

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal. It will be supported by separate Equality Analyses for each District.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

A proposed list of future building use by the County Council. The report contains a 'long' list of 238 premises from which it is proposed that 132 premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery.

The list includes premises currently used to deliver the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service including designated children's centres, Older People's Day Time support services, Adult Disability Day Services, Registration Services, Children's Services, Youth Offending Team services and Welfare Rights Services.

In summary the proposals for each Service are:

- Libraries – to have 37 libraries and 7 satellite sites with self-service facilities (unstaffed);
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help – would be located at a total of 72 sites which would comprise of 34 sites to support 0-11 year olds, 11 sites for 12-19 years (plus special educational needs young people up to 25) and 27 sites that will cover the entire age range;
- Registration Service – there are currently 13 buildings which provide Registration Services. 8 will remain the same whilst those in Clitheroe, Lancaster, Morecambe, Rawtenstall and Fylde are proposed to move to premises alongside other County Council Services;
- Children's Social Care – it is proposed that the service will operate from the following neighbourhood centres; Burnley Children's Social Care (Easden Clough) and The Zone; Chorley – Children's Social Care (The Hawthorns), Fylde – Children's Social Care (Sydney Street) and Oak Tree Children's Centre; Lancaster – Children's Social Care (Sefton Drive); Pendle – Children's Social Care (Burnley Road) Colne; Preston – Children's Social Care (Ripon Street), Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre), Stoneygate Children's Centre and Sunshine Children's Centre; Rossendale – Children's Social Care (Newchurch Road), Rawtenstall; West Lancashire – Skelmersdale Library and Wyre – Children's Social Care (The Anchorage, Fleetwood) and West View Children's Centre.
- Youth Offending Team: the changes to current buildings proposed are: Lancaster – moving from Fraser House to White Cross Education Centre (Mill 14); Thornton – proposed to move from Marsh Mill to The Zone in Wyre. Preston – proposed to move from Guildhall Street to Preston Bus Station; Accrington – move from Blake Street to the Zone in Burnley. The Youth Offending Team Services delivered from the Zone in Burnley and The Zone in West Lancashire will remain in those buildings.
- Adult Disability Day Services – there are currently 12 premises and it is proposed that these continue except; Pendleton Brook in Clitheroe where due to low usage and suitability issues with the building it is proposed to combine

with Hyndburn Disability Day Centre (Enfield), and Holly Trees, Disability Day Service Chorley when alternative and more suitable premises can be identified.

- Older People's Daytime Support Services – there are currently 12 existing day services for older people and these are proposed to be unchanged except: Fylde – a neighbourhood centre is proposed to be established at Milbanke Centre which would also incorporate the Library Service for the Kirkham area, and subject to the outcome of detailed feasibility study, the Derby Street Day Care Centre in Ormskirk would be combined with Mere Brook Day Centre in Ormskirk.
- Welfare Rights – will have a central administrative function in Preston and be able to use the flexible accommodation at Neighbourhood Centres to reach communities as effectively as possible.

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 it will impact on all communities as the County Council delivers a wide range of services across Lancashire in premises which are open to members of the public. The extent of any impact will depend on the use made of such premises and proposals for their future which will mean people in some areas needing to travel further to access services whilst in other areas service delivery may be unchanged.

We have used evidence based premises information to draw up the premises proposal contained in the Property Strategy report, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations have also helped to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected. Some residents will be able to access services in the same places that they do now, other people may need to travel further or go to a different building to access services and other services may become available in one building as a result of the specific proposals for each location.

The proposal for consultation listed 238 premises. This included premises which currently provide targeted services such as children's centres, youth services, older people's daytime support services, adult disability day services and other service points which are of particular relevance to people from protected characteristics groups. Proposals for the future use of these locations may have a greater impact amongst those with the age (both younger and older people), pregnancy and maternity, gender and disability protected characteristics groups.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff structure consultations), staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following specific public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

As the premises contained within the consultation include children's centres, youth service premises, older people's daytime support centres and adult disability day services premises amongst others. There is a potential impact particularly on:

- People in the age protected characteristic group: statistically the proportion of older people (aged from 55 onwards) who use the library is higher than for other adult groups so changes in location may adversely impact this group, particularly where libraries close or change location resulting in longer journeys or an inability to reach alternative locations. They are the group from which users eligible for Older People's Daytime Support

Services are drawn and in the Fylde area may be affected by changes proposed for the future of the Milbanke Centre and in Ormskirk due to the uncertainty about the future of Derby Street Day Service and its possible combining with Mere Brook Day Service.

- Children and young people aged 0-11 are statistically high users of Library Services and aged 5-9 they are the highest proportion of the population (36% of this age group use the library) who used Libraries. They may also be impacted by changes proposed for children's centre premises as some may need to travel further to access services or find that it is not possible to access the alternative locations in their area.
- Young people may be disadvantaged by closures in Libraries (28% of 10-15 year olds use the library) and by changes to the Young People's Service delivery (12-19+) where some premises are proposed to close and others change location which may lead to difficulties in travelling to use alternative premises. There are also implications for those young people required to visit the Youth Offending Team where a number of premises are changing location within a town, the impact will be most severe for those in Hyndburn where the office is closing and those young people will need to travel to Burnley.
- Those who are pregnant or on maternity leave may be adversely affected by changes in the locations of children's centres and libraries across the county. Travelling to alternative locations may be particularly difficult for those who are heavily pregnant or have a small baby as it may be difficult to take a pram on a bus or across a town or city on foot. The possible loss of access to peer support and group sessions at these locations has also been identified as a concern. It is not expected that changes to Registration Service locations will significantly affect service users as these are changes in premise within the same town but women who have recently had children are more likely to visit these premises than other members of the community.
- Disabled people may be disadvantaged should the location of services changed as it may be harder to travel to alternative venues by public transport due to its availability or accessibility, it may not be possible to walk to an alternative location or park close by and alternative premises may not have the same level of access or facilities as those used previously. Users of Adult Disability Day Services in Ribble Valley and Chorley may also be affected if they are users of those premises which are being proposed for possible closure – Pendleton Brook and Holly Trees.

The profile of Lancashire residents in terms of protected characteristics provides background and context for this Analysis. The mid-year population estimates 2015 and information from the 2011 Census have been used to compile this information.

The Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015 reported that the Lancashire County

Council administrative area (LCC area) has a resident population of 1,191,691 people. This has risen from 1,171,339 people in intervening years since the 2011 Census, a rise of over 20,000 people.

Age – at the time of the 2011 Census 24% of Lancashire residents were aged 0-19, 58% were aged 20-64 and 18% were aged 65 and over. There are variations across the county – Hyndburn has 26% of its population aged 0-19 and Burnley, Preston and Pendle have 25% whilst Wyre (21%) and Fylde (20%) are below the LCC area 0-19 percentage. For people aged 20-64, 61% of Preston residents are in this age group and Chorley and Rossendale have 60% of residents whilst Ribble Valley (56%) and Wyre (54%) have fewer residents in this age group than the LCC percentage of 58%. 18% of Lancashire residents are aged 65 and over but in Wyre (25%) and Fylde (24%) of residents are in this age groups whilst in contrast 14% of Preston residents are aged 65 and over.

Gender - the 2011 Census reported that 49% of Lancashire's population were male and 51% were female. The mid-year population estimates 2015 suggest a slight narrowing of this gap to male 49.3% and females 50.7%. Chorley and Preston are the only Districts in the LCC area where the majority of residents are male – (50.7% in Chorley and 50.5% in Preston) whilst Fylde, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre have female populations of between 51 and 51.5%.

Ethnicity – 7.7% of the LCC area's population are from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, (90,652 people) according to the 2011 Census. There are significant differences across the county from Pendle (20.1%) and Preston (19.8%) through to West Lancashire and Wyre where under 2% of the population are from BME backgrounds. The county's BME populations comprises of 1.1% who are mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 6.1% described as Asian/Asian British, 0.3% described as Black/Black British and 0.2% from "other ethnic groups". 821 Lancashire residents identified as Gypsy/Irish Travellers.

Disability – the 2011 Census did not include a specifically disability related question but did ask whether respondents felt their normal day to day activities were limited a lot or a little by a health condition or disability. 9.8% of Lancashire residents (115,343 people) said that their activities were limited a lot and 10.2% of respondents (119,669 people) said their activities were limited a little by a disability of health condition. 79.9% of Lancashire residents (936,327 people) said their normal day to day activities were not limited by any health condition or disability. There is again variation across the county, 76.2% of Wyre residents did not have any limiting health conditions or disabilities whilst the percentage for Ribble Valley is 83.3%.

Religion or Belief – 69% of residents in the LCC area identified as being Christian (with Ribble Valley, West Lancashire, South Ribble and Chorley all ranking in the top 10 of local authorities in terms of Christians in their population) whilst 19%

identified as having no religion. Around 6% of residents are Muslim but this varies between approximately 18% in Pendle to around 1% in Wyre and West Lancashire. There are small percentages of Buddhists, Hindus, Jews and Sikhs across Lancashire.

No Census data is available for the sexual orientation protected characteristic although Stonewall estimates that between 5 and 7% of Lancashire's population are gay or lesbian. ONS information has indicated around 1.5% in contrast. Although the Census included questions on the numbers of people in civil partnerships that is not a reliable indicator of whether people are gay or lesbian.

Information is not available on the number or percentage of Lancashire residents who are Transgender from the 2011 Census or other sources.

The 2011 Census provided information on the number of people who were married in Lancashire but this has the potential to have changed significantly in the intervening years. In 2011 457,279 people were married (39% of LCC area residents). There were variations in the county profile from 44.5% of Ribble Valley residents being married to 33.42% of Preston residents. At the time of the 2011 Census 1,649 residents of the LCC area were in registered civil partnerships – 0.14% of the population, ranging from 0.08% in West Lancashire and Hyndburn to 0.24% in Wyre and 0.2% in Lancaster.

Given the nature of this proposal use has been made of information on car ownership per household in Lancashire. Young people, older people and people with some disabilities – e.g. sight loss – are more likely not to be able to drive and may therefore be more adversely affected by changes in location of County Council services. 22.9% of households in Lancashire do not have a car or van available to them – this level varies in different towns from 32.3% in Burnley and 31% in Preston to 13% of households in Ribble Valley and 15.6% of households in South Ribble. 43.5% of households in the LCC area have one car or van available to them and there is less difference between districts for this category. 26.3% of households have two cars available ranging from 19.8% in Burnley to 34.4% in Ribble Valley. 5.6% of households have three cars or vans available and 1.8% had more than four cars available to them.

Similarly, access to the home computer or the internet may impact on the extent of any disadvantage experienced given the nature of the proposals, particularly changes to locations of Libraries. There is no detailed information about digital access across Lancashire but the Living in Lancashire residents Panel were asked if they had the internet at home Around 75% did but rates were closer to 66% for those in Preston, Burnley, Hyndburn and Pendle. While 9 out of 10 Panel members aged 16-24 had internet access less than 6 in 10 Panel members aged 60+ had internet access. Similarly while 85% of non-disabled Panel members had internet access at home, only 57% of disabled Panel members had it. This

indicates that older people and disabled people might be more disadvantaged by reductions in Libraries either because they use computers there or are less likely to be able to use digital alternatives such as e-books.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile is 4.45% of employees are aged 16-24; 23.3% of employees are aged 25-39; 66.6% of employees are aged 40-64 and 4.4% of employees are aged 65 and over. Employment data for sexual orientation and religion or belief is very incomplete on the Oracle HR system whilst information is not requested by the system on marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy or maternity leave or if an employee is transgender.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses and have been reflected in this Equality Analysis.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services which will also be reflected in the updated Equality Analysis alongside others which may be received as part of the formal public consultation.

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other

contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have also taken place for County Councillors on a District by District basis and meetings have been held with District, Town and Parish Councils for further briefings.

A public consultation on the Property Strategy was carried out between 18 May and 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available on the "Have Your Say" area of the County Council's website and responses could be returned on line. Alternatively over 15,000 printed versions of the consultation documents were available at a wide range of County Council service delivery premises across Lancashire and completed responses could be returned to any of them. During the consultation period a number of social media and other communications were issued to encourage people to take part in the consultation process. The Consultation webpage had over 16,000 unique page views, the top 5 Facebook posts had combined total of over 25,000 views/impressions and the Top 5 Twitter Tweets had a combined total of over 19,000 impressions.

7719 responses have been received to the consultations.

The responses will not necessarily reflect the views of Lancashire residents as a whole (although 97% of those taking part were Lancashire residents) but are the views of those people who were aware of the consultation and participated in it.

Questions about the protected characteristics of respondents were optional and were answered by between 4,781 and 4,219 respondents The protected characteristics profile of consultation participants is as follows:

Gender

Females 72% (4,898 participants) and males 28% (1,861 participants);

Age

<i>Under 16</i>	<i>4%</i>
<i>16-19</i>	<i>2%</i>
<i>20-34</i>	<i>16%</i>
<i>35-49</i>	<i>20%</i>
<i>50-64</i>	<i>22%</i>
<i>65-74</i>	<i>22%</i>
<i>75+</i>	<i>15%</i>

Transgender

32 people have taken part who identified as Transgender, 1% of consultation participants.

Disability

81% of participants do not consider themselves to have a disability or to be a Deaf person. Of the remainder disabilities are in the following categories (and some respondents may have indicated more than one)

Learning Disability	3%
Physical Disability	9%
Sensory Disability	4%
Mental Health Condition	4%
Other Disabilities	4%

Pregnancy or Maternity

2% had no children but were expecting.

Those with the pregnancy or maternity protected characteristic may also be included amongst those who already have children of whom:

20% had children aged under 5
14% had children aged 5-8
10% had children aged 9-11
11% had children aged 12-16
6% had children/young people aged 17-19 in their household
59% of respondents had no children/young people aged under 20 in their household.

Disabled Young People (aged 20-25 in Household)

2% of respondents had a disabled young person aged 20-25 in their household.

Marriage or Civil Partnership

2% were in a civil partnership
56% were married
38% were not married or in a civil partnership
4% preferred not to say.

Sexual Orientation

1% identified as Bisexual
31 participants identified as Gay Men
23 participants identified as Lesbian/Gay Women
31 participants identified as "other"
9% preferred not to say;

88% identified as Heterosexual/Straight

Religion or Belief

1% identified as Any Other Religion

1% identified as Buddhist

69% identified as Christian (including CofE/Catholic)

1% of participants identified as Jewish

1% identified as Muslim

25% identified as having No Religion

1% of participants identified as Sikh.

Ethnicity

93% identified as White English/Scottish/Welsh/British

2% identified as "Any Other White Background"

2% participants identified as Pakistani

1% identified as Indian

1% were Irish

1% of participants identified as Bangladeshi

1% of participants identified as Chinese

1% of participants identified as Caribbean

1% of participant identified as African

1% of participants identified as Gypsy/Irish Traveller

1% of participants identified as White and Black Caribbean

1% were identified as Arab

1 % of participants identified as White and Asian

1% of participants identified as White and Black African

1 % of participants identified as "Other"

The consultation also asked whether participants had access to the internet in their household

81% had access to the internet in their household

18% did not have access to the internet in their household

1% didn't know.

The profile of consultation respondents shows significantly more females participating than in the Lancashire population, and a smaller percentage of males. The profile is broadly similar to the Census percentage in terms of BME participants and the percentage of disabled people taking part. In age terms the percentage of participants aged over 65 taking part in the consultation is double their representation in the Lancashire area population.

Service use	Count	Percentage
-------------	-------	------------

Library Service	6,160	91.0%
Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (Young People's Service)	2,486	36.7%
Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre)	2,257	33.3%
Welfare Rights	1,864	27.5%
Registration Service	1,693	25.0%
Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (children's centre)	1,190	17.6%
Children's Social Care	468	6.9%
Older People's Daytime Support Service	217	3.2%
Children's Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team	212	3.1%
Community Association - no LCC service	155	2.3%
Adult Disability Day Services	148	2.2%
None	146	2.2%
Adult Social Care	142	2.1%
Records Office	108	1.6%
Scientific Services	79	1.2%
Youth Offending Team	71	1.0%
Supporting Carers of Children and Young People (SCAYT+)	69	1.0%
Conferencing	34	0.5%
Leaving Care Outreach	33	0.5%
Community Mental Health Service	30	0.4%

Base: all respondents (6,770)

Consultation respondents were asked which premises they had used within the last three years which are proposed to continue to deliver services (the services proposed to be delivered from each location were included with the question) and whether they would be likely to use those services in the future. The five highest scoring premises in terms of respondents' usage were Morecambe Library, Lancaster Central Library, Rawtenstall Library, Heysham Library, St Anne's Library and Clitheroe Library. It is not surprising that Libraries featured so prominently as they are used by people of all ages and are a universal service which people often use regularly. Other services included in the Property Strategy have a more targeted age range for service delivery, are needed at specific times (Registration Service) or may have eligibility criteria for usage (e.g. Older People's Daytime Support Services or Adult Disability Services. Respondents seemed to reduce for some premises in terms of future usage, there is no clear opportunity for people to indicate why this might be the

~~case but responses to the Libraries and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help consultations have made reference to concerns from different age groups about using the same premises at all or at the same time (e.g. older people and teenagers).~~

Respondents were also asked which premises which are proposed to no longer deliver County Council services they have used in the last three years. The top five premises in terms of respondents were Ansdell Library, Whalley Library & Spring Wood Children's Centre, Lytham Library and Registration Office, Bacup Library and Thornton Library. Whilst Libraries are prominent in this group, Children's Centres have also begun to feature.

Respondents who had used premises which are proposed to close were also asked which remaining premises in their District they would use as an alternative. Most respondents did identify alternatives but between 23 and 0 respondents said "none of these".

Respondents who had used premises which were proposed to close were asked how this would impact on them. The leading answers which have an equality related theme are given below:

18% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing;

15% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme, exercise classes and health walks will be lost and closing the Library will negatively impact on children's education, literacy, ability to access information and reading;

14% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset;

12% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet;

11% I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastated/depressed); and I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (e.g. drive, use public transport) causing inconvenience;

8% Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities (general), leading to a negative impact on health and wellbeing;

6% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all); and concerns that loss of children's centres will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impacts;

5% Closing the library will remove my access to learning/research resources;

5% Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for elderly, leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness;

5% I will lose access to local information/news/events;

5% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services (they may use them less);

4% Concern that loss of children's centres will limit support for families (general negative impact); Unlikely to continue using the library services (because of

distance); and Closures will negatively impact my child's social development.

Respondents were asked where it was proposed to no longer deliver services from a buildings, what reasons did they have for services to continue. The categories of responses which have an equality related element are:

24% They are vital to the community/community asset;

17% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

15% It is a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated. Elderly especially;

13% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services; It provides computer/internet access for those without it; and Sessions/groups such as Baby Bounce and Rhyme, exercise classes and health walks would stop leading to a negative impact on people;

10% I would no longer borrow books/read regularly;

9% Some people might not be able to get to new service locations because it's inconvenient;

7% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

6% There are no viable alternatives in the area providing these services – e.g. book lending; Villages/towns will lose a big sense of community if the libraries close; No alternative place for organised groups to meet in the area; and The area is severely deprived so should maintain services to support vulnerable groups;

5% Current property is well situated in town centre: and It provides access to local information/news/events; Concerned that there will be a lack of support, guidance, help for children and families if children's centres close; and Concern that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums leading to negative impacts.

Finally respondents were asked whether there was anything else they wanted the County Council to consider or do differently. The categories in the Top 20 mentions which appear to have an equality related theme were as follows:

35% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property;

9% Other budget comments – (save money elsewhere, reduce costs); and Heart of the community/community asset/hub;

7% Will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups in society (young, elderly, job seekers);

5% Don't make cuts to the library services. Stop cutting useful learning services (e.g. library); Consider the negative impact on local communities; Stop cutting useful social services (e.g. children's/youth centres);

and It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

4% Explore offering more services from the existing buildings (public toilets, community services, ICT, youth service); Reduce opening hours of the service (rather than close libraries or children's centres); Use more volunteers to reduce staffing costs; It's a social hub promoting wellbeing/community cohesion through social interaction. Without it people may become lonely; and Provides vital access reading/learning/research material to the wider community;

Many of the comments reflect themes from the Libraries and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service public consultations carried out earlier in 2016.

During the public consultation period a number of Facebook posts and Tweets appeared from members of the public in relation to the proposals. The themes of posts were broadly similar to the consultation comments and referred to specific facilities needing to remain open (e.g, Rishton Library, Adlington Library and Morecambe Library); libraries being the heart of the community, helping children achieve their potential, reducing isolation and providing digital access for many and broader links to Save Our Libraries and Save Our Children's Centres e-petitions.

A number of petitions and e-petitions about the Property Strategy and for specific properties. At the time of this Analysis there had been 26,642 signatures on petitions and 11,685 signatures received on e-petitions. A further 211 items of correspondence have been received by letter or email mainly being opposed to library closures in general, proposals for specific area or proposals for specific libraries. Others were against the children's centre proposals, against the proposals for young people's centres and expressing concern for vulnerable groups being able to access services.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Consultations with Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service staff and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff have already been carried out. The responses included those focussed on property matters – particularly in the Library, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services consultation – with concerns about social isolation, loss of space for activities and groups, the impact on community cohesion as facilities bring people together, difficulties for people who are pregnant or on maternity leave, younger and older people and disabled people in getting to alternative premises.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features

such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

For those people who use Adult Disability Day Services and Older People's Daytime Support Services the proposal may also be impacted by changes in Transport to Day Services arrangements which take effect from September 2016.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
3. Burnley City Learning Centre	Proposed for future use for Conferencing	Proposed for future use for Conferencing and WPEH 12-19+ years (outreach)	Service delivery change - preference by young people not to access social care premises for support. This building provides a suitable neutral alternative for delivery of WPEH 12-19+ group learning activities and meetings.
13. Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0–19+ years (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years.	This will be a linked children's centre to The Chai Children's Centre.
28. Chorley Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years, Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team.	Utilise Highfield Children's Centre for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) to meet access and reach requirements for the service.
45. Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for delivery of WPEH 0-11years (designated children's centre) instead of at Chorley Library.	It is proposed to retain Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service. In addition, the complexity of the Chorley Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
55. Ansdell Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to St Anne's Library	To ensure the provision of a full library service is available to the community whilst works to St Anne's Library are completed.

86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings.
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use with full Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite	Proposed for future use with full	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and

	Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+ and support for families, Youth Offending Team	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service pending a detailed site review of Carnforth Hub.	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+, Youth	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+ and	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to

	Offending Team	support for families, Youth Offending Team	better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service pending a detailed site review of Carnforth Hub.	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
132. Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre)	Proposed for future use by children's social care.	Not proposed for future use and to re-locate the children's social care service at Sunshine Children's Centre.	Sunshine Children's Centre will provide accommodation for the children's social care service which is in better condition and within the same reach area.
148. Sunshine Children's Centre, Brockholes Wood Primary School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use to accommodate Children's Social Care and provide contact/access facilities for families.	The community access WPEH services at Sunshine Drop-in (New Hall Lane) and Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre) giving the opportunity to re-locate children's social care from St Luke's Centre to the site.
151. Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) and children's services.	The community access WPEH services in higher levels at Preston East Children's Centre than Sunshine Children's Centre and so retention of this site will better meet access and reach requirements for the service.
154. Longridge Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ and Library service.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years and Library service.	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library

			with further review at a later date.
155. Mearley Fold Day Centre	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service and Disability Day Services Drop-In.	To maintain a presence for Adult Disability Day Services in the Ribble Valley where appropriate to service user care and travel plans. The main service provision is to be consolidated at Hyndburn Adult Disability Day Services (Enfield).
165. Willows Park Children's Centre, Longridge Civic Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.
169. Haslingden Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service, Registration Service and Welfare Rights.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Welfare Rights.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
170. Rawtenstall Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Registration Service.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
171. Maden Centre, Bacup	Proposed for future use by satellite Library, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights	Proposed for future use by, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights, full Library Service	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in Bacup. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
174. Bacup Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to establish a full Library service in the Maden Centre, Bacup.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in Bacup. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
197. Wellfield Children's Centre, Wellfield High School, Leyland	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use as a Neighbourhood Centre however proposed to be retained for use	The building provides a local facility for the delivery of schools training and development functions.

		by Traded Services (Start Well).	
200. Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service subject to confirmation of arrangements with the premise owner.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
213. Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People)	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
206. Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School *	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Not proposed for future use – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain St John's Children's Centre, St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.
215. St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale), St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) *	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library.
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices.
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations.
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- Using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Revising Mobile Library routes in light of the final outcome of the Property Strategy.
- Availability of outreach, detached and mobile services as part of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service Offer.
- Consideration of expressions of interest under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.
- Consideration of the possibility of an Independent Community Library offer.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale

3. Burnley City Learning Centre	Proposed for future use for Conferencing	Proposed for future use for Conferencing and WPEH 12-19+ years (outreach)	Service delivery change - preference by young people not to access social care premises for support. This building provides a suitable neutral alternative for delivery of WPEH 12-19+ group learning activities and meetings.
13. Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years.	This will be a linked children's centre to The Chai Children's Centre.
28. Chorley Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years, Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team.	Utilise Highfield Children's Centre for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) to meet access and reach requirements for the service.
45. Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for delivery of WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) instead of at Chorley Library.	It is proposed to retain Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service. In addition, the complexity of the Chorley Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
55. Ansdell Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to St Anne's Library.	To ensure the provision of a full library service is available to the community whilst works to St Anne's Library are completed.
86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service,	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the

		WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings.
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use with full Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings.
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use with full Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-	Proposed for future use for	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location

Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+ and support for families, Youth Offending Team	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service pending a detailed site review of Carnforth Hub.	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+ and support for families, Youth Offending Team	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service pending a detailed site review of	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub

		Carnforth Hub.	site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.
132. Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre)	Proposed for future use by children's social care.	Not proposed for future use and to re-locate the children's social care service at Sunshine Children's Centre.	Sunshine Children's Centre will provide accommodation for the children's social care service which is in better condition and within the same reach area.
148. Sunshine Children's Centre, Brockholes Wood Primary School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use to accommodate Children's Social Care and provide contact/access facilities for families.	The community access WPEH services at Sunshine Drop-in (New Hall Lane) and Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre) giving the opportunity to re-locate children's social care from St Luke's Centre to the site.
151. Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) and children's services.	The community access WPEH services in higher levels at Preston East Children's Centre than Sunshine Children's Centre and so retention of this site will better meet access and reach requirements for the service.
154. Longridge Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ and Library service.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years and Library service.	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.
155. Mearley Fold Day Centre	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service and Disability Day Services Drop-In.	To maintain a presence for Adult Disability Day Services in the Ribble Valley where appropriate to service user care and travel plans The main service provision is to be consolidated at Hyndburn Adult Disability Day Services (Enfield).

