

Equality Analysis Toolkit For Decision Making Items

- Services for single people who are homeless
- Service for people who are homeless (including young people, single people and homeless families)
- services for people with substance misuse issues
- services for offenders (supported housing and specialist floating support (MAPPA))

2016 Report

For Decision Making Items

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

AskEquality@lancashire.gov.uk

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis is available from your Service contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team or from Jeanette Binns

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

To cease the £2.15m Supporting People (SP) funding for the support provided within the following services from 31st March 2017:

- Supported housing for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues and;
- Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) service

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Lancashire County Council is required to make savings of £262M by 2020/21. This extremely difficult financial position is the result of continued cuts in Government funding, rising costs and rising demand for our key services.

As part of its plan to achieve the overall level of savings required, LCC is proposing to cease SP funding for non-statutory services with effect from 31st March 2017. The SP budget funds a range of services. This EA focuses on the proposal to withdraw funding for support from the following services:

- Supported housing for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues and
- Specialist floating support services (MAPPA) across Lancashire.

As services are jointly funded with rental/housing benefit income we don't know what this proposal will mean for each service, however there is a possibility for any or some of the following to take place:

- The service closes;
- The service continues with major changes (eg reduction in number of staff);
- The service continues with little change as your provider has managed to obtain other funding (eg from charities not Supporting People

As part of the consultation, we asked providers to give us details of their current plans. The responses received have been included within Question 2.

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.

Supported Housing for People who are Homeless, Who have a History of

Offending and who have Substance Misuse Issues

The 13 supported housing services are based in the following 8 district areas. Individuals from other districts will also access the services

District	No of services	No of buildings	No of units
Burnley	1	1	20
Chorley	2	4	48
Hyndburn	1	1	13
Preston	3	3	78
Ribble Valley	1	2	15
Lancaster	2	2	29
West Lancashire	1	1	22
Wyre	2	3	25
Total	13	17	250

The Client Profile in 2015/16 (CRD) reflected that 541 people accessed the supported housing services

Specialist floating support service (MAPPA)

The client profile in 2015/16 (CRD), reflected that 63 people accessed the service.

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

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

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

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

Yes. The service currently caters for adults of all ages from age 16+. As the service caters for any vulnerable adult within Lancashire, the profile of service users does include people with protected characteristics.

Due to the short term nature of the service, many of the current service users would be unlikely to be still receiving the service in the event that the service ceases.

A detailed breakdown in terms of the characteristics of service users over the last 12 months is included in response to question 1.

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

Yes

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

Description

The services provide a short to medium term housing and support service

- Services for people who are homeless (single people or families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and who are vulnerable and need support) – aimed at enabling individuals to develop or regain the skills required to live more independently in the community,
- In addition, substance misuse services are aimed at assisting people who are abstinent to develop the skills required to live independently in the community, thereby assisting their recovery,
- In addition, offender services are aimed at people with a history of offending who present a high risk of harm and/or high risk of re-offending and require a high level of ongoing supervision and support.

Currently the accommodation and housing management is funded from rents and housing benefit, and the support is funded from the SP Budget

There are currently 14 services delivered by 12 providers:

- Supported housing for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues (276 units);
- Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) service (26 units)

The following are the locations and number of units of services;

	Combined	Single Homeless	Offender	Substance misuse
Burnley	20			
Chorley	25		26	
Hyndburn				13
Lancaster		23		6
Preston	36	42		
Ribble Valley	15			
West Lancs		22		
Wyre	15		10	
Across Lancs			26	

The allocation of funding is currently based on £2,155,978.56, per annum for 14 services.

Supported accommodation services delivered support to 541 people between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2016 (CRD) and 63 people were supported by the MAPPA service. Support is short term in nature and accessed by a range of vulnerable adults inclusive of all protected characteristics. Demographic information is collected by the service provider when the service commences delivery, however the data availability is subject to service user willingness to disclose and therefore information in relation to some of the protected characteristics is unavailable. This includes information in relation to gender re-assignment, pregnancy, sexual orientation and single/partner.

