protected characteristics and the additional burden this would place on the County Council will need to be considered.

It should also be noted that VCFS organisations are also able to attract other sources of funding either from national bodies such as Big Lottery or from private sector or individual contributions. Figures vary dependant on the type of organisation but this is estimated to be between £2 to £6 additional funding for every £1 invested in VCFS organisations.

Additionally most VCFS organisations will utilise volunteers which on the basis of average earnings is estimated to be an input of £13.03 per hour per volunteer. It is also recognised that volunteering contributes to well being and employability.

Consequently there would be a secondary negative impact on the ability to attract other funding into the county and a negative impact on the "volunteer premium" should existing VCFS organisations face closure.

Local community organisations and grass root organisations will be affected if the individual budgets for each County Councillor (currently £3,000 per annum) are reduced. Amongst other things this will impact on the many community events that aid social inclusion and one off training events and purchases of vital equipment or improving access/accessible facilities at small organisations' premises that the fund currently supports.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

A proposal is currently being considered to reduce the budgets for the Central Gateway Grants Scheme and Local Initiative Funds, together with the annual budget for each of the 84 County Councillors.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate review and monitoring arrangements will be considered once the proposals have been finalised.

Equality Analysis Prepared By

Position/Role

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member