

**Additional Service Offers
Equality Analysis**

04/12/2014

An equality analysis has been produced to accompany those service offers where officers consider there is a potential significant impact on communities within Lancashire. Where no equality analysis has been produced we will consider further the potential impact of the service offer and, where appropriate, develop and refine our equality analysis over the period of consultation.

All equality analysis will be subject to ongoing review and further development where appropriate.

INDEX

Service Offer Title and related Equality Analysis	Page
Supporting People - Supporting People EA	3
Residential Services, Fostering and Adoption - Residential Services, Fostering and Adoption EA	20
Public Health and Wellbeing - Healthy Lifestyles EA - Sexual health EA - Tobacco Control EA - CYP and Families Public Health Service EA - Substance Misuse Services EA - Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help EA - Health Services to CYP EA - Community Safety EA - Road Safety EA - Scientific Services EA - Trading Standards EA - Safe Trader Scheme EA	 39 50 61 70 81 95 110 120 137 147 157 167
Highways - Highways EA	177

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Supporting People
For Decision Making Items

December 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Reduction in Supporting People funding by £4.778million

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to reduce the Supporting People budget by £4.778m, from £12.371 million to £7.593 million by 31st March 2017.

We are proposing to cease funding for sheltered housing with effect from 1st April 2017. This would generate £2.5 million savings. Delaying the implementation would give providers around 2 years to put plans in place to decommission or reconfigure services.

It is likely that the impact of the reduction will be a combination of the following:

- a greater focus on housing management
- removal or reduction of support
- charging of tenants

The remaining £2.3 million savings will be identified from funding for short term supported accommodation services, floating support services and supported living services for people with mental health issues.

We will be seeking to identify the most appropriate models of service delivery over the next 12 -18 months. This will include considering the impact of the integrated wellbeing service and the development of community asset based approaches. We will also consider the impact of local housing markets.

A full EA will be completed once we have developed detailed proposals and consultation has been undertaken

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.

It is likely that the decision will affect people across Lancashire in a similar way. However, until the detailed proposals are developed it is impossible to be absolutely sure that this will be the case.

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.

SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION

In the region of 12,000 people receive financial assistance to pay for their sheltered housing support charge. Whilst a breakdown of the protected characteristics of people who have accessed sheltered housing is not currently available, services can only be accessed by older people and people with disabilities.

SHORT TERM SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION SERVICES - The current funding for short term supported accommodation is outlined below. Whilst services have been given a primary client group designation, most people will have multiple needs.

Funding

Client Group	Annual funding
Domestic violence refuges	1,057,673
Young people (16-25 year olds)	2,672,564
Homeless families	605,195
Single homeless (over 25 year olds)(includes 1 mixed single homeless and homeless families)	1,003,173
Offenders	319,479
Teenage Parents	246,260
People with substance misuse issues	153,863

Services/Units

	Central		North		East	
	Services	Units	Service	Units	Service	Units
DV refuges	4	36	3	12	2	29
Young people	8	76	6	92	5 plus 1 dispersed	73(80)
Homeless families	2	61	1	9	1	8
family/single homeless					1	20
Single homeless	3	85	1	10		
Offenders	1	23	2	16	No provision	
Teenage parents	2	15	No provision		1	8
People with substance misuse issues	No provision		1	6	2	20

Profile of People Accessing Supported Accommodation Services

The tables below include the services listed above and supported housing for people with mental health issues

Disability

	Yes	Yes %	No	No %	Don't Know	Don't Know %	Total
Supported housing	189	16%	981	84%	3	0%	1173
Refuge	72	21%	271	78%	4	1%	347
Lancashire (16-64)	106,663	14.66%	621,040	85.34%	n/a	n/a	727,703

21% of people accessing refuges and 16% of people accessing supported accommodation are disabled, compared to 14.6% of the Lancashire population aged 16-64 years old. This means that any changes to provision will have a greater impact on people with disabilities.

Sex

Service Type	Female	Female %	Male	Male %	Total
Supported housing	483	41%	690	59%	1173
Refuge	347	100%	0	0%	347
Lancashire (16-64)	367,240	50.47%	360,463	49.53%	727,703

41% of people accessing supported housing service and 100% of people accessing refuges are female compared to 50.47% of the Lancashire population aged 16-64.

This means that any changes in refuge provision will have a greater impact on women and changes in supported housing will have a greater impact on men

Age

	Supported housing	Supported housing %	Refuge	Refuge %	Total
16-17	307	26%	9	3%	316
18-24	561	48%	109	31%	670
25-31	85	7%	97	28%	182
32-38	67	6%	55	16%	122
39-45	71	6%	44	13%	115
46-52	47	4%	17	5%	64
53-59	18	2%	11	3%	29
60-64	9	1%	0	0%	9
65-69	4	0%	2	1%	6

70-74	0	0%	3	1%	3
75-79	0	0%	0	0%	0
80+	4	0%	0	0%	4
Lancashire figures					
16-24					141,132
25-49					377,550
Age 50 and over					438,274

Whilst the above information does not enable a direct comparison for all age groups, it does demonstrate that there is a significantly higher proportion of people between 16 and 24 years old accessing services than can be found in the Lancashire general population. This means that changes to supported housing will have a greater impact on young people.

Ethnic Origin

Service Type	Supported housing	%	Refuges	%	Lancs.	%
White	1105	94.20%	258	74.35%	687,774	92.22%
Mixed	27	2.30%	6	1.73%	6,693	0.90%
Asian	12	1.02%	66	19.02%	46,076	6.18%
Black	22	1.88%	5	1.44%	3,084	0.41%
Other	3	0.26%	12	3.45%	2,136	0.29%
Refused	4	0.34%				
Total:	1173		347		745,763	

7% of people accessing supported housing and 29% of people accessing refuges are from minority ethnic groups compared to 7.78% of the 16-64 year old Lancashire population, This means that any changes to refuges will have a greater impact on people from minority ethnic groups.

Profile of People Accessing Floating Support

The most accurate comparison would be between the profile of people accessing services and the profile of people within Lancashire with a need for floating support services. However, as this data is not available, we have used the population of Lancashire as our comparator group.

Ethnic Origin	Lancs (16+)	Floating Support
White	93.52%	94.44%
Mixed/multiple ethnic group	0.74%	1.04%
Asian/Asian British	5.14%	2.53%

Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	0.37%	0.74%
Other ethnic group	0.23%	0.94%

Sex	Lancs. (16+)	Floating Support
Males:	49%	31.76%
Females:	51%	68.19%

Disability	Lancs. (16+)	Floating Support
Disabled	23.71%	39%
Not disabled	76.29%	61%

The above tables show that we are supporting

- A greater proportion of people with disabilities than the comparator group
- A marginally smaller proportion of people from minority ethnic groups than the comparator group
- A greater proportion of women than the comparator group

Therefore people with disabilities and women will be most affected if funding is reduced

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)

Sheltered Accommodation

Consultation has taken place regarding the £2million savings which formed part of the savings proposals for 2014/15. A report is due to be considered by the Cabinet Member on 8th December 2014 which

outlines the consultation feedback and proposes a reduction in the funding by £2 million.

The additional £2.5 million savings proposed within this report would result in all funding being withdrawn from sheltered housing and community alarms. There has been no consultation to date with service users, districts or providers. Consultation will take place prior to any decision being taken and a full EA will be completed.

Short term supported accommodation, floating support and supported living for people with mental health

There has been no consultation to date with service users, districts or providers. Consultation will take place to determine the most appropriate approach to securing the outstanding £2.3 million

A full EA will be completed once detailed proposals have been developed and consultation undertaken

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 high level of proposed savings, it is predicted that overall there will be a significant impact on people in need of housing related support services.

There will be a significant impact on people living within sheltered housing as it is proposed that all funding which provides financial assistance for the support element of the service would be withdrawn. The housing element would not be at risk as this is funded by housing benefits.

Services are already being reconfigured with a greater focus on housing management, consequently the impact of further savings is likely to be the introduction of charges for support or the withdrawal of

support. However, the full impact will not be known until consultation is 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.

Yes. Given the high proportion of people who are not working and dependent on benefits, it is possible that the decision could combine with other factors or decisions taken at a national level to exacerbate the impact on particular groups. (e.g. welfare reforms) and at a local level (e.g. other proposals to achieve savings - changes in relation to equipment, the amount of funding available for care packages)

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

Given the level of savings which need to be achieved by the County Council, it is acknowledged that the funding for housing related support services will need to reduce. However, it is not possible to complete this section until consultation has been undertaken in relation to withdrawal of funding from sheltered housing and detailed proposals have been developed, and consulted on, in relation to the remaining savings.

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.

SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION

It is hoped that the following services will mitigate some of the impact; however, this will be dependent on the level of capacity and whether individuals meet the eligibility criteria:

- telecare
- Integrated Wellbeing Service
- asset based approaches to providing support

In addition, some service providers are reconfiguring their services to provide a greater emphasis on housing management which may help

to offset some of the potential reductions in staffing. However, this option isn't available to all providers

OTHER SERVICES

Mitigation will be fully considered as part of the planning of the detailed proposals; however initial thoughts are as follows:

Short term accommodation based services

We will be seeking:

- to explore the opportunity for reconfiguring services some services with less of a focus on support;
- to identify other models of service delivery which would meet the strategic needs of a district and the County Council but may be more cost effective;
- to identify other models of service delivery for covering the night time hours in services requiring a 24 hour staff presence

Mental Health Assessment

We are seeking to undertake an assessment of the needs of all people living in supported housing in order to identify if any individuals are receiving more support than they require.

Floating Support

Any reductions in floating support will be mitigated to some extent by the integrated wellbeing service; however this will be dependent on capacity and eligibility

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 proposals are being put forward in order to achieve savings. It is clear that the full withdrawal of funding from sheltered housing will have a negative impact on older people and people with disabilities. The full impact will not be known until we undertake consultation; however it is likely that support will be withdrawn or charges will be levied.

In relation to the remaining £2.3 million savings, detailed proposals have not yet been developed.

A full EA will be developed prior to any decision being made

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The proposal is to reduce the Supporting People budget by £4.778m, from £12.371 million to £7.593 million by 1st April 2017.

We are proposing to cease funding for sheltered housing with effect from 1st April 2017. This would generate £2.5 million savings. Delaying the implementation until April 2017 would give providers around 2 years to put plans in place to put plans in place.

It is likely that the impact of the reduction will be a combination of the following:

- a greater focus on housing management
- removal or reduction of support

- charging of tenants

It is proposed that the remaining £2.3 million savings will be identified from funding for short term supported accommodation services, floating support services and supported living services for people with mental health issues.

We will be seeking to identify the most appropriate future models of service delivery over the next 12 -18 months. This will include considering the impact of the integrated wellbeing service and the development of community asset based approaches. We will also consider the impact of local housing markets.

A full EA will be developed once detailed proposals have been developed and consultation has been undertaken.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The following arrangements will be put in place:

Consultation will be undertaken in relation to sheltered housing.

In order to achieve the remaining savings, the County Council, Districts and providers will work together over the next 12 -18 months to identify the most appropriate models of service delivery. This will include considering the impact of the integrated wellbeing service and the development of community asset based approaches. We will also consider the impact of local housing markets.

Section 1

Equality Analysis Toolkit

**Residential Services, Fostering and
Adoption/ Youth Offending**

For Service Managers

November 2014

1) What is the aim of your service?

This should complement the County Council's Corporate Strategy or your Directorate's objectives.

Residential Services, Fostering and Adoption / Youth Offending Service Offers

We are committed to doing everything we can to help and support the children and young people in Lancashire to have a positive future. To do this we have adopted as our core belief; A moral commitment to work in the best interests of children and young people and their families at all times and make a positive difference to their lives.

2) What outcomes do you want to achieve from your service?

To deliver residential provision for children looked after, including those young people with complex needs, for whom long term residential care is appropriate. The residential provision will include an assessment unit, mainstream units and a complex needs unit.

For the assessment unit and fostering service to maximise the use of approved placements for young people who would otherwise have been placed in residential homes. To recruit, assess and train connected and mainstream foster carers and adopters within current legislation to provide care and permanence where appropriate, to children and young people who are unable to live with their birth families.

To implement a placement strategy that maximises the use of current and new foster care resource. To provide post permanence support from the fostering and adoption services to prevent adoption and fostering breakdowns.

To delivery youth justice services across Lancashire – preventing entry into the system and reducing reoffending.

The overnight break Service provides overnight/short care packages for children with profound learning or physical disabilities but does not look after young people with a medium – profound disability. Lancashire County Council will continue to meet its statutory obligations in respect of providing services for children in need of accommodation.