Age Profile

Service type	Age group						Grand Total
	16-24		25-64		65+		
Supported Accommodation services	222	41%	310	57%	9	2%	541
MAPPA	10	16%	51	81%	2	3%	63

Disability

Service Type	Don't Know		No		Yes		Grand Total
Supported Accommodation services	3	0.5%	431	79.5%	107	20%	541
MAPPA			43	68%	20	32%	63

Gender Reassignment

	Supported Accommodation		MAPPA	
Does not wish to disclose			1	2%
Don't Know	1	20%	5	8%
No	539	99.6%	56	89%
Not available	1	0.2%		
Yes			1	2%
Grand Total	541	100%	63	100%

Pregnancy and maternity

- Data not available / not collected

Race/ethnicity

Ethnicity	Supported Accommodation services		MAPPA	
Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi	2			
Asian/Asian British: Chinese	1			
Asian/Asian British: Indian	2			
Asian/Asian British: Other	1			
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	5	1%	2	3
Black or Black British: African	4	1%		
Black or Black British: Caribbean			1	1.5%
Mixed: Other	2			
Mixed: White & Asian	3	1%		
Mixed: White & Black African	2			
Mixed: White & Black Caribbean	6	1%	1	1.5%
Other: Arab	3	1%		
Other: Other	5	1%		

White British	499	92%	59	94%
White Irish	5	1%		
White Other	3	1%		
Grand Total	541	100%	63	100%

Religion/Belief

	Supported Accommodation services		MAPPA	
Buddhist	1	0%	1	2%
Christian (All Denominations)	179	33%	18	29%
Does not wish to disclose	6	1%	6	10
Hindu	1	0%		
Jewish	2	0%		
Muslim	16	3%	2	3
None	301	56%	9	14
Not available	3	1%		
Not Known	26	5%	27	43
Other	6	1%		
Grand Total	541	100%	63	100%

Gender

	Female		Male		Grand Total
Supported Accommodation services	183	34%	358	66%	541
MAPPA	4	6%	59	94%	63

Sexual Orientation

	Supported Accommodation		MAPPA	
Bisexual	6	1%		
Does not wish to disclose	7	1%	14	22%
Gay Man	5	1%		
Heterosexual	518	96%	49	78%
Lesbian	2	0%		
Not available	3	1%		
Grand Total	541	100%	63	100

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 PROCESS

Meetings

- Separate meetings were held with district councils (commissioners) and providers on 23rd November 2015 to inform them of the proposal to cease SP funding from 31st March 2017.
- Eleven out of twelve district council (commissioners) and approximately 60 providers attended the above meetings.
- LCC staff attended the Wyre and Fylde Health and Wellbeing Task Group on 1st July 2016 and discussions were held with providers and stakeholders
- A meeting was held with district councils on 4th July to consider interim consultation findings

Questionnaires

Service Users

LCC undertook postal surveys with all the existing service users in the services for:

- people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues and
- Specialist floating support (MAPPA) service.

The service user surveys were also made available on line. The service user surveys asked:

- What services the service user received?
- What was important to them about the service?
- If the service ended what do you thinking the people who need this type of service would do in the future? and
- Any further comments.

Providers/Stakeholder and Districts

LCC also undertook on line surveys on the www.lancashire.gov.uk. with the following;

- 12 providers of services
- 12 district councils and
- The wider stakeholders.

There were separate questionnaires for each of the above groups and separate questionnaires for supported housing and floating support.

We asked providers

- What their plans were should SP funding cease from 1st April 2017?
- What the impact would be on the service users?
- What the impact would be on their organisation and on the wider community? and
- Any further comments

The district council and stakeholder questionnaires asked the same questions, apart from the first question regarding the providers' plans.

Summaries of service user, district, stakeholder and provider responses have been provided in the Consultation Findings (see Appendix J).

SERVICE FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS, WHO HAVE A HISTORY OF OFFENDING AND WHO HAVE SUBSTANCE MISUSE ISSUES

Summary of Consultation Responses

The consultation ran for 12 weeks from 21st April to 17th July 2016

- 240 questionnaires were sent out to current service users of services for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues We received 131 completed questionnaires, giving a 55% response rate
- There was an 83% (10 providers) response rate from the provider survey
- 9 district councils (75%) responded and 1 stakeholder response was received.

Provider Responses

In the event that the funding for services for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues is to be removed then the providers of these services stated that the following is likely to take place

- 50% Service ceases (5) and examining options for alternative funding (5)
- 50% Services to be reviewed (5)
- 40% Service at risk (4)
- 40% Provider are already or there is potential for drawing down increased

housing management (no support) (4).

In the event that the services are removed then the impact will be as follows

- 80% disagree with cutting funding for SP services (8);
- 70% increase in crime/re offending and returning to prison (7);
- 70% more social problems (drug, alcohol and addiction problems (7); and
- 70% will not maintain substance misuse free lifestyle (7).

Stakeholder and District responses

9 district councils and 1 stakeholder responded. The key issues raised in terms of the impact on service users were:

- May reach crisis point due to a lack of available, accessible, supported accommodation (1); and
- Increase in the demand on Public services (More ill health and greater access to health services, Criminal justice systems, CSC, A&E) (1).