165. Willows Park Children's Centre, Longridge Civic Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.
169. Haslingden Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service, Registration Service and Welfare Rights.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Welfare Rights.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
170. Rawtenstall Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Registration Service.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
171. Maden Centre, Bacup	Proposed for future use by satellite Library, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights	Proposed for future use by, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights, full Library Service	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in Bacup. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
174. Bacup Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to establish a full Library service in the Maden Centre, Bacup.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in Bacup. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
197. Wellfield Children's Centre, Wellfield High School, Leyland	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use as a Neighbourhood Centre however proposed to be retained for use by Traded Services (Start Well).	The building provides a local facility for the delivery of schools training and development functions.
200. Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service subject to confirmation of	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people

		arrangements with the premise owner.	on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
213. Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People)	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
206. Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School *	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Not proposed for future use – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain St John's Children's Centre, St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.
215. St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale), St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) *	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring and review procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements and to assess impact, e.g. user figures by Districts for WPEH Services and registered borrowers/issues for the Library Service.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Burnley

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal, specifically in relation to Burnley. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Burnley. The report contained a list of premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery.

In Burnley it was proposed to retain the following buildings to deliver services:

- Burnley & Pendle Day Services, Temple Street Burnley– service delivery unchanged;
- Burnley & Pendle Registration Service, Todmorden Road, Burnley – service delivery unchanged;
- Burnley City Learning Centre, Townley Holmes, Burnley – service delivery unchanged;
- Burnley Library, Grimshaw Street, Burnley – service delivery unchanged;
- Burnley The Fold Co-location Project, Venice Avenue, Burnley – service delivery unchanged;
- Burnley Wood Children's Centre, Brunswick Street, Burnley – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11 years proposed)
- Children's Social Care (Easden Clough), Morse Street, Burnley – currently delivers children's social care and proposed to deliver children's social care and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+years) (& designated children's centre)
- Coal Clough Library, Coal Clough Lane, Burnley – service delivery unchanged;
- Ightenhill Children's Centre, Ightenhill Primary School, Alder Street Burnley – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11);
- Padiham Library, Burnley Road, Padiham – library remains but will also include Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (12-19 years)
- Reedley Hallows Children's Centre, Barden Lane, Burnley – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11 years)
- South West Burnley Children's Centre, Tay Street, Burnley – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11 years)
- Stonyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre – currently a Young People's Centre and proposed to change to Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Centre (0-19+) and designated children's centre;
- The Chai Centre Children's Centre, Hurtley Street, Burnley – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11 years)
- The Zone in Burnley, Mount Pleasant Street, Burnley – current services: leaving care outreach, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services Young People's Service and Youth Offending Team proposed to retain these services plus children's social care;

- Whitegate Children's Centre, Whitegate Nursery School, Victoria Road, Padiham – service delivery mainly unchanged (0-11 years).

Premises where the County Council proposed to no longer deliver Services from in Burnley are:

- Belmont Community Centre, Belmont Grove Burnley – no current LCC service delivery, used by community association;
- Briercliffe Library, Jubilee Street, Briercliffe;
- Brunshaw Young People's Centre, Morse Street, Burnley;
- Burnley Campus Library, Barden Lane, Burnley;
- Hapton Young People's Centre, Carter Avenue, Hapton;
- Padiham Young People's Centre, Burnley Road, Padiham;
- Pike Hill Library, Langwyth Road, Pike Hill, Burnley;
- Rosegrove Library, Lowerhouse Lane, Burnley;
- Stoops & Hargher Clough Young People's Centre, Venice Street, Burnley.

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 it will impact on all communities as the County Council delivers a wide range of services in Burnley from premises which are open to the public. The extent of any impact will depend on the use made of such premises and proposals for their future which will mean people in some areas needing to travel further to access services whilst in other areas services will be unchanged.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations have also helped to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The original proposal lists 25 premises in the Burnley District with 16 proposed to remain in use and 9 proposed to no longer be used to deliver services. The proposals for individual premises are listed above. They includes premises which currently provide targeted services such as:

- children's centres and youth services where some premises may move locally –e.g. Padiham Young People's Centre - whilst other may require longer journeys to alternative facilities – e.g. Hapton Young People's Centre and those which provide services to all groups/universal services:
- libraries where proposals to no longer use buildings – e.g. Pike Hill and Rosegrove Libraries and particularly Burnley Campus Library for young people– may result in longer journeys for users and given that younger and older people are more highly represented amongst library users this may have an increased adverse impact on those groups.

Proposals for the future use of locations in Burnley may have a greater impact amongst those with the age (both younger and older people) protected characteristics groups.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service, Libraries Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Youth Offending Team – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal.

The proposal lists 25 premises in the Burnley District with 16 proposed to remain in use and 9 proposed to no longer be used to deliver services. The proposals for individual premises are listed above. They includes premises which currently provide targeted services such as:

- children's centres and youth services where some premises may move locally –e.g. Padiham Young People's Centre - whilst other may require longer journeys to alternative facilities – e.g. Hapton Young People's Centre and those which provide services to all groups/universal services:
- libraries where proposals to no longer use buildings – e.g. Pike Hill and Rosegrove Libraries and particularly Burnley Campus Library for young people– may result in longer journeys for users and given that younger and

older people are more highly represented amongst library users this may have an increased adverse impact on those groups.

Proposals for the future use of locations in Burnley may have a greater impact amongst those with the age (both younger and older people) protected characteristics groups.

Information for the Burnley District shows that the ONS Mid-Year Population Estimate for Burnley 2015 was 87,371 people.

Other information comes from the 2011 Census where the resident population was 87,065:

Age: 25% of the population were aged 0-19, 59% aged 20-64 and 16% aged 65+.

Ethnicity: 12.6% (11,005 people) of Burnley's population identified as BME – made up of 1.1% (976 people) who were mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 11.0% (9,578 people) who were Asian/Asian British, 0.2% (211 people) who were Black/Black British and 0.3% (240 people) who were from other ethnic backgrounds. 87.3% (76,054 people) came from the White group of categories. Burnley also had 10 residents who identified as from Gypsy or Irish Traveller communities.

Disability – the Census 2011 information identified that amongst residents of Burnley 11.6% (10,090 people) had their activities limited a lot by a long term illness or health condition, 10.9% (9,517 people) had their activities limited a little and 77.5% (67,452 people) did not have their acivities limited at all.

Religion or Belief – in the 2011 Census 64% of Burnley residents identified as Christian which is slightly lower than 69% for the LCC area and 20% as having no religion, similar to the 19% for the LCC area. A larger percentage of residents identified as Muslim with small percentages of Buddhist and Hindu residents for the LCC area.

Marriage and Civil Partnership status – 36% of Burnley residents said they were married in the 2011 Census (31,340 people) which is lower than the 39% for the LCC area. At the 2011 Census 102 people (0.117% of Burnley residents) were in same sex civil partnerships which is lower than the LCC area's 0.14%. This information will have changed in the intervening years.

The Census did not include information on sexual orientation or transgender protected characteristics and authoritative information for Districts in Lancashire is not available at this time.

Car Ownership – whilst not a protected characteristic in itself, given the potential change in location for some premises and other recent budget decisions information has been obtained on the percentage of households in Districts without a car. 32.3% of households in Burnley do not have a car or van according to 2011 Census data, which is an above average figure for the Lancashire County Council

area (22.9%). Young people, older people and disabled people are heavily represented amongst those who cannot drive and may be more heavily disadvantaged by changes in locations of services.

Digital Access – information from the 2015 GO ON UK Digital Exclusion Heatmap shows that Burnley is the only District in Lancashire at a high risk of digital exclusion, primarily because of the relatively low level of digital skills amongst its residents.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile of employees within the County Council workforce is: 4.45% of employees are aged 16-24, 23.3% are aged 25-39, 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% of employees are aged 65 and over (December 2015). Employee information for the sexual orientation and religion or belief protected characteristics is very incomplete on the Council's HR information system and is not included on the equality profile area of the system for marriage and civil partnership status, pregnancy and maternity leave or transgender status.

The County Council also uses a number of volunteers in a wide range of services and roles, some of whom may be affected by the outcome of these proposals. Volunteers come from all protected characteristics groups.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be summarised when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Burnley District area a petition signed by 149 people has been received in respect of Belmont Community Centre.

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have also taken place for County Councillors on a District by District basis and meetings have been held with District, parish and town councils across the county.

A public consultation ran from 18th May 2016 to 14th August 2016 which invited residents to "Have Your Say" on the proposed Property Strategy. The consultation was available on-line or in hard copy form from a range of County Council Service points and could be completed in either format. The documents explained the context/background to the proposals, explained the possible impact for a range of Services and then identified the premises included in each District with the proposal for their future.

During the period the consultation webpage had over 16,000 unique users visits and various Facebook and Twitter posts and general communications were produced to raise awareness of an encourage participation in the process.

377 respondents have commented on the proposals for Burnley (4.3 respondents per 1,000 population). The equalities profile of respondents is set out in Appendix A.

Respondents have been asked to identify the premises they have used in the last 3 years and for those proposed to remain which they would be likely to use in the future.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Burnley and Pendle Day Services (1)	16	23

Burnley and Pendle Registration (2)	52	60
Burnley City Learning Centre (3)	34	20
Burnley Library (4)	159	122
Burnley The Fold Co-location Project (5)	19	17
Burnley Wood Children's Centre (6)	21	24
Children's Social Care (Easden Clough) (7)	12	15
Coal Clough Library (8)	103	75
Ightenhill Children's Centre (9)	15	14
Padiham Library (10)	73	50
Reedley Hallows Children's Centre (11)	24	21
South West Burnley Children's Centre (12)	15	17
Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre (13)	20	18
The Chai Centre Children's Centre (14)	37	29
The Zone in Burnley (15)	33	22
Whitegate Children's Centre (16)	21	17
Property	Count used in last three years	
Belmont Community Centre (17)	55	
Briercliffe Library (18)	78	
Brunshaw Young People's Centre (19)	10	
Burnley Campus Library (20)	79	
Hapton Young People's Centre (21)	9	
Padiham Young People's Centre (22)	30	
Pike Hill Library (23)	49	
Rosegrove Library (24)	69	
Stoops and Hargher Clough Young People's Centre (25)	26	

Respondents who use premises which are proposed to continue delivering services were also asked which of those other premises proposed to continue they would use in the future, if any. Most respondents would use the remaining premises but 5 users of Burnley Library and between 1 and 3 users of other locations said they would not use any of the remaining premises.

For all the premises proposed to no longer deliver LCC services respondents were asked which of the premises which are currently proposed to remain open they would use as an alternative. Most respondents did identify other premises but between 3 and 9 respondents said they would not be likely to use any of those listed – 9 current users of Padiham Young Centre, 6 current users of Rosegrove and Briercliffe Libraries, 5 users of Pike Hill and Burnley Campus Libraries and 4 current users of Stoops and Hargher Clough Young People's Centre and Belmont Community Centre whilst other locations had 3 respondents each.

Respondents who used premises which were proposed to no longer deliver LCC services were asked how this would impact on them. The leading responses and those with a specific equality related theme were:

15% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading materials which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing;

15% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise class and health walks will be lost leading to a negative impact on mental health and wellbeing.

12% Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities (general) leading to negative impact on health and wellbeing.

11% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet and closing the library will negatively impact on children's education, literacy, ability to access information and reading.

10% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset and will unlikely continue using the library service (because of distance) and will miss the library greatly if it closed (devastated/depressed) and concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for elderly, leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness.

4% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing the services (they may use them less/not at all) and longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services (they may use them less/not at all).

3% Concerned that loss of children's centres will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impact.

Residents were also asked where it was proposed to no longer deliver services but you think we should continue to deliver services from it, what were their reasons. The leading responses or those with a specific equality reference were:

20% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially.

16% They are vital to the community/community asset and it is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure.

15% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme, exercise class and health walks would stop and leading to a negative impact on mental health and wellbeing.

11% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services and it provides computer/internet access for those without it.

7% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services, (they may use them less/not at all).

Finally respondents were asked if they thought there was anything else the County Council need to consider or could do differently. The leading responses and those with a specific equality reference were:

31% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property.

9% Other budget comment – e.g. save money elsewhere/reduce costs.

7% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure.

6% Heart of the community/community asset/hub.

5% Will disadvantage the most vulnerable groups in society (young, elderly, Job-seekers) and it's a social hub promoting wellbeing/community cohesion through social interaction. Without it people may become lonely.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Consultation responses for the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services made no specific reference to proposals for premises in Burnley.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about the current use of each building e.g. how close the building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular younger and older people, and possibly those with disabilities, pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses and residents of Burnley are at higher risk of digital exclusion which could be exacerbated. It was stated that job seekers, older

people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally. Information from our Living in Lancashire residents' panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have internet access at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres. Where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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

If Yes – please identify these.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in routes which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidy arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users. For example previously subsidised bus routes which served Hapton and Stoops Hargher Clough Young People's Centres were proposed to stop weekday evening services at 19.30 or 20.00 hrs which could impact attendance at alternative Youth Service locations.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours. It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

Similarly for those older or disabled people who use Older People's Daytime Support Services or Adult Disability Day Services, the implementation of new arrangements for Transport to Day Services which take effect from September 2016 may also combine with these proposals.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
3. Burnley City Learning Centre	Proposed for future use for Conferencing	Proposed for future use for Conferencing and WPEH 12-19+ years (outreach)	Service delivery change - preference by young people not to access social care premises for support. This building provides a suitable neutral alternative for delivery of WPEH 12-19+ group learning activities and meetings.
13. Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0–19+ years (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years.	This will be a linked children's centre to The Chai Children's Centre.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library.
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line

visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.

- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices.
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations.
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we

have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including:

- Using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Revising Mobile Library routes in light of the final outcome of the Property Strategy.
- Availability of outreach, detached and mobile services as part of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service Offer.
- Consideration of expressions of interest under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.
- Consideration of the possibility of an Independent Community Library offer

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
3. Burnley City Learning Centre	Proposed for future use for Conferencing	Proposed for future use for Conferencing and WPEH 12-19+ years (outreach)	Service delivery change - preference by young people not to access social care premises for support. This building provides a suitable neutral alternative for delivery of WPEH 12-19+ group learning activities and meetings.
13. Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Young People's Centre	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0–19+ years (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years.	This will be a linked children's centre to The Chai Children's Centre.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring and review procedures will continued following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements – e.g. service usage data for Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services and numbers of registered library users or issue for the Library Service.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Chorley

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with specific reference to Chorley. This supports information in the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list of future building use by the County Council in the District of Chorley. The report contained a 'long' list of 22 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery.

The premises in Chorley identified to be retained with their current and future proposed use are as follows:

- Children's Social Care (The Hawthorns) Gloucester Road, Chorley – service delivery is unchanged;
- Chorley Adult Disability Day Services (Bankside), Weldbank Lane, Chorley – service delivery is unchanged;
- Chorley Library, Union Street, Chorley – premises currently used by Children Currently Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (Young People's Service) and in future it would continue to deliver the Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service and Welfare Rights with the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+years) (designated children centre) and Youth Offending Teams also located here.
- Chorley Registration Office, Devonshire House, Devonshire Road, Chorley – service delivery unchanged;
- Clayton Green Library, Clayton Green Road, Clayton Green, Chorley – currently a Library Service point and proposed to continue as a Library Service location with also a Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help (0-19+) (designated children's centre) also based here;
- Coppull Library, Spendmore Lane, Coppull, Chorley – currently a Library Service location and proposed to become a Library Service satellite and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) facility;
- Duke Street Children's Centre, Duke Street Primary School, Duke Street, Chorley – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Eccleston Library, The Green, Eccleston, Chorley – currently a Library Service location and proposed to become a Library Service satellite and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (0-19+ years) facility;
- Euxton Library, St Mary's Gate, Euxton, Chorley – service delivery is unchanged;
- Fosterfield Day Centre, Eaves Lane, Chorley – service delivery is unchanged.

The following Service premises are proposed not to be retained as service delivery locations in the Property Strategy:

- Adlington Library and Children's Centre, Railway Road, Adlington, Chorley;

- Astley and Buckshaw Children's Centre, Buckshaw Primary School, Chancery Road, Astley Village, Chorley;
- Blossomfields Children's Centre, Eccleston Primary School, Doctors Lane, Eccleston, Chorley;
- Chorley Adult Disability Day Services (Holly Trees), St Thomas's Road, Chorley;
- Chorley Youth Offending Team, 15/17 Halliwell Street, Chorley;
- Clayton Brook Children's Centre, Clayton Brook Primary School, Great Greens Lane, Clayton Brook, Preston;
- Coppull Children's Centre, Coppull Primary School, Park Road, Coppull;
- Eccleston Young People's Centre, Drapers Avenue, Eccleston, Chorley;
- Highfield Children's Centre, Highfield Nursery School, Wright Street, Chorley;
- Millfield Children's Centre, School Lane, Brinscall, Chorley;
- The Zone in Chorley, Lord Street, Chorley.

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 it will impact on all communities. 22 premises in Chorley are identified with 10 proposed to remain in use by the County Council and 12 proposed to be no longer used.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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

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

- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

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

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

The proposal listed 22 premises in Chorley including 10 which are proposed to continue providing services and 12 which are proposed to no longer do so.

Those which are proposed to no longer be used could impact on people with protected characteristics and include Services targeted at particular groups such as:

- Children's centres – e.g. at Clayton Green or Astley and Buckshaw Village which could most impact those aged 0-11 and their families and those who are pregnant or on maternity leave;
- Youth Centres such as the Zone in Chorley which may impact most upon young people aged 12-19+;
- Holly Trees Adult Disability Daytime Support Service which could impact disabled people eligible for daytime support services depending on the nature of alternative provision.

Universal Services available to all members of the public:

- Library Services – e.g. Adlington Library – which can be used by everyone but which proportionately have higher usage by children and young people and older people.

The extent of any detriment will be influenced by whether alternative services are available close by or whether longer journeys are needed. For children's centre, young people's centre and adult day services users there will also be an element of integrating into new groups and surroundings.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation has helped inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations

to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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 section 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position prior to specific public consultation on the property strategy and will be updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

Those which are proposed to no longer be used could impact on people with protected characteristics and include services targeted at particular groups such as:

- Children's centres – e.g. at Clayton Green or Astley and Buckshaw Village which could most impact those aged 0-11 and their families and those who are pregnant or on maternity leave;
- Youth Centres such as the Zone in Chorley which may impact most upon young people aged 12-19+;
- Holly Trees Adult Disability Daytime Support Service which could impact disabled people eligible for daytime support services depending on the nature of alternative provision.

Universal Services available to all members of the public:

- Library Services – e.g. Adlington Library – which can be used by everyone but which proportionately have higher usage by children and young people and older people.

The extent of the impact will depend on whether alternative premises for Children's centres, young People's centres and adult day service users will have an element of integrating into new groups and surroundings, or if they are available nearby or whether longer journeys are needed.

Some information is available on the profile of residents of Chorley. The ONS Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015 for Chorley is that there are 112,969 residents.

Other information comes from the 2011 Census when 107,155 residents were identified. This shows an increase of over 5,000 residents within the last five years.

Information in terms of protected characteristics within the Chorley population comes from the 2011 Census.

Age - 23% of residents were aged 0-19, 60% aged 20-64 and 17% aged 65+.

Ethnicity - 3.1% of the population (or 3,322 people) were from BME communities of whom 1% (1,016 people) were described as mixed/multiple ethnic groups; 1.6% (1,710 people) were Asian/Asian British; 0.4% (401 people) were Black/Black British and 0.2% (195 people) were from other ethnic groups. The White categories make up 96.9% of the population (103, 833 people). The BME percentage is lower than for the Lancashire County Council area at 7.7%.

57 people were identified as Gypsy or Irish Travellers in the Chorley District area.

Disability – 9.0% (9,626 people) said that their normal day to day activities were limited a lot by a disability or health condition and 9.4% (10,112 people) said their activities were limited a little. These are slightly lower figures than for the Lancashire County Council area of 9.8% (a lot) and 10.2% (a little). 81.6% (87,417 people) activities were not limited by health or disability issues.

Religion or Belief – in the 2011 Census, 75% of Chorley residents described themselves as Christian which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 69%. 17% of Chorley residents identified as having no religion, slightly lower than the LCC area's 19%. There were small numbers of Muslims, Buddhists and Hindus in the area.

Marriage and Civil Partnership Status – in the 2011 Census, 41% of Chorley residents are married (44,004 people) which is slightly higher than the LCC area figure of 39%. 138 people were in a same sex civil partnership (0.13% of the

population) which is slightly lower than the LCC area's figure of 0.14%. This will probably have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative information is not available at District level for the population in terms of sexual orientation, pregnancy and maternity and transgender status.

Census information on car ownership has also been included given the nature of this proposal. In Chorley 17.1% of households did not have a car whilst 41.2% had one car, 32.8% had two cars and 9% had more than 3 cars in their household. The numbers are below the average for the Lancashire County Council area. This information can be of use given that significant proportions of younger people, older people and disabled people do not drive so may have increased difficulties travelling to changed locations independently.

Digital Access – Chorley was not considered to be at high risk of digital exclusion according to the 2015 Go ON UK Digital Exclusion Heatmap.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile is 4.45% of employees are aged 16-24; 23.3% are aged 25-39; 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 or over at December 2015. Employment data for sexual orientation and religion or belief is very incomplete on the Oracle HR system whilst information is not captured on the system for pregnancy and maternity leave, marriage or civil partnership status or if an employee is transgender.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public

consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be summarised when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. To date we are aware of the following:

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Deadline to sign</u>
Save Clayton Brook Child Centre	51	09/09/2016
Save Coppull Library	849	finished
Save Eccleston Library	954	finished
Save Adlington Library	311	finished
Save Euxton Library	92	finished
Save Clayton Green Library	24	finished

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have also take place for County Councillors on a District by District basis and meetings have been held with District, parish and town Councils for further briefings.

The public consultation on the Property Strategy ran from 18 May until 14 August 2016. The consultation was available on-line via the County Council's "Have Your Say" internet site and was promoted using social media at various stages. The webpage received over 16,000 unique page views. The top 5 Facebook posts had over 25,000 combined views/impressions and the Top 5 Twitter Tweets had over 19,000 views/impressions. Some Twitter accounts appeared during this time of particularly relevance to the Chorley area including Save Adlington Library and Save Coppull Library.