3) How is your service performing?

Write here any information you have collected that shows how your service is performing. See the corporate intranet site at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2665&pageid=30233 for directorate business planning information.

Residential Ofsted Judgements

Home	Previous Judgement	Latest
Alexandra House, Lancaster	Outstanding	Outstanding
South Avenue, Morecambe	Good	Outstanding
The Bungalow, Preston	Outstanding	Outstanding
Maplewood House, Bamber Bridge	Adequate	Good
Grimshaw Lane, Ormskirk	Good	Outstanding
Long Copse, Chorley	Outstanding	Outstanding
Hargreaves House, Oswaldtwistle	Good	Good
Reedley Cottages, Burnley	Good	Good
Bowerham Rd, Lancaster	Good	Good
Thornton, Cleveleys	Outstanding	Outstanding
Eden Bridge	Adequate	Good
Grange Avenue, Preston	Adequate	Adequate
The Willows, Skelmersdale	Adequate	Good
Chorley Hall Road, Chorley	Good	Good
Warwick Avenue, Accrington	Outstanding	Outstanding
The Haven, Burnley	Good	Good
Marsden Hall Rd, Nelson	Outstanding	Good
Crestmoor, Rossendale	Outstanding	Outstanding

Residential Schedule 5 Notifications

Number of Schedule 5 forms received per month	Jan 14	Feb 14	Mar 14	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Oct 14	Total
	5	4	2	4	8	1	6	6	4	5	45

Residential Compliments and Complaints

Number of Compliments received per month	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Oct 14	Nov 14	Dec 14	Total
	21	12	17	6	6	11	4	0	0	77

Number of Complaints received per month	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Oct 14	Nov 14	Dec 14	Total
	4	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	11

Residential Missing from Home

Number of Children reported missing	Jan 14	Feb 14	Mar 14	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Total
	12	8	8	12	18	12	11	10	5	96

Number of times M.F.H.	Jan 14	Feb 14	Mar 14	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Total
	32	15	9	30	35	18	21	17	10	187

The adoption service was rated good by Ofsted in 2011, and the fostering service rated as excellent in 2012. Performance on the adoption score card is slowly improving.

4) Who are the people who will benefit from your service?

The answer to this question could be everyone in Lancashire, or it could be everyone within a District of Lancashire e.g. Burnley, or everyone within a ward e.g. Daneshouse etc. Alternatively, the answer could be a particular group of people e.g. young people in Leyland, people with a disability in Frenchwood etc.

Information on Lancashire's population can be found at

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/profile>

The main people who will benefit from our service are young people in Lancashire in need of care or interventions. In addition to this our foster carers and residential staff will also benefit from our service by giving them different opportunities, experience and training.

Children looked after

The total number of CLA has increased over recent months. Most, but not all, districts have shown a small increase since the beginning of this year. Approximately 70% of these are in foster care, which equates to approximately 930 children. An outreach service will support the assessment unit to work with families, foster carers and young people to achieve foster care placements, whilst also working with young people and families on the edge of care to remain at home.

The fostering service will work alongside the residential assessment unit to identify and offer foster care placements to those children who need longer term care who would otherwise be placed in residential units.

The fostering and adoption services will be provided through the amalgamation of recruitment and assessment and support functions. This will allow more flexible use of resources across the services to respond to the needs of children, foster carers and adopters. The criteria for accepting applications will be more flexible.

The fostering service will make additional use of tier 3 foster carers in supporting new carers, service developments, specific projects and post adoption support.

Delivering emotional health and wellbeing training to residential practitioners from all ten Lancashire County Council residential homes.

The provision of emotional health and wellbeing interventions with children, young people and carers supported by an appropriate therapeutic intervention which is responsive to the level of identified need.

The overnight short break provision will provide 6-bed new-build home/s.

In the Central/South area this first new build is under construction and will help facilitate a review of all provision across the county based on a further reduction of need.

Overnight short break provision will be offered to other Local Authorities on a full cost recovery basis.

There will be no change to the delivery of youth justice services.

5) How do you monitor the use of your service and which citizens do you monitor? Please ensure you retain information in relation to your monitoring as evidence of it may be required.

We have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to monitor the use of our services by users who share the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)
- gender reassignment/gender identity
- race/ethnicity/nationality
- sex/gender
- pregnancy/maternity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (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 prohibited by the Act)

Monitoring can be done in a variety of ways, to best meet the needs of the service. See the corporate service monitoring form at lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e

If you are not currently monitoring across all these characteristics, please say how you will develop your monitoring systems to do so.

The Service will continue to consult with local stakeholders when determining the development of provision. It will work in partnership with all those affected and ensure that any impact is minimal.

The fostering, adoption and residential service will continue to review and monitor the use of the service through statistical data and will make any judgements as a part of ongoing business planning. However it is clear that service users are motivated and coordinated, when considering change to overnight break services it is acknowledged that considerable resistance may lead to incidents of disharmony.

We monitor foster carer's information all on one spreadsheet that is regularly updated when necessary. Columns on this spreadsheet include: ethnicity, religion, date of birth, relationship, gender etc.

The spreadsheet is used to collate statistics on a monthly basis and for other ad hoc research projects such as looking at the number of black minority ethnic (BME) carers and same sex couple carers in Lancashire.

Age range	%
20-30	4
31-40	12
41-50	36
51-60	35
61+	13

Ethnicity

Ethnicity group		%
A1	White British	72
A2	White Irish	5
A3	Any other white background	5

B1	White and black Caribbean	1
B2	White and black African	1
B4	Any other mixed	1
C1	Indian	5
C2	Pakistani	1
C3	Bangladeshi	1
C4	Any other Asian background	1
D1	Caribbean	1
D2	African	1
E2	Any other ethnic group	1
E4	Information not yet available	2
No details given		2

Gender

60% of foster carers in Lancashire are Female, 40% Male.

6) What does your monitoring information tell you about who is and who is not using your service?

The monitoring information tells us that this proposal will impact on services to Preston, Leyland and Chorley residents who currently or potentially will, access the residential short break service for children and young people with disabilities. This is the first phase of a county wide restructure of the service and additional Cabinets reports will be presented to implement the restructure in other areas. The new service offer will match current need, in terms of nights available, as the new unit/s will be operational for 364 nights per year. Existing units are closed for a significant number of nights. The provision will meet the needs of all young people with disabilities, assessed as eligible and requiring overnight breaks, even those with the most complex needs. Currently not all units can meet the needs of all

young people due to building restrictions. Young people in other parts of the county with complex needs are currently served by units in their areas but the new build could be accessed by any young person in Lancashire, if it is assessed that a local unit could not meet their need.

Foster placements are required for young people across Lancashire. Likewise county provision is required for youth justice services.

7) How do you consult, inform, and involve people in developing your service? Please ensure you retain materials relating to your consultation in case evidence of it is required.

There are a range of techniques to involve people in developing your services. They include:

- service user surveys and panels
- service user satisfaction surveys
- focus groups
- community consultation and engagement exercises
- residents' surveys, including the Living in Lancashire survey - see <http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=2660&pageid=3543&e=e>
- for more information.
- discussion with front line employees
- complaints, compliments, and comments
- Customer Focus Consultancy see lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5196&pageid=27362 for more information
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) see <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/jsna> for more information

- mystery shopping
- talking to voluntary, community, and faith sector (VCFS) organisations that represent different groups of people
- feedback from district and sub district groups i.e. Local Strategic Partnerships, Area Forums, Area Committees, Neighbourhood Management Boards, Parish and Town Council meetings, Police and Community Together (PACT) meetings etc.

See the Neighbourhood Engagement Intranet site at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=3949&pageid=21780&e=e for further advice.

Consultation:

All staff working within the service and other partners will be invited to consultation events to give their views on any suggested changes.

Finally, all young people have been encouraged to participate in the consultation process. Their views are paramount in shaping the service to the needs of young people.

8) Which groups of people do you involve in developing your service? Are there any particular groups that you need to target? In considering this question, you should focus first on whether the service has particular relevance to groups of individuals who share the protected characteristics under the Equality Act, namely:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)
- gender reassignment/gender identity
- pregnancy or maternity

- race, ethnicity or nationality
- religion or belief
- sex/gender
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (in respect of which s.149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct prohibited by the Act)

In doing so, where relevant, you should consider any effects on specific groups or sub-groups sharing one or more protected characteristics such as, for example:

- older people
- people of a particular religion or ethnic group
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender communities
- It may also be appropriate to consider the specific needs of those with non-statutory characteristics, e.g.:
- people living in deprived areas
- people living in rural areas
- Children Looked After
- young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
- carers
- other groups as appropriate e.g. teenage parents, offenders etc

If there are groups that you need to target, how will you do this?

The Children in Care Council (CiCC) is a group for children and young people looked after by Lancashire. It is designed to give the children the opportunity to have a voice and influence over the decisions made for them. It also provides them with the opportunity to get involved and help make a difference.

The fostering forum is a regular meeting that includes foster carer representatives and county councillors. The representatives take any questions they have from the foster carers under their remit and get information to feedback from them. It is also a time where information about the service is passed to them to fill in the other carers. It is useful as it is a direct route to county councillors on a regular basis and gives foster carers direct responsibility and involvement.

Lancashire Parent Carer forum operates on a three monthly basis and will be updated and consulted with as part of the new service offer.

The corporate parenting board will also be consulted on the above.

9) If appropriate, how have you involved the following in developing your service? Again, please retain any evidence of this.

- Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations
- county councillors
- parish and town councils see lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=2339&tab=1 for more information
- district ward councillors/district councillors
- overview and scrutiny committees see lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=1788&tab=1
- other statutory agencies e.g. National Health Service, Lancashire Constabulary etc

Not considered at this point.

10) Taking into consideration the information you have collected already, are there any potential negative impacts that might affect citizens because of their:

- age
- disability including Deaf people
- race/ethnicitynationality
- sex/gender
- gender reassignment/ gender identity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- pregnancy or maternity status
- marriage or civil partnership status

Or because they are:

- people who have young children
- living in an area of deprivation
- living in a rural area
- Children Looked After
- young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
- teenage parents
- carers
- others e.g. offenders, people out of work, problem drug users etc.

There is the potential for negative impact on those families living in rural areas accessing one unit for Residential overnight breaks. This would be dependent on the location of any further new builds.

Please note that the consideration of potential negative effects should be specific and realistic. Potential adverse effects should not be minimised

or exaggerated.

n/a

11) Does your review indicate that the effect of the policy or decision under review could combine with other policies or decisions of LCC or other public authorities?

Yes

Could the results of your review combine with other decisions within LCC or elsewhere to affect any of the above groups (i.e. the cumulative effect)?

Yes

Are you aware of other local or national decisions which could combine with this decision to particularly disadvantage any specific groups?

No

12) In relation to your service review findings, whether viewed alone or in combination with other factors, are these likely to have adverse effects on groups sharing relevant protected characteristics? If so you must consider how to mitigate such adverse effects.

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

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

Clearly, when some provision is modified this usually means that a particular area or group will receive a different service. However, it is believed that the clear and fair basis on which these proposals have been developed together with widespread consultation should minimise the chances of any disharmony.

13) Think about the potential positive impacts your service could have on certain groups of people, and in particular those sharing protected characteristics. What are they and how might they be developed?

Use this information to think about how your service might improve quality of life and assist in relation to promoting equality.

Will the positive impacts be accompanied by any negative impacts on groups of citizens sharing the protected characteristics? If so, how might these be addressed or balanced?

The proposals aim is to Improve the emotional health and well-being of Lancashire's children who are looked after/ adopted and whom Lancashire has a responsibility Increase the understanding about emotional health and well-being issues for children and young people who are looked after/ adopted amongst all those working within the professional and carer network. To maintain a professional training programme for foster carers, adopters and staff to ensure the services are equipped to deliver quality care to children and young people.

14) How can your service contribute to the following priority areas:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation or any other

unlawful conduct

Will the service be provided by people who treat all clients/customers/service users with dignity and respect?

Yes

Will assessment or eligibility criteria be set objectively and fairly? Will training in some form be available to ensure that these requirements are properly applied?

Yes

- Tackling social exclusion and advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share it.

This will involve taking steps to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and that are connected to that particular characteristic, taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, and encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

It is important to bear in mind that taking steps to meet the needs of disabled persons which are different from those of persons who do not share that disability include steps to take account of the disabilities in question. This may even include treating some persons more favourably than others in order to allow them to participate in social or public life.