Service User Responses

131 service users responded. The responses were as follows;

Support received by service users

- 86% (113) received support to claim the right benefits
- 84% (110) received support to learn to budget properly and pay bills
- 81% (106) received support to improve physical health
- 80% (105) received support to set up and maintain their home

Important aspect of the services were as follows;

- 95% Accommodation
- 82% dedicated support within the accommodation
- 76% Support to claim right benefits and support to keep safe and to avoid harm caused by others

If the services ended then;

- 74% (97) would sleep on the street/homeless
- 68% (89) would stay in unsafe/inappropriate accommodation
- 56% (73) would seek help about housing from district council (housing) from Social Services (LCC)
- 43% (56) would seek help from police

SPECIALIST FLOATING SUPPORT (MAPPA) SERVICE

Summary of Consultation Responses

The consultation ran for 12 weeks from 16th May to 12th August 2016

- 26 questionnaires sent out to service users of the specialist floating support (MAPPA) service. We received 9 completed questionnaires giving a 35% response rate
- The single provider of the specialist floating support (MAPPA) responded to the provider questionnaire,
- 2 district response and 2 stakeholder responses were received.

Provider Response

In the event that the funding for Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) in Lancashire is to be removed then the provider has stated that the following is likely to take place:

- Service ceases if no alternative funding is sourced
- Examining options for alternative funding
- Staff redundancies
- No service to transfer the clients to

The impact on service users will be as follows:

- Significantly less access to stable accommodation and this significantly increases re-offending
- Increase in risk to members of public and children
- Reduce likelihood to secure and maintain appropriate accommodation as high risk offenders face barriers to housing
- More likely to suffer from mental and physical health problems and have higher rates of alcohol misuse

Stakeholder and District responses

The 2 district councils and 2 stakeholder who responded to the specialist floating support (MAPPA) service consultation raised the following as the key issues in relation to the impact on their organisation;

- Difficulties in finding accommodation leading to an increase in homelessness (2).
- Additional request from housing needs (2)
- Huge impact on multi agency working and support available to the vulnerable group of people who need it most (1)

Service user Response

There was 9 service user responses. The responses were as follows:

Support received by service users

- 8 people received support to claim the right benefits

- 8 people received support to learn to budget properly and pay bills
- 8 people received support to improve physical health
- 7 people received support to set up and maintain their home

Important aspect of the services were as follows;

- support to set up and maintain their home (7)
- support to claim the right benefits and learn to budget properly and pay bills (6)
- support to improve physical health (5)

If the services ended, what do you think that people who need this type of service would do in the future?

- Sleep on the street/homeless (8)
- Seek help from family and friends (6)
- Seek help about housing from local district council (6)
- Stay in unsafe accommodation (5)

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION – CONSULTATION NOT COMPLETED

Consultation with residents of one service in West Lancashire did not take place. This will be undertaken over the coming months and feed into the review of services outlined later in the report

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

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

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

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

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be

amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities

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

The demographic information outlined in the response to question 1 seems to suggest that some people with protected characteristics will be disproportionately affected by the proposal including young people and men:-

Age Profile

41% (222) of the service users in supported accommodation and 16% within MAPPA were aged between 16-24 which appears to be greater than the proportion of the wider population (13%) and may be disproportionately impacted by the proposal

57% (310) of the service users in supported accommodation were aged between 26-64 compared to 58% of the Lancashire population who are between 20 and 64

2% (9) of the service users in supported accommodation and 3% of MAPPA clients were aged 65 plus which appears to be significantly lower than the proportion of the wider population (18%)

Gender

A majority of those who used the supported housing services and MAPPA in 2015/16 were male, 66% and 94% respectively. This contrasts with 51% of the population in Lancashire being female and 49% being male. Accordingly, it would appear that males will be disproportionately affected by the proposal to reduce funding in services

Disability

18% of service users who accessed supported housing services and 31% of those

who accessed MAPPA considered themselves to be disabled. Whereas in Lancashire (2011 census) 9.8% of the population said their activities were limited a lot and 10.2% said they were limited a little by a disability or health condition. This would suggest that there would be a disproportionate impact on people with disabilities who are accessing the MAPPA service

Ethnicity

The race/ ethnicity profile of service users appears to be broadly representative of the wider population as 94% (supported housing) and 94% (MAPPA) are White (All Groups) and 6% (MAPPA) and 8% (supported accommodation) are from BME communities compared to 92% of the Lancashire population being White (All Groups) and 7.7% from BME communities. No ethnic groups appear to be disproportionately impacted.