Over 15,000 hard copy versions of the consultation were also available in service points across the county and could be returned there after completion.

480 responses had been received which based on a population of 112,969 gave a 4.2 response per 1,000 response rate. The equalities profile of respondents is included in Appendix A to these Analyses.

Respondents were asked which of the premises which are proposed to continue they had used in the last 3 years and whether they were likely to use them in the future. The second table shows which premises had been used where services are not proposed to continue.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Children's Social Care (The Hawthorn's) (26)	21	29
Chorley Adult Disability Day Services (Bankside) (27)	4	22
Chorley Library (28)	212	178
Chorley Registration Office (29)	58	63
Clayton Green Library (30)	53	54
Coppull Library (31)	85	71
Duke Street Children's Centre (32)	42	37
Eccleston Library (33)	80	67
Euxton Library (34)	98	86
Fosterfield Day Centre (35)	8	24
Property	Count used in last three years	
Adlington Library and Children's Centre (36)	124	
Astley and Buckshaw Children's Centre (37)	30	
Blossomfields Children's Centre (38)	15	
Chorley Adult Disability Day Services (Holly Trees) (39)	5	
Chorley Youth Offending Team (40)	8	
Clayton Brook Children's Centre (41)	18	
Coppull Children's Centre (42)	29	
Coppull Young People's Centre (43)	24	
Eccleston Young People's Centre (44)	42	
Highfield Children's Centre (45)	36	
Millfield Children's Centre (46)	9	
The Zone in Chorley (47)	52	

Respondents who use premises proposed to remain were also asked which locations which will continue to deliver services in Chorley they would use in the future. Most would use other premises and for some location there was no entry in the "none of these" column. However, 8 users of Chorley Library said they would use none of the remaining premises as did 5 users of Clayton Green Library, 2 users of Chorley Registration Office and 1 each for Duke Street Children's Centre and Eccleston Library. It is possible that some of the responses may be because people no longer need the location but may also be because of changes in services provided there which are proposed.

A question was also asked about which remaining premises people would use as an alternative to those where premises are proposed to no longer deliver services. Of the Chorley respondents many would use alternative premises, however, 8 users of Adlington Library and Children's centre said they would not use an alternative 5 for the Youth Zone Chorley, 4 for Highfield Children's Centre and between 3-1 for the remaining premises.

Respondents who used premises no longer proposed to deliver County Council services were asked how the proposal would impact on them. In Chorley, the leading 5 responses and those with a specific equalities reference were:

17% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's education, literacy, ability to access information and reading and other comments/general;

14% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset;

13% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my wellbeing;

9% I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastated/depressed);

10% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet;

8% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise classes and health walks will be lost;

5% Concern that loss Children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for mums leading to negative impact; Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for elderly leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness; and Longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services (they may use them less or not at all);

5% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

1% Concerned about loss of events and the Children's centres; and Closure will negatively impact my child's social development.

These respondents were also asked why they thought those service points should continue to deliver LCC services. The leading 5 responses and specific equality responses were:

17% They are vital to the community/community asset; and it is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

15% It is a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially;

13% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services;

11% Some people may not be able to get to new service locations because it is inconvenient;

9% It provides computer/internet access for those without it;

7% Longer journeys are a barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all); and The area is severely deprived so should retain services to support vulnerable groups;

6% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks would stop leading to a negative impact;

4% Concerned that loss of Children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums leading to negative impact.

Finally the respondents were asked if there was anything else the County Council needed to consider. The leading three answers and equality specific responses are below:

24% Prioritise this area. Don't close specific property;

9% Other budget comments (e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs); and Stop cutting useful social services (e.g. Children's centre, youth centres);

7% Heart of the community/community asset/hub; Keep specific properties/services as they are; and Explore offering more services from the existing building (public toilets, community services, library, ICT, youth service);

6% Will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups in society (young, elderly, job seekers);

5% It is vital to Children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure; and It's a social hub promoting wellbeing/community cohesion through social interaction. Without it people may become lonely.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Staff consultation responses for the Library, Museums Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services have raised concerns about using the same premises to deliver different Services – i.e. the Neighbourhood Centres idea – whilst others have expressed

concerns about the practicalities of how an unstaffed, satellite library will operate.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links;

buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and Children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, Children's Centre focus group in Chorley, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/Children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

Chorley contains two of the proposed satellite libraries – Coppull and Eccleston and there have been concerns from staff in particular about how library users

who are older or have disabilities will be able to use the self-service/unstaffed satellite libraries.

The proposals for Chorley include the potential closure of Holly Trees Adult Disability Day Service when a replacement depending on the outcome of identifying alternative premises. There is a possibility that service users may need to become familiar with a new location, new staff and potentially different users of the service which may cause some anxiety and uncertainty.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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

If Yes – please identify these.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidy arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more

adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

Those older or disabled people who attend Older People's Daytime Support Services or Adult Disability Day Services will also be affected by the implementation of changes in Transport to Day Services arrangements which will take effect from September 2016.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
28. Chorley Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years, Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team.	Utilise Highfield Children's Centre for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) to meet access and reach requirements for the service.
45. Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for delivery of WPEH 0-11years (designated children's centre) instead of at Chorley Library.	It is proposed to retain Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service. In addition, the complexity of the Chorley Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an

			appropriate children's centre facility.	
--	--	--	---	--

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young People's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library.
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices.
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations.
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy.
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents including:

- availability of Home Library Service;
- Mobile Library Service and outreach and detached services in the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services;
- the availability of free e-books services;
- ensuring the design and delivery of Neighbourhood Centres will accommodate the needs of the service included within them;
- the outcome of decisions on the Community Asset Transfer Policy and the possibility of independent community libraries.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
28. Chorley Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years, Children Missing Education and Pupil Attendance Team, Library Service, Welfare Rights, Youth Offending Team.	Utilise Highfield Children's Centre for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) to meet access and reach requirements for the service.
45. Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for delivery of WPEH 0-11years (designated children's centre) instead of at Chorley Library.	It is proposed to retain Highfield Children's Centre (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service. In addition, the complexity of the Chorley Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will be developed following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements – e.g. Libraries information on registered borrowers and/or issues and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service information on service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Fylde

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with specific reference to Fylde. This supports the Equality Analysis for the Property Service/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in the Fylde District. The report contained a 'long' list of premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery.

The premises listed for Fylde which were proposed to deliver services in the future and the services to be delivered were:

- Children's Social Care (Sydney Street) and Oak Tree Children's Centre, Sydney Street, St Anne's – service delivery unchanged;
- Fylde Adult Disability Day Services (Sunnybank), Marquis Street, Kirkham – service delivery unchanged;
- Milbanke Day Centre, Station Road, Kirkham – is currently an Older People's Daytime Support Service which will continue alongside a Library Service location;
- St Anne's Library, Clifton Drive South, St Anne's – will continue as a Library and also become a Registration Service location;
- The Woodlands Resource Centre, St Andrew's Road South, Lytham St Anne's – service delivery unchanged;
- The Zone in Fylde, Chapel Walks, off Royal Avenue, Kirkham – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service Young People's Service location and is proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+years) (designated children's centre) location;
- Weeton Children's Centre, Henderson Road, Weeton – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);

The following premises are not proposed to continue to deliver services in the Fylde area:

- Ansdell Library, Commonside, Ansdell;
- Freckleton Library, Preston Old Road, Freckleton;
- Kirkham Library, Station Road, Kirkham;
- Kirkham Young People's Centre, Kirkham United Reformed Church, Mill Street, Kirkham;
- Lower Lane Young People's Centre, Auster Crescent, Freckleton;
- Lytham Children's Centre, Mythop Road Sports Pavillion, Lytham St Anne's;
- Lytham Library and Registration Office, Clifton Street, Lytham;
- Orchard Children's Centre, Freckleton Strike Lane Primary School, Strike Lane, Freckleton;

Pear Tree Children's Centre, Kirkham Pear Tree School, Station Road, Kirkham;

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 it will impact on all communities. The proposal for Fylde lists 16 premises of which 7 premises are proposed to continue to be used and 9 are proposed to no longer be used.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposal lists 16 premises in Fylde. The premises included within the Fylde District and the proposals for these buildings are listed above. This includes premises which currently provide targeted services being proposed to no longer deliver County Council Services such as:

- Kirkham Young People's Centre and Lower Lane Young People's Centre. Although alternative premises are available individuals using the Service may feel disrupted;
- Children's Centres including Orchard Children's Centre, Pear Tree Children's Centre and Lytham Children's Centre as although alternative premises may be available individuals may be disrupted or inconvenienced by travelling to different premises, e.g. those who are pregnant or on maternity leave.

Proposals also include universal services which are proposed to no longer be based at the same premises e.g.

- Lytham Library and Registration Office. This will affect a wide range of people as proportionately children are more likely to use the Library and there is also higher usage amongst older people than in other age groups. Those who have recently had a baby may be more likely to use the Registration Office.
Freckleton, Kirkham and Ansdell Libraries where the impact may be more severe on children, older and disabled people particularly in relation to travelling to alternative libraries – e.g. from Freckleton or Lytham to St Anne's.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. with Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service staff and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help staff) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following specific public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposal lists 16 premises in Fylde. The premises included within the Fylde District and the proposals for these buildings are listed above. This includes premises which currently provide targeted services being proposed to no longer deliver County Council Services such as:

- Kirkham Young People's Centre and Lower Lane Young People's Centre. Although alternative premises are available individuals using the Service may feel disrupted;
- Children's Centres including Orchard Children's Centre, Pear Tree Children's Centre and Lytham Children's Centre as although alternative premises may be available individuals may be disrupted or inconvenienced

by travelling to different premises, e.g. those who are pregnant or on maternity leave.

Proposals also include universal services which are proposed to no longer be based at the same premises e.g.

- Lytham Library and Registration Office. This will affect a wide range of people as proportionately children are more likely to use the Library and there is also higher usage amongst older people than in other age groups. Those who have recently had a baby may be more likely to use the Registration Office.

Freckleton, Kirkham and Ansdell Libraries where the impact may be more severe on children, older and disabled people particularly in relation to travelling to alternative libraries – e.g. from Freckleton or Lytham to St Anne's. Information from the mid-year population estimates 2015 states that there are 77,322 residents in Fylde.

Other information largely comes from the 2011 Census which showed a usual resident population of 75,757. There is a rise of over 1,600 people within that time.

Age – when the 2011 Census was carried out 20% of the population were aged 0-19, 56% were aged 20-64 and 24% were aged over 65. Fylde has a higher percentage of residents aged over than the Lancashire average, and slightly lower levels of those aged 0-19 and 20-64.

Ethnicity – 97.4% (73,844 people) in Fylde were in all the White Census categories in 2011. 2.5% (1,913 people) were identified as in all the BME categories comprising 0.9% (742 people) identified as mixed/multiple ethnic group, 1.1.% (845 people) as Asian/Asian British, 0.2% (163 people) as Black/Black British and 0.2% (163 people) as other ethnic group. Fylde has a much smaller BME population than the Lancashire County Council area as a whole where it is around 7.7%. The Census also reported that 15 people identified as Gypsy/Irish Traveller in Fylde.

Disability – the 2011 Census included a question of whether people's normal day to day activities were limited by a disability or long-term health condition. In Fylde 10.4% (7,849 people) said their activities were limited a lot, 11.5% of Fylde residents (8,714 people) had their activities limited a little and 78.1% (59,194 people) did not have their activities limited at all by such a condition. Fylde is slightly above average for Lancashire in terms of the percentage whose activities were limited a lot (9.8%) and was significantly above the Lancashire average (10.2%) in terms of those whose activities are limited a little.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census recorded that 74% of Fylde residents identified as Christian. There are small numbers of Buddhist, Jewish, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh residents and 18% of the population identified as having no

religion. The percentage of Christians is higher than the LCC area percentage of 65%.

Marriage and Civil Partnership Status – 42.8% of Fylde residents (32,457 people) which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 39%. 111 Fylde residents are in a civil partnership (0.146% of the Fylde population) which is a similar percentage to the LCC area. As this information is from the 2011 Census it will have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative information is not available at District level for the pregnancy and maternity, transgender and sexual orientation protected characteristics.

Car Ownership – given the nature of the proposals it is also helpful to include Census information on car or van ownership in Fylde households. 19.1% of households did not have a car (the LCC area average is 22.9%), 45.6% of households had 1 car (LCC area average is 43.5%), 27.4% of households had 2 cars (LCC average is 26.3%), 5.8% have three cars (LCC average is 5.6%) and 2.1% of households had four or more cars and vans in their household. Disabled people – e.g. those with sight loss, young people and older people may be less likely to have their own access to a car making independent access to services which have relocated more difficult.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. 4.45% of employees are aged between 16-24, 23.3% are aged between 25-39, 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 and over according to data from December 2015. Information on sexual orientation and religion or belief of employees is very incomplete on the HR employee recording system and the equalities area of that system is not designed to include information on whether employees are married or in a civil partnership, are transgender or are pregnant or on maternity leave.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g. the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be summarised when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services, In terms of the Fylde District the following petitions have been received:

<u>Library</u>	<u>Signatures</u>
Freckleton	493
Kirkham	4711
Lytham	3947
Ansdell	2507

E-Petitions:

<u>Establishment</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Deadline to sign by</u>
Save St Anne's Library	256	01/09/2016
Save Lytham Library	74	01/09/2016
Keep Freckleton Library open	145	Finished
Save Ansdell Library	267	Finished

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Further District by District briefings were held for County Councillors and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

A public consultation on the proposed Property Strategy was carried out between 18 May and 14 August 2016. This was available on-line or through printed information available at service points throughout the county, to which completed responses could also be returned. 7719 responses have been received.

757 responses have been received relating to Fylde from a population of 77,322 residents, a response rate of 9.8 per 1000 population. Details of the equalities profile of Fylde respondents is included at Appendix A to the Equality Analyses.

Consultees were asked which premises in Fylde they have used in the last three years which are proposed to continue to deliver County Council services and if they would use it in the future and responses are in the first table below. The second table is for those who have used premises which are not proposed to be used to deliver services.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Children's Social Care (Sydney Street) and Oak Tree Children's Centre (48)	83	62
Fylde Adult Disability Day Services (Sunnybank) (49)	17	29
Milbanke Day Centre (50)	16	29
St Anne's Library (51)	374	287
The Woodlands Resource Centre (52)	32	32
The Zone in Fylde (53)	13	16
Weeton Children's Centre (54)	11	21

Property	Count used in last three years
Ansdell Library (55)	491
Freckleton Library (56)	97
Kirkham Library (57)	83
Kirkham Young People's Centre (58)	10
Lower Lane Young People's Centre (59)	7
Lytham Children's Centre (60)	68
Lytham Library and Registration Office (61)	428
Orchard Children's Centre (62)	26
Pear Tree Children's Centre (63)	38

Respondents who used premises proposed to continue delivering services were also asked which of those remaining they might use in the future. Most people identified premises they would use but 8 users of St Anne's Library and Sydney Street & Oaktree Children's Centre said they would not use any of the remaining premises.

Respondents who used premises which are proposed to no longer deliver LCC services were also asked which of those premises proposed to remain they would use as an alternative. Most respondents did identify alternative premises but 41 people who had used Ansdell Library and 34 who had used Lytham Library & Registration Office said they would not use any of the other buildings listed which was some way ahead of 7 respondents each for Kirkham and Freckleton Libraries, 4 respondents for Pear Tree Children's Centre, 3 respondents who used Lytham Children's Centre and 2 for other premises listed.

Respondents who used premises which are proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly, how this proposal will impact on them. The highest 5 responses for Fylde and those with an equalities element are given below:

19% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my wellbeing;

17% Closing the library will negatively impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset;

15% I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (e.g. drive, using public transport) causing inconvenience;

12% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's education, literacy, ability to access information and reading; and Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet;

12% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise classes and health walks will be lost; and I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastated/depressed);

6% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all); and Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for the elderly leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness;

4% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

2% Concerned that loss of children's centres will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impact;

1% Concerned about loss of events in the children's centre; and Closures will negatively impact my child's social development.

Respondents were then asked what their reasons were for wanting LCC to continue to deliver services from these premises. The top 5 responses and those with an equalities reference are listed below:

43% They are vital to the community/community asset;

22% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially;

16% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure; and Criticism of the budget, libraries should be protected;

15% It provides computer/internet access for those without it;

11% Villages/towns will lose a big sense of community if the libraries close; and sessions groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercises classes and health walks will would stop leading to a negative impact;

6% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

2% The area is severely deprived so should retain services to support vulnerable groups;

1% Concerned that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums leading to negative impacts.

Finally, respondents were asked whether there was anything else the County Council needed to consider or do differently. The top three responses and those with an equalities reference were:

32% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property;

13% Heart of the community/community asset/hub;

11% Other budget comment – e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs;

6% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

5% Will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups in society (young, old, job seekers);

4% It's a social hub promoting wellbeing/community cohesion through social interaction. Without it people may become lonely.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Both the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service consultations and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help consultations included comments expressing reservations about whether services will be able to successfully share the same premises.

The Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration consultation did include several specific responses about the selection of the Milbanke Centre as a library location and views that Freckleton was a more appropriate premises. Similarly there were other comments about the continued use of St Anne's Library rather than Ansdell and or Lytham Libraries and a concern in both cases that users – particularly those with prams, older and disabled people - may not travel to the alternative locations.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

There are particular concerns raised within Fylde in terms of the impact on older people of these proposals. Fylde has a high percentage of residents aged 65 and over. Both the public consultation and Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service staff structure consultations raised concerns that many of these people may find it difficult to get to the Milbanke Centre and/or St Anne's Library if their current library is no longer available – the high figures for Ansdell Library and Lytham Library users who would not use an alternative building may be an indicator of this. Comments have also been made about the availability of other services close by to St Anne's as opposed to Lytham and Ansdell including parking which may be a factor for those with reduced mobility.

The proposal for Lower Lane Young People's Centre and Freckleton Library will result in longer journeys to access provision for younger or older people or disabled people. This may make independent access to alternative services more difficult.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of

children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

Those older or disabled people who use Adult Disability Day Services or Older People's Daytime Support Services may also be affected by the implementation of the decision relating to Transport to Day Services from September 2016.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
55. Ansdell Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to St Anne's Library.	To ensure the provision of a full library service is available to the community whilst works to St Anne's Library are completed.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;

- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full

Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres), however, we have tried to reduce any negative impact by introducing mitigating actions such as:

- The availability of the Mobile Library Service,
- The availability of outreach and detached services from Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service:
- free loan of e-books and e-audiobooks,
- availability of the Home Library Service for those eligible
- designing neighbourhood centres to take account of the requirements of the different services within them.
- Consideration of the Community Asset Transfer Policy and the possibility of an independent community libraries option depending on their final outcome.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
55. Ansdell Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to St Anne's Library.	To ensure the provision of a full library service is available to the community whilst works to St Anne's Library are completed.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Services will continue to use existing monitoring and review processes e.g. library issues and information on registered borrowers and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help data on those using their services in terms of protected characteristics.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Hyndburn

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal for consultation with specific reference to Hyndburn. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres Equality Analysis for All Lancashire.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in the Hyndburn District. The report contains a 'long' list of 20 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in Hyndburn.

The premises proposed to continue to be used in Hyndburn and suggested services to be delivered there are as follows:

- Accrington Library and Registration Office, St James' Street, Accrington – service delivery unchanged;
- Children's Social Care (Silver Birches), Atlas Street, Clayton-le-Moors – service delivery unchanged;
- Clayton-le-Moors and Altham Children's Centre, Arthur Street, Clayton-le-Moors – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) it is proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre);
- Copperhouse Children's Centre, Station Road, Rishton – is currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and is proposed to remain a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (0-11years) (designated children's centre) and have a library service satellite at this location;
- Fairfield Children's Centre, Fairfield Nursery School, Fairfield Street, Accrington – service delivery broadly unchanged;
- Great Harwood Children's Centre, Great Harwood Primary School, Rushton Street, Great Harwood – service delivery broadly unchanged;
- Great Harwood Library, Queen Street, Great Harwood – currently a Library Service which will remain and a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (12-19+) will also be located at this building;
- Hyndburn Adult Disability Services (Enfield), Church Lane, Accrington – service delivery unchanged;
- Sure Start Hyndburn – Church and West Accrington Childrens Centre (The Park), Norfolk Grove, Church – service delivery broadly unchanged;
- The Zone in Hyndburn, Paradise Street, Accrington – service delivery unchanged;

- Woodhaven Day Centre, Thorneyholme Road, Accrington - service delivery unchanged.

The premises where it is proposed to cease delivering County Council services from are:

- Accrington Youth Offending Team, Blake Street, Accrington;
- Clayton-le-Moors Library, Pickup Street, Clayton-le-Moors;
- Clayton-le-Moors Young People's Centre, Moor Street, Clayton-le-Moors;
- Great Harwood Young People's Centre, Lowerfold Road, Great Harwood;
- Huncoat Children's Centre, Huncoat Primary School, Lynwood Road, Huncoat;
- Oswaldtwistle Library, Union Road, Oswaldtwistle;
- Oswaldtwistle Young People's Centre, Harvey Street, Oswaldtwistle;
- Rishton Library, High Street, Rishton;
- Sure Start Hyndburn – Accrington South Children's Centre (The Beeches), Rimington Avenue, Accrington;

Of the 20 premises, 11 are proposed to continue delivering services and 9 will no longer be used to deliver County Council 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.

Yes it will impact on all communities given the services proposals outlined above.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the public consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people

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

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

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

The proposal for consultation lists 20 premises, 11 are proposed to remain and 9 proposed to no longer deliver LCC services in the Hyndburn District and proposals for their future use are listed above.

This in terms of targeted services:

- Children's and Young Peoples Centres, particularly in Huncoat or Oswaldtwistle where any alternative may be in a different town/village, this may adversely impact young people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave as travel distances will be longer. Even where premises remain in the same area – e.g. Great Harwood and Clayton-le-Moors – there may be the disruption of using a new location, meeting new people and staff;
- Youth Offending Team, Blake Street - although the proposal is that the office will cease to deliver services and office service will be delivered from Burnley, the impact on young people may be reduced as services to young people will continue to be delivered at locations in Hyndburn wherever practicable.
- Disabled people. The Adult Disability Day Services at Enfield Centre is unchanged but may be affected by proposals for service users from Pendle Brook Centre in Ribble Valley to relocate to the Centre. This may have some impact in terms of new people and/or staff coming to the centre.

More general/universal services will also be affected by proposals to deliver future services:

- Libraries – e.g. in Rishton, Oswaldtwistle and Clayton-le-Moors – are included amongst those premises which will no longer be used to deliver County Council services which may impact children and young people

whose use of libraries is proportionately high, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and disabled people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave who may find it harder to get to alternative locations particularly if, as in Oswaldtwisite, the alternative location is outside the town or village.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the public consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Library, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposal for consultation lists 20 premises, 11 are proposed to remain and 9 proposed to no longer deliver LCC services in the Hyndburn District and proposals for their future use are listed above.

This in terms of targeted services:

- Children's and Young People's Centres, particularly in Huncoat or Oswaldtwistle where any alternative may be in a different town/village this may adversely impact young people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave as travel distances will be longer. Even where premises remain in the same area – e.g. Great Harwood and Clayton-le-Moors –

there may be the disruption of using a new location, meeting new people and staff;

- Youth Offending Team, Blake Street - although the proposal is that the office will cease to deliver services and office service will be delivered from Burnley, the impact on young people may be reduced as services to young people will continue to be delivered at locations in Hyndburn wherever practicable.
- Disabled people. The Adult Disability Day Services at Enfield Centre is unchanged but may be affected by proposals for service users from Pendle Brook Centre in Ribble Valley to relocate to the Centre. This may have some impact in terms of new people and/or staff coming to the centre.

More general/universal services will also be affected by proposals to deliver future services:

- Libraries – e.g. in Rishton, Oswaldtwistle and Clayton-le-Moors – are included amongst those premises which will no longer be used to deliver County Council services which may impact children and young people whose use of libraries is proportionately high, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and disabled people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave who may find it harder to get to alternative locations, particularly if, as in Oswaldtwistle, the alternative location is outside the town or village.

Information about the protected characteristics profile of residents of Hyndburn District is based on the 2011 Census and some mid-year residents population estimates information for 2015. The MYPE 2015 listed 80,228 residents in Hyndburn District.

The 2011 Census had given a population for Hyndburn of 80,734, which indicates a reduction of around 500 residents in the last five years.