Activities that help improve social inclusion include those that improve the quality of life for people who are disadvantaged or are in danger of poor outcomes in their lives through various circumstances e.g. a lack of

money, difficulty in accessing services difficulties accessing premises, and barriers to taking part in relationships and activities that are available to most people in communities etc.

- Improving community cohesion /Fostering Good Relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it

This may include thinking about ways to tackle prejudice and promote understanding between groups of people with protected characteristics and those who do not share those characteristics. Activities that help improve community cohesion include those that bring people from different communities together (e.g. people of different ethnicities, faiths, ages, geographical backgrounds etc); those that empower communities and those that reduce tensions in communities. (See the Community Cohesion website at

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2966&pageid=5956&e=e> for more information).

- Improving health and wellbeing

Health and wellbeing means that people feel well enough and sufficiently supported to live their lives to the full. Activities that help improve health and wellbeing include those that ensure that basic needs are met, that individuals have a sense of purpose, that they feel able to achieve important personal goals and participate in society.

- Supporting the county council's role as a corporate parent

The Corporate Parenting Board ensures that Children Looked After have the same opportunities as their peers to a good quality of life. Activities that help support this are those that help improve health and wellbeing outcomes for children and young people who are looked after and those that support them to be prepared for the future. (See Corporate Parenting Board website at

lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=4183&pageid=17628&e=e
for more information).

15) Taking into consideration all the information you have collected in answering the previous questions, what are the changes/actions you will carry out to tackle any issues you have identified? These may be – no change to the service; adjust the proposal; continue with proposed changes or stop the changes and reconsider.

If going ahead with changes, what are the factors you have balanced – e.g. financial, operational – which you have considered alongside your Analysis findings (countervailing factors).

Adjust the proposal.

16) When will you review your actions?

Monitoring should be at least half yearly in line with the business planning performance management cycle.

As appropriate

17) When will you report progress on your actions and who to?

Progress on actions should be reported to relevant county councillors, officers, partnerships and groups etc

As and when required to Head of service.

18) When will you review your service or service plan?

As required there will be ongoing monitoring in place.

Name of officer completing this template

Brendan Lee and Stasia Osiowy

Role

Senior Manager Residential and Head of service for Fostering, Adoption, Residential and Youth offending teams.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Healthy
Lifestyles)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

NHS Health Checks and Healthy Lifestyles Service Offer

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

What is the service offer

The budgets included in the Healthy Lifestyles cost centres are varied and are not part of one overarching service. They include the following:

- 1. The NHS Health Checks screening programme**
- 2. Healthy weight and physical activity including:**
 - Weight management and exercise referral services**
 - Food growing/ community allotment projects (2 – one in East Lancs one in Central Lancs)**
 - Some walking and cycling schemes**
- 3. Other Healthy Lifestyles projects including:**
 - Healthy Living Centres/ community healthy lifestyles initiatives (contribution to 2 in East Lancs)**
 - Active Ageing (East Lancs)**
- 4. East Lancashire Health Improvement Service (training, capacity building, health education/ promotion, community development**
- 5. Other:**
 - Home Improvement Agency (2 in North Lancs)**
 - Sayhelian Women's Forum (grant, Central Lancs)**
 - Communities against Cancer project (promoting early presentation and detection of cancer, East Lancs)**

Only NHS Health Checks, weight management and exercise referral services are commissioned in every locality of Lancashire. The remainder vary according to locality, and are based on differing historical commissioning priorities from the legacy PCTs whose public

health contracts transitioned to LCC in 2013. There are multiple providers including the Third and statutory sectors. Some services are commissioned from NHS providers and part of large NHS Trust "block" contracts.

The service offers related to these are described below:

What is the service offer?

This service will be provided as part of the wellbeing, prevention and early help service and will include NHS Health Checks, healthy weight and physical activity programmes.

The NHS Health Checks programme is a national initiative aimed at early detection and management of people aged 40-74 who are at risk of developing cardio vascular disease, diabetes and kidney disease. It also aims to raise awareness of dementia in people aged between 65 - 74 and includes an alcohol assessment.

How will the service offer be provided?

NHS Health Checks

Health checks will be provided by primary care providers including community pharmacies; a community and workplace outreach programme will be commissioned which will expand the delivery across a range of other providers e.g. borough council health improvement services already commissioned by LCC to deliver healthy weight and physical activity services.

Weight management and exercise referrals service will include:

- Children and family weight management services embedded as part of the wider offer for children, young people and families.
- Promotion of physical activity including lower level activities such as walking; cycling; green gyms
- Personalised support for people at higher risk e.g. exercise referral

- Health Trainers/ physical activity peer activators
- Community based programmes in target areas e.g. community allotments; community cafes
- Brief interventions and training for front line workers to Make Every Contact Count

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.

Yes the decision will affect people across the county in a similar way:

NHS Health Checks

Health checks will be provided by primary care providers including community pharmacies; a community and workplace outreach programme will be commissioned which will expand the delivery across a range of other providers e.g. borough council health improvement services already commissioned by LCC to deliver healthy weight and physical activity services.

Healthy Weight and Physical activity

Through a redesigned Healthy weight and physical activity pathway which will include:

- Children and family weight management services
- Promotion of physical activity including lower level activities such as walking; cycling; green gyms
- Personalised support for people at higher risk e.g. exercise referral
- Health Trainers/ physical activity peer activators
- Community based programmes in target areas e.g. community allotments; community cafes

- Brief interventions and training for front line workers to Make Every Contact Count

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 it is not envisaged that there will be any disproportionate negative impact on any group of people sharing protected characteristics:

NHS Health Checks

There will be no adverse impact on the service provision, which will be more accessible to service users by having a more community based access points, in addition to the established GP programme.

Healthy Weight and physical activity

These projects are not funded uniformly across Lancashire at present, and therefore the current inequities in provision will be reduced through including the budgets in the county wide service redesign.

The providers of those services would be able to bid to deliver different types of services as part of this re-design.

A more integrated way of commissioning Lifestyle Services including Stop Smoking will be pursued, which will create efficiencies in management costs.

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

N/A

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.)

Services will be re-designed and current inequities in provision will be reduced as described above, therefore this service offer is not considered to disproportionately affect any group of people with protected characteristics.

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.

N/A

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)

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

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

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

If Yes – please identify these.

N/A

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

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

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

N/A

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

N/A

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Janet Walton

Position/Role: Head of Public Health Commissioning, Adults and Wellbeing

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Sexual Health)
For Decision Making Items
November 2014

www.lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The corporate savings plan requires all service areas to realign existing resources to deliver more efficient and effective provision within a reduced financial envelope.

Sexual Health covers more than the services that LCC commissions. For the purposes of this offer we have concentrated on the authority's commissioning responsibilities.

LCC is the main commissioner of sexual health services (clinical/ non-clinical), the only exclusions are abortion care (Clinical Commissioning Group [CCG]) and the responsibility for the treatment and care of those living with HIV, (NHS England) though local authorities are responsible for testing and screening for HIV.

LCC is mandated with the commissioning of "Comprehensive open access sexual health services". Comprehensive sexual health services include;

- Genitourinary medicine (GUM), including HIV screening and GUM care for those living with HIV
- Contraception services (what were family planning services)
- Designated Young Peoples Services (providing primarily contraception, but inclusive of some screening for Chlamydia and HIV)
- Sexual Health aspects of Psychosexual (current understanding is that it excludes treatment for erectile dysfunction where the cause is mechanical and not psychosexual)
- Cervical Screening within contraceptive services (the responsibility for screening lies with NHS England, but this service is part of the integrated offer for women and will continue to offer opportunistic screening services)
- Condom Distribution
- Chlamydia screening to achieve the diagnostic indicator

- Outreach services
- Education and training (in and out of services)
- Pharmacy Emergency Contraception schemes

General practice delivery of Sub Dermal Implants and Intrauterine Contraceptive devices.

How will the service offer be provided?

Funding Approach

Sexual health services are currently funded through a mixture of large NHS Trust "Block" contracts for Contraception services and "tariff" payments for Genitourinary Medicine services (GUM). There are currently 5 providers of these clinical services. Sexual health services will continue to be commissioned from suitably qualified providers.

In the future, we intend to use the basis of a nationally developed Integrated tariff for the procurement, this will be the means to make cost efficiencies and early indication suggests this will affect the required savings. However as services are 'open- access', meaning Lancashire residents can attend anywhere in the country and vice versa, (the funding follows the resident) we need to model demand and any increase overtime to ensure that the risk of increased cost is mitigated. If we foresee an increase we will need to add marginal rates to try and minimise impact, to ensure that increased demand doesn't cancel out savings.

What will be different and why?

It is anticipated that there will be able to reduce costs.

The revised service will include;

- Better integration of contraception and sexually transmitted infection services, delivered in parallel
- The requirement for all contraceptive methods to be available at all sites and at all times
- Flexible hours of operation according to need
- Central hubs with greater number of opening hours
- Satellite services to meet needs of geography (less sites than previously)
- Provision of dedicated young people's services.
- outreach and Psychosexual services
- prevention services

We believe we can make the efficiencies from re-procurement, as the services have largely remained the same for a number of years without

the benefit of re-procurement. Additionally, we have inherited multiple providers of similar services, with the associated on costs for each, however, reducing the current resource by will require;

- Provision of a reduced offer at each visit, difficult to achieve, other than not moving to integration of contraception and STI screening

or

- Discontinue some of the current services (Outreach, Condom Distribution)

or

- Reduce the demand by limiting access (less 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.

Yes. The proposed budget savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on sexual health activity and outcomes within the Public Health outcomes:

Re-procurement of a Lancashire-wide Sexual Health Service

During 2015/16 we are planning to tender for one Lancashire-wide sexual health service, which will commence from April 2016. This will reduce the five current services into one. Savings will be made by reducing management costs from five teams to one. Whilst TUPE transfer will apply to all staff, savings will be made by reducing the management costs from five services to one. A sexual health needs assessment and consultation events will be undertaken to support the re-procurement process, which will include current stakeholders and service users.

The formation of a one Lancashire-wide sexual health service will also facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all Lancashire citizens have access to the same range of sexual health services offer.

Review of commissioned initiatives and programmes

All elements of the sexual health agenda, including GUM, CASH, condom distribution, chlamydia screening programmes and Young People's provision will all be reviewed to deliver savings as part of a more integrated approach to other programmes and processes.

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, it is not considered that the proposed savings from the sexual health budget will have an adverse impact on any groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics. The service offer will continue in the Lancashire-wide service.

The proposed budget savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on sexual health activity and the achievement of the Public Health outcomes.

The formation of a one Lancashire-wide sexual health service will facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all Lancashire citizens regardless of gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation are offered effective support in order to reduce the rates of teenage conceptions, chlamydia diagnosis and to aid with the early detection of HIV.

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.)

Approval of the proposal to achieve savings from the sexual health budget is not considered to have an adverse impact on any groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics.

The savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on sexual health activity.

Overall targets (North, East and Central Lancashire) will be maintained to ensure activity is directed to areas of sexual health need to address health inequalities.

In addition, the formation of a one Lancashire-wide sexual health service will facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all Lancashire residents regardless of gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation are offered effective support in order to reduce the rates of sexually transmitted infections and other sexual health needs in order for them to enjoy positive relationships.

The sexual health needs assessment process has included consultation with a range of groups with protected characteristics in order to make sure that the new services best meet the requirements

of these groups. Details of all these consultations can be viewed on request. It is hoped that some of the groups identified will have better access via the new service offer than they have currently with existing arrangements.

It is expected that the new service offer will advance equality of opportunity for those who share the listed protected characteristics.

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.

N/A

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)

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

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

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

If Yes – please identify these.

N/A

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

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

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

N/A

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

N/A

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Lee Girvan

Position/Role: Public Health Specialist – Sexual Health Service
Commissioner



Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Tobacco Control)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Lancashire

County
Council



Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

Tobacco control

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

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.

Yes. The proposed budget savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on smoking cessation and smokefree activity:

Re-procurement of a Lancashire-wide Stop Smoking Service

During 2015/16 we are planning to tender for one Lancashire-wide stop smoking service, which will commence from April 2016. This will reduce the four current services into one. It will be undertaken as part of the integrated health and wellbeing model and therefore there is potential to link with healthy weight and physical activity services. Savings will be made by reducing management costs from four teams to one. Whilst TUPE transfer will apply to all staff, savings will be made by reducing the management costs from four services to one. The Authority will need to consider the redundancy costs for staff of the current four services in 2016/17. A review and consultation events will be undertaken to support the re-procurement process, which will include current stakeholders and service users.