Religion

The religious profile of service users appears to show that a much higher number of supported accommodation service users (56%) have no religious belief compared to the wider population where 19% are identified as having no religion. There appears to be a lower proportion of Christians 33% (supported accommodation) and 29% (MAPPA) than the wider population (69%) and also a lower proportion of muslims (3%) compared to the wider population (6%). Consequently, no religious group appears to be disproportionately negative impact.

Sexual Orientation

The sexual orientation profile of service users appears to show that 2% of service users in services identified as LGBT. Stonewall have estimated about 5-7% of the Lancashire population is LGB whilst ONS had a figure around 1%. This suggests that based on the census, there does not appear to be a disproportionately negative impact on any groups.

Gender Reassignment

One service user who accessed supported housing and one person who accessed the specialist floating support service (MAPPA) considered themselves to be transgender. This appears to be lower than the other consultations figures which have been around 1% of respondents saying they have changed gender.

Marriage

Of the people who responded to the consultation: 0% said that they were in a civil partnership, 2% of the respondents said that they were married and 98% preferred not to say or didn't provide a response or said it was none of the options. Other consultations have reflected that around 50-60% of respondents as married, 30-40% as not married and around 1-2% as being in civil partnerships. Consequently it is not possible to draw any conclusions.

Pregnancy

8% of the respondents to the consultation are pregnant and do not have children which is higher than other consultations which have a figure of 2%. We cannot identify from either the SP data or other consultations, the number of women who were pregnant who also had children. Consequently, it is not possible to draw any conclusions

Mitigation for those protected groups that may be disproportionately affected by the proposal is given in response to question 6

People who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues

The consultation shows how the above supported accommodation based services have helped 87% (113), of individuals to claim the right benefits, 84% (110) to learn to budget properly and pay bills (risk losing accommodation/tenancies), 81% (106) to improve their physical health and 80% (105) to set up and maintain their homes which fits the advancing equality of opportunity objective.

The above services enabled 75% (98) of individuals to keep safe and to avoid harm caused by others, 73% (96) were supported to develop their domestic/social and life skills and 71% were supported to access community facilities. This contributes to fostering good relations between communities/community cohesion and other elements as there can be tensions and a lack of safety generally in area where a lot of people are on the streets.

The personal safety of people who **are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues** is paramount in terms of health and wellbeing, reducing isolation and helping service users to participate more fully in public life which are all connected to the Public Sector Equality Duty.

Any reduction in funding will affect the above positive impact of services.

Specialist Floating support (MAPPA) service

The findings from the consultation for this service are similar to the supported accommodation findings in that the service has helped people to claim the right benefits, learn to budget properly and pay bills (risk losing accommodation/tenancies), improve their physical health set up and maintain their homes which fits the advancing equality of opportunity objective.

The personal safety of the service users is also important in terms of health and wellbeing, reducing isolation and helping service users to participate more fully in public life which are all connected to the Public Sector Equality Duty.

The proposal to cease the funding for the service could:

- affect the above positive impact of services in terms of promoting equality of

opportunity and participation in public life

- harm the fostering of good relations/community cohesion where if/incidents occurred
- result in increased re-offending and increased risk of harm to others, including children as result of the level of risk of clients currently accessing the service

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 effects of the reduction in funding could combine with the national welfare reforms and other local proposals to make savings to exacerbate the impact (welfare reform; specifically the impact of the single room rate for under 35's after April 2017 when 18 - 21 year olds will not be entitled to any form of housing benefit unless in an exempt group and changes in relation to local housing allowance etc.)

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

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

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

We are proposing to continue with the original proposal to cease SP funding for

the provision of support within the following services:

- Supported housing for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues and;
- Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) service

However while the intention is to proceed with the original proposal, the council intends to take steps to mitigate the effect of the funding reduction. This is outlined more fully in the next section of this report.

Question 6 - Mitigation

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

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

The following mitigation is being put in place to reduce any potential adverse effects of the above proposal

As the needs of the above client groups meet the agreed criteria for accessing the Prevention and Early Help Fund, it is recommended that up to £1.25m annually is made available for supported housing for homeless households with complex needs.

It was originally envisaged that these services will primarily be aimed at single people. However, it is recognised that the needs of homeless families with complex needs are not fully understood.

Consequently it is proposed that approximately £500k from the PEH (2016/17) budget underspend will be made available to provide sufficient time to better understand the needs of this group, the number of families requiring assistance and to explore the options available.