Age – information from the 2011 Census showed that in Hyndburn 26% of residents are aged 0-19, 58% are aged 20-64 and 16% are aged over 65. Hyndburn's age profile is slightly higher than for the LCC area average (24%) of 0-19 year olds, matches the LCC area average for 20-64 year olds and has a slightly lower percentage of people aged over 65 than the Lancashire average of 18%.

Ethnicity – the ethnicity data from the 2011 Census has been grouped into broad categories as follows: 12.3% of Hyndburn residents were described as BME comprising of 0.8% (696 people) described as mixed/multiple ethnicities, 11.2% (9,007 people) described as Asian/Asian British; 0.1% (106 people) described as Black/Black British and 0.2% (147 people) described as other ethnic group. 87.6% of the Hyndburn population (70,778 people) were categorised under the All White groups heading. Hyndburn has a higher percentage of residents from BME backgrounds than the average for the Lancashire County Council area of 7.7%.

The Census also reported that Hyndburn had 97 residents who were identified as Gypsy/Irish Travellers.

Disability – the 2011 Census included questions on whether health issues or disabilities limited normal day to day activities a little or a lot. In Hyndburn 11.3% of residents (9,153 people) said their activities were limited a lot which is 1.5% above the average for the Lancashire County Council area of 9.8%. 10.4% of residents (8,400 people) said their activities were limited a little which only slightly above the LCC area average of 10.2%.

Marriage and Civil Partnership status – 66% of Hyndburn residents are Christian which is slightly under the LCC area figure of 69%. 17% of residents had no religion – slightly lower than the LCC area's 9%. There is significant percentage of Muslims – approximately 10% - and smaller percentages of Hindus, according to the 2011 Census.

Marriage or Civil Partnerships – the 2011 Census reported that 36.3% of Hyndburn residents (29,303 people) are married which is slightly lower than the LCC area figure of 39%. 65 people were in a civil partnership which is 0.08% of the population and lower than the LCC area average of 0.14%. It is likely this information has changed in the intervening years.

No authoritative information is available at District level for the numbers of people who are pregnant or on maternity leave, those who are transgender or for people's sexual orientation.

Car ownership – given the nature of the proposals it seemed helpful to include 2011 Census information about car ownership within the Lancashire Districts. In Hyndburn 28.2% of households do not have a car or van which is over 5% higher than the LCC area average of 22.9%. 44.5% of households had one car which is around 1% higher than the LCC area average of 43.5% whilst the percentage for two or more cars in a household were all lower than the LCC area average. Some groups with protected characteristics such as older people, young people, some with disabilities – e.g. sight loss – are less likely to be able to drive so may be more disadvantaged when premises change location particularly if it involves travel to another village, town or part of town some distance away.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. In terms of age 4.45% of employees were aged 16-24, 23.3% aged 25-39, 66.6% aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 and over in December 2015. The HR employee recording system has fairly incomplete data on sexual orientation and religion or belief as individuals complete that information themselves. The

system does not include categories within the equalities suite for marriage or civil partnership status, pregnancy and maternity or transgender status of employees.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g. the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be summarised when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Hyndburn District we have received a petition of 1332 signatures in support of Oswaldtwistle Library.

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. County Councillors have also been briefed on a

District by District basis and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

A public consultation on the proposed Property Strategy was carried out between 18 May 2016 and 14 August 2016. The consultation was available on-line via the "Have Your Say" area on the County Council's internet and was also available in printed form from service points across the county, which could also be used to return completed questionnaires. 7719 responses have been received.

For Hyndburn 446 responses have been received, based on the mid-year population estimates of 80,228, this gives a response rate of 5.6 per 1,000.

Premises which respondents have used within the last three years are as follows:

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Accrington Library and Registration Office (64)	214	156
Children's Social Care (Silver Birches) (65)	42	25
Clayton-le-Moors and Altham Children's Centre (66)	61	46
Copper House Children's Centre (67)	79	59
Fairfield Children's Centre (68)	72	55
Great Harwood Children's Centre (69)	50	40
Great Harwood Library (70)	118	95
Hyndburn Adult Disability Day Services (Enfield) (71)	36	36
Sure Start Hyndburn - Church and West Accrington Children's Centre (The Park) (72)	102	68
The Zone in Hyndburn (73)	44	36
Woodhaven Day Centre (74)	15	33

The table above features those premises proposed to continue delivering services and respondents and the one below those used by respondents which are proposed to no longer deliver services.

Property	Count used in last three years
Accrington Youth Offending Team (75)	13
Clayton-le-Moors Library (76)	89
Clayton-le-Moors Young People's Centre (77)	24
Great Harwood Young People's Centre (78)	41
Huncoat Children's Centre (79)	23
Oswaldtwistle Library (80)	170

Oswaldtwistle Young People's Centre (81)	29
Rishton Library (82)	130
Sure Start Hyndburn - Accrington South Children's Centre (The Beeches) (83)	87

Respondents of premises proposed to continue delivering services were asked which of the remaining premises they would use in the future. Most would use some of the remaining buildings. 6 respondents who had used Accrington Library and Registration Office said they would not use any of the remaining buildings as did 4 users of Copper House Children's Centre whilst responses for other buildings were between 3 and 1.

Respondents who had used premises which were proposed to cease were also asked which of the premises proposed to remain operating in Hyndburn they might use as an alternative, which included an option for none of these. Most respondents identified alternatives. 8 users of Rishton Library said that they were not likely to use any of the remaining premises as did 4 users of Oswaldtwistle Library whilst other responses ranged between 3 and 1 for the remaining buildings except Clayton le Moors Young Peoples Centre where 10 people identified using Clayton-le-Moors and Altham Children's Centre.

Users of premises proposed to cease were asked a series of questions. Firstly how the service no longer being delivered from a location they used would impact on The top 5 responses and those with a specific equalities reference are:

16% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my wellbeing; and Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise classes and health walks will be lost.

13% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's literacy, education, access to information and reading; Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset and Concerned about the loss of events at the children's centre;

15% I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (e.g. drive, use public transport) causing inconvenience; and I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastated/depressed);

13% Closing the library will negatively impact on childrens education, literacy, ability to access information and reading

11% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet; and other general comments

6% Concern that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impact;

5% Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for elderly, leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness;

5% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

5% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services they may use them less/not at all;

Respondents were also asked where premises were proposed to no longer deliver services why they thought services should continue to be delivered from them. The top 5 responses and those with a specific equalities reference were:

20% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

18% They are vital to the community/community asset;

15% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercises classes and health walks would stop leading to a negative impact: and it provides computer/internet access for those without it;

14% I would no longer borrow books/read regularly; and should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services;

9% There are no viable alternatives in area providing these services – e.g. book lending;

6% Concern that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums leading to negative impacts;

6% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

4% The area is severely deprived so should retain services to support vulnerable groups

Finally respondents were asked if they thought there was anything else that should be considered or done differently. The top 3 responses and those with a specific equalities reference were:

27% Prioritise the area/don't close specific property;

15% Other budget comment (e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs);

7% Heart of the community/community asset/hub; suggestion for a service that could be offered and Move services into one building to reduce overall running costs (not just LCC services);

9% Will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups (young, elderly, job seekers):

7% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure: and Stop cutting useful social services (e.g. children's/youth centres).

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Staff consultations for both the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service have included comments about whether moving different services into the same location can/will work successfully for the various groups. The Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service also saw comments about the proposals for unstaffed satellite libraries and whether older and disabled customers would be able to easily use this self-service option, one of which is proposed to be included at Copper House in Rishton.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres, in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

There are particularly concerns where an area may no longer have services within the village/town – e.g. Oswaldtwistle – and this may mean that some people will no longer find it as easy to access services.

Rishton will also be the location of a satellite library at Copper House. The change to using a self-service system may impact on some older and disabled people in particular who may find it more difficult to use this without library staff on hand and may also miss the social interaction of visiting the library. This may impact their equality of opportunity in using the satellite library.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of

children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

For those older or disabled people who use Older People's Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services the implementation of new arrangements under the Transport to Day Services decision from September 2016 may also have an impact on these proposals.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

At present the proposal with regard to Hyndburn is unchanged. Of the 20 current premises used it is proposed to continue to use 11 premises and no longer deliver services from 9 premises.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;

- The Youth Offending Team will make arrangements to use premises in Hyndburn for meetings with young people;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) including children and young people, older people, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and disabled people. We have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including:

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents;
- Availability of the mobile library service and for those eligible older and disabled people the Home Library Service;
- Free loan of e-books and e-audiobooks which can be used on computers, e-readers, tablets and smartphones;
- Availability of outreach and detached services to deliver the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service as appropriate;
- Use of premises in Accrington for meetings with young people as part of the Youth Offending Team service delivery;
- Outcome of considerations of the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibility of independent community libraries considerations.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with specific reference to Hyndburn. The proposal is unchanged.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. These include information on library issues and numbers of registered borrowers and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service user information.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Lancaster

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal for consultation with specific reference to Lancaster. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in the Lancaster District. The report contains a 'long' list of premises 24 premises in Lancaster from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery.

The premises proposed to continue to deliver services in Lancaster and the services proposed to be delivered from them are as follows:

- Appletree Children's Centre, Appletree Nursery School, Milking Stile Lane, Lancaster – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Children's Social Care (Sefton Drive), Sefton Drive, Lancaster – service delivery unchanged;
- Halton Library and Children's Centre, Penny Stone Road, Halton, Lancaster – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Heysham Library, Heysham Road, Heysham – service delivery unchanged;
- Lancaster & Morecambe Adult Disability Day Services (Thorpe View), Thorpe Avenue, Morecambe – service delivery unchanged;
- Lancaster Central Library, Market Square, Lancaster – service delivery unchanged;
- Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park, Lancaster – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Morecambe Library, Central Drive, Morecambe – current provision at location is a Library Service, Welfare Rights and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service). Proposed provision is a Library Service satellite, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+years) (designated children's centre);
- The Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre. Carnforth High School, Kellet Road, Carnforth – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (Young People's Service) Proposed to be a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre) and Library Service location.
- Vale View Day Centre, Stratford Close, Lancaster – service delivery unchanged;
- Westgate Children's Centre, Westgate Primary School, Langridge Way, Westgate, Morecambe – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- White Cross Education Centre, Mill 14, White Cross Industrial Estate, Quarry Road, Lancaster – current service provision at this location is Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service) and proposed to be

Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (12-19+ years), Registration Office and Youth Offending Team Office.

Premises proposed to cease delivering Lancashire County Council services in the Lancaster area are:

- Balmoral Children's Centre, Sandylands Primary School, Hampton Road, Morecambe;
- Barton Road Young People's Centre, Barton Road, Lancaster;
- Bolton-le-Sands Library, Main Road, Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth;
- Carnforth Library, Lancaster Road, Carnforth;
- Firbank Children's Centre, Keswick Road, Lancaster;
- Galgate Children's Centre, Ellet St Johns CE Primary School, Chapel Street, Galgate, Lancaster;
- Heysham Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Middleton Way, Douglas Park, Heysham;
- Lancaster Registration Office, Queen Street, Lancaster;
- Morecambe Registration Office, Town Hall, Marine Road East, Morecambe;
- Poulton Children's Centre, Clarke Street, Morecambe;
- Ryelands Young People's Centre, Ryelands Primary School, Torrisholme Road, Lancaster;
- Silverdale Library, Emesgate Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth;

Of the 24 premises 12 are proposed to continue to be used and 12 are proposed to no longer be used.

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 it will impact on all communities. There are 24 premises included in the Lancaster District.

We have used evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The consultation lists 24 premises, 12 are proposed to continue delivering services whilst 12 are proposed to no longer deliver services. The impacts identified in terms of protected characteristics are:

In terms of targeted services:

- 5 children's centres are proposed to no longer deliver services which could impact on children (young people) and those who are pregnant or on maternity leave in terms of impact. The extent will depend on whether there are alternative premises identified close by or if – as for example in Galgate or Heysham Children's Centres – the nearest alternative premises are in a different village/town. Increased travel would then be added to the disruption of going to a new location, possibly working with different staff and different service users;
- Young People's Centres – 3 young people's centres are proposed to no longer deliver the service which may affect those aged 12-19+ who will need to access an alternative location. For young people this may involve travelling to a new location, new staff and new people and there may be increased travel issues particularly in an evening (youth service).

Other services proposed to change have a more general/universal delivery:

- Libraries in Carnforth, Silverdale and Bolton-le-Sands are proposed to no longer deliver a service. Although there is an alternative proposed for Carnforth Hub, those from Silverdale and Bolton-le-Sands may face longer journeys. As children and young people are proportionately the highest library users, older people and disabled people may find this has an adverse impact.
- Registration Services – these are used by potentially higher numbers of those who have had babies. It has been suggested by the Service that the changes proposed should not have a detrimental effect and the new locations proposed may be more easily accessible.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal.

The consultation lists 24 premises, 12 are proposed to continue delivering services whilst 12 are proposed to no longer deliver services. The impacts identified in terms of protected characteristics are:

In terms of targeted services:

- 5 children's centres are proposed to no longer deliver services which could impact on children (young people) and those who are pregnant or on maternity leave in terms of impact. The extent will depend on whether there are alternative premises identified close by or if – as for example in Galgate or Heysham Children's Centres – the nearest alternative premises are in a different village/town. Increased travel would then be added to the

disruption of going to a new location, possibly working with different staff and different service users;

- Young People Centres – 3 young people's centres are proposed to no longer deliver the service which may affect those aged 12-19+ who will need to access an alternative location. For young people this may involve travelling to a new location, new staff and new people and there may be increased travel issues particularly in an evening (youth service).

Other services proposed to change have a more general/universal delivery:

- Libraries in Carnforth, Silverdale and Bolton-le-Sands are proposed to no longer deliver a service. Although there is an alternative proposed for Carnforth Hub, those from Silverdale and Bolton-le-Sands may face longer journeys. As children and young people are proportionately the highest library users, older people and disabled people may find this has an adverse impact.
- Registration Services – these are used by potentially higher numbers of those who have had babies. It has been suggested by the Service that the changes proposed should not have a detrimental effect and the new locations proposed may be more easily accessible.

Information on the profile of the Lancaster area in terms of the protected characteristics included in the Equality Act 2010 is included below to provide a context for this analysis. This information is largely drawn from the 2011 Census with some material also coming from the Mid-Year Population Estimates for 2015.

Lancaster has a population of 142,283 residents according to the Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015, at the 2011 Census the resident population was 138,375 which shows an increase of over 4,000 people in the last 5 years suggesting a steady growth in population.

Age – 24% of the Lancaster's population are aged 0-19, 58% are aged 20-64 and 18% of the population are aged 65 or over, these percentages were the same as for the whole Lancashire County Council area in the 2011 Census.

Ethnicity – 4.4% (6,033 people) of Lancaster's were identified as from BME groups which comprised of 0.9% (1,356 people) as mixed or multiple ethnic groups, 2.7% (3,732 people) as Asian/Asian British, 0.5% (628 people) as Black/Black British and 0.2% (317 people) as other. 95.6% (132,342 people) were identified in the All White groups in the 2011 Census. Lancaster had a lower BME population than for the county as a whole where 7.7% of residents are BME. 331 people were Gypsy/Irish Travellers which made Lancaster the 29th ranked local authority in England and Wales for the number of Gypsy/Irish Traveller people in its community, it also has the highest total in Lancashire.

Disability – the Census 2011 question which provides the most appropriate information on disability is the question relating to whether a disability or health

condition limited a person's normal day to day activities a little or a lot. When this was asked in the 2011 Census 9.2% (12,751 people) of Lancaster residents said their activities were limited a lot, this is lower than the Lancashire County Council area percentage of 9.8%. 10.2% (14,176 people) said their activities were limited a little which is the same as the Lancashire County Council area percentage.

Religion or Belief – 66% of Lancaster's population reported that they were Christian in the 2011 Census, slightly lower than the LCC area 69% figure. There are small numbers of Buddhists, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim and Sikh people in Lancaster. 25% of the population had no religion – slightly higher than the 19% for the LCC area.

Marriage and Civil Partnership status – according to the 2011 Census 36.07% of Lancaster residents (49,911 people) are married – a slightly lower percentage than the 39% for the LCC area. 290 people were in a same sex civil partnership ((0.209%) which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 0.14% and the second highest in the county.

Authoritative information was not available to District level for the numbers/percentage of people who are pregnant or on maternity leave, who are transgender or in terms of sexual orientation.

Car Usage – given the nature of the proposals it may be helpful to include information on the number of households in Lancaster which do not own a car or van. 24.6% of Lancaster households do not have a car or van, slightly higher than the LCC area average of 22.9%. 45.5% of households in Lancaster had one car or van, higher than the LCC area average of 43.5% whilst the percentages of households with two or more vehicles were all lower than those for the LCC area as a whole. As it is likely that those from the young and older people and some disabled people – e.g. with sight loss – are proportionately more likely to be non-drivers this may increase impacts for them where locations change and particularly where services are no longer available in the village or town where they live, e.g. Silverdale or Bolton-le-Sands.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile in December 2015 were: 4.45% are aged 16-24, 23.3% are aged 25-39, 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 and over. Information on the equalities area of the HR employee recording system for sexual orientation and religion or belief is very incomplete and this part of the system does not include information on pregnancy or maternity leave, transgender status or marriage and civil partnership status.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be summarised when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Lancaster District, we have received the following:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Signatures</u>
Bolton-le-Sands Library	1728
Heysham Childrens Centre and Young Peoples Centre	1041
Heysham youth and Communities Centre	266

In addition the following ePetitions have been received which have all now closed:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Signatures</u>
Don't close Heysham Library	220
Keep Carnforth Library	104
Bolton le Sands Library	55
Keep Morecambe Library staffed	51

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided

some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been 3 briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. County Councillors have also received a District by District Briefing whilst meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

The public consultation for the Property Strategy ran for a 12-week period from 18 May 2016 to 14 August 2016. The consultation was available on-line through the "Have Your Say" section on the County Council's internet pages and printed versions were available at County Council service premises throughout the county to which completed forms could also be returned. Messages appeared through social media to encourage people to take part in this consultation at various stages throughout the May to August period. 7719 response have been received.

1,280 consultation responses have been received in relation to proposals for the Lancaster area, which based on the MYPE figure of 142,283 gives a response per 1,000 of 9.0. Lancaster had the highest number of respondents. Information on the equalities profile for respondents is included in Appendix A to the Equality Analyses.

Consultation respondents were asked to indicate which of those premises they use or had used within the last three years. The first table shows those premises proposed to continue delivering services and the second those premises proposed to no longer deliver services.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Appletree Children's Centre (84)	113	100
Children's Social Care (Sefton Drive) (85)	50	49
Halton Library and Children's Centre (86)	82	81
Heysham Library (87)	358	280
Lancaster and Morecambe Adult Disability Day Services (Thorpe View) (88)	39	53
Lancaster Central Library (89)	643	492
Lune Park Children's Centre (90)	182	129
Morecambe Library (91)	680	517
The Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre (92)	101	95
Vale View Day Centre (93)	34	35
Westgate Children's Centre (94)	210	143
White Cross Education Centre (95)	188	140
Property	Count used in last three years	
Balmoral Children's Centre (96)		272

Barton Road Young People's Centre (97)	143
Bolton-le-Sands Library (98)	249
Carnforth Library (99)	222
Firbank Children's Centre (100)	161
Galgate Children's Centre (101)	37
Heysham Children's Centre and Young People's Centre (102)	217
Lancaster Registration Office (103)	284
Morecambe Registration Office (104)	122
Poulton Children's Centre (105)	215
Ryelands Young People's Centre (106)	62
Silverdale Library (107)	76

Respondents who used premises proposed to continue to deliver services were also asked which of those premises they might use in the future. Most identified premises they would use but 14 people who had used Lancaster Central Library, 6 user of Heysham Library, 5 users of Morecambe Library and between 1 and 2 users of other premises said they would use none of the remaining premises.

Similarly those people who used premises no longer proposed to deliver services were asked which of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. 14 respondents who had used Balmoral Children's Centre and 12 who had used Bolton-le-Sands Library said they would not use any of the remaining buildings, 6 users of Barton Young People's Centre and Lancaster Registration Office and between 5 and 2 users of other premises proposed to close said they would use none of the remaining premises.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses and those with an equalities reference were as follows:

13% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which will negatively impact on my wellbeing;

11% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's literacy, education, access to information and reading;

10% Other comment/general;

8% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/internet; and Concerned that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for mums leading to negative impact;

9% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset; and positive comment about staff;

10% Concerns that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme, exercise classes and health walks will be lost;

8% Concerned that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impact

5% Longer journeys are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all); Concerned about loss of events in the children's centre; and Longer journeys are a potential barrier to disabled people/people with health conditions accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

3% Concern that loss of the library will limit social opportunities for the elderly leading to seclusion/isolation/loneliness;

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 response and those with an equalities reference were:

13% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

13% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially;

14% They are vital to the community/community asset;

9% It provides computer/internet access for those without it; Positive comment about staff and Concerned that there will be a lack of support, guidance and help for families if the children's centres close;

7% The area is severely deprived so should retain services to help vulnerable groups; The recent investment/refurbishment of this building will be a complete waste of money if it closed and I would no longer borrow books/read regularly;

8% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise classes and health walks would stop leading to negative impact; and Concern that loss of the children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums leading to negative impacts;

5% Longer journey are a potential barrier to older people accessing services (they may use them less/not at all);

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses and those with an equality reference were:

37% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property;

8% Other budget comments – (e.g. save money elsewhere/reduce costs);

10% Will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups in society (young, elderly, job seekers);

6% Stop cutting useful social services (e.g. children's and youth centres);

4% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure;

5% It's a social hub promoting wellbeing/community cohesion through social interaction. Without it people may become lonely.

Lancaster was one of the areas where a focus group on children's centres in relation to the Property Strategy took place. Attendees had concerns about travelling to alternative locations – feeling that some people "would not cross the river" to attend an alternative venue and that the one way system could make travel more difficult. They were also concerned about building new relationships with staff and others at alternative premises. There were also concerns about a children's centre being located in a building such as Morecambe Library.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Consultations have been completed with Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service staff and with Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff. Amongst responses for both consultations were concerns about different service co-locating in the same premise. As Morecambe Library was proposed to be a satellite (unstaffed) library there were concerns raised about service users being able to access the self-service equipment and whether a satellite could meet the demand for services –e.g. job seekers would be unlikely to be able to meet the travel costs of going to Lancaster or Heysham to a staff library, it was suggested.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

There remained concerns about travel from consultees in the public consultation, children's centres Lancaster focus group and employee consultation in relation to the cost of travelling to other locations and practicality – e.g. for young people using Heysham Youth Service there is no subsidised bus service after 19:30p.m.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced

by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Morecambe Library is proposed to be a self-service satellite library and there were concerns that older people and disabled people would be disadvantaged by the absence of regular staff whilst concerns were also raised that demand for this library is high – e.g. Job-seekers are signposted to use the free computers there.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups. Staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas. This can assist in fostering good relations between different groups/community cohesion.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations. It was suggested, for example, that some people "would not cross the river" to access alternative premises.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

For those older people or disabled people who use Older People's Day Services and Adult Disability Day Services, the proposal may combine with the implementation of the Transport to Day Services new arrangements which take effect from September 2016.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings.
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use with full Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-	Proposed for future use by Registration	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and

	19+, Youth Offending Team	Service, WPEH 12-19+ and support for families, Youth Offending Team	advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service pending a detailed site review of Carnforth Hub.	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.

- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full

Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres). We have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including:

- Using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents;
- Availability of the mobile library service and for those eligible older and disabled people the Home Library Service;
- Availability of free loan of e-books and e-audiobooks which can be downloaded onto computers, e-readers, tablet and smartphones;
- Availability of outreach and detached services within the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service offer;
- Including flexibility in Neighbourhood Centres delivery and design to include meeting rooms, interview rooms and consulting rooms where possible
- Consideration of the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibilities of an independent community libraries offer depending on the final outcomes.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
86. Halton Library and Children's Centre	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years.	Proposed for future use by Library Service, WPEH 0-11 years (outreach).	This is currently a satellite of Lune Park Children's Centre (designated children's centre). There are low levels of families choosing to access support at Halton Children's Centre and so the service proposes to add capacity at Lune Park and ensure outreach support for the community in Halton.
90. Lune Park Children's Centre, Ryelands Park (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Service delivery change - consultation conducted by WPEH showed preference by young people to access this site for support. It is situated in the Skerton and Ryelands park area which has significant levels of deprivation. Increasing levels of service at this site will ensure support is available without having to cross the river to other buildings.
91. Morecambe Library	Proposed for future use with satellite Library, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH service 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use with full Library service, Registration Service, Welfare Rights and WPEH 12-19+ years.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe.
92. Carnforth Hub Children's Centre and Young People's Centre, Carnforth High School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre) and Library service.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre).	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
95. White Cross Education Centre	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+, Youth Offending Team	Proposed for future use by Registration Service, WPEH 12-19+ and support for families, Youth Offending Team	Families with children outside of the 12-19+ age range may need to be able to access support and advice. Additional use of this building will enable the service to better meet access and reach requirements.
99. Carnforth Library	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for full library service	It is proposed to retain Carnforth Library due to its current location best serving the access

		pending a detailed site review of Carnforth Hub.	requirements for the service as the complexity of the Carnforth Hub site would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate library service.
105. Poulton Children's Centre, Morecambe (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use for WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Planning and Needs Assessment identified the need to retain a full Library service in Morecambe. The complexity of the Morecambe Library building would require significant investment in order to provide an appropriate children's centre facility.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. This includes information on library issues or borrower registrations for the Library Service and data on services used within the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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



Pendle

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

Lancashire

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal for consultation with particular reference to Pendle. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres Equality Analysis for All Lancashire.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Pendle. The report contains a 'long' list of 22 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in Pendle.