A small reduction can also be made to the NRT voucher scheme budget in line with the 0.5-1% annual decrease in smoking prevalence. The smokefree homes and cars programme and supporting a smokefree pregnancy scheme will also be integrated into the service model.

The overall quit target will remain in line with the target of 5% of the total smoking population⁸ and locality targets (North, East and Central Lancashire) regarding four-week quits and smokefree homes will continue to ensure activity is directed to areas of higher smoking prevalence to address health inequalities.

The formation of a one Lancashire-wide stop smoking service will also facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all smokers are offered effective support in order to reduce the rates of smoking.

Review of commissioned initiatives and programmes

All elements of the tobacco control agenda, including Tobacco Free Futures, Smoking in Pregnancy, Smokefree Play Programme and Tobacco Use in Young People will all be reviewed to deliver savings as part of a more integrated approach to other programmes and processes. For example, the inclusion of stop smoking into the future service delivery model for health visitors, maternity services and peer mentor services.

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, it is not considered that the proposed savings from the tobacco control budget will have an adverse impact on any groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics. All smokers aged 12 years and above of all gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation can currently access the stop smoking services for quit support and this will continue in the Lancashire-wide service.

The proposed budget savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on smoking cessation and smokefree activity.

Overall four-week quit and smokefree home targets and locality targets (North, East and Central Lancashire) will be maintained to ensure activity is directed to areas of higher smoking prevalence to address health inequalities. In 2014/15 a Lancashire-wide service specification was introduced to all four stop smoking which included targets regarding routine and manual workers and the unemployed (50% of all four-week quits), BME communities (6% of all four-week quits) and pregnant women (10% of pregnant smoking population) to address health inequalities. These targets will also be maintained in the Lancashire-wide stop smoking service.

The formation of a one Lancashire-wide stop smoking service will facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all smokers aged 12 years and above of all gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation are offered effective support in order to reduce the rates of smoking.

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.)

Approval of the proposal to achieve savings from the tobacco control budget is not considered to have an adverse impact on any groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics.

The savings will be achieved through integrating services and reducing management costs, without impacting on smoking cessation activity. Overall four-week quit and smokefree home targets and locality targets (North, East and Central Lancashire) will be maintained to ensure activity is directed to areas of higher smoking prevalence to address health inequalities.

In addition, the formation of a one Lancashire-wide stop smoking service will facilitate consistency of service delivery and ensure all smokers aged 12 years and above of all gender, ethnicity, marital status, disability and sexual orientation are offered effective support in order to reduce the rates of smoking.

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.

N/A

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)

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

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

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

of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

N/A

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

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

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

N/A

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

N/A

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

N/A

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Joanne McCullagh

Position/Role: Public Health Specialist – Tobacco Control & Stop Smoking Services

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Children Young
People and Families Public Health)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

Children Young People & Families Public Health Services Service

There will be an integrated wellbeing, prevention and early help offer for children and young people with a proposed reduction in the current children and young people's public health budget by 2018.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The corporate savings plan requires all service areas to realign existing resources to deliver more efficient and effective provision within a reduced financial envelope.

This proposal forms part of the corporate savings plans and outlines how a savings could be achieved from the CYP Public Health Services budget. Savings will be realised through redesign and re-procurement and based on alignment of PH CYP existing services with LCC services, where appropriate, in order to streamline pathways, avoid duplication and better integrate services.

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.

A number of services under review as part of the commissioning cycle were previously commissioned by East Lancashire Primary Care Trust in response to need. These services are not currently replicated elsewhere across the county and might be affected following the review.

Other services under review e.g. School Nursing and Health Visiting provide a universal service to all Children & Young People.

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.

NA

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.)

It is not considered that the proposed savings from the Children's public health budget will have a specific adverse impact on any groups of individuals sharing protected characteristics.

Engagement and consultation processes will inform all service redesign to ensure that new commissioned services are accessible and open to Children, Young People and Families with any of the protected characteristics. Other key stakeholders will be consulted to ensure any potential issues are identified and addressed during the re-commissioning of services.

We will update and refine the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as we gather information on the impact that these changes may have on people from groups with protective characteristics. This will enable the LCC Children's Public Health Commissioners to ensure that service users diverse needs are recognised and new commissioned services are able to meet their needs. Providers of any new service provision will be expected to work within the UK legislative framework.

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.

N/A

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)

To date we have not undertaken any consultation work regarding this proposal. When the proposal is agreed we will begin a comprehensive series of engagement and consultation activities with service users, schools, and partners as part of the review, redesign and re-commissioning of services.

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 consultation and engagement processes will be ongoing as we seek to review, redesign and re-commission Children & Young Peoples Service, it is too soon to predict the potential impact this project may have and any reduction in funding will take into consideration the rising demands around:

- The new legislation re SEND reforms and supporting children with medical needs.
- Education Health Care Plans and the work required around this
- The increase in Children Looked After (CLA), referrals to Social Services and cases of Domestic Violence

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 expected that individuals or groups covered by the protected characteristics would be more adversely impacted upon as a result of the decision to progress the review, redesign and re-commissioning of services than those people without protected characteristics

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 the evidence gathering and consultations through engagement activities, an action plan will be drawn up to incorporate any recommendations into the redesigned service specifications for services within the treatment system.

The EIA will be updated throughout the projects life time to reflect learning and feedback from the different groups with 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.

All newly commissioned services will have to comply with the legislative requirements as set out in the Equalities Act 2010.
--

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 integration, redesign and re-commissioning aims to make these savings without impacting on the universal delivery and it is not anticipated that the proposal will disadvantage any individuals from within groups with protected characteristics.
--

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The corporate savings plan requires all service areas to realign existing resources to deliver more efficient and effective provision within a reduced financial envelope.

This proposal forms part of the corporate savings plans and outlines how savings can be achieved from the CYP Public Health Services budget. Savings will be realised through review, redesign and re-procurement and based on alignment of PH CYP existing services with LCC services, where appropriate, in order to streamline pathways, avoid duplication and better integrate services.

Any re-procurement/decommission, service redesign will be closely aligned to the 0-5 HCP which although does not transfer until October 2015 and is likely to be mandated for 18 months provides opportunities to further enhance value for money and social value

All newly re-commissioned services will have built into their service specifications the following statement:

The Service Provider shall ensure that their workforce is equipped with good local knowledge of services, initiatives and schemes within their area(s). They must also ensure that staff can respond sensitively and appropriately to the needs of individuals who are defined in law as sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

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

- o Sexual orientation;
- o Marriage or civil partnership status.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

All services will have key performance indicators and performance management frameworks in place to monitor and review the service offer against the effects of the proposal and also the Public Health outcome measures

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Sheridan Townsend

Position/Role: Public Health Specialist – Children, Young people and families PH Commissioning

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member



Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing
(Substance Misuse Services)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

Substance Misuse Services:

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Reductions will not be taken from across the entire budget. The outline proposition is to invest in young people's services and recovery infrastructure in order to enhance prevention at the start of substance misuse careers and protect treatment gains by maximising sustained recovery; leaving adult services to pick up the impact of efficiency requirements. All services will be re-commissioned with a view to further enhance value for money and social value.

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 may impact on people across the county who have been assessed as requiring access to Tier 3 Community Services substance misuse treatment services and Tier 4 residential and community based detoxification and rehabilitation services. We will undertake evidence gathering and consult with existing providers, service users and broader stakeholders to assess the impact that these changes may have upon people and groups sharing protected characteristics. As we review, redesign and re-commission services for the substance misuse treatment system representatives from protected groups will be consulted during the engagement phase of the process.

The aim of the proposal is not to reduce the number of people accessing treatment but to continue to modernise and develop the treatment system.

It is worth noting that the treatment system has been through a process of modernisation over the last eight years and substantial savings have already been made. The proposed changes may have an adverse impact on the total quality of the treatment offer to the people of Lancashire and may result in a general reduction in the amount and range of interventions that can be offered. We will also seek to build and promote prevention by focusing additional resources on young people's services and by continuing to invest in the recovery community to prevent relapse and rehospitalisations.

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 engagement and consultation process will be an on-going process as we move through and review, redesign and re-commission different aspects of the substance misuse treatment system and will involve consultation with individuals and representatives from groups with protected characteristics. Other key stakeholders will be consulted to ensure any potential issues are identified and addressed during the re-commissioning of services.

Access to the services being developed is based on clinical and social care need and will be available to all citizens that require support and treatment through the substance misuse treatment system.

We will be analysing the composition and demographics of our past, current and potential service users to establish that new commissioned services are accessible and open to people with any of the protected characteristics.

We will be undertaking a pathways analysis with key stakeholders and substance misuse services to ensure that clients with protected characteristics are able to access newly commissioned services and that those services meet the needs of a diverse client group.

We will update and refine the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as we gather information on the impact that these changes may have on people from groups with protective characteristics. This will enable the LCC Public Health Substance Misuse Commissioners to ensure that service users diverse needs are recognised and new commissioned services are able to meet their needs. Providers of any new service provision will be expected to work within the UK legislative framework.

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 review, redesign and re-commissioning of services within the substance misuse treatment system will be informed by data from the existing services data sets and information from key partners and stakeholders, for example from the Police, Probation (and new Crime Reduction Companies, CRC) and Clinical Commissioning Group's (CCG). We will also use information from national data sets including: The Diagnostic and Outcomes Monitoring Executive Summary (DOMES), National Drug Treatment Monitoring System (NDTMS) data set, from activity reports and performance management framework data from community and prison based substance misuse services.

We will be using guidance and evidence generated by a comprehensive literature search and guidance produced by Public Health England. We will consult with the national recovery lead at Public Health England to ensure that any newly commissioned services comply with current best practice, ensuring value for money and promoting social value.

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)

To date we have not undertaken any consultation work regarding this proposal. When the proposal is agreed we will begin a comprehensive series of engagement and consultation activities with service user groups as part of the review, redesign and re-commissioning of services.

We will hold focus groups in community substance misuse providers, non-residential and residential treatment providers with current service users. We will ensure that participants are representative of the client base of those organisations; including individuals from groups with protected characteristics.

We also plan to consult with different bodies and groups that represent the interests of individuals from groups with protected characteristics.

In addition to the engagement work undertaken with service users we will establish a framework for engagement with the following:

- Community treatment providers,
- Current providers of inpatient detoxification services,
- Current providers of residential rehabilitation services,
- Other leading providers highlighted as delivering best practice,
- Public Health England,
- NHS England,
- Lancashire Constabulary,
- Lancashire Probation Trust (and the new Community Rehabilitation Company)
- Partners and stakeholders within LCC
 - The five Lancashire CCG's
 - Lancashire based NHS Trusts

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 consultation and engagement processes will be ongoing as we seek to review, redesign and re-commission services within the Substance Misuse Treatment Service, it is too soon to predict the potential impact this project may have upon service users in treatment with protected characteristics. We will be developing the project products/deliverables ensuring accessibility to all citizens of Lancashire that have a need for substance misuse treatment. The consultations will also play a key part in understanding potential impact and helping to identify solutions to these.

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.

Within the review and redesign of substance misuse services we are not proposing to remove, reduce or limit access to treatment for service users with protected characteristics. We do not expect individuals or groups covered by the protected characteristics to be more adversely impacted upon as a result of the decision to progress the review, redesign and re-commissioning of services than those people without protected characteristics

We will work with representative from groups with protected characteristics to ensure fair access to treatment services and that those services reflect their needs.

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 the evidence gathering and consultations through engagement activities, an action plan will be drawn up to incorporate any recommendations into the redesigned service specifications for services within the treatment system.

The EIA will be updated throughout the projects life time to reflect learning and feedback from the different groups with protected characteristics.

Data from our community providers consistently show that the gender balance in treatment services is biased towards males.

In the east locality at the end of year 2013 – 2014 the gender split remained consistent throughout the year for primary drug use with approximately 70% male to 30% female. Alcohol use is split at approximately 60% male to 40% female. These gender divisions are consistent across the country with males making up the majority of clients.

At present individuals from BME communities are underrepresented in treatment services. In the east locality the percentage of people from BME communities receiving support for a drug problem is 6% and for alcohol only 2%. We will include consultations with BME groups both within treatment and outside to seek to understand why this is.

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.

This will be determined through the engagement activities and data collection and analysis. We will develop an action plan which will minimise and/or mitigate any potential negative impacts on those that share a protected characteristic.