We are therefore proposing to extend all contracts for supported accommodation for people who are homeless (single people and homeless families), people with substance misuse issues, and people at risk of offending until 30th September 2017 (excludes MAPPA floating support service). This will provide sufficient time to enable us to determine the most appropriate approach to allocating the £1.25 million in terms of location and needs of households (single, homeless families etc). This will also tie in with the proposal in relation to young people, where we are intending to also extend contracts for 6 months in order to provide sufficient time to reconfigure the housing and support pathways and services.

Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) service

The proposal is to cease this funding with effect from 31st March 2017

Many service users accessing the service receive support to claim the right benefits and manage financial issues, or support to secure or maintain their housing. There are other agencies such as Citizens Advice and Welfare Rights which may potentially be able to assist service users with financial issues.

Similarly district council housing advice teams may be able to offer information and advice in relation to finding new accommodation or avoiding evictions / maintaining current housing.

It is anticipated that the Lancashire Wellbeing Service might mitigate some of the impact; however, this will be dependent on the complexity of needs presented by service users.

The Lancashire Wellbeing Service helps people to deal with the underlying causes that are affecting their ability to manage their health and wellbeing. It aims to ensure that people feel included in their communities, are able to live more independently and to enjoy a good quality of life. Referrals into the service can be made by a wide range of professionals or through self-referral. The service is available to all people over the age of 18yrs who are affected by one or more of the following issues:

- Mild mental health problems (such as low mood, anxiety, stress and mild depression)
- Social Isolation, loneliness, few or poor social networks
- Experiencing difficult circumstances e.g. problems with family, finance, employment
- Struggling to cope/feeling overwhelmed
- Need support in relation to healthy living and developing a healthier lifestyle, through understanding and adapting behavior

The support provided consists of :

- Personal support to make positive changes in your life for up to 6 sessions
- Provide opportunities that open up other support and social networks such as volunteering, peer networks, community groups
- Provide drop-in facilities in your local communities
- Identify and point you in the direction of relevant services in your community

LCC will be working with criminal justice agencies during the next few months to consider how to best meet the needs of those individuals who will no longer receive a service if the proposal to cease funding is agreed.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

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

This proposal has originally emerged following the need for the County Council to make unprecedented budget savings. The Medium Term Financial Strategy reported in the November 2015 forecast that the County Council will have a financial shortfall of £262 million in its revenue budget in 2020/21.

This is a combination of reducing resources as a result of the Government's extended programme of austerity at the same time as the Council is facing significant increases in both the cost (for example as a result of inflation and the national living wage) and demand for its services.

The revised position following the financial settlement for 2016/17 is now a budget gap of £200.507m by 2020/21. This revised gap takes into account the impact of the settlement, new financial pressures and savings decisions taken by Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of Council services.

As outlined above, we acknowledge that people with protected characteristics will be negatively impacted; however we are striving to minimise any negative impacts by proposing to utilise £1.25 million of the Prevention and Early Help Fund to commission housing related support within supported accommodation for people with complex needs

In addition, in order to ensure that we utilise this funding most effectively, we are also proposing to extend supported housing contracts for services included within this EA (but not MAPPA floating support) until September 2017 to provide sufficient time to determine our commissioning intentions and to procure services. It is proposed that £500k of underspend from the 16/17 PEH budget is used to fund the contract extensions

In the event that this reviews leads to the withdrawal of funding from specific supported housing services, the Cabinet Member will be provided with details of the review and approval will be sought for the recommendation.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

The final proposal is as follows:

- To implement Supporting People budgetary savings in relation to Supported housing for people who are homeless, who have a history of offending and who have substance misuse issues and; Specialist Floating Support (MAPPA) service
- To allocate funding from the Prevention and Early Help Fund to fund supported housing for homeless households with complex needs

The following groups will be affected

- Vulnerable adults (and their families) over the age of 16

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

We will work with all partners over the next few months to define our intentions in relation to the commissioning of services for people with complex needs which will be funded from the £1.25 million identified in the PEHF.

In addition, we will complete the consultation with residents of the West Lancashire service (see Question 2)

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Tahera Chaudhrey

Position/Role: Strategy Needs Analysis Co-ordinator

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

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

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

Service contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are:

Karen Beaumont – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Karen.beaumont@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Adult Services; Policy Information and Commissioning (Age Well); Health Equity, Welfare and Partnerships (PH); Patient Safety and Quality Improvement (PH).

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Community Services; Development and Corporate Services; Customer Access; Policy Commissioning and Information (Live Well); Trading Standards and Scientific Services (PH), Lancashire Pension Fund

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Children's Services; Policy, Information and Commissioning (Start Well); Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help (PH); BTLS

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Governance, Finance and Public Services; Communications; Corporate Commissioning (Level 1); Emergency Planning and Resilience (PH).

Thank you