The premises which were proposed to be retained in Pendle and the Services which it is proposed to operate from them are as follows:

- Barnoldswick Library, Fernlea Avenue, Barnoldswick – currently a Library Service location which is proposed to continue with a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (12-19+ years) also located there;
- Beacon Childrens Centre, Maurice Street, Nelson – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Burnley & Pendle Adult Disability Service (Marsden Centre), Rigby Street, Nelson – service delivery unchanged;
- Byron View Day Centre, Byron Road, Colne – service delivery unchanged;
- Childrens Social Care (Burnley Road Colne) Burnley Road, Colne – service delivery unchanged;
- Colne Childrens Centre, Walton Street, Colne – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre);
- Colne Library, Market Street, Colne – service delivery unchanged;
- Earby Community Centre, New Road, Earby, Barnoldswick – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (Young Peoples Service) and proposed to be a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (0-19+ years) location);
- Family Tree Childrens Centre, Tunstill Square, Brierfield – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and proposed to be a Library Service satellite and a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre)
- Gisburn Road Childrens Centre, Gisburn Road Primary School, Gisburn Road, Barnoldswick – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Nelson Library, Market Square, Nelson – service delivery unchanged;
- The Zone in Pendle, Leeds Road, Nelson – service delivery unchanged;
- Walton Lane Childrens Centre, Walton Lane Nursery School, Walton Lane, Nelson – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years).

The following premises are proposed to no longer be used to delivery County Council services:

- Barnoldswick Young Peoples Centre, Civic Hall, Station Road, Barnoldswick;
- Barrowford Library, Ann Street, Barrowford, Nelson;
- Brierfield Library, Colne Road, Brierfield, Nelson;
- Brierfield Young Peoples Centre, Colne Road, Brierfield, Nelson;
- Colne Young Peoples Centre, Byron Road, Colne;
- Earby Library, Cemetary Road, Earby, Barnoldswick;
- Pendleside Childrens Centre, Barrowford School, Rushton Street, Barrowford, Nelson;
- Trawden Library and Riverside Childrens Centre, Church Street, Trawden, Colne;
- Trawden Young Peoples Centre, Church Street, Trawden, Colne.

There are 22 premises listed, 13 are proposed to continue to deliver services and 9 are proposed no longer be used to deliver 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.

Yes it will impact on all communities in Pendle.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposal for consultation lists 22 premises in Pendle, 13 are proposed to continue to deliver services and 9 are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services. There is a potential impact in relation to:

Services which are targeted at specific groups:

- 4 Young Peoples Centres are included in the proposal for Pendle which will impact on young people aged 12-19+. Whilst some may have an alternative nearby location identified this will still mean disruption in terms of new staff and service users. Others such as Trawden may involve longer journeys to an alternative location.
- 2 children's centres are included in the proposals. Pendleside Childrens Centre in Barrowford and Riverside Childrens Centre in Trawden will no longer delivering services may mean that women with babies or young children will need to access alternative services which are not in Barrowford and Trawden.

Universal or general services:

- 4 libraries are proposed to no longer deliver services. In locations such as Brierfield this may mean using an alternative location but in area such as Trawden and Earby there will be no alternative in the village/town. This could disadvantage children and young people who are the highest proportion amongst library users, older people who are the highest adult proportion of library users and disabled people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave who may find travelling to another location more difficult.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery

and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position prior to specific public consultation on the property strategy and will be updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposal for consultation lists 22 premises in Pendle, 13 are proposed to continue to deliver services and 9 are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services. There is a potential impact in relation to:

Services which are targeted at specific groups:

- 4 Young Peoples Centres are included in the proposal for Pendle which will impact on young people aged 12-19+. Whilst some may have an alternative nearby location identified this will still mean disruption in terms of new staff and service users. Others such as Trawden may involve longer journeys to an alternative location.
- 2 children's centres are included in the proposals. Pendleside Childrens Centre in Barrowford and Riverside Childrens Centre will no longer

delivering services may mean that women with babies or young children will need to access alternative services which are not in Barrowford and Trawden.

Universal or general services:

- 4 libraries are proposed to no longer deliver services. In locations such as Brierfield this may mean using an alternative location but in area such as Trawden and Earby there will be no alternative in the village/town. This could disadvantage children and young people who are the highest proportion amongst library users, older people who are the highest adult proportion of library users and disabled people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave who may find travelling to another location more difficult.

Information on the protected characteristics for the population of Pendle is given below to provide some context and background for this Equality Analysis. The main information used has come from the 2011 Census but some use has also been made of the Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015, which reported that Pendle had a population of 90,111.

The 2011 Census reported a population of 89,452 for Pendle which indicates a rise in population of around 650 people over the last 5 years.

Age – 25% of Pendle residents were aged 0-19, slightly higher than the Lancashire County Council area percentage of 24%. 59% of residents were aged 20-64, again slightly higher than the LCC area percentage of 58%. 16% of Pendle residents were aged 65 and over, lower than the LCC area percentage of 18%.

Ethnicity – 20.1% (18,015 people) of Pendle residents were from BME backgrounds, comprising of 1.2% (946 people) of residents who were grouped as mixed/multiple ethnicities, 18.8% of residents (16,807 people) are described as Asian/Asian British, 0.1% of residents (126 people) were grouped as Black/Black British and 0.2% of residents (136 people) were described as "other). 79.8% of residents (71,437 people) were included in "All White" groups. Pendle has a far higher percentage of BME residents than the average for the LCC area which is 7.7%. The 2011 Census also reported that 26 Pendle residents were Gypsy/Irish Travellers, no percentages were available for this group and only a total is given for the LCC area (821 people).

Disability – the Census 2011 question closest to providing information on the prevalence of disability is that relating to whether a person felt their normal day to day activities were limited a lot or a little by a health condition or disability. In Pendle 10.4% of residents (9,280 people) reported that their activities were limited a lot, higher than the LCC area percentage of 9.8%. 10.5% of residents (9,428 people) said their activities were limited a little, which is again higher than the LCC

area percentage of 10.2%. It is noticeable that the numbers and percentages for each category are very similar in Pendle. 79.1% of residents (70,744 people) did not have their normal day to day activities limited by a health condition or disability which is lower than the LCC area percentage of 79.9%.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census recorded that 54% of Pendle residents were Christian, lower than the LCC area percentage of 69%. 22% of residents had no religion, slightly higher than the LCC area percentage of 19%. Approaching 20% of Pendle residents were Muslim which is the highest in the LCC area, whilst there are small numbers of Buddhist and Hindu communities.

Marriage and Civil Partnerships – 38.25% of Pendle residents (34,213 people) were married at the time of the 2011 Census which is similar to the LCC area percentage of 39%. 99 people were in a same sex civil partnership (0.11%) which is lower than the LCC area figure of 0.14%. This information is likely to have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative data was not available on at District level for the sexual orientation, transgender and pregnancy and maternity protected characteristics.

Car Ownership - given the nature of Property Strategy it is useful to also include information on car ownership in each District. 26.8% of households in Pendle do not own a car or van, which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 22.9%. 44.8% of households have 1 car or van, also higher than the LCC area percentage of 43.5%. Percentages for the categories households with more than two vehicles are all lower than for the LCC area, so fewer households have more than one vehicle available for use. This information is of use in protected characteristic terms in that older people, younger people and some disabled people – e.g. those with sight loss – are less likely to be able to drive.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile in December 2015 was 4.45% were aged between 16-24, 23.3% were aged 25-39, 66.6% were aged 40-64 and 4.4% were aged 65 and over. Information in the equalities area of the HR self-classification system is very incomplete in terms of sexual orientation and religion or belief and this area does not include information relating to employees' marriage or civil partnership status, whether they are transgender or pregnancy or maternity status.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be reflected when this Equality Analysis is updated.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Pendle District we have received one e-petition with one signature in support of saving Earby Library.

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been 3 briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. There have also been District by District briefings for County Councillors and meetings held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

The public consultation on the Property Strategy ran from 18 May to 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available through the "Have Your Say" area on the County Council's website and responses could be submitted on line. Printed versions of the consultation materials were available through LCC

service across the county and completed consultation responses could be returned to any of them. At various times during the consultation period social media and other communications were produced to encourage more people to take part in the consultation. 7,719 people have responded.

700 people had taken part in the Property Strategy consultation in relation to Pendle. Based on the Mid-Year Population Estimate of 90,111 this produced a response rate per 1,000 of 7.8. The equalities profile of respondents is at Appendix A to these Equality Analyses.

Respondents were asked which of the buildings proposed to continue delivering County Council services they had used in the last 3 years. The first table shows those premises proposed to continue delivering services and the second those proposed to no longer be used to deliver services.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Barnoldswick Library (108)	183	148
Beacon Children's Centre (109)	78	62
Burnley and Pendle Adult Disability Day Services (Marsden Centre) (110)	21	27
Byron View Day Centre (111)	22	21
Children's Social Care (Burnley Road Colne) (112)	40	32
Colne Children's Centre (113)	84	63
Colne Library (114)	188	138
Earby Community Centre (115)	201	175
Family Tree Children's Centre (116)	92	73
Gisburn Road Children's Centre (117)	77	67
Nelson Library (118)	246	141
The Zone in Pendle (119)	77	54
Walton Lane Children's Centre (120)	97	78

Property	Count used in last three years
Barnoldswick Young People's Centre (121)	73
Barrowford Library (122)	54
Brierfield Library (123)	196
Brierfield Young People's Centre (124)	58
Colne Young People's Centre (125)	42
Earby Library (126)	116
Pendleside Children's Centre (127)	22
Trawden Library and Riverside Children's Centre (128)	50
Trawden Young People's Centre (129)	23

Respondents who had used premises proposed to continue delivering services were asked which of the premises remaining they were likely to use in the future in Pendle. Most respondents would continue to use premises but 6 current users of Cone Library, 5 users of Nelson Library and between 4 and 1 users of the other premises said they would use none of those remaining.

Respondents who had used premises which are proposed to no longer deliver LCC services were also asked which, if any, of the remaining buildings they would use as an alternative. Most respondents have identified alternative premises 5 users of Barrowford Library and between 3-1 respondent for each of the other locations would use none of the remaining buildings in Pendle.

Pendle was the location for one of the children's centre property strategy focus groups. Attendees were concerned about safeguarding arrangements at the new neighbourhood centres and whether the premises could accommodate the various services proposed. There was a particular concern that parents in Trawden may become isolated particularly in winter if their Centre closed. Parents also spoke about the crucial support children's centres offered to new parents and how the service had moved vulnerable parents to a position of empowerment.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Both respondents in the Libraries, Museums and Cultural Services Consultations and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help consultations had expressed some concerns about different services being co-located in the same premises. Pendle is also an area proposed to have a satellite library at Family Tree Childrens Centre in Brierfield and there have been concerns from Library staff about how service users who are older or disabled will manage the self-service element and the impact having no library staff may have on their experience of visiting the library.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

A number of respondents (15%) took the opportunity to express their opinions outside of the framework of the structured questionnaire and these comments are summarised in the separate consultation report submitted with this Equality Analysis.

12% expressed concern that session/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme sessions, exercise class and health walks will be lost.

10% felt that closing the library would result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on their mental wellbeing

10% felt that closing the library would impact on community cohesion as it was seen as a vital community asset.

9% said that closing the library would remove their main/sole access to computers/the internet.

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 3 responses were:

17% felt that they were a vital asset to the community

11% felt that it is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure

8% said that some of the sites provide computer/internet access for those with it

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses and those with an equality reference were:

23% asked that this area be prioritised/don't close this property

10% made specific comments which are summarised in appendix 4 of the full consultation report that has been submitted with this Equality Analysis

8% said stop cutting useful social services (e.g. children's/youth centres)

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

The value of children's centres was mentioned by the Pendle focus group and the support given has helped empower vulnerable parents and helping overcome anxieties which they may have. This Service helps advance equality of opportunity.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Pendle is an area where a satellite library is proposed for Family Tree Childrens Centre and there have been concerns about how the self-service, unstaffed nature of the satellites might impact on older and disabled people in terms of using the equipment and missing the social interaction with library staff who they are familiar with.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support. There were concerns about the possible loss of services in Trawden and the impact this might particularly have in bad weather or winter.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

This proposal may also combine with the changes to Transport I to Day Services which are due to take effect from September 2016 and may affect those older and disabled people who use Older Peoples Day Services and Adult Disability Day Services.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours. It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

At present the proposal remain unchanged in relation to Pendle. There are currently 22 buildings and it is proposed to continue to use 13 and no longer use 9 locations.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.

- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we

have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Availability of mobile library services and for those eligible older and disabled people use of the Home Library Service;
- The digital offer of free loan of e-books and e-audio books which can be downloaded on to computers, e-readers, tablets and smartphones;
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service include outreach and detached services as part of their service offer;
- The delivery and design of Neighbourhood Centres will include meeting rooms, interview rooms and consulting rooms;
- The outcome of considerations of the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibilities of an independent community libraries offer.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal in relation to Pendle remains unchanged.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will be continued following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. For example the Library Service have library issues and registered borrowers information whilst Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service have data on usage of their services.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Preston

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal for consultation with particular reference to Preston. It supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Preston. The report contains a 'long' list of 23 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in the Preston area.

The premises proposed to continue to deliver services in Preston and the service delivery proposed for them are as follows:

- Ashton Young People's Centre, Tulketh Crescent, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Children's Social Care (Ripon Street), Ripon Street, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre), Ribbleton Lane, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Harris Library, Market Square, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Ingol Library, Ventnor Place, Ingol, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Lady Elsie Finney House Day Centre, Cottam Avenue, Ingol, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Lancashire Register Office and Records Office, Savoy Street, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Moor Nook Young People's Centre, Burholme Road, Ribbleton, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Preston Adult Disability Day Services (Ribblebank), Gerrard Street, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Preston Bus Station, Tithebarn Street, Preston – no LCC services on site at Preston but proposed to locate the Youth Offending Team for Preston.
- Preston West Children's Centre, Ashton Primary School, Ainsdale Drive, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years)
- Ribbleton Children's Centre, Ribbleton Hall Drive, Ribbleton, Preston – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Ribbleton Library, Ribbleton Hall Lane, Ribbleton, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Riverbank Children's Centre, Brieryfield Road, Preston – services currently delivered will remain except the Young People's Service location;
- Savick Library, Birkdale Drive, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Scientific Services Laboratory, Peddars Lane Road, Dock Estate, Ashton-on-Ribble, Preston – service delivery unchanged;
- Sharoe Green Library and Cherry Tree Children's Centre, Sharoe Green Lane, Fulwood, Preston – service provision broadly unchanged (0-11 years)

- Stoneygate Children's Centre, Stoneygate Nursery School, Lennox Street, Preston – service provision broadly unchanged (0-11 years) (designated children's centre);
- Sunshine Children's Centre, Brockholes Wood Primary School, Brant Road, Preston – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years) (designated children's centre);
- Sunshine Children's Centre (New Hall Lane Drop-in), New Hall Lane, Preston – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years).

The following premises are proposed to be no longer used to deliver County Council services:

- Fulwood Library, Garstang Road, Fulwood, Preston;
- Preston East Children's Centre, Brookfield Primary School, Watling Street Road, Ribbleton, Preston;
- St Lawrence Children's Centre, St Lawrence CE Primary School, Jepps Avenue, Barton, Preston.

It is proposed that 20 of the premises will continue to deliver County council services and 3 premises will no longer be used.

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 it will impact on all communities. It concerns 23 premises in Preston.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposals for Preston include 23 premises 3 of which are proposed to no longer deliver services and the impact on those with protected characteristics may be in terms of targeted services;

- 2 Children's Centres are proposed to no longer deliver services. Any change in location may disrupt those people who are pregnant or on maternity leave or who have young children who use the Centres. If alternative premises are close by they may be able to access those but there would be disruption of changing location, different staff and different service users so it may take longer to build up relationships.

Universal or general services:

- Fulwood Library is proposed no longer delivery services. As with libraries generally there is a higher proportion of children and young people who use libraries than the rest of the population. Library usage is also highest amongst older people and disabled people or those with young children often also feature quite highly amongst library users. Any change in location may present difficulties in travelling for those without a car if there is no direct bus route and disruption/anxiety caused by going to a new location with different staff and service users.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations

to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposals for Preston include 23 premises 3 of which are proposed to no longer deliver services and the impact on those with protected characteristics may be in terms of targeted services;

- 2 Children's Centres are proposed to no longer deliver services. Any change in location may disrupt those people who are pregnant or on maternity leave or who have young children who use the Centres. If alternative premises are close by they may be able to access those but there would be disruption of changing location, different staff and different service users so it may take longer to build up relationships.

Universal or general services:

- Fulwood Library is proposed no longer delivery services. As with libraries generally there is a higher proportion of children and young people who use libraries than the rest of the population. Library usage is also highest amongst older people and disabled people or those with young children often also feature quite highly amongst library users. Any change in location may present difficulties in travelling for those without a car if there is no direct bus route and disruption/anxiety caused by going to a new location with different staff and service users.

The profile of residents of Preston in terms of protected characteristics helps provide some background and context for this Equality Analysis. The Census 2011 and Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015 have been used as a source for this information. The Mid-Year Population Estimates for 2015 reported that Preston's population was 141,302.

The 2011 Census reported a population of 140,202 for Preston, indicating that the population has risen by 1,100 over the intervening four years.

Age – the 2011 Census reported that 25% of Preston's population were aged 0-19, this is slightly higher than the Lancashire County Council area percentage of 24%. 59% of Preston's population were aged 20-64, slightly higher than the LCC area average of 58%. 16% of Preston's population were aged 65 and over, this is slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 18%.

Ethnicity – at the 2011 Census 19.8% of Preston's population were identified as being from BME communities, comprising of: 2.4% of residents (3,326 people) grouped as being mixed/multiple ethnicities, 15.5% of residents (21,732 people) identified as Asian/Asian British, 1.2% of residents (1,626 people) being grouped as Black/Black British and 0.8% of Preston residents (1,053 people) described as "other" groups. The "All White groups" made up 80.2% of Preston's population (112,415 people). Preston's percentage of BME residents is significantly higher than the LCC area percentage of 7.7%. The 2011 Census also reported that Preston had 111 residents who were Gypsy or Irish Travellers, there is no comparator for the LCC area as only a total for the area of 821 residents is available.

Disability – the 2011 Census included a question on whether residents' activities were limited a little or a lot by a health condition or disability, which is the closest information available for this protected characteristic. 9% of Preston residents (12,605 people) said their activities were limited a lot, which is lower than the LCC area percentage of 9.8%. 9.2% of Preston residents (12,880 people) said their activities were limited a little which is also lower than the LCC area percentage of 10.2%. 81.8% of Preston's population (114,717 people) did not have their normal

day to day activities limited by a health condition or disability which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 79.9%.

Religion or Belief – 61% of Preston residents are Christian, slightly lower than the Lancashire area percentage of 69%, according to the 2011 Census. 18% of residents had no religion, similar to the LCC area percentage of 19%. There are significant numbers of Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist and Sikh residents in Preston.

Marriage and Civil Partnership status – at the 2011 Census 33.42% of Preston residents (46,865 people) were married, lower than the LCC area's 39%. 176 people were in a registered same sex civil partnership (0.126% of residents) which is lower than the LCC area percentage of 0.14%. This information is likely to have changed over the intervening years.

Authoritative information is not available for the pregnancy and maternity, transgender and sexual orientation protected characteristics at District level.

Car ownership – given the nature of the Property Strategy's proposals it may be helpful to include Census 2011 information on the levels of car and van ownership for households in Preston. 31.0% of households in Preston do not own a car or van, which is significantly higher than the 22.9% for the LCC area. The percentages of households with one or more cars or vans are all lower than those for the LCC area. As older people, younger people and those with some disabilities – e.g. sight loss – are more likely to be unable to drive this information can impact on those protected characteristics where premises people have used to access services are changed.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. In December 2016 the age profile of employees was 4.45% were aged 16-24, 23.3% were aged 25-39, 66.6% were aged 40-64 and 4.4% were aged 56 and over. The HR information's equalities suite includes information on sexual orientation and religion or belief but it is very incomplete, that area of the system does not include information on pregnancy or maternity leave, marriage or civil partnership status or transgender status.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses is reflected in this Equality Analysis.

A number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Preston District, we have received a petition containing 3739 signatures in support of Fulwood Library. In addition, we note the following E-petitions:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Deadline to sign by</u>
Save Fulwood Library from closure	182	01/09/2016
Save Ingol Library	47	finished
Save Preston East Children's Centre	722	finished

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older People's Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. District by District briefings have also been held for County Councillors and meetings have been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

The public consultation on the Property Strategy ran from 18 May to 14 August 2016. Consultation materials were available through the "Have Your Say" area on the County Council's website and on-line responses could be submitted. Printed versions of the consultation documents were available at County Council premises across the county and completed responses could be returned to any

of these. Throughout the consultation social media and other communications were issued to encourage participation in this consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

456 responses have been received in relation to the Property Strategy proposals for Preston. Based on the mid-year population estimate of 141,302 this gives a response rate per 1,000 of 3.2. The equalities profile for respondents is included in the Property Strategy EAT protected characteristics appendix.

For premises proposed to continue delivering services the number of respondents who had used a location within the last 3 years were

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Ashton Young People's Centre (130)	6	19
Children's Social Care (Ripon Street) (131)	48	32
Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre) (132)	48	30
Harris Library (133)	255	209
Ingol Library (134)	55	48
Lady Elsie Finney House Day Centre (135)	9	14
Lancashire Register Office and Records Office (136)	113	81
Moor Nook Young People's Centre (137)	36	31
Preston Adult Disability Day Services (Ribblebank) (138)	7	17
Preston Bus Station (139)	155	119
Preston West Children's Centre (140)	42	33
Ribbleton Children's Centre (141)	81	62
Ribbleton Library (142)	60	40
Riverbank Children's Centre (143)	53	35
Savick Library (144)	32	33
Scientific Services Laboratory (145)	85	94
Sharoe Green Library and Cherry Tree Children's Centre (146)	149	111
Stoneygate Children's Centre (147)	80	70
Sunshine Children's Centre (148)	63	43
Sunshine Children's Centre (New Hall Lane Drop-in) (149)	64	43

For those premises no longer proposed to deliver services respondents who had visited in the last 3 years were

Property	Count used in last three years
Fulwood Library (150)	203
Preston East Children's Centre (151)	125
St Lawrence Children's Centre (152)	14

Respondents who currently used premises which are proposed to continue delivering services were asked which remaining premises they might use in the future. Most respondents would use some of the remaining premises with

numbers from 0-2 in the "none of these" column but 5 people who had used the Scientific Services Laboratory said "none of these".