All newly commissioned services will have to comply with the legislative requirements as set out in the Equalities Act 2010.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

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

This will be completed when the results of the consultations through engagement and work from the action plan have been considered.

This new service offer for substance misuse services is part of the wider authorities cost savings initiatives.

The integration, redesign and re-commissioning aims to make these savings without having to reduce the overall access to treatment services for people in need and we do not anticipate the proposal will

disadvantage any individuals from within groups with protected characteristics.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The funding reduction will not be taken from across the entire budget. The outline proposition is to invest in young people's services and recovery infrastructure in order to enhance prevention at the start of substance misuse careers and protect treatment gains by maximising sustained recovery; leaving adult services to pick up the impact of efficiency requirements. All services will be re-commissioned with a view to further enhance value for money and social value

- Re-commission via open tender services for young people
- Re-commission via open tender services for adult substance misusers
- Re-commission recovery services

All newly re-commissioned services will have built into their service specifications the following statement:

The Service Provider shall ensure that their workforce is equipped with good local knowledge of services, initiatives and schemes within their area(s). They must also ensure that staff can respond sensitively and appropriately to the needs of individuals who are defined in law as sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- o Age;
- o Disability including Deaf people;
- o Gender reassignment;
- o Pregnancy and maternity;
- o Race/ethnicity/nationality;

- o Religion or belief;
- o Sex/ Gender;
- o Sexual orientation;
- o Marriage or civil partnership status.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The Public Health substance misuse commissioning team will be responsible to reviewing the effects of the proposed and re-commissioned services during and after the process.

To ensure that the effects of the proposal are monitored beyond the life of the project, metrics and intermediate indicators will be developed that sit within:

- A refreshed service specification and performance framework for all newly re-commissioned services.
- We will include within the monitoring system the ability to monitor take-up of services/referrals for each of the protected characteristic groups
- All newly commissioned services will need to continue to comply with national targets for treatment effectiveness and will use information from the national data sets to demonstrate the treatment systems impact and the outcomes achieved by individuals.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Lee Harrington

Position/Role: Public Health Coordinator – Substance Misuse Commissioning

Section 1

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Wellbeing
Prevention and Early Help)

For Service Managers

December 2014

1) What is the aim of your service?

This should complement the County Council's Corporate Strategy or your Directorate's objectives.

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

In line with Lancashire's corporate strategy and the Children and Young People's plan the service aim is to

- improve and protect the health and wellbeing of Lancashire's population and improve the health of the most vulnerable, enable children, young people and families to achieve success, resist stress, manage change and uncertainty, and make safe decisions about their future
- improve and protect the health and wellbeing of Lancashire's families, prioritising vulnerable groups of children, young people and their families to reduce health inequalities

2) What outcomes do you want to achieve from your service?

The service offer will contribute to achieving the following outcomes:

1. Children and young people and families are resilient, aspirational and have the knowledge, capability and capacity to deal with wider factors which affect their health and wellbeing
2. Children, young people and their families are helped to live healthy lifestyles, make healthy choices
3. Children, young people and families health is protected from major incidents and other threats, whilst reducing health inequalities
4. Targeting those in more disadvantaged communities, the number of children, young people and families living with preventable ill health and people dying prematurely is reduced

In addition to improving outcomes this service model will aim to reduce demand on specialist services.

3) How is your service performing?

Write here any information you have collected that shows how your service is performing. See the corporate intranet site at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2665&pageid=30233 for directorate business planning information.

<p>This service will become operational once the corporate transformation process is completed. Monitoring and performance arrangements will be developed alongside the service Outcomes Framework.</p>

4) Who are the people who will benefit from your service?

The answer to this question could be everyone in Lancashire, or it could be everyone within a District of Lancashire e.g. Burnley, or everyone within a ward e.g. Daneshouse etc. Alternatively, the answer could be a particular group of people e.g. young people in Leyland, people with a disability in Frenchwood etc.

Information on Lancashire's population can be found at <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/profile>

<p>The Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service will deliver a universal prevention offer to all children, young people and their families and a targeted early help offer for those that are most vulnerable and those with the highest level of need.</p>
--

5) How do you monitor the use of your service and which citizens do you monitor? Please ensure you retain information in relation to your monitoring as evidence of it may be required.

We have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to monitor the use of our services by users who share the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)

- gender reassignment/gender identity
- race/ethnicity/nationality
- sex/gender
- pregnancy/maternity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (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 prohibited by the Act)

Monitoring can be done in a variety of ways, to best meet the needs of the service. See the corporate service monitoring form at lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e

If you are not currently monitoring across all these characteristics, please say how you will develop your monitoring systems to do so.

Monitoring arrangements will be developed incorporating all of the characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010.

6) What does your monitoring information tell you about who is and who is not using your service?

This will be collated and evaluated as part of the monitoring and performance arrangements once the service is operational.

7) How do you consult, inform, and involve people in developing your service? Please ensure you retain materials relating to your consultation in case evidence of it is required.

There are a range of techniques to involve people in developing your

services. They include:

- service user surveys and panels
- service user satisfaction surveys
- focus groups
- community consultation and engagement exercises
- residents' surveys, including the Living in Lancashire survey - see <http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=2660&pageid=3543&e=e>
- for more information.
- discussion with front line employees
- complaints, compliments, and comments
- Customer Focus Consultancy see lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5196&pageid=27362 for more information
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) see <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/jsna> for more information
- mystery shopping
- talking to voluntary, community, and faith sector (VCFS) organisations that represent different groups of people
- feedback from district and sub district groups i.e. Local Strategic Partnerships, Area Forums, Area Committees, Neighbourhood Management Boards, Parish and Town Council meetings, Police and Community Together (PACT) meetings etc.

See the Neighbourhood Engagement Intranet site at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=3949&pageid=21780&e=e for further advice.

There will be an extensive and inclusive communication and engagement programme that will underpin the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service.

Widespread communication and co-operation with all partners will allow for the views of a wide range of stakeholders including; children, young people, families, frontline practitioners, elected members, the voluntary, community and faith sector, LCC CYP Partnership Board and Partnership members, district CYP partnerships, Lancashire Constabulary and health commissioners and providers, etc to be heard.

8) Which groups of people do you involve in developing your service? Are there any particular groups that you need to target? In considering this question, you should focus first on whether the service has particular relevance to groups of individuals who share the protected characteristics under the Equality Act, namely:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)
- gender reassignment/gender identity
- pregnancy or maternity
- race, ethnicity or nationality
- religion or belief
- sex/gender
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (in respect of which s.149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct prohibited by the Act)

In doing so, where relevant, you should consider any effects on specific groups or sub-groups sharing one or more protected characteristics such as, for example:

- older people
- people of a particular religion or ethnic group
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender communities
- It may also be appropriate to consider the specific needs of those with non-statutory characteristics, e.g.:
 - people living in deprived areas
 - people living in rural areas
 - Children Looked After
 - young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
 - carers
 - other groups as appropriate e.g. teenage parents, offenders etc

If there are groups that you need to target, how will you do this?

The Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service will deliver a universal prevention offer to all children, young people and their families and a targeted early help offer for those that are most vulnerable based on assessed levels of need i.e. CLA, Young Carers, NEET.

The following Information has been used to inform service development linked to vulnerable characteristics:

- National Context including:
 - Early Intervention: The Next Steps. Graham Allen, <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/early-intervention-next-steps.pdf>
 - The Munro Review of child Protection: final report,

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175391/Munro-Review.pdf

- The Early Years; Foundation for Life, Health and Learning,
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180919/DFE-00177-2011.pdf

- The Healthy Child Programme 0 – 10 (HCP)

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130107105354/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh_108866.pdf

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/167998/Health_Child_Programme.pdf

- The Lancashire JSNA
<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/web/?siteid=6101&pageid=35157&e=e>
- The district profiles to look at need both Lancashire wide and at a district level
<http://www3.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/atoz/toptasks/index.asp?catID=16308>

9) If appropriate, how have you involved the following in developing your service? Again, please retain any evidence of this.

- Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations
- county councillors
- parish and town councils see
lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=2339&tab=1
for more information
- district ward councillors/district councillors
- overview and scrutiny committees see
lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=1788&tab=1
- other statutory agencies e.g. National Health Service, Lancashire

Constabulary etc

There will be an extensive and inclusive communication and engagement programme that will underpin the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service. Feedback from this will inform the design and delivery of the service offer.

Findings will be included in reports that will be presented through the appropriate governance arrangements.

10) Taking into consideration the information you have collected already, are there any potential negative impacts that might affect citizens because of their:

- age
- disability including Deaf people
- race/ethnicity/nationality
- sex/gender
- gender reassignment/ gender identity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- pregnancy or maternity status
- marriage or civil partnership status

Or because they are:

- people who have young children
- living in an area of deprivation
- living in a rural area
- Children Looked After

- young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
- teenage parents
- carers
- others e.g. offenders, people out of work, problem drug users etc.

A reduction in budget contributing to the organisation achieving its efficiency targets will impact on the scale and scope of the delivery of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help offer.

Please note that the consideration of potential negative effects should be specific and realistic. Potential adverse effects should not be minimised or exaggerated.

A robust risk assessment will underpin the Wellbeing Prevention & Early Help offer

11) Does your review indicate that the effect of the policy or decision under review could combine with other policies or decisions of LCC or other public authorities?

This service offer will align with all other LCC service offers delivering support to children, young people and families across Lancashire's Continuum of Need.

Could the results of your review combine with other decisions within LCC or elsewhere to affect any of the above groups (i.e. the cumulative effect)?

It is not anticipated that there will be any heightened disadvantage among any of the identified groups; in fact it is likely that this service model will align with other policy and strategic developments to provide further advantages amongst the outlined groups.

The service review is being undertaken in order to bring together a coordinated prevention and early response which might otherwise take place in an isolated and uncoordinated way, thus maximising the impact, effectiveness and cost of improving outcomes for children, young people and families.

Are you aware of other local or national decisions which could combine with this decision to particularly disadvantage any specific groups?

It is not anticipated that there will be and disadvantage to the outlined groups as a result of local or national decisions although a reduction in budgets will impact on the scale and scope of the delivery of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help offer.

12) In relation to your service review findings, whether viewed alone or in combination with other factors, are these likely to have adverse effects on groups sharing relevant protected characteristics? If so you must consider how to mitigate such adverse effects.

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

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

Once the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service is operational, regular review of both service delivery and the risk assessments will be undertaken. Responsive action will be taken to mitigate the level of risk identified.

13) Think about the potential positive impacts your service could have on certain groups of people, and in particular those sharing protected characteristics. What are they and how might they be developed?

Use this information to think about how your service might improve quality of life and assist in relation to promoting equality.

Will the positive impacts be accompanied by any negative impacts on groups of citizens sharing the protected characteristics? If so, how might these be addressed or balanced?

The Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service delivers a unified approach focussing on achieving improved outcomes for Lancashire's children, young people and families. There will be a focus on ensuring every contact with service users counts, enabling early identification of need to avoid escalation of poor health and wellbeing and prevent the intervention from statutory services.

14) How can your service contribute to the following priority areas:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation or any other unlawful conduct

Will the service be provided by people who treat all clients/customers/service users with dignity and respect?

The service is committed to ensuring all stakeholders are treated with dignity and respect.

Will assessment or eligibility criteria be set objectively and fairly? Will training in some form be available to ensure that these requirements are properly applied?

Assessment of need will follow Lancashire's Continuum of Need thresholds. Training is available to the wider workforce to ensure this approach is fully embedded.

- Tackling social exclusion and advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share it.

This will involve taking steps to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and that are connected to that particular characteristic, taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, and encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

It is important to bear in mind that taking steps to meet the needs of disabled persons which are different from those of persons who do not share that disability include steps to take account of the disabilities in question. This may even include treating some persons more favourably than others in order to allow them to participate in social or public life.

Activities that help improve social inclusion include those that improve the quality of life for people who are disadvantaged or are in danger of poor outcomes in their lives through various circumstances e.g. a lack of money, difficulty in accessing services difficulties accessing premises, and barriers to taking part in relationships and activities that are available to most people in communities etc.

- Improving community cohesion /Fostering Good Relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it

This may include thinking about ways to tackle prejudice and promote understanding between groups of people with protected characteristics and those who do not share those characteristics. Activities that help improve community cohesion include those that bring people from different communities together (e.g. people of different ethnicities, faiths, ages, geographical backgrounds etc); those that empower communities and those that reduce tensions in communities. (See the Community Cohesion website at

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2966&pageid=5956&e=e> for more information).

- Improving health and wellbeing

Health and wellbeing means that people feel well enough and sufficiently supported to live their lives to the full. Activities that help improve health and wellbeing include those that ensure that basic needs are met, that individuals have a sense of purpose, that they feel able to achieve important personal goals and participate in society.

- Supporting the county council's role as a corporate parent

The Corporate Parenting Board ensures that Children Looked After have the same opportunities as their peers to a good quality of life. Activities that help support this are those that help improve health and wellbeing outcomes for children and young people who are looked after and those that support them to be prepared for the future. (See Corporate Parenting Board website at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=4183&pageid=17628&e=e for more information).

The Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service will contribute to improving the social determinants of health of Lancashire's population:

- improve and protect the health and wellbeing of Lancashire's population, improve the health of the most vulnerable, enable children, young people and families to achieve success, resist stress, manage change and uncertainty, and make safe decisions about their future
- improve and protect the health and wellbeing of Lancashire's families, prioritising vulnerable groups of children, young people and their families to reduce health inequalities

15) Taking into consideration all the information you have collected in answering the previous questions, what are the changes/actions

you will carry out to tackle any issues you have identified? These may be – no change to the service; adjust the proposal; continue with proposed changes or stop the changes and reconsider.

If going ahead with changes, what are the factors you have balanced – e.g. financial, operational – which you have considered alongside your Analysis findings (countervailing factors).

Service development will continually be reviewed to ensure an appropriate response to any issues that are identified.

16) When will you review your actions?

Monitoring should be at least half yearly in line with the business planning performance management cycle.

Monitoring will be in line with the corporate business planning performance management cycle.

17) When will you report progress on your actions and who to?

Progress on actions should be reported to relevant county councillors, officers, partnerships and groups etc

Progress will be reported through the appropriate governance structure once the corporate transformation is complete.

18) When will you review your service or service plan?

Service plans will be reviewed in line with the corporate review cycle.

Name of officer completing this template Debbie Duffell

Role: Integrated Service Development Manager



Section 4
Equality

Analysis Toolkit

**Public Health and Wellbeing (Health Services
to Children and Young People)
For Decision Making Items**

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer
Health Services to Children and Young People

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

All commissioning decisions supported by the service will include a robust needs analysis and consultation with service users and stakeholders, build on assets within communities and be underpinned by a sound evidence base.

A comprehensive commissioning review of CAMHS has been agreed by the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Local Authority's contribution will be reviewed alongside all other responsible agencies to ensure that reductions in funding is managed appropriately through a service redesign aimed at intervening earlier.

A draft commissioning Strategy for CAMHS has been developed and a separate draft Equality Impact Analysis has been completed for this.

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 service offer for commissioned support should not affect the population directly.

The review of CAMHS will be undertaken across Lancashire and it is anticipated to affect all areas in a similar way. As services at tier 3 are commissioned by the 6 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) however, the variance in their contribution may impact on some areas more than others.

This will be understood and considered with the CCGs as part of the review.

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

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

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

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

Yes for the CAMHS element only, as set out below.

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 impact on staffing at Grades 10 and below will be considered as part of Phase 2 of the County Council's Transformation.

It is estimated that in 2015 the number of children and young people with an Emotional Health and Wellbeing need requiring an intervention at tier 2 will be 20,751 and at tier 3 will be 5,118. Children and young people with protective characteristics are more at risk of having an emotional health and wellbeing need, this is broken down in detail in the draft EHWB Commissioning Strategy.

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 already taken place with children and young people, service users, carers and other stakeholders to inform the strategy. This will be used to inform the review along with further consultation around current gaps, models of delivery and what works.

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.

Reducing the Tier 2/3 CAMHS offer to service users may result in speeding up deterioration in service users' emotional health and wellbeing leading to increased demand for Children's Social Care, Tier 4 residential CAMHS, and hospital admissions. It may also have an impact upon parents/carers resulting in increased family and placement breakdowns.

It is hoped that by reviewing and redesigning with partners the current provision of CAMHS across Lancashire that the reduction in resource is managed. While it is likely that specialist service capacity will be reduced it is hoped that redirection of resource to preventative services should mitigate some of this and enable CYP needs to be met earlier and more effectively.

This would be considered in more detail as part of the review.

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.

Other service offer proposals could heighten disadvantage to children and young people with emotional health and wellbeing needs.

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 CAMHS service redesign will take account of information gained from consultation and further analysis – we are just at the start of the process so no changes are planned in the immediate future.
--

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.

Reviews will be undertaken in a sensitive and consistent manner to mitigate against any negative impact.

Mitigation will also be achieved by co-ordination of all internal service offers, partner agencies commissioning intentions, a project management approach to the review, widespread consultation and publicity campaign and the promotion and development of alternative supports.

As and when other issues are identified we will revisit our plans and take account of issues identified via the consultation undertaken to support this review

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 offer has been developed to achieve budget savings. The reductions will only be realised by the comprehensive review which will

be time consuming and intensive and likely to result in complaints which will need to be managed.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

A new service offer for commissioning support which will move towards consistency in robust commissioning process and enable the services commissioned for the population of Lancashire to be effective in improving outcomes and offer value for money.

A new service offer for the Local Authority's contribution to CAMHS which is developed in partnership with children, young people, parents and carers and all partner agencies following a comprehensive review. There is potential negative impact for children, young people and families and upon other agencies if the services available for emotional health and wellbeing are not sufficient.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The review of CAMHS will be undertaken by a multi- agency task and finish group reporting to the Health and Wellbeing Board. Recommendations within the review will be considered by each agency's senior leadership teams prior to implementation. The review and subsequent services commissioned will ensure that the 9 x protected characteristic groups are monitored in terms of service take-up/losses.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Lesley Tiffen

Position/Role Integrated Health Manager

Section 1

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Community
Safety)

For Service Managers

November 2014

1) What is the aim of your service?

This should complement the County Council's Corporate Strategy or your Directorate's objectives.

- Overall responsibility within Lancashire County Council for the continuous improvement of effective partnerships and systems to make Lancashire's communities safer, including collaborating with partners to improve and maintain the Lancashire Community Safety Strategy Group (LCSSG), and wider community safety and criminal justice partnership working
- Identification and implementation of changes to the community safety and criminal justice systems in the county in response to the legislative reforms
- Strategic leadership of Lancashire County Council's approach to community safety, ensuring it is effectively integrated into the wider management and planning mechanisms within the County Council
- Enabling effective engagement and collaboration with the Police and Crime Commissioner for Lancashire including delivery of the Community Safety Agreement, Police and Crime Plan and subsequent delivery plans
- Ensuring a joined up, strategic approach to tackling domestic abuse for the county council and on behalf of partners through the joint commissioning of support services and delivery of the domestic abuse strategy.
- The service enables the county council to meet its statutory duties under a range of legislation, in particular the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Police Reform Act 2006 and the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011

2) What outcomes do you want to achieve from your service?

The service coordinates, influences, drives and develops community safety initiatives and services on behalf of the county council and in partnership. This includes:

- Development of services and initiatives aimed at reducing crime and anti-social behaviour through:
 - o Working with partners to secure central government and other grant funding
 - o Building pooled budgets with partners through which to commission services
 - o Coordinating partner bids for OPCC grant applications
- Improved delivery, review and performance through the production of a single Strategic Needs Assessment and supporting analytical products through which to support evidence based decision making across the partnership landscape
- Effective advice and guidance on community safety and criminal justice matters for the PCC and community safety partners
- Effective advice and guidance on changes in community safety related legislation to enable the development of local preparations and a consistent response across the county eg use of ASB tools and powers
- Strategic and secretariat support to Lancashire Community Safety Strategy Group and Area Community Safety Steering Groups
- Strategic support and guidance to key thematic delivery groups to ensure delivery against the Community Safety Agreement and thematic delivery plans
- Delivery against the Community Safety Agreement, Police and Crime Plan and associated delivery plans eg domestic abuse strategy,

reducing reoffending, organised crime, early action, CONTEST and preventing violent extremism

- Collaboration with the OPCC, to drive effective partnership working at a district, area, county and pan-Lancashire level in order to achieve the shared strategic priorities of reducing the harm caused to communities by domestic abuse, violent crime, anti-social behaviour and hate crime, anti-social road use, offending and re-offending, and substance misuse
- Strategic direction for tackling domestic abuse in partnership across Lancashire incorporating: commissioning support services for victims, children, young people and families; prevention programmes for perpetrators; workforce development; pathway improvement; and, the conduct of statutory functions eg Domestic Homicide Reviews

3) How is your service performing?

Write here any information you have collected that shows how your service is performing. See the corporate intranet site at lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2665&pageid=30233 for directorate business planning information.

The community safety team maintains a performance scorecard on behalf of community safety partners which shows that in general crime continues to reduce and that performance against priority issues is good. This can be found at: www.saferlancashire/made

4) Who are the people who will benefit from your service?

The answer to this question could be everyone in Lancashire, or it could be everyone within a District of Lancashire e.g. Burnley, or everyone within a ward e.g. Daneshouse etc. Alternatively, the answer could be a

particular group of people e.g. young people in Leyland, people with a disability in Frenchwood etc.

Information on Lancashire's population can be found at

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/profile>

The service benefits everyone in the county through working with partners to keep Lancashire a safe place to live, work and visit. However there is a particular focus on improving outcomes for vulnerable victims of crime and anti-social behaviour and in working to reduce levels of offending, re-offending and substance.

5) How do you monitor the use of your service and which citizens do you monitor? Please ensure you retain information in relation to your monitoring as evidence of it may be required.

We have a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to monitor the use of our services by users who share the following protected characteristics:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)
- gender reassignment/gender identity
- race/ethnicity/nationality
- sex/gender
- pregnancy/maternity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (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 prohibited by the Act)

Monitoring can be done in a variety of ways, to best meet the needs of the service. See the corporate service monitoring form at lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5580&pageid=33450&e=e

If you are not currently monitoring across all these characteristics, please say how you will develop your monitoring systems to do so.

6) What does your monitoring information tell you about who is and who is not using your service?

The service is provided at a general level across the population. Where groups with protected characteristics are found to be disproportionately affected by particular crime types/incidents, the service works with partner agencies to better understand the problem and where possible to develop targeted interventions to improve outcomes.

7) How do you consult, inform, and involve people in developing your service? Please ensure you retain materials relating to your consultation in case evidence of it is required.

There are a range of techniques to involve people in developing your services. They include:

- service user surveys and panels
- service user satisfaction surveys
- focus groups
- community consultation and engagement exercises
- residents' surveys, including the Living in Lancashire survey - see

<http://lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=2660&pageid=3543&e=e>

- for more information.
- discussion with front line employees
- complaints, compliments, and comments
- Customer Focus Consultancy see lccintranet2/corporate/web/?siteid=5196&pageid=27362 for more information
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) see <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/jsna> for more information
- mystery shopping
- talking to voluntary, community, and faith sector (VCFS) organisations that represent different groups of people
- feedback from district and sub district groups i.e. Local Strategic Partnerships, Area Forums, Area Committees, Neighbourhood Management Boards, Parish and Town Council meetings, Police and Community Together (PACT) meetings etc.

See the Neighbourhood Engagement Intranet site at

lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=3949&pageid=21780&e=e

for further advice.

The service conducts regular surveys through Living in Lancashire. The survey is designed to be representative of the community in Lancashire, with the most recent showing:

9 out of 10 residents consider the local area to be safe, the most common reasons given were having a good community and neighbours, living in a quiet area without trouble, having good street lighting and low levels of crime. 3 out of 5 also said they feel safe after dark.

4 out of 5 said that anti-social behaviour was not a big problem in their area and over half think that the police are successfully tackling anti-social behaviour. Two thirds agree that the police are successful in tackling crime in the local area however less than 1 in 5 believe that offenders get tough enough sentences.

The service produces community safety intelligence products (modelled on the JSNA) to better understand the profile of priority issues and to inform the development of services and interventions. These products are available on www.saferlancashire/made

Community safety commissions specialist services to provide support to victims of domestic abuse. Whilst this issue can affect anybody, national statistics show that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 7 men will experience domestic abuse at some point in their lives. Local service data shows that there is still considerable under-reporting of the issue but that all groups with protected characteristics are both affected by the issue and access support services. All commissioned services are required to collect service user data as part of contract monitoring and are supported to improve access where appropriate and possible. The commissioned service has a separate equality impact analysis.