Respondents who had used a premises proposed to cease delivering LCC services were also asked which of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. 9 users of Fulwood Library said that they would not use any of the remaining premises as an alternative whilst 2 respondents from Preston East Children's centre and 1 from St Lawrence Children's Centre said they would not use any of the premises.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Both the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help staff consultations have been carried out. They have both included responses expressing reservations about the possible colocation of services. A number of Library staff also commented specifically on the proposal to no longer deliver services from Fulwood Library because of the number of borrowers and groups the Library has, its connection with service users and concerns that older and disabled users will be unable to reach other libraries due to the distance they may need to walk, etc.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

24% Concerned that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for mums, leading to negative impact

17% concerned about loss of events at the children's centre

15% concerned that loss of children's centre will limit support for families (general negative impact)

14% indicated that they would miss their library greatly if closed (devastated/depressed)

13% I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (e.g. drive, use public transport) causing inconvenience

13% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 responses were:

27% They are vital to the community/community asset

20% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services

19% concerned that there will be a lack of support, guidance and help for families if children's centres close

18% concerned that loss of children's centre will limit social opportunities and support for new mums, leading to negative impact

15% some people might not be able to get to new service locations because its inconvenient

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top 5 responses were:

31% wanted to prioritise their area/not close a specific property

14% said stop cutting useful social services (e.g. children's/youth centres)

12% consider the negative impact on communities

11% will disadvantage the most deprived/vulnerable groups in society (young, elderly, job seekers)

9% felt that the site they were considering was viewed as the heart of the community/community asset/hub.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Consultation from employees has, however, highlighted concerns around Fulwood Library and the distance/terrain users may have to walk to reach an alternative library. There are also concerns with all buildings proposed to no longer deliver services about the impact, disruption or anxiety going to a new location with new staff and service users may have on those who have built up a rapport at their current service delivery point, particularly for older and disabled people at libraries and for parents or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave with their children's centre.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age

groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

For those older or disabled people who use Older People's Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services this proposal may also combine with the implementation of new arrangements from September 2016 included in the Transport to Day Services decision.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
132. Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre)	Proposed for future use by children's social care.	Not proposed for future use and to re-locate the children's social care service at Sunshine Children's Centre.	Sunshine Children's Centre will provide accommodation for the children's social care service which is in better condition and within the same reach area.
148. Sunshine Children's Centre, Brockholes Wood Primary School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use to accommodate Children's Social Care and provide contact/access facilities for families.	The community access WPEH services at Sunshine Drop-in (New Hall Lane) and Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre) giving the opportunity to re-locate children's social care from St Luke's Centre to the site.
151. Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) and children's services.	The community access WPEH services in higher levels at Preston East Children's Centre than Sunshine Children's Centre and so retention of this site will better meet access and reach requirements for the service.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.

- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by implementing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- Using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- The availability of a mobile library service and, for those older or disabled people who are eligible, a Home Library Service is available;
- A free e-books and e-audiobooks loan services is available to download material on to e-readers, computers, tablets and smartphones;
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service include outreach and detached services as part of their service offer;
- Neighbourhood Centres will be designed to include where possible meeting rooms, interview rooms and consulting rooms and other facilities;
- The outcome of consideration of the Community Asset Transfer expressions of interest process and the considerations of the possibility of supporting independent community libraries offers.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
132. Children's Social Care (St Luke's Centre)	Proposed for future use by children's social care.	Not proposed for future use and to re-locate the children's social care service at Sunshine Children's Centre.	Sunshine Children's Centre will provide accommodation for the children's social care service which is in better condition and within the same reach area.
148. Sunshine Children's Centre, Brockholes Wood Primary School (designated children's centre)	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Proposed for future use to accommodate Children's Social Care and provide contact/access facilities for families.	The community access WPEH services at Sunshine Drop-in (New Hall Lane) and Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre) giving the opportunity to re-locate children's social care from St Luke's Centre to the site.
151. Preston East Children's Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) and children's services.	The community access WPEH services in higher levels at Preston East Children's Centre than Sunshine Children's Centre and so retention of this site will better meet access and reach requirements for the service.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will be continued following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. For example the Library Service collects information on issues in libraries and registered borrowers whilst the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service have arrangements for collecting equalities information about service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Ribble Valley

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with particular reference to Ribble Valley. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Ribble Valley. The report contains a 'long' list of 13 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in Ribble Valley.

The premises in Ribble Valley from which it is proposed to continue to deliver services and the services proposed to be delivered from them are as follows:

- Clitheroe Library, Church Street, Clitheroe – a Library Service will continue at this location and the Registration Service will also be located here;
- Longridge Library, Berry Lane, Longridge – a Library Service will continue at this location and a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) will also be located here;
- Mearley Fold Day Centre, Bright Street, Clitheroe – service delivery unchanged;
- Mellor Library, St Mary's Gardens, Mellor – service delivery unchanged;
- Ribblesdale Children's Centre, Ribblesdale Nursery School, Queens Road, Clitheroe – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- The Zone in Ribble Valley, Wesleyan Row, Parson Lane, Clitheroe – service delivery unchanged.

Premises from which the County Council does not propose to continue to deliver services from in Ribble Valley are as follows:

- Chatburn Library, Sawley Road, Chatburn, Clitheroe;
- Longridge Young People's Centre, Berry Lane, Longridge,
- Read Library, Whalley Road, Read;
- Ribble Valley Adult Disability Day Services (Pendleton Brook), George Street, Clitheroe;
- Slaidburn Young People's Centre, Slaidburn Village Hall, Slaidburn, Clitheroe;
- Whalley Library and Spring Wood Children's Centre, Abbey Road, Whalley;
- Willows Park Children's Centre, Longridge Civic Centre, Calder Avenue, Longridge.

Of the 13 premises it is proposed to continue to use 6 premises and no longer deliver services from 7 premises.

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 it will impact on all communities as it includes 13 premises in Ribble Valley.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposals for Ribble Valley include 13 premises with 6 proposed to continue to deliver services and 7 proposed to no longer deliver services, the details are set out above. The proposals include:

Targeted services:

- Adult Disability Day Services as it is proposed to no longer use Pendleton Brook due to low usage and building issues. The proposal is that service users will move to Enfield Day Centre. There is the possibility that service users who are disabled people may feel some anxiety about moving to a new location and being with some new staff and service users although the service will endeavour to minimise disruption;
- Whalley Childrens Centre – there may be difficulties for those who are pregnant or have very young children as the children's centre is not proposed to be in Whalley itself. In Longridge although provision remains in the town there may be some disruption using a new location;
- Young People – the proposal to no longer use Slaidburn Young People's Centre could disadvantage young people in Slaidburn as travelling to alternative youth service locations. In Longridge although provision remains in the town there may be some disruption from using a new location;

General and universal services:

- 3 libraries are included within Ribble Valley to no longer deliver services at Chatburn, Whalley and Read and the alternatives will involve travelling beyond the town/village. This could impact on children and young people using the library independently and this group is the highest proportion of library users. Those who are older, have disabilities or are using prams may also find it more difficult to travel to other locations.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following the public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposals for Ribble Valley include 13 premises with 6 proposed to continue to deliver services and 7 proposed to no longer deliver services, the details are set out above. The proposals include:

Targeted services:

- Adult Disability Day Services as it is proposed to no longer use Pendleton Brook due to low usage and building issues. The proposal is that service users will move to Enfield Day Centre. There is the possibility that service users who are disabled people may feel some anxiety about moving to a new location and being with some new staff and service users although the service will endeavour to minimise disruption;

- Whalley Childrens Centre – there may be difficulties for those who are pregnant or have very young children as the children's centre is not proposed to be in Whalley itself. In Longridge although provision remains in the town there may be some disruption using a new location;
- Young People – the proposal to no longer use Slaidburn Young People's Centre could disadvantage young people in Slaidburn as travelling to alternative youth service locations. In Longridge although provision remains in the town there may be some disruption from using a new location;

General and universal services:

- 3 libraries are included within Ribble Valley to no longer deliver services at Chatburn, Whalley and Read and the alternatives will involve travelling beyond the town/village. This could impact on children and young people using the library independently and this group is the highest proportion of library users. Those who are older, have disabilities or are using prams may also find it more difficult to travel to other locations.

Information from the 2011 Census and Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015 has been included to provide some background and context about the protected characteristics profile in the Ribble Valley. The mid-year population estimates for 2015 reported a resident population in Ribble Valley of 58,480.

The 2011 Census had reported a resident population in Ribble Valley of 57,132 which indicates a rise in population of over 1,300 people in the last four years.

Age – According to the 2011 Census, 23% of Ribble Valley residents are aged 0-19, which is slightly lower than the Lancashire County Council area percentage of 24%. 56% of Ribble Valley residents are aged 20-64 which is below the LCC area percentage of 58%. 20% of Ribble Valley residents are aged 65 and over which is higher than the percentage for the LCC area of 18%.

Ethnicity – 2.1% of Ribble Valley residents (1,228 people) were described as from BME groups in the 2011 Census, comprising of 0.7% (360 people) described as mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 1.3% (729 people) described as Asian/Asian British, 0.2% (92 people) described as Black/Black Britain and 0.1% (47 people) as "other ethnic groups". 97.8% of the Ribble Valley population (55,904 people) are identified as being in "All White Groups". The BME percentage in Ribble Valley is far lower for than the LCC area as a whole where it is 7.7%. The 2011 Census also recorded 6 people identifying as Gypsy/Irish Travellers in Ribble Valley, which was the lowest number of any of Lancashire's Districts. The LCC area had a total of 821 people identifying as Gypsy/Irish Travellers.

Disability – the 2011 Census included a question on whether respondents had a health condition or disability which limited their normal day to day activities a little or a lot. This is the closest information to assess the prevalence of the disability protected characteristic amongst Ribble Valley residents. 7.1% of Ribble Valley

residents (4,076 people) reported that their normal day to day activities were limited a lot, compared to 9.8% for LCC area residents so this was a considerably lower percentage. 9.6% of Ribble Valley residents (5,470 people) said their normal day to day activities were limited a little which is also lower than the LCC area percentage of 10.2%.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census reported that 78% of Ribble Valley residents were Christian, higher than the LCC area figure of 69%. 15% of residents had no religion (slightly below the LCC area percentage of 19%) and there are small numbers of Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh communities also.

Marriage or Civil Partnership status – the 2011 Census reported that 25,429 residents of Ribble Valley are married, 44.5% of the population which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 39%. 65 people, 0.113% of Ribble Valley residents are in a civil partnership which is lower than the LCC area figure of 0.14%. This information is likely to have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative data for the pregnancy and maternity, transgender and sexual orientation protected characteristics is not available at District level.

Car ownership – given the nature of the Property Strategy it seems useful to include information on car ownership within Ribble Valley in this analysis. Only 13% of Ribble Valley households reported in the 2011 Census that they did not have a car or van in their household, which is significantly below the 22.9% of households in the LCC area. 41.2% of households had one car or van within their household which is also lower than the 43.5% of LCC area households whilst higher percentages of households had two or more cars than the Lancashire area percentages. As some protected characteristics groups are more likely to have higher proportions of non-drivers such as older people, disabled people and young people and particularly given the rural nature of Ribble Valley this could increase the effect and impact of proposals.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. Age profile of employees at December 2015 was 4.45% aged 16-24, 23.3% of employees aged 25-39, 66.6% aged 40-64 and 4.4% aged 65 and over. Information in the equalities suite of the HR recording system for religion or belief and sexual orientation is very incomplete and this area does not include information on pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership or transgender status for employees.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be reflected in this Equality Analysis.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services. In terms of the Ribble Valley District we have received:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Signatures</u>
Whalley Library	149
Rishton Library	358
Longridge Young People's Centre	633

In addition, there have been two e-petitions which have now closed as follows:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>
Save Longridge Youth Club	18
Save Longridge Library	2194
Save Read Library	36

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided

some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery.

The Property Strategy public consultation took place between 18 May and 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available on line via the "Have Your Say" section of the County Council internet site and could be submitted via the website. Printed versions of the consultation were available at service premises across the county and completed responses could be returned to these locations. During the consultation a number of social media and other communications were produced to encourage participation in the consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

812 responses have been received in relation to proposals for Ribble Valley. Based on the mid-year population estimate of 58,480 this gives a response rate per 1,000 population of 13.9, the highest response rate for Districts.

Respondents were asked which of the premises they had used in the last 3 years. The table below shows those premises proposed to continue.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Clitheroe Library (153)	405	336
Longridge Library (154)	190	176
Mearley Fold Day Centre (155)	14	33
Mellor Library (156)	37	42
Ribblesdale Children's Centre (157)	94	69
The Zone in Ribble Valley (158)	63	59

The table below shows respondents for those proposed to no longer deliver LCC services.

Property	Count used in last three years
Chatburn Library (159)	56
Longridge Young People's Centre (160)	87
Read Library (161)	65
Ribble Valley Adult Disability Day Services (Pendleton Brook) (162)	23
Slaidburn Young People's Centre (163)	22
Whalley Library and Spring Wood Children's Centre (164)	469
Willows Park Children's Centre (165)	43

Respondents of premises proposed to continue delivering services were asked which of the remaining premises they were likely to use in the future. Most respondents included some premises but 10 users of Clitheroe Library said they would use none of the remaining buildings, 5 users of Longridge Library would also use none of the remaining buildings and 2 users of Ribblesdale Childrens Centre and 1 of the Zone in Ribble Valley said the same. No users of other buildings would not use any of the remaining buildings.

Respondents who used a buildings from which it is proposed to cease delivering LCC services were also asked which of the remaining LCC premises in the area they would use as an alternative. Most respondents identified alternative premises but 27 users of Whalley Library and Spring Wood Childrens Centre, 4 users of Longridge Library and between 1 and 2 users of the other buildings listed said they would not use any of the remaining premises.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Staff consultations have been completed for the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services. Both have raised concerns from staff about the effects of locating different services in the same building from a safeguarding perspective and in terms of different client groups feeling comfortable in using the buildings.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

26% Closing the Library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing

21% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's education , literacy, ability to access information and reading

15% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset

15% I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (e.g. drive, use public transport) causing inconvenience

14% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 responses were:

25% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure

23% They are vital to the community/community asset

21% New housing developments mean communities are growing and will increase demand for these services

15% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide peoples services

13% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, especially the elderly

13% I would no longer borrow books/read regularly

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses were:

35% wanted their area to be a priority/ didn't want a specific property to close

9% felt that the site in question was the heart of the community/community asset/hub

9% made a range of other singular comments that are summarised in appendix 4 of the full consultation report that accompanies the Equality Analysis

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Services such as Pendleton Brook Adult Disability Day Services which are proposed to no longer be delivered from the same building and are proposed to move to an existing service at Enfield Day Centre in Accrington/Hyndburn, may lead to disruption and anxiety for service users even with the support of the staff and service, about going to a new location and integrating with new service users and staff which may have an adverse effect for some. This may also be experienced by those going to new children's centres and youth services, the young people and pregnancy and maternity protected characteristics being most affected.

It is also possible that users whose libraries are proposed to no longer deliver a service such as Read, Whalley and Chatburn may find any change of location more difficult depending on the frequency of bus services or their availability. Some areas of the Ribble Valley have two-hourly services and there may be no evening subsidised bus services – e.g. route from Chatburn is daytime only. This

may impact on children and young people accessing the library independently and they are proportionately the highest users of library service users, older people who are the highest adult users of libraries and disabled people or those with prams who may find it harder to travel to other locations.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 (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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

Older people or disabled people who use Older Peoples Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services may also be affected by the implementation of arrangements arising from the Transport to Day Services decision which take effect from September 2016.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours. It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
154. Longridge Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ and Library service.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years and Library service.	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.
155. Mearley Fold Day Centre	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service and Disability Day Services Drop-In.	To maintain a presence for Adult Disability Day Services in the Ribble Valley where appropriate to service user care and travel plans. The main service provision is to be consolidated at Hyndburn Adult Disability Day Services (Enfield).
165. Willows Park Children's Centre, Longridge Civic Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.

Question 6 - Mitigation

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

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

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups – e.g. older people, young people, disabled people and those who are pregnant or on maternity leave - may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Availability of the mobile library service and for those older and disabled people who are eligible the Home Library Service;
- Free loan of e-books and e-audio books which can be downloaded onto computers, e-readers, tablets and smartphones;
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service include outreach and detached services as part of their service offer;
- The outcome of considerations of expressions of interest under the Community Asset Transfer policy and possibilities of an independent community libraries offer.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
154. Longridge Library	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-19+ and Library service.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 12-19+ years and Library service.	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.
155. Mearley Fold Day Centre	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future delivery by Older People's Daytime Support Service and Disability Day Services Drop-In.	To maintain a presence for Adult Disability Day Services in the Ribble Valley where appropriate to service user care and travel plans. The main service provision is to be consolidated at Hyndburn Adult Disability Day Services (Enfield).
165. Willows Park Children's Centre, Longridge Civic Centre (designated children's centre)	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Recognition that the refurbishment and condition costs will be less through retention of Willow's Park Children's Centre and so do not warrant the potential investment in providing the service at Longridge Library at this time. This will allow for consolidation of the WPEH 12-19+ years offer into the Library with further review at a later date.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements, e.g. the Library Service collect information on

library issues and registered borrowers whilst the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service collect information on service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Rossendale

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with particular reference to Rossendale. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Rossendale. The report contains a 'long' list of 16 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in Rossendale.

The premises in Rossendale from which it is proposed to continue to deliver services and the services proposed to be delivered from them are as follows:

- Bacup Olive House Parkside Day Centre, New Line, Bacup – service delivery unchanged;
- Children's Social Care (Newchurch Road, Rawtenstall), Newchurch Road, Rawtenstall – service delivery unchanged;
- Haslingden Community Link Children's Centre, Bury Road, Haslingden – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated childrens centre) and proposed to be a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated childrens centre);
- Haslingden Library, Higher Deardengate, Haslingden – currently a Library Service, Welfare Rights and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young Peoples Service) location. Proposed to remain a Library Service and Welfare Rights Service location and a Registration Service premises.
- Rawtenstall Library, Queens Square, Rawtenstall – service delivery unchanged;
- The Maden Centre, Rochdale Road, Bacup – currently a Welfare Rights, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated childrens centre) and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young Peoples Service) location. Proposed to become a Library Service – satellite, Welfare Rights Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated childrens centre);
- The Zone in Rossendale, The Old Fire Station, Burnley Road, Rawtenstall – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service) location and proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated childrens centre);
- Whitworth Children's Centre, Whitworth St Bartholomew's Primary School, Hall Fold, Whitworth – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated childrens centre) and proposed to be a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated childrens centre).

The premises from which it is proposed to no longer deliver County Council services from in Rossendale are as follows:

- Bacup Library, St James Square, Bacup;
- Balladen Children's Centre, Balladen Primary School, Linden Lea, Rawtenstall;
- Crawshawbooth Library and Community Centre, The Village Centre, Adelaide Street, Crawshawbooth;
- Rossendale Registration Office, Grange Street, Rawtenstall;
- Staghills Children's Centre, Staghills Nursery School, Top Barn Lane, Newchurch, Rawtenstall;
- Whitewell Bottom Community Centre, Burnley Road East, Whitewell Bottom – currently does not deliver any LCC services but is a community association;
- Whitworth Library, Lloyd Street, Whitworth;
- Whitworth Young People's Centre, Market Street, Whitworth.

It is proposed to continue to deliver services from 8 premises and to no longer use 8 premises in Rossendale to deliver 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.

Yes it will impact on all communities. 16 premises in Rossendale are included.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposal includes 16 premises in Rossendale of which 8 are proposed to no longer deliver County Council services. This may impact people with protected characteristics in the following ways:

Targeted Services:

- 2 children's centres are included amongst those buildings proposed to no longer deliver services – Balladen and Staghills Children's centres. Although there may be alternative premises in the area, there will be some disruption for service users who are pregnant or have young children in changing location and integrating with new staff and service users as well as potentially issues in travelling to a new location.
- Young People's Service – this could impact on 12-19+ young who use Whitworth Young Peoples Centre which is proposed to no longer deliver a service. There may be difficulties in travelling to alternative locations outside Whitworth or adjusting to a new style of service delivery.

General/Universal Services:

- Libraries are proposed to no longer deliver a service from premises in Crawshawbooth and Whitworth which will impact on children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users and older people who are the highest group of adult library users. As the alternative buildings will be outside the town/village it may be more difficult to access these independently and some of the current social interaction and connections may be lost. For those with disabilities and who have prams travelling to different towns/villages may also be more difficult.

- Registration Service – feedback from the Service has been that it is hoped that the new location will be in an improved service point and still reachable by service users.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff structure consultations), – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

Targeted Services:

- 2 childrens centres are included amongst those buildings proposed to no longer deliver services – Balladen and Staghills Children's centres. Although there may be alternative premises in the area, there will be some disruption for service users who are pregnant or have young childrens in changing location and integrating with new staff and service users as well as potentially issues in travelling to a new location.
- Young People's Service – this could impact on 12-19+ young who use Whitworth Young Peoples Centre which is proposed to no longer deliver a

service. There may be difficulties in travelling to alternative locations outside Whitworth or adjusting to a new style of service delivery.

General/Universal Services:

- Libraries are proposed to no longer deliver a service from premises in Crawshawbooth and Whitworth which will impact on children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users and older people who are the highest group of adult library users. As the alternative buildings will be outside the town/village it may be more difficult to access these independently and some of the current social interaction and connections may be lost. For those with disabilities and who have prams travelling to different towns/villages may also be more difficult.
- Registration Service – feedback from the Service has been that it is hoped that the new location will be in an improved service point and still reachable by service users.

Information from the mid-year population estimates 2015 and 2011 Census has been used to provide some background and context to the protected characteristics groups in Rossendale. The mid-year population estimates 2015 reported a population for Rossendale of 69,487 people.

The 2011 Census had reported a population of 67,982 which indicates a rise of around 1,500 people in the last four years.

Age – the 2011 Census reported that 24% of Rossendale residents were aged 0-19, which is the same percentage as the LCC area for this age group. 60% of Rossendale residents are aged 20-64 which is slightly above the LCC area percentage of 58%. 16% of Rossendale residents are aged 65 and over which is slightly below the LCC area percentage of 18%.

Ethnicity – the 2011 Census recorded that 6.2% of Rossendale residents (4,204 people) were from BME communities comprising of 0.9% (602 people) grouped as mixed/multiple ethnic groups, 5% (3,396 people) described as Asian/Asian British, 0.2% (123 people) as Black/Black British and 0.1% (83 people) as being in "other ethnic groups". 93.9% of Rossendale residents (63,778 people) were in "All White Groups". The Rossendale percentage of BME residents is slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 7.7%. The 2011 Census also reported that Rossendale had 47 residents who were Gypsy/Irish Travellers, no percentage was given for this group either for Lancashire or individual Districts but the total number of Gypsy/Irish Traveller residents in Lancashire was 821 people.

Disability – the 2011 Census question closest to this protected characteristic is that relating to whether a person's normal day to day activities were limited a lot or a little by a disability or health condition. In Rossendale 10% of residents (6,818 people) said their activities were limited a lot, which is slightly higher than the LCC

area percentage of 9.8%. 9.8% of Rossendale residents (6,692 people) said their activities were limited a little which is lower than the LCC area average of 10.2%. 80.1% of Rossendale residents (54,472 people) did not have their normal day to day activities limited at all by a disability or health condition, which is slightly above the LCC area percentage of 79.9%.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census recorded that 64% of Rossendale residents were Christian, a little below the LCC area percentage of 69%. 25% of residents had no religion, slightly above the LCC area figure of 19%. There is a small percentage of Muslims, Buddhists and Hindus in Rossendale.

Marriage or Civil Partnership Status – the 2011 Census reported that 25,539 residents of Rossendale were married, 37.5% which is slightly under the LCC area percentage of 39%. 111 Rossendale residents were in a registered same sex civil partnership, 0.63% of residents which is slightly higher than the LCC area percentage of 0.14%. This information will have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative information on the percentage for the pregnant or on maternity leave, sexual orientation and transgender protected characteristics is not available at District level.

Car ownership – given the nature of the Property Strategy proposals it is useful to include information from the 2011 Census about car ownership in Rossendale. 21.5% of households in Rossendale do not have a car or van in their household, this is lower than the LCC area percentage of 22.9% of households. 43.2% of Rossendale households have one car or van, which is slightly below the LCC area percentage of 43.5%. The percentages of households in Rossendale with two or more cars or vans per household are all higher than the LCC percentages for the corresponding group/category. As members of some protected characteristics groups such as young people, older people and those with some disabilities – e.g. sight loss – will be more heavily represented amongst non-drivers, this information may help consider the impact.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile for employees in December 2015 was 4.45% of employees were aged 16-24, 23.3% were aged 25-39, 66.6% of employees were aged 40-64 and 4.4% were aged 65 and over. The HR recording system's equalities suite does include information on religion or belief and sexual orientation but it is very incomplete and that area does not include information on whether employees are married or in a civil partnership, pregnant or on maternity leave or their transgender status.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be reflected in this Equality Analysis.

A number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of the Rossendale District we have received a petition containing 161 signatures in support of retaining Bacup Library. In addition, we have noted the following e-petitions:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Deadline to sign by</u>
Save Haslingden Library	131	Finished
Possible Closure of Whitworth Library	106	1/10/2016

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. District by District meetings were held for County

Councillors and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

The public consultation on the proposed Property Strategy ran from 18 May 2016 until 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available on the "Have Your Say" area of the County Council's website and responses could be submitted on line. Alternatively printed versions of the consultation documents were available at a wide range of LCC service premises across the county and completed responses could be returned to any of these locations. During the consultation period a number of social media and other communications were issued to encourage people to take part in this consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

700 responses have been received relating to the Rossendale area. Based on the mid-year population estimate 2015 of 69,487 people this provides a response rate per 1,000 of 10.1. The equalities profile of respondents is included in the Property Strategy District EAT Protected Characteristics data.

Respondents were asked which of the premises they currently used or had used in the last 3 years. The first table is for those using premises proposed to continue delivering services

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Bacup Olive House Parkside Day Centre (166)	64	107
Children's Social Care (Newchurch Road Rawtenstall) (167)	49	55
Haslingden Community Link Children's Centre (168)	114	80
Haslingden Library (169)	131	93
Rawtenstall Library (170)	367	249
The Maden Centre (171)	168	128
The Zone in Rossendale (172)	70	69
Whitworth Children's Centre (173)	40	37

Respondents for premises proposed to no longer deliver services are given below.

Property	Count used in last three years
Bacup Library (174)	394
Balladen Children's Centre (175)	67
Crawshawbooth Library and Community Centre (176)	224
Rossendale Registration Office (177)	91
Staghills Children's Centre (178)	81
Whitewell Bottom Community Centre (179)	105
Whitworth Library (180)	80
Whitworth Young People's Centre (181)	29

Respondents who have used premises which are proposed to continue were asked which of the service points proposed to remain in Rossendale they would use in the future. Most people identified some premises but 10 users of Rawtenstall Library, 6 users of Haslingden Library, 5 users of Haslingden Community Link Childrens Centre and the Maden Centre and between 3 and 2 users of other buildings would use none of those remaining.

Respondents who have used premises which are proposed to no longer deliver LCC services were also asked which of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. For Bacup Library 18 people said they would not use any of the alternative premises available, 12 users of Crawshawbooth Library and Community Centre would not use other premises, 7 users of Rossendal Registration Office and Whitewell Bottoms Community Centre would not use remaining premises and between 4 and 2 users of other premises.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Staff structure consultations have been completed for both the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services. Both included concerns about combining different services into the same buildings. Library respondents raised concerns about the concept of unstaffed, self-service satellite libraries – one of which is proposed for the Maden Centre – and about the moving of the Headspace young people's project from Haslingden Library to a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help service point in the town.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

24% Concerns that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks will be lost

23% closing the library will impact community cohesion because it's a vital community asset

17% closing the library will negatively impact on children's education , literacy, ability to access information and reading

16% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing

15% closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 responses were:

33% They are vital to the community/community asset

18% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated especially the elderly

17% It provides computer/internet access for those without it

16% it is vital to children's literacy, education , access to information, stimulation and pleasure

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses were:

39% wanted their site to be prioritised or not be closed

13% felt that the site they were concerned about was the heart of the community/community asset/hub

12% made other comments about the budget (e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs).

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

The Maden Centre in Bacup is proposed to include a library service satellite library which will be largely unstaffed and rely on self-service by library users. This has raised concerns generally about the impact such a delivery model may have on some older and disabled people who use the service.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

The proposal to no longer have services delivered from premises in Crawshawbooth and Whitworth may present difficulties for those service users who will need to travel to other towns/villages. This may impact on older people, disabled people, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave or young people and children.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced

by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and childrens centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/childrens centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

Those older or disabled people who use Older Peoples Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services may also be affected by the implementation of the decision relating to Transport to Day Services which will take effect from September 2016 and could combine with this proposal.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours. It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
169. Haslingden Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service, Registration Service and Welfare Rights.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Welfare Rights.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
170. Rawtenstall Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Registration Service.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
171. Maden Centre, Bacup	Proposed for future use by satellite Library, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights	Proposed for future use by, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights, full Library Service	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in the Bacup area. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
174. Bacup Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to establish a full Library service in the Maden Centre, Bacup.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in the Bacup area. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups – e.g. older people, children and young people, disabled people or those who are pregnant or on maternity leave - may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including:

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents;
- Availability of the Mobile Library Service and for those eligible older and disabled people the Home Library Service;
- Free loan of e-books and e-audio books which can be downloaded on to computers, e-readers, tablets and smartphones as part of the library service offer;
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service already have outreach and detached services as part of their service offer;
- The outcome of the expressions of interest considerations as part of the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibilities of considerations of an independent community libraries offer.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
169. Haslingden Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service, Registration Service and Welfare Rights.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Welfare Rights.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
170. Rawtenstall Library	Proposed for future use by Library Service.	Proposed for future use by Library Service and Registration Service.	A further review of the Registration Service has indicated that it is preferable to provide the service at Rawtenstall Library.
171. Maden Centre, Bacup	Proposed for future use by satellite Library, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights	Proposed for future use by, WPEH 0-19+ years (designated children's centre), Welfare Rights, full Library Service	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in the Bacup area. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.
174. Bacup Library	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use but to delay closure of the building whilst works are carried out to establish a full Library service in the Maden Centre, Bacup.	A review of the requirements set out in the Library Strategy identified the need to retain a full Library service in the Bacup area. There are on-going discussions with Rossendale Borough Council in terms of enhancements above and beyond the comprehensive Library service for Bacup and Whitworth.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. Library Service undertake reviews of issues numbers and borrower registrations and the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help

Service review information on the usage of their services by protected characteristics groups.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

South Ribble

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3
For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with particular reference to South Ribble. It supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire equality analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in South Ribble. The report contains a 'long' list of 16 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in South Ribble.

The premises which are proposed to continue to deliver services in South Ribble and the services proposed to be delivered from them are as follows:

- Kingsfold Library, Hawksbury Drive, Penwortham – service delivery unchanged;
- Leyland Day Centre, King Street, Leyland – service delivery unchanged;
- Leyland Library, Lancastergate, Leyland – currently location for the Library Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service). Proposed to continue to provide a Library Service and become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (0-19+ years) location;
- Longton Library, Liverpool Old Road, Longton – currently a Library Service location and proposed to continue as a Library Service location along with Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-11 years);
- South Ribble Adult Disability Day Services (Crossways), West Paddock, Leyland – service delivery unchanged;
- The Zone in South Ribble, West Paddock, Leyland – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service) location and proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre);
- Wade Hall Children's Centre, Royal Avenue, Leyland – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Walton-le-Dale Young People's Centre, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service) and proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+years) (designated children's centre).

The following premises are proposed to no longer be used to deliver County Council services in South Ribble:

- Bamber Bridge Children's Centre, Walton-le-Dale High School, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge;
- Bamber Bridge Library, Station Road, Bamber Bridge;
- Kingsfold Children's Centre, Kingsfold Primary School, Martinfield Road, Penwortham;

- Longton Children's Centre, Longton Primary School, School Lane, Longton;
- Lostock Hall Library and Children's Centre, Watkin Lane, Lostock Hall;
- Penwortham Library, Liverpool Road, Penwortham;
- Penwortham Young People's Centre, Old St Mary's Church Hall, Priory Lane, Penwortham;
- Wellfield Children's Centre, Wellfield High School, Yewlands Drive, Leyland.
-

It is proposed to continue to deliver services from 8 premises in South Ribble and to no longer deliver services from 8 premises.

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 it will impact on all communities. This will impact on 16 premises in South Ribble.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposal affects 16 premises in South Ribble. Impacts will be felt most in relation to the 8 premises which are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services in South Ribble.

Targeted Services:

- 5 children's centres are proposed to no longer deliver services. Although for some – e.g. Longton – the service may move to an alternative location close by this could still produce some anxiety for those who are pregnant or on maternity leave or for children moving to a different location. More significantly could be the impact on these groups who use, for example, Kingsfold or Bamber Bridge children's centres where alternative provision may be some distance away in a different town/village.
- Penwortham Young People's Centre is also proposed to no longer be used as a service delivery point. Young people aged 12-19+ could be disadvantaged as alternative provision is in Leyland and there would be no direct bus route available to access alternative provision there.

General or universal services:

- 3 library premises are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services in Penwortham, Lostock Hall and Bamber Bridge. This will impact children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and disabled people or those with prams who will need to travel to other towns/villages to access library services. They may be unlikely to access them as easily independently. The extent of this disadvantage may depend on the availability of public transport to alternative locations and its frequency.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help

inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following specific public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposal affects 16 premises in South Ribble. Impacts will be felt most in relation to the 8 premises which are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services in South Ribble.

Targeted Services:

- 5 children's centres are proposed to no longer deliver services. Although for some – e.g. Longton – the service may move to an alternative location close by this could still produce some anxiety for those who are pregnant or on maternity leave or for children moving to a different location. More significantly could be the impact on these groups who use, for example,

Kingsfold or Bamber Bridge children's centres where alternative provision may be some distance away in a different town/village.

- Penwortham Young People's Centre is also proposed to no longer be used as a service delivery point. Young people aged 12-19+ could be disadvantaged as alternative provision is in Leyland and there would be no direct bus route available to access alternative provision there.

General or universal services:

- 3 library premises are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services in Penwortham, Lostock Hall and Bamber Bridge. This will impact children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and disabled people or those with prams who will need to travel to other towns/villages to access library services. They may be unlikely to access them as easily independently. The extent of this disadvantage may depend on the availability of public transport to alternative locations and its frequency.

Information from the Mid-Year Population Estimates 2015 and 2011 Census has been used to provide some background and context for the protected characteristics profile of South Ribble. The mid-year population estimates 2015 report that South Ribble has a population of 109,651.

The 2011 Census reported a population for South Ribble of 109,057, so the population of South Ribble has risen by around 600 over the last 4 years.

Age – the 2011 Census reported that 23% of South Ribble residents are aged 0-19, which is slightly under the Lancashire area percentage of 24%. 59% of South Ribble residents are aged 20-64 which is slightly higher than the 58% of people in the LCC area for this age group. 18% of South Ribble residents are aged 65 and above which is the same as the LCC area percentage.

Ethnicity – the 2011 Census reported that 2.9% of South Ribble's population (3,210 people) were from BME communities comprising of 1.2% (1,174 people) of South Ribble residents were from mixed/multiple ethnicities; 1.5% of South Ribble residents (1,612 people) were Asian/Asian British; 0.2% of South Ribble residents (268 people) are Black/Black British and 0.1% of South Ribble residents (156 people) are from "other ethnic groups". 97.1% of South Ribble residents (105,847 people) are described as being from "All White groups". South Ribble has a lower BME population than the LCC area percentage of 7.7%. 17 residents of South Ribble were described as being from Gypsy/Irish Traveller backgrounds, no percentages are included for this group but 821 Gypsy/Irish Travellers were residents of the LCC area at the time of the 2011 Census.

Disability – information most closely associated with the disability protected characteristic is provided by the 2011 Census question asking if normal day to day activities are limited a lot or a little by any disability or health condition. In South Ribble 8.5% of residents (9,227 people) said their activities were limited a lot, which is significantly lower than the LCC area percentage of 9.8%. 9.5% of residents (10,409 people) said their activities were limited a little which is again lower than the percentage for the LCC area of 10.2%. 82% of South Ribble residents (89,421 people) do not have their activities limited by any disability or health condition which is higher than the 79.9% figure for the LCC area.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census reported that 76% residents are Christian, slightly more than the LCC area percentage of 69%. 17% identified as having no religion, slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 19%. There are small communities of the Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh faiths in South Ribble.

Marriage or Civil Partnership Status – the 2011 Census reported that 42% of South Ribble residents (45,821 people) are married, higher than the LCC area percentage of 39%. 136 people (0.124% of residents) are in a registered same sex civil partnership which is slightly lower than the LCC area figure of 0.14%. This information is likely to have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative information is not available at District level for the pregnancy and maternity, transgender or sexual orientation protected characteristics.

Car Ownership – given the nature of the Property Strategy proposal it is helpful to include information about car and van ownership from the 2011 Census for the South Ribble District. 15.6% of households do not have a car or van, which is significantly lower than the 22.9% for the LCC area. For all the categories for numbers of vehicles owned by households from one vehicle to four or more cars and vehicles in a household, South Ribble residents have a higher percentage of car/van ownership than for the LCC area. As people from the protected characteristics groups of older people, younger people and some with disabilities – e.g. sight loss – are likely to be more heavily represented amongst non-drivers the impact of the proposal may be increased for these groups.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. The age profile at December 2015 was 4.45% of employees aged 16-24, 23.3% of employees aged 25-39, 66.6% of employees are aged 40-64 and 4.4% of employees are aged 65 and over. The HR employee information system's equalities suite does include the facility for employees to record their sexual orientation and religion or belief but the data is very incomplete, individuals cannot

record their marriage or civil partnership status, transgender status or if they are pregnant or on maternity leave.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but have been reflected in this Equality Analysis.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. To date we have received a petition containing 2286 signatures in support of retaining Priory Lance Young Peoples Centre as well as the following Epetitions which are all closed now:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>
Save Bamber Bridge Library	12
Save Lostock Hall Library	48
Save Longton Library	200

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have been held for County Councillors on a District by District basis and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

A public consultation was held on the Property Strategy proposals between 18 May and 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available on the "Have Your Say" area of the County Council's website and responses could be submitted on line. Printed versions of the consultation documents were also available from a wide range of County Council service points across Lancashire and completed responses could be returned to any of these. Throughout the consultation period social media and other communications were issued to encourage people to take part in this consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

In South Ribble 636 consultation responses have been received and based on the mid-year population estimates 2015 of 109,651 this gives a response rate per 1,000 of 5.8. The equalities profile of respondents is included in the Property Strategy District EAT Protected Characteristics Data appendix.

The table below shows respondents who used buildings proposed to continue being used within the last 3 years and future use.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Kingsfold Library (182)	192	157
Leyland Day Centre (183)	6	18
Leyland Library (184)	129	93
Longton Library (185)	153	123
South Ribble Adult Disability Day Services (Crossways) (186)	10	14
The Zone in South Ribble (187)	28	32
Wade Hall Children's Centre (188)	35	34
Walton-le-Dale Young People's Centre (189)	46	37

The table below shows responses those who had used in the last 3 years premises which were proposed to no longer deliver services

Property	Count used in last three years
Bamber Bridge Children's Centre (190)	120
Bamber Bridge Library (191)	237

Kingsfold Children's Centre (192)	41
Longton Children's Centre (193)	36
Lostock Hall Library and Children's Centre (194)	258
Penwortham Library (195)	157
Penwortham Young People's Centre (196)	92
Wellfield Children's Centre (197)	27

Respondents who had used premises which were proposed to continue to deliver services were asked which of those premises remaining they would use in the future. Most would use some premises but 7 respondents for the Zone in South Ribble, Wade Hall Childrens Centre and Walton-le-Date Young People's Centre would not use any of the remaining premises, 5 users of Kingsfold Library, 4 users of Longton Library and between 3 and 0 users of other buildings.

Respondents who currently use premises which are proposed to cease delivering LCC services were also asked which of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. 45 respondents who use Lostock Hall Library and Childrens Centre said that they would not use any of the alternative premises listed, 34 users of Bamber Bridge Library, 18 respondents for Bamber Bridge Library, 16 respondents of Penwortham Library and 6 users of Penwotham Young People's Centre also said that they would not use any of the other premises listed. There were between 2 and 0 respondents for other premises who would use none of the remaining buildings.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

- 23% I will have to make alternative travel arrangements (eg drive, use public transport) causing inconvenience
- 22% Closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing
- 20% Closing the library will negatively impact on children's education , literacy, ability to access information and reading
- 15% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks will be lost
- 15% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 response were:

20% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information , stimulation and pleasure

18% It provides computer/internet access for those without it

17% They are vital to the community/community asset

15% I would no longer borrow books/read regularly

14% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially

14% Some people might not be able to get to new service locations because its inconvenient

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses were:

31% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property

13% Other budget comment (e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs)

9% Other comments that don't naturally fall into a category but are detailed in appendix 4 of the full consultation report submitted with this Equality Analysis

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Consultations on both the Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help consultations had included comments about the possible difficulties of combining different service in the same location including whether service users would feel comfortable and have the same interaction with staff and service users. Particular concerns were raised by some library staff respondents about proposals for Lostock Hall and Bamber Bridge libraries in terms of the distance users would need to travel for alternative provision and impact this could have on older people and children and young people.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Within South Ribble difficulties may be experienced by service users who are older people, disabled people or have prams in travelling to alternative libraries particularly where they do not drive given the nature of bus routes (whether they are direct routes or need a change of bus) and frequency of services between some locations, or similarly by users of children's and youth centres.. This was specifically raised in relation to Lostock Hall and Bamber Bridge libraries but can be viewed more widely

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a

particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

Those older people or disabled people who use Older Peoples Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services will also be affected by arrangements being implemented from September 2016 arising from the Transport to Day Services decision.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours. It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
197. Wellfield Children's Centre, Wellfield High School, Leyland	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use as a Neighbourhood Centre however proposed to be retained for use by Traded Services (Start Well).	The building provides a local facility for the delivery of schools training and development functions.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.

- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full

Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups – e.g. younger people, older people, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave or disabled people - may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Availability of a mobile library services and, for eligible older and disabled people, the availability of the Home Library Service;
- Availability of free loan from libraries of e-books and e-audio books which can be downloaded on to computers, e-readers, tablets or smartphones;
- The Wellbeing and Early Help Service include within their service offer outreach and detached services;
- The outcome of considerations on expressions of interest under the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibilities of an independent community library offer

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
197. Wellfield Children's Centre, Wellfield High School, Leyland	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use as a Neighbourhood Centre however proposed to be retained for use by Traded Services (Start Well).	The building provides a local facility for the delivery of schools training and development functions.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements, e.g. Libraries have arrangements in place to

review numbers of issues and registered borrowers whilst Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help collect information on users of their services.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

West Lancashire

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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 (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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with particular reference to West Lancashire. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in West Lancashire. The report contains a 'long' list of 19 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in West Lancashire.

The premises in West Lancashire proposed to continue to deliver County Council services and the services it is proposed to deliver from them are as follows:

- Frist Steps Children's Centre, Eavesdale, Skelmersdale – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Ormskirk Library, Burscough Street, Ormskirk – currently used as a Library Service location and will continue as a Library Service but is also proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre)
- Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre, Brookside, Aughton Street, Ormskirk – service delivery unchanged;
- Park Children's Centre, Barnes Road, Skelmersdale – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Skelmersdale Library, Southway, Skelmersdale – currently used as an Adult Social Care and Library Service location and proposed to continue delivering these service and to also become a Childrens Social Care location.
- Tarleton Library, Mark Square, Tarleton – service delivery unchanged;
- The Grove Young People's Centre and Children's Centre, Station Approach, Burscough – currently delivers Welfare Rights Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service). It is proposed to continue to deliver these Services and to provide a Library Service satellite at this location;
- The Zone in West Lancashire, Southway, Skelmersdale – service delivery unchanged;
- Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School, Mill Lane, Upholland – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- West Lancashire Adult Disability Day Services (Whiteledge), Spencers Lane, Skelmersdale – service delivery unchanged;
- West Lancashire Registration Office, Charter House, 52A Derby Road, Ormskirk – service delivery unchanged.

The premises in West Lancashire from which it is proposed to no longer deliver County Council services from are as follows:

- Burscough Library, Mill Lane, Burscough;
- Children's Social Care (Fairlie, Skelmersdale), Fairlie, Birch Green, Skelmersdale;
- Hesketh with Beconsall Children's Centre, Hesketh with Beconsall CE Primary School, Shore Road, Hesketh Bank;
- Moorgate Children's Centre, Moorgate Nursery School, Moorgate, Ormskirk;
- Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People), Derby Street, Ormskirk;
- Parbold Library, The Common, Parbold;
- St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale), St John's Catholic Primary School, Flamstead, Birch Green, Skelmersdale;
- Upholland Library, Hall Green, Upholland;

The proposal for West Lancashire contained 19 buildings from which it was proposed that 11 continue to deliver County council services and 8 would no longer deliver them.

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 it will impact on all communities, the proposal for West Lancashire lists 19 premises.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposals for West Lancashire relate to 19 premises with 8 proposed to no longer be used to deliver County Council services. This may impact on people with protected characteristics:

Targeted Services:

- 1 older people's day services premises in Ormskirk – Derby Street - is proposed if it is feasible, merge with Mere Brook Day Service. This may create some disruption and anxiety for service users at both Services in terms of changes of staff or service users, although the service will try to minimise this as far as possible.
- 4 premises which deliver children's centres or children's social care are included amongst those proposed to no longer deliver services. Depending on the location of alternative premises this may impact to differing degrees on parents, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and young children. For some locations an alternative service will be close by so the disruption may be in staff and service users they interact with, however, for those in locations such as Hesketh and Beconsall it may be some distance to an alternative Centre.

General or universal services:

- 3 libraries are proposed to no longer deliver services which will impact on a wide range of people but it may particularly disadvantage children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and those with prams (pregnancy and maternity) or disabled people where villages/towns such as Parbold or Upholland no longer have a library as travelling to alternative towns/villages may be more difficult.

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following specific public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposals for West Lancashire relate to 19 premises with 8 proposed to no longer be used to deliver County Council services. This may impact on people with protected characteristics:

Targeted Services:

- 1 older people's day services premises in Ormskirk – Derby Street - is proposed if it is feasible, merge with Mere Brook Day Service. This may create some disruption and anxiety for service users at both Services in terms of changes of staff or service users, although the service will try to minimise this as far as possible.

- 4 premises which deliver children's centres or children's social care are included amongst those proposed to no longer deliver services. Depending on the location of alternative premises this may impact to differing degrees on parents, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and young children. For some locations an alternative service will be close by so the disruption may be in staff and service users they interact with, however, for those in locations such as Hesketh and Beconsall it may be some distance to an alternative Centre.

General or universal services:

- 3 libraries are proposed to no longer deliver services which will impact on a wide range of people but it may particularly disadvantage children and young people who are proportionately the highest group of library users, older people who are the highest proportion of adult library users and those with prams (pregnancy and maternity) or disabled people where villages/towns such as Parbold or Upholland no longer have a library as travelling to alternative towns/villages may be more difficult.

The mid-year population estimates 2015 and 2011 Census information has been used to provide some background and context about the population profile of West Lancashire in relation to protected characteristics. The mid-year population estimates report a population of 112,742.

The 2011 Census reported a population of 110,685 for West Lancashire, which indicates that the population has risen by over 2,000 in the intervening four years.

Age – the 2011 Census reported that 24% of West Lancashire residents were aged 0-19, the same as the percentage for this age group in the LCC area. 57% of West Lancashire residents were aged 20-64 which is slightly below the LCC area percentage of 58%. 19% of West Lancashire residents were aged 65 and over which is slightly higher than the LCC area figure of 18%.

Ethnicity – the 2011 Census recorded that 1.9% of West Lancashire residents (2,082 people) were from BME communities comprising of 0.7% (866 people) described as mixed/multiple ethnicities, 0.8% (913 people) described as Asian/Asian British, 0.2% (174 people) described as Black/Black British and 0.1% (129 people) as from "other ethnic groups". 98.1% of the West Lancashire population (108,603 people) are categorised as in "All White groups". The BME population in West Lancashire is significantly lower than the 7.7% figure for the Lancashire County Council area. The 2011 Census also reported that 8 residents of West Lancashire were Gypsy/Irish Travellers, there is no percentage figure for this element but the Lancashire County Council area had a total of 821 people identified as Gypsy/Irish Travellers then.

Disability – the closest 2011 Census information relating to disability is obtained from the information on whether respondents normal day to day activities were limited a lot or a little by a disability or health condition. In West Lancashire 10.1% of residents (11,212 people) said their activities were limited a lot which is slightly higher than the LCC area percentage of 9.8%. 9.9% of West Lancashire residents (10,926 people) reported that their activities were limited a little which is slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 10.2%.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census reported that 76% they were Christian, higher than the LCC area percentage of 69%. 17% said they had no religion, slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 19%. There are smaller numbers of people of the Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim and Sikh faith in West Lancashire.

Marriage or Civil Partnership Status – the 2011 Census reported that 45,457 residents of West Lancashire, 41.06% of the population, were married which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 39%. 98 people were in a registered same sex civil partnership (0.088% of the population which is lower than the LCC area percentage of 0.14%). This information is likely to have changed in the intervening years.

Authoritative information is not available at District level for the protected characteristics of pregnancy or maternity, transgender status or sexual orientation.