8) Which groups of people do you involve in developing your service? Are there any particular groups that you need to target? In considering this question, you should focus first on whether the service has particular relevance to groups of individuals who share the protected characteristics under the Equality Act, namely:

- age
- disability (including Deaf people)
- gender reassignment/gender identity
- pregnancy or maternity

- race, ethnicity or nationality
- religion or belief
- sex/gender
- sexual orientation
- marriage/civil partnership (in respect of which s.149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct prohibited by the Act)

In doing so, where relevant, you should consider any effects on specific groups or sub-groups sharing one or more protected characteristics such as, for example:

- older people
- people of a particular religion or ethnic group
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender communities
- It may also be appropriate to consider the specific needs of those with non-statutory characteristics, e.g.:
 - people living in deprived areas
 - people living in rural areas
 - Children Looked After
 - young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
 - carers
 - other groups as appropriate e.g. teenage parents, offenders etc

If there are groups that you need to target, how will you do this?

Service users and groups with protected characteristics are consulted in the development of community safety intelligence products and as part of the commissioning cycle to ensure that their views inform both service design and delivery. The providers of commissioned services eg Domestic Abuse, are required to consult with service users as part of their contracted duties.

9) If appropriate, how have you involved the following in developing your service? Again, please retain any evidence of this.

- Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) organisations
- county councillors
- parish and town councils see lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=2339&tab=1 for more information
- district ward councillors/district councillors
- overview and scrutiny committees see lccintranet/corporate/atoz/a_to_z/service.asp?u_id=1788&tab=1
- other statutory agencies e.g. National Health Service, Lancashire Constabulary etc

Community Safety Partnerships are required to consult stakeholders in carrying out the Strategic Assessment of Crime and Disorder which in turn is used to inform development of the Community Safety Agreement (CSA - the pan-Lancashire strategic document produced every 2 to 3 years). The Living in Lancashire Survey forms part of this consultation in conjunction with a range of other surveys carried out across the partnership and by partner agencies including: the police, the police and crime commissioner, local authorities, criminal justice agencies etc. Community Safety is required to report to overview and

scrutiny on an annual basis to consider any performance or significant service developments. In addition, the CSA is subject to the approval of overview and scrutiny, cabinet and full council, and takes account of the priorities of the Police and Crime Commissioner. In addition, the service participates in consultation with VCFS, communities and councillors as part of local partnership arrangements.

Stakeholders and service users are consulted as an integral part of the commissioning process where new services are developed or where reviews of service delivery are carried out.

Consultation will be ongoing with relevant stakeholders throughout the review of the service.

10) Taking into consideration the information you have collected already, are there any potential negative impacts that might affect citizens because of their:

- age
- disability including Deaf people
- race/ethnicity/nationality
- sex/gender
- gender reassignment/ gender identity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation
- pregnancy or maternity status
- marriage or civil partnership status

Or because they are:

- people who have young children
- living in an area of deprivation
- living in a rural area
- Children Looked After
- young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)
- teenage parents
- carers
- others e.g. offenders, people out of work, problem drug users etc.

No

Please note that the consideration of potential negative effects should be specific and realistic. Potential adverse effects should not be minimised or exaggerated.

N/a

11) Does your review indicate that the effect of the policy or decision under review could combine with other policies or decisions of LCC or other public authorities ?

There are implications for other public bodies in relation to potential reduction in funding for PCSOs and subsequent re-direction of resource towards front-line delivery of domestic abuse services.

Could the results of your review combine with other decisions within LCC or elsewhere to affect any of the above groups (i.e. the cumulative effect)?

The results of this review would combine with other decisions to provide an ongoing, secure service for vulnerable victims of domestic abuse.

Are you aware of other local or national decisions which could combine with this decision to particularly disadvantage any specific groups ?

There may be a cumulative impact in the potential reduction of funding allocated towards PCSO numbers where other authorities carry out a similar review of their contributions. However this would impact across the population rather than disproportionately against any particular group.

12) In relation to your service review findings, whether viewed alone or in combination with other factors, are these likely to have adverse effects on groups sharing relevant protected characteristics ? If so you must consider how to mitigate such adverse effects.

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

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

LCC is developing its provision of prevention and early help services which would mitigate against any reduction in PCSO numbers.

13) Think about the potential positive impacts your service could have on certain groups of people, and in particular those sharing

protected characteristics. What are they and how might they be developed?

Use this information to think about how your service might improve quality of life and assist in relation to promoting equality.

Will the positive impacts be accompanied by any negative impacts on groups of citizens sharing the protected characteristics? If so, how might these be addressed or balanced?

The service aims to improve the quality of life of communities in Lancashire through maintaining a reducing level of crime and anti-social behaviour. This aims holds true for all communities and groups with protected characteristics. Where particular groups are found to be disproportionately affected by particular crime types or incidents, evidence based steps will be taken to influence service delivery and so produce better outcomes for these groups.

Whilst there is a reduction in the core funding allocated to Community Safety, the remaining resource will be re-aligned towards front-line delivery and in particular towards services which aim to reduce and prevent harm caused by domestic abuse.

14) How can your service contribute to the following priority areas:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation or any other unlawful conduct

Will the service be provided by people who treat all clients/customers/service users with dignity and respect?

Yes, this is required of all commissioned services

Will assessment or eligibility criteria be set objectively and fairly? Will training in some form be available to ensure that these requirements are properly applied?

Yes, this is required of all commissioned services

- Tackling social exclusion and advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not share it.

This will involve taking steps to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and that are connected to that particular characteristic, taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it, and encouraging persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

It is important to bear in mind that taking steps to meet the needs of disabled persons which are different from those of persons who do not share that disability include steps to take account of the disabilities in question. This may even include treating some persons more favourably than others in order to allow them to participate in social or public life.

Activities that help improve social inclusion include those that improve the quality of life for people who are disadvantaged or are in danger of poor outcomes in their lives through various circumstances e.g. a lack of money, difficulty in accessing services difficulties accessing premises, and barriers to taking part in relationships and activities that are available to most people in communities etc.

- Improving community cohesion /Fostering Good Relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it

This may include thinking about ways to tackle prejudice and promote understanding between groups of people with protected characteristics and those who do not share those characteristics. Activities that help improve community cohesion include those that bring people from different communities together (e.g. people of different ethnicities, faiths, ages, geographical backgrounds etc); those that empower communities and those that reduce tensions in communities. (See the Community Cohesion website at

<http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=2966&pageid=5956&e=e> for more information).

- Improving health and wellbeing

Health and wellbeing means that people feel well enough and sufficiently supported to live their lives to the full. Activities that help improve health and wellbeing include those that ensure that basic needs are met, that individuals have a sense of purpose, that they feel able to achieve important personal goals and participate in society.

- Supporting the county council's role as a corporate parent

The Corporate Parenting Board ensures that Children Looked After have the same opportunities as their peers to a good quality of life. Activities that help support this are those that help improve health and wellbeing outcomes for children and young people who are looked after and those that support them to be prepared for the future. (See Corporate Parenting Board website at

lccintranet2/corporate/web/view.asp?siteid=4183&pageid=17628&e=e for more information).

15) Taking into consideration all the information you have collected in answering the previous questions, what are the changes/actions

you will carry out to tackle any issues you have identified? These may be – no change to the service; adjust the proposal; continue with proposed changes or stop the changes and reconsider.

If going ahead with changes, what are the factors you have balanced – e.g. financial, operational – which you have considered alongside your Analysis findings (countervailing factors).

Changes will continue to evolve in line with the organisational transformation.

16) When will you review your actions?

Monitoring should be at least half yearly in line with the business planning performance management cycle.

17) When will you report progress on your actions and who to?

Progress on actions should be reported to relevant county councillors, officers, partnerships and groups etc

18) When will you review your service or service plan?

Review is currently ongoing in line with the organisational transformation.

Name of officer completing this template Mel Ormesher

Role Community Safety Manager



Equality Analysis

Public Health and Wellbeing (Road
Safety)

November 2014

Nature of the Decision

Speed Management

There will be a reduction in the number of road safety and speed management courses delivered as follows:

- Non-diversionary courses including Older Drivers and Motorcycles but number of courses delivered is reduced by 50%
- Speed Tasking, deployment of SPIDS, speed counts but quantum delivered reduced by 50%

Safer Travel Unit

To reduce the amount of training provided by the Safer Travel Unit as follows:

- Road safety education delivery through the Moodle or through partners such as police, fire and rescue, health and Children's Trust
- Delivery of cycling schemes but only those that are funded externally, principally through DfT eg. bikeability
- Road safety and sustainable travel engagement, including early years, but output reduced by 25%
- Healthy Streets programme but output reduced by 50% but with the potential to deliver more by increased delivery through partnership working and other means
- Reduced resources focused on areas of highest need as directed by Strategic Casualty Assessments.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

- Reduce the level of direct motorcycle engagement/awareness which currently only impacts on a relatively small number of riders and focus on supporting police engagement campaigns
- An increased targeted approach towards speed management working with the police to target the worst areas for enforcement, engagement and engineering measures. Limited SpID deployment, encouraging Parish and Community Groups to own their own SpIDs. Working with Police to do more Community Road Watch
- Direct social media campaigns aimed at young drivers who represent a disproportionate percentage of the killed and seriously injured casualties in Lancashire and are most open to influence through social marketing
- Focus Older Driver courses in areas of highest need and work with Public Health to support safe driving and sustainable modes of travel

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 to target areas of greatest need will mean that there will be disproportionate effects on people dependent upon where they live in the County. Whilst there will be a service reduction, an intelligence based targeted approach will ensure areas of greatest need continue to be delivered so impact of service reduction will be minimised.

It is anticipated that the proposal would not have a disproportionate negative impact on anyone or groups of people with a protected characteristic, with the exception of the Older Driver courses which will have some impacts on the elderly. Road safety education to younger

people will change with more road safety education delivery through the Moodle.

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 in the number of Older Driver courses will have an impact on the elderly.

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.

Budget savings and resulting reduction and changes in service means that the services provided through the Moodle are equally accessible to all schools in Lancashire and the reduced delivery of other

resources will be targeted at areas of highest need identified through statistics

The reduction in the number of Older Driver courses will have an impact on the elderly. Currently, 500 courses per year are delivered with County Council funding and it is proposed that this will be reduced by 50% and targeted to those geographical areas with the most need.

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)

At this stage, views have not been sought but should the proposals progress then wider consultation will be undertaken to develop a fuller understanding of the impacts.

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 the number of Older Driver courses will have an impact on the elderly. Those elderly people who will be unable to attend a course, the impact may be that they will have to give up driving sooner than if they had attended a course. This will mean that they would have to use public transport, seek lifts from others or be at risk of social isolation.

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 proposed withdrawal of all subsidised bus services is likely to exacerbate the impact of this proposal.

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

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

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated.

Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

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

We will continue to provide a reduced level of Older Driver courses and these will be targeted to those geographical areas identified to have the most need.

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.

Budget reductions have to be achieved and LCC is required to find £300m in budget savings over the period 2014 – 2018 and these proposals will contribute to this reduction.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

At this stage, the proposal is set out as above.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

The new service area will need to develop appropriate review and monitoring arrangements as it moves forward.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Tony Moreton

Position/Role: Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Scientific
Services)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

Reductions to the Lancashire County Scientific Service (LCSS) budget creating an opportunity to review the commercial business model for this service. This review will aim to produce a new commercial business model that will provide a high quality analytical 'in-house' service whilst working commercially to generate external income.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Lancashire County Scientific Services (LCSS) provides a wide range of UKAS accredited environmental, food substance and agricultural testing services for the council and on behalf of the council as an income generating service.

Historically, the service has aimed to offer a wide range of analytical scientific services whilst positioning itself as a centre of excellence for analytical services in the North West. The service is classified as an 'Official Food Control Laboratory' recognised at national and EU level. It is also the platform that provides LCSS with the reputation to deliver services across other areas.

However, with a reduction on the level of budget provided to this service and a change in the nature of demand for services there is a need for the service to adapt and respond to these changing markets.

The service has spent the last two years scrutinising services both financially and strategically and establishing performance management systems that have and continue to enable the commercial viability of these services to be tested. This work supports the need for a fundamental reprioritisation of services and re-modelling of the service if it is to become more financially self sustaining.

The service will therefore focus its resources upon the growth of its 'core' business areas which best meet the internal needs of the County Council and those where we are most likely to maintain a strong position commercially. This will happen whilst remaining open to developing new areas of activity as business opportunities arise.

This approach may result in ending the delivery of some services where there is a business case that some services are better being procured through external sources by LCC or where there is little commercial viability for continuing with their delivery and where staff can be redeployed or reduced in numbers. Any decisions to cease services going forward will be accompanied by a consideration of the impact of such a decision and will consider especially the impact on protected groups.

The service will also, where appropriate, continue to contribute to strategic projects such as the Priority Neighbourhoods work, for example, by working with Trading Standards to undertake nutritional profiling, testing and advice to the public in these areas.

Services will be tailored around work programmes and customer needs so that they are demand led and can respond quickly to changes in workloads and priorities.

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 service provides internal services to LCC and is commercially led so work is provided to wherever the demand is.

There are unlikely to be any equality related issues relating to the budget savings being proposed as these relate mostly to:

- A reduction in management costs, overtime, mileage, operational consumables, the termination of leases for buildings no longer required, minimising the use of agency staff and re-negotiating servicing contracts with suppliers.
- An increase in the level of income being achieved by the service.
- The ending of some services however LCSS does not provide services which are designed specifically for any group of individuals and provides to a general market.

It should be noted however that as proposals become clearer it will be necessary to review any equality related issues again.

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.

This decision would not have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. It should be noted however that as proposals become clearer it will be necessary to review any equality related issues again.

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.)

I do not believe that the reductions proposed to Scientific Services budget will have a particular and disproportionate impact on any group of people sharing protected characteristics under the equality Act 2010. It should be noted however that as proposals become clearer it will be necessary to review any equality related issues again.

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.

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Trading
Standards)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Public Health and Wellbeing Service Offer

Reductions to the Trading Standards Service budget leading to a consequent reduction in capacity across the service. Reference should be made to the Safe Trader Scheme Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The new Service offer is strongly focused on high risk activities, being increasingly intelligence led and prioritising available resources towards the most vulnerable in Lancashire communities and/or those problems which affect large numbers of people and cause the greatest detriment. Services which are being delivered at present will need to be reduced, refocused and some activities will not be undertaken on the same scale or at all going forward.

All services provided will have a clear statutory basis, except consumer support which provides second tier advice and assistance to consumers and maintains vital civil law expertise to assist Lancashire businesses comply with their civil obligations in their dealings with their customers. The team also monitors and deals with some of the most complained about businesses in Lancashire. While this Service will still be provided due to its significant contribution to supporting vulnerable and elderly people and those in the most deprived communities the policies under which it operates will be amended to reflect the need to prioritise resources to these priority customers. The level of assistance provided and level of detriment involved before certain support can be provided will need to be adjusted to reflect the reduction in Service resources.

As services are statutory it is essential to maintain some level of activity/capacity to respond in each area. This activity is intelligence led and risk based, so that resources are directed to areas of greatest need – this means that it is not possible at this stage to indicate other than in broad terms what the service will be delivering in terms of specific projects, inspections and visits in 2017/18, although the offer will involve reductions to the level of activity on each these. However, while we will seek to minimise the impact of any reductions, increased response times, focus on high risk premises with limited audit based and intelligence led interventions at other premises and an increased prioritisation of advice to more vulnerable consumers and smaller businesses will be an aspect of the service offer.

Resources will be deployed to areas of greatest need and in line with intelligence available, delivery will be prioritised to the most significant consumer and business detriment and focused on priority neighbourhoods and areas of deprivation as appropriate.

The Service will be more closely linked with LCSS and efficiencies resulting from this alignment will be identified and realised to the benefit of both Services.

The Service will also seek to have in house capacity to pursue Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) funding in appropriate cases. While this money can only be pursued in certain types of cases and has to be reinvested in enforcement, it can reduce the costs of Service provision.

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 Trading Standards service is intelligence led and undertakes a range of statutory duties which impact on the health and wellbeing of residents of Lancashire. The service operates from County Hall in Preston, officers respond to complaints and intelligence, and carry out inspections dealing with consumers and businesses across the County, and beyond.

The current proposal is to maintain activity across all areas of Trading Standards, with an emphasis on high risk issues and businesses.

The service will maintain a focus on service delivery in all districts from its base in County Hall and will continue to consider any potential disproportionate impact of trading standards contraventions on vulnerable neighbourhoods of 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.

This service already has a strong focus on protecting the elderly and vulnerable groups and it is proposed that this focus will be maintained including prioritising work which impacts on public health and elderly vulnerable consumers.

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.)

I do not believe that the reductions proposed to Trading Standards service delivery will have a particular and disproportionate impact on any group of people sharing protected characteristics of:

- 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

The service will continue to deliver across the full range of Trading Standards functions with an increased emphasis on dealing with high risk issues and provision of support to

elderly and vulnerable consumers. As the transformation process progresses further equality impact assessments may need to be undertaken to ensure that any more detailed proposals do not impact on groups with protected characteristics.

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 Amanda Maxim/David Scott

Position/Role Trading Standards Managers

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Public Health and Wellbeing (Safe Trader Scheme)

For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

A change in the funding arrangements for the Safe Trader Scheme to include provision in the core Trading Standards Service Budget leading to a consequent reduction in resource allocated to the scheme. Reference should be made to the full Trading Standards Service Equality Impact.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

The Safe Trader Scheme is currently part of the Help Direct programme and has been in operation since October 2009 operated by the Environment Directorate's Trading Standards Service. The Safe Trader scheme is currently largely funded by ASHW and as part of the ASHW savings plans it is intended to cease funding of this service by the end of March 2015. It is proposed that the scheme will in future be administered as part of the Trading Standards Service's core service offer. The way the service operates will also be reviewed and efficiencies sought.

The scheme is part of the Help Direct programme which is currently being redesigned as part of the new Integrated Health and Wellbeing Framework, which will include the provision of information and advice. In addition, there is also a project underway to look at how Adult Services provides information and advice regarding its services and support to members of the public including self-funders via the internet. This project is looking towards development of an IT database and customer portal which can include information about some service providers currently in the Safe Trader scheme although by no means all categories of traders.

ASHW would seek to support the future scheme by aligning with projects across all directorates including the Home Improvement Service, Retail model, community portal and the local offer linked to the SEN reforms.

The Trading Standards Service is currently looking into options to continue and sustain the service long term as the service supports a number of priorities such as preventing doorstep crime, protecting vulnerable consumers and supporting businesses. Future options include potentially charging traders to be part of the scheme, as some other authorities currently do. If this is pursued consultation with businesses will be undertaken.

The new Trading Standards Service offer is strongly focused on high risk activities, being increasingly intelligence led and prioritising available resources towards the most vulnerable in Lancashire communities and/or those problems which affect large numbers of people and cause the greatest detriment. Services which are being delivered at present will need to be reduced, refocused and some activities will not

be undertaken on the same scale or at all going forward. In relation to the Safe Trader Scheme it is proposed that the scheme will be maintained with a reduced resource resulting in slower development, recruitment to and publicising of the scheme, but little impact on the service users including protected groups, especially the elderly and vulnerable who are key target users of the scheme.

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 Safe Trader Scheme is available to all residents of Lancashire so any reduction in service will affect the whole county 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.

Trading Standards already has a strong focus on protecting the elderly and vulnerable groups, however a reduction in resource for safe trader, which, while used by all is of considerable benefit to the elderly and vulnerable, has the potential to impact disproportionately on those groups and therefore it will be imperative that we review delivery of the scheme as the transformation process progresses to assess the impact and address those issues which can be resolved.

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.)

I do not believe that the reductions proposed at present to delivery of the safe trader scheme will necessarily have a particular and disproportionate impact on any group of people sharing protected characteristics of:

- 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

The service will continue to deliver the scheme with an increased emphasis on provision of support to elderly and vulnerable consumers, and with appropriate support as identified to other groups with protected characteristics.

However, as we move through the transformation process, we will need to carefully monitor any changes or reductions to the scheme to assess the impact on groups with protected characteristics, and take appropriate steps to mitigate

these effects where possible. Further Equality Impact Assessments will therefore be undertaken as necessary during the transformation process.

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 Amanda Maxim/David Scott

Position/Role Trading Standards Managers

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Highways Service
For Decision Making Items

November 2014

Name/Nature of the Decision

Highways – Service offer

Highways Service offer – taking into account the revised funding envelope available in the years 2015/16 to 2017/18 inclusive.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Overall the Highway service offer is providing a reduced level of service which in the main relates to reduced levels of maintenance, this will be achieved through prioritising where and how resources are utilised.

Road & Street Maintenance

A reduction in the level of highway maintenance that will be provided, with a reduction in the level of defects repaired, the point at which we will attend to a footway defect, known as the "intervention level", will increase.

Prioritising the maintenance of road traffic signs and lines associated with enforceable restrictions.

Service requests for the introduction of parking restrictions will be prioritised with a focus on casualty reduction, with strategic traffic management, economic growth and significant environmental improvement being considered where resources allow.

The use of external contractors will reduce as a result of less work resulting in a greater percentage being delivered through the in house team.

Street Lighting

An increase in the number of LED lighting units and where this is not possible the dimming of existing lighting units will be extended to operate at 50% light level during all the hours of darkness, rather than between specified hours as at present.

Drainage & Flood Prevention

A reduction in the level of proactive work undertaken into flood investigations/standing water on the highway and the identification of flood assets, together with a more targeted cyclic maintenance visit to gullies, some of which may be visited less frequently. The development of potential flood alleviation schemes may reduce.

Keep Traffic Moving

A reduction by agreement with the local planning authority on the level of service provided in terms of our highway consultation response for planning applications.

Parking Services

A reduction in the level of enforcement hours available will result in more targeted enforcement, meaning that rural and some urban areas will receive little or no enforcement.

Traffic Signals

Prioritising the maintenance of traffic signals where safety or major delay risks are most acute.

Priorities Contingency

Removal of funding for minor highway and traffic improvements which cannot be prioritised from within other budgets.

Stakeholder Engagement

There will be less capacity within services to undertake liaison with key stakeholders due to reduced management resource and the introduction of new systems. There will be limited capacity to engage direct with Members in the way that they currently enjoy.

The target response time to contacts will be increased to 20 working days

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 service reductions in the main are likely to affect people across the county in a similar way , however the following service area reductions and or focused delivery may have more of an affect in rural areas :-

Enforcement of parking restrictions – this is as a result of less enforcement in the rural areas.

Cyclic gully maintenance and proactive flood investigations, given the topography in rural areas it is likely that the service will be more focused in these areas.

However at this early stage in the development of the analysis it is difficult to fully quantify and understand the impacts and further work will be required.

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 likely that the decision to reduce highway maintenance levels in relation to defect repairs, and to extend further the hours of streetlighting dimming where LED's cannot be fitted, will impact individuals sharing protected characteristics – see Q1

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 doesn't have specific information surrounding the groups with protected characteristics as the service is provided across the county in a universal way

The reduced highway maintenance levels in relation to defect repairs might particularly impact on those with a disability or the elderly, as their ability to identify a defect in the highway that they may subsequently fail to avoid or navigate around may be reduced.

The further reductions in lighting levels might particularly impact the following protected characteristics :-

Age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity/nationality, sexual orientation and gender identity as they are more likely to be the victims of crime including hate crimes and have a greater concern surrounding the fear of crime.

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)

At this stage views have not been sought, however should the proposals progress then wider consultation will be undertaken to understand the impact.

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.

In relation to further extending the hours of dimming where LED's have not been introduced, the impact against the specific groups is indicated below :-

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 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 are likely to be impacted greater by these decisions there is particular concern amongst Women, LGBT people and some race/ethnicity/nationality groups about the potential personal safety consequences of reductions in street lighting.

In relation to highway defects it is likely that the following specific groups will be affected:-

Age - agility deteriorates with age as does vision and older people may be less able to avoid the defects in the highway.

Disability -people with disabilities of varying natures may be impacted as a result of the change in highway defect repairs – e.g. due to mobility or balance difficulties or sight loss.

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.

If evening bus services are reduced then we might see an increase in pedestrian activity during the evenings when light levels will be lower , alternatively this may reduce the number of people leaving their homes and could result in isolation particularly for the older people and females, although other groups could be similarly affected.

The reduction in highway maintenance and reduced lighting levels could lead to an increase in "tripping claims", however the revised intervention level for defects will be in line with many other local highway authorities, and in line with case law established over several years.

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

Analysis stage not yet undertaken, further work will be required in this if the proposals progress.

Question 6 - Mitigation

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

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

It is likely that any mitigation will arise following the analysis and consultation that has yet to be undertaken.

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.

To be developed further informed by analysis and consultation

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

At this stage the proposal is as documented in the service offer.

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 need to develop the review and monitoring arrangements as it moves forward.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Shaun Capper/Rick Hayton/Sue Procter
Position/Role ADs Highways service