Car Ownership – given the nature of these proposals it seems useful to include information on the levels of car ownership per household in West Lancashire as reported in the 2011 Census. 19.8% of households did not have a car or van in their household which is lower than the 22.9% figure for the LCC area. 41% of households had one car or van, which is lower than the 43.5% for the LCC area. For the categories covering households having two cars or above West Lancashire's percentages were higher than for the LCC area. It is likely that people from the protected characteristics groups of older and younger people and people with some disabilities – e.g. sight loss – will be more heavily represented amongst those who do not drive and may be more disadvantaged when services move from a town or village.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. In December 2015 the age profile of County council employees was 4.45% are aged between 16-24, 23.3% are aged 25-39, 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 and over. Although the HR recording system's equalities suite includes facilities for employees to record their sexual orientation and religion or belief this information is very incomplete, this area of the system does not

include recording information for employees' marriage or civil partnership status, transgender status or whether they are pregnant or on maternity leave.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but will be reflected in this Equality Analysis.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings. In terms of the West Lancashire District area we have received 3 Petitions as follows which have all now concluded:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>
Save Upholland Library	558
Tarleton Library	2218
Save Parbold Library	1210

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations on the Corporate Strategy. Whilst neither of these consultations specifically referenced issues included in the Property Strategy consultation, they provided

some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have also been held on a District by District basis for County Councillors and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

The public consultation on the Property Strategy took place between 18 May and 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available in the "Have Your Say" area on the County Council's website and responses could be submitted on line. Alternatively printed versions of the consultation documents were available at County Council service points throughout Lancashire and could be returned to any of these locations when completed. Throughout the consultation period social media and other communications were issued to encourage people to take part in the Property Strategy consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

497 responses have been received in relation to the proposals for West Lancashire. Based on the mid-year population estimate 2015 of 112, 742 this gives a response rate per 1,000 of 4.4. The Equality profile of respondents is included in the appendix at the end of this document.

Respondents were asked which of the premises which are proposed to continue delivering County Council services they had used within the last 3 years.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
First Steps Children's Centre (198)	32	33
Ormskirk Library (199)	146	111
Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre (200)	12	20
Park Children's Centre (201)	41	36
Skelmersdale Library (202)	142	115
Tarleton Library (203)	117	109
The Grove Young People's Centre and Children's Centre (204)	63	59
The Zone in West Lancashire (205)	22	32
Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School (206)	20	24
West Lancashire Adult Disability Day Services (Whiteledge) (207)	11	14
West Lancashire Registration Office (208)	58	50

The respondents for premises proposed to no longer deliver services, who had used them in the last 3 years were:

Property	Count used in last three years
Burscough Library (209)	110
Children's Social Care (Fairlie Skelmersdale) (210)	36
Hesketh with Becconsall Children's Centre (211)	11
Moorgate Children's Centre (212)	37
Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People) (213)	43
Parbold Library (214)	81
St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale) (215)	63
Upholland Library (216)	128

Respondents who had used premises proposed to continue were asked which remaining premises they were likely to use in the future. Although most respondents would use other premises, 10 users of Ormskirk Library, 9 users of Skelmersdale Library, 2 users of Tarleton Library and one user of First Steps Childrens centre would not use any other premises. Everyone for other premises would use a building in the future.

Respondents who have used a premises which is proposed to no longer deliver County Council services were also asked which of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. 10 users of Upholland Library, 8 users of Burscough Library, 7 users of St Johns Childrens Centre and 5 users of Parbold Library, 3 users of Derby Street Day Services and 2 users of Moorgate Children's Centre and Fairlie Skelmersdale said they would not use any of the remaining premises. Respondents for other premises identified other remaining premises that they would use.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

26% Concern that session/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks will be lost

22% closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing

16% closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset

14% closing the library will negatively impact on children's education, literacy, ability to access information and reading

14% I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastate/depressed)

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 responses were:

22% They are vital to the community/community asset

20% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks would stop leading to a negative impact

19% No alternative place for organised groups to meet in the area

18% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, elderly especially

15% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses were:

38% of respondents wanted their areas prioritised/don't close specific property

13% Made specific comments that could not easily be categorised and are included in Appendix 4 of the full consultation report submitted with this Equality Analysis

9% Stop cutting useful social services e.g. children's/youth centres

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. The Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service consultations have both taken place. Some respondents to these consultations have raised concerns about different services being located in the same building and whether this will work effectively for users with different needs – e.g. older people or those with disabilities in the same location as teenage/young people. West Lancashire is the location for a satellite library at The Grove, Burscough and there is concern about how particularly older and disabled people will respond to the predominantly unstaffed, self-service nature of the satellites.

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 developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

There are concerns about the possible distance service users may need to travel to access services particularly from places such as Parbold, Upholland or Hesketh and Beconsall which may mean reduced service use depending on the availability of buses, etc.

Where children's centres, youth centres or older people's day centres are combined there may be issues for varying lengths of time where service users feel disrupted or anxious about building relationships with different staff and service users. Employees will endeavour to ease this transition but concerns will remain for some people.

The Grove at Burscough is proposed to host one of the satellite libraries. Unfamiliarity with the nature of the satellite offer is likely to result in disruption for most users but this will ease for many. However particularly older and disabled people may find it harder to feel at ease with the self-service system and miss the social interaction with regular library staff.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also

highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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 (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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

The proposal may combine for those older people or disabled people who use Older Peoples or Adult Disability Day Services with the implementation from September 2016 of changes resulting from the Transport to Day Services decision.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
200. Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service.	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service subject to confirmation of arrangements with the premise owner.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
213. Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People)	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on

			a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.	
Building				
	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	Rationale	
206. Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School *	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Not proposed for future use – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain St John's Children's Centre, St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.	
215. St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale), St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) *	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.	

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy

communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.

- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;
- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups - e.g. older people, those who are pregnant or on maternity leave, young people and disabled people - may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation documents.
- Availability of the Mobile Library Service and for those older and disabled people who are eligible, the Home Library Service;
- Availability of free loan of eBooks and audiobooks from the Library Service which can be downloaded on to a computer, e-reader, tablet or smartphone,
- The Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service have arrangements for outreach and detached service provision as part of their service offer;
- Neighbourhood Centres will be designed where practicable to meet the needs of all service based there including meeting rooms, interview rooms and consulting rooms;
- Outcome of considerations of expressions of interest for Community Asset Transfer and possible consideration of independent community libraries offers.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

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

Building	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery)	Rationale
200. Ormskirk Mere Brook Day Centre	Proposed for future use by Older	Proposed for future use by Older People's Daytime Support Service subject to	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield

	People's Daytime Support Service.	confirmation of arrangements with the premise owner.	Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
213. Ormskirk Derby Street Day Centre (Older People)	Not proposed for future use.	Not proposed for future use.	This proposal will replicate the service model delivered at Vale View and Fosterfield Daytime Support Centres within Mere Brook Day Centre providing a range of support for older people on a single site and within appropriate settings in response to their identified needs and so reduces the potential for movement to alternate provision should their care needs increase.
Building			
	Consultation Proposal (Main service delivery)	Revised Proposal (Main service delivery) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	Rationale
206. Upholland Children's Centre, St Thomas the Martyr CE Primary School *	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre).	Not proposed for future use – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain St John's Children's Centre, St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.
215. St John's Children's Centre (Skelmersdale), St John's Catholic Primary School (designated children's centre) *	Not proposed for future use.	Proposed for future use by WPEH 0-11 years (designated children's centre) – SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONSULTATION	It is proposed to retain due to its current location best serving the access and reach requirements for the service.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

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

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continued following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. For example Library Services will review library issues and borrower registrations and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service have arrangements in place which collect data on service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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

Wyre

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood
Centres) v3

For Decision Making Items

August 2016

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

Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) proposal with particular reference to Wyre. This supports the Property Strategy/Neighbourhood Centres All Lancashire Equality Analysis.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

Consideration of a proposed list for consultation of future building use by the County Council in Wyre. The report contains a 'long' list of 22 premises from which it is proposed that premises/multi-functional Neighbourhood Centres could be selected and form the basis for future service delivery in Wyre.

The premises which the County Council propose to continue delivering services from in Wyre and the services which it is proposed to deliver from them is as follows:

- Children's Social Care (The Anchorage, Fleetwood) and West View Childrens Centre, Rothwell Drive, Fleetwood – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Fleetwood Children's Centre (Flakefleet satellite), Fleetwood Flakefleet Primary School, Northfleet Avenue, Fleetwood – service delivery broadly unchanged (0-11 years);
- Fleetwood Library and Registration Office, North Albert Street, Fleetwood – service delivery unchanged;
- Fylde and Wyre Adult Disability Day Services (Larkholme), Larkholme Avenue, Fleetwood – service delivery unchanged;
- Garstang Library, Windsor Road, Garstang – currently a Library Service and proposed to continue to be a Library Service and also a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre);
- Knott End Library, Lancaster Road, Knott End, Fleetwood - service delivery unchanged;
- Poulton Library, Blackpool Old Road, Poulton-le-Fylde – service delivery unchanged;
- Teal Close Day Centre, Teal Close, Off Mayfield Avenue, Thornton-Cleveleys – service delivery unchanged;
- The Zone in Wyre, Milton Street, Fleetwood – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help (Young People's Service) location and proposed to become a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre) and Youth Offending Team location;
- Thornton Children's Centre, Thornton Primary School, Heys Street, Burn Naze, Thornton-Cleveleys – currently a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (designated children's centre) and proposed to be a Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service (0-19+ years) (designated children's centre).

The following premises in Wyre are proposed to no longer deliver County Council services:

- Cleveleys Library and Children's Centre, Rossall Road, Thornton-Cleveleys;
- Fleetwood Children's Centre, Kemp Street, Fleetwood;
- Garstang Young People's Centre, Wyre Borough Council Offices, High Street, Garstang;
- Northfleet Library, Fleetwood Flakefleet Primary School, Northfleet Avenue, Fleetwood;
- Over Wyre Children's Centre (Hambleton satellite), Hambleton Primary Academy, Church Lane, Hambleton;
- Over Wyre Children's Centre (Preesall satellite), Preesall Fire Station, Sandy Lane, Preesall;
- Poulton-le-Fylde Children's Centre, Carleton Green Primary School, Arundel Drive, Carleton, Poulton-le-Fylde;
- Preesall Young People's Centre, Sandly Lane, Preesall;
- Rural Wyre Children's Centre, Garstang St Thomas CE Primary School, Kepple Lane, Garstang;
- Thornton Library, Victoria Road, Thornton-Cleveleys;
- Thornton Young People's Centre, Marsh Road, Thornton-Cleveleys;
- Thornton Youth Offending Team, Marsh Mill Village, Fleetwood Road North, Thornton-Cleveleys.

Of the 22 premises in Wyre it is proposed to continue to deliver services from 10 premises and to no longer use 12 premises.

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 it will impact on all communities. It concerns 22 premises in Wyre.

We will use evidence based premises information, including the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), population distribution and natural geographical communities alongside the draft Corporate Strategy to reflect the different levels and types of needs within our communities alongside responses to the Property Strategy consultation. The information received from Stage 1 consultations for the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and other service consultations will also help to inform this process.

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.

Any proposed reduction in the number of service delivery premises will impact on all residents and others who use county council services. People from all protected characteristics groups will be included within those affected.

The proposal listed 22 premises in Wyre, 10 of which would continue to be used to deliver County Council services and 12 would no longer be used. Of those proposed to no longer be used there may be implications for:

Targeted Services:

- 6 childrens centres are proposed to close which may impact most on those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and parents of young children. For some locations there may be an alternative location within the town/village this may create some disruption in terms of going to a new location and interacting with some different staff and service users which may create some anxiety. This may be increased for those who use services at, for example, Hambleton or Pressall where alternatives may be beyond their village or town and involved travel issues or increased distance.

- Young People – the location of the Youth Offending Team's office will change but a location at The Zone may be more convenient for service users. Garstand and Preesall Young Peoples Centres are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services which may negatively impact 12-19+ young people who may find it harder to travel to other locations.

General/universal services

- 3 libraries are included amongst premises proposed to no longer deliver services at Northfleet, Thornton and Cleveleys. This will impact on children and young people who are the highest proportion of library users, older people who make up the highest proportion of adult library users and those with disabilities or who are pregnant or have young children as travel to alternative libraries may involve changing buses to complete a journey adding to the inconvenience or reduced independence for some service users..

Services will be expected to have due regard to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty when decisions are being made on future service delivery and premises use. The outcome of the Property Strategy consultation will help inform these developments and assess any possible adverse impact on people from protected characteristics groups.

The outcome of this process will also potentially impact on employees of the County Council. Whilst arrangements are in place for specific staff consultations to be carried out separately, in line with service structure proposals (e.g. Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Service and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service staff structure consultations) – staff may potentially also be affected by the outcome of the Property Strategy proposals.

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

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

Question 1 – Background Evidence

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

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

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

It is proposed that the reduction in premises from 238 be based upon need across the County using the 2015 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, population density, detailed analysis of each premise and consultation to identify the candidates for inclusion in the new 'Neighbourhood Centres' portfolio and by exception, which premises would be recommended for disposal. This Equality Analysis reflects the position following the specific public consultation on the property strategy and has been updated to reflect the outcome of the consultation.

The proposal listed 22 premises in Wyre, 10 of which would continue to be used to deliver County Council services and 12 would no longer be used. Of those proposed to no longer be used there may be implications for:

Targeted Services:

- 6 childrens centres are proposed to close which may impact most on those who are pregnant or on maternity leave and parents of young children. For some locations there may be an alternative location within the town/village this may create some disruption in terms of going to a new location and interacting with some different staff and service users which may create some anxiety. This may be increased for those who use services at, for example, Hambleton or Pressall where alternatives may be beyond their village or town and involved travel issues or increased distance.
- Young People – the location of the Youth Offending Team's office will change but a location at The Zone may be more convenient for service users. Garstand and Preesall Young Peoples Centres are proposed to no longer be used to deliver services which may negatively impact 12-19+ young people who may find it harder to travel to other locations.

General/universal services

- 3 libraries are included amongst premises proposed to no longer deliver services at Northfleet, Thornton and Cleveleys. This will impact on children and young people who are the highest proportion of library users, older people who make up the highest proportion of adult library users and those with disabilities or who are pregnant or have young children as travel to alternative libraries may involve changing buses to complete a journey adding to the inconvenience or reduced independence for some service users..

Information on the profile of Wyre residents has been taken from the mid-year population estimates 2015 and 2011 Census in terms of protected characteristics to provide some background and context for this analysis. The mid-year population estimates 2015 report that Wyre has a resident population of 109,745 people.

The 2011 Census reported that Wyre had a population of 107,749 meaning that the population has risen by almost 2,000 people in the intervening 4 years.

Age – The 2011 Census reported that 21% of Wyre residents were aged 0-19, which is lower than the Lancashire County Council area percentage of 24%. 54% of Wyre residents were aged 20-64 which is significantly lower than the 58% of the LCC area population in this age group. 25% of Wyre residents are aged 65 and over which is considerably higher than the 18% in this age group for the LCC area.

Ethnicity – the 2011 Census reported that 1.8% of Wyre's population were from BME groups, comprising of 0.6% (664 people) who were of mixed/multiple ethnicities, 0.9% (993 people) who were Asian/Asian British, 0.1% (130 people) who were Black/Black British and 0.1% (110 people) who were from "other ethnic groups". Wyre has a much lower percentage of BME residents than the Lancashire County Council area's 7.7%. 98.3% of Wyre's residents (105,852

people) were described as being in "All White groups". Wyre also had 96 residents who were Gypsy/Irish Travellers recorded in the 2011 Census, no percentage are given but the total for the Lancashire County Council area is 821 people who identified as Gypsy/Irish Travellers.

Disability – the closest information from the 2011 Census in terms of numbers of disabled people comes from the question asking if people's normal day to day activities were limited a lot or a little by and disability or health condition. In Wyre 11.7% of residents (12,656 people) said their activities were limited a lot which is significantly higher than the LCC area percentage of 9.8%. 12% of Wyre residents (12,945 people) said their activities were limited a little, which is also significantly higher than the 10.2% figure for the LCC area. 76.2% of Wyre's population (82,148 people) did not have their normal day to day activities limited by a disability or health condition which is considerably lower than the 79.9% figure for the LCC area.

Religion or Belief – the 2011 Census recorded that 75% of Wyre residents were Christian, higher than the LCC area percentage of 69%. 17% of residents had no religion, slightly lower than the LCC area percentage of 19%. There are small numbers of people from the Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish and Muslim faith in Wyre.

Marriage or Civil Partnership status – in the 2011 Census 46,940 people were married, 43.56% of the population which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 39%. 256 people were in registered same sex civil partnerships, 0.237% of the Wyre population which is higher than the LCC area percentage of 0.14%.

Authoritative information is not available for the pregnancy and maternity, transgender or sexual orientation protected characteristics at District level.

Car Ownership – given the nature of this proposal it can be helpful to consider the levels of car ownership in Wyre. The 2011 Census reported that 20.1% of households in Wyre did not have a car or van, which is below the LCC area percentage of 22.9%. 44.6% of households had one car or van in their household which is slightly higher than the LCC area percentage of 43.5%. 26.4% of households had 2 cars or vans, the LCC area percentage is 26.3%. The percentages of households with three cars and four or more cars were both higher in Wyre than for the LCC area as a whole.

The final outcome of the Property Strategy proposals may also impact on employees of the County Council in various locations and services. The workforce includes employees from all protected characteristics groups which includes over 73% female employees, 3.34% who are from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds and 2.13% who consider themselves to have a disability or to be Deaf people. In December 2015 the age profile of employees was 4.45% are aged 16-24, 23.3% are aged 24-39, 66.6% are aged 40-64 and 4.4% are aged 65 and over. The Hr recording system's equalities suite allows employees to record

their sexual orientation and religion or belief but the information is incomplete, it does not include options to record whether an employee is pregnant or on maternity leave, is married or in a civil partnership or is transgender.

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

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

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

The proposed strategy for the rationalisation of public facing service delivery premises has developed alongside the draft Corporate Strategy and has been discussed with relevant heads of service with a view to ensuring that any final recommended list of premises to remain as Neighbourhood Centres would align operationally with various delivery plans, e.g., the Libraries Strategy and the Wellbeing, Prevention and Early Help Strategy which have both been the subject of public consultation during the early months of 2016. The results of these public consultations have been included within service specific equality analyses but are reflected in this Equality Analysis.

To date, a number and range of e-petitions and hard copy petitions have been received with regard to reductions in services generally or to concerns about the future of particular buildings/services. In terms of Wyre District we have a petition with 3265 signatures in respect of the Ferry, buses, library and Youth services in Knott End and Preesall. In addition, we have received the following e-petitions:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Respondents</u>
Save Fleetwood Library	175
Saving the Knott-End-on-Sea Library	16

A stakeholder consultation on service budget proposals took place between 10 December 2015 and 18 January 2016 which included circulating by email a letter outlining the County Council's budget position, a link to the individual budget proposals and link to an on-line questionnaire. This went to 334 stakeholders including County Councillors, District/Borough and Unitary Councils, the Older Peoples Forum, young people's engagement forums, the Lancashire Parent Carers Forum, Lancashire Carers Forum, Third Sector Lancashire and other contacts. These stakeholders had also been contacted as part of consultations

some context and background for the Property Strategy proposals for stakeholders.

There have also been briefing sessions for County Councillors and other engagement with them which has provided intelligence on the local context of buildings and service delivery. Briefings have been held for County Councillors on a District by District basis and meetings have also been held with District, Town and Parish Councils.

A public consultation on the proposed Property Strategy took place between 18 May and 14 August 2016. The consultation materials were available on the "Have Your Say" area of the County Council's website and responses could be submitted on line. Alternatively printed versions of the consultation documents were made available at a wide range of County Council service locations across Lancashire and completed responses could be returned to any of them. Throughout the consultation period social media and other communications were issued to encourage people to take part in the consultation. 7,719 responses have been received.

720 responses have been received in relation to the proposals for Wyre. Based on the mid-year population estimates 2015 of a population of 109,745 this gives a response rate per 1,000 of 6.6. The equalities profile of respondents is included in the Protected Characteristics of Respondents Appendix.

The table below shows the number of respondents who had used premises proposed to continue delivering services in the last 3 years.

Property	Count used in last three years	Count will likely use in the future
Children's Social Care (The Anchorage Fleetwood) and West View Children's Centre (217)	42	31
Fleetwood Children's Centre (Flakefleet satellite) (218)	40	34
Fleetwood Library and Registration Office (219)	257	203
Fylde And Wyre Adult Disability Day Services (Larkholme) (220)	13	23
Garstang Library (221)	154	135
Knott End Library (222)	104	91
Poulton Library (223)	254	201
Teal Close Day Centre (224)	9	12
The Zone in Wyre (225)	15	13
Thornton Children's Centre (226)	75	57

The table below shows respondents who had used premises proposed to no longer deliver services, within the last 3 years.

Property	Count used in last three years
Cleveleys Library and Children Centre (227)	243
Fleetwood Children's Centre (228)	47
Garstang Young People's Centre (229)	29
Northfleet Library (230)	53
Over Wyre Children's Centre (Hambleton satellite) (231)	24
Over Wyre Children's Centre (Preesall satellite) (232)	16
Poulton-le-Fylde Children's Centre (233)	49
Preesall Young People's Centre (234)	14
Rural Wyre Children's Centre (235)	28
Thornton Library (236)	301
Thornton Young People's Centre (237)	31
Thornton Youth Offending Team (238)	8

Respondents for premises which are proposed to continue to be used were also asked which remaining premises they would use in the future. Most would use some of the remaining premises but 12 users of Fleetwood Library and Registration Office, 10 users of Garstang Library and between 2 and 4 users of the other premises said they would use none of the remaining properties.

Respondents for those premises which are proposed to no longer deliver County Council services were also asked which, if any, of the remaining premises they would use as an alternative. Numbers of respondents who said they would not use any alternative premises in Wyre were 21 for Cleveleys Library, 17 for Thornton Library and between 5 and 2 for the remaining premises.

Respondents of premises proposed to no longer deliver services were also asked three questions. Firstly what impact would this have on them? The top 5 responses were as follows:

26% closing the library will result in a lack of access to reading material which would negatively impact on my mental wellbeing

24% Concern that sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks will be lost

18% I will miss my library greatly if it closed (devastating/depressed)

18% Closing the library will remove my main/sole access to computers/the internet

17% Closing the library will impact on community cohesion because it's a vital community asset

Respondents were also asked what their reasons were for wanting services to continue to be delivered from a building. The top 5 responses were:

27% Sessions/groups such as baby bounce and rhyme session, exercise class and health walks would stop leading to a negative impact

25% They are vital to the community/community asset

20% It is vital to children's literacy, education, access to information, stimulation and pleasure

20% It's a social hub. Without it people may become lonely/isolated, especially the elderly

19% Should be protected from budget savings/cuts because they provide people's services

Finally respondents were asked if there was anything else they felt should be considered or could be done differently. The top three responses were:

35% Prioritise this area/don't close specific property

12% Other budget comment – (e.g. save money elsewhere, reduce costs)

12% Heart of the community/community asset/hub

Wyre was also a location for one of the children's centres Property Strategy focus groups. Attendees were particularly concerned that if the service was no longer delivered from Fleetwood Children's Centre (Kemp Street) there could be a loss of the sensory room and that Fleetwood and Cleveleys Children's Centres were easily accessible by tram. There was also a fear that some communities/areas were losing all services – e.g. Cleveleys – and their were concerns about social isolation and losing support networks parents had built up at the Centres.

Separate consultations are being carried out with staff affected by service structure changes and these will be conducted using agreed consultation arrangements. Consultations for staff in Libraries, Museums, Cultural and Registration Services and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Services have already been carried out. Amongst responses have been concerns from staff in both Services about the

effects of co-locating services in the same premises and the impact this may have on service users.

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

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

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

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

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

understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

In developing the premise proposals the County Council assessed a lot of different information including reviewing key facts about each building used now e.g. how close its building is to the local population; where each building is compared to where our services are most in demand; public transport links; buildings costs, etc. alongside feedback received from the various consultation elements outlined above.

It is recognised that this proposal will still impact on people with protected characteristics in terms of location of the new Neighbourhood Centres in particular disabled, age (young and old), pregnancy & maternity e.g. who may have transport, travel and accessibility issues. The criteria used to form the basis of suggestions for the future of individual premises have therefore included features such as numbers of storeys within buildings, car parking facilities and distance from public transport amongst the assessment criteria.

Concerns have been expressed from consultation respondents and the Yre childrens centres Property Strategy focus groups, about communities which may be losing all their services – e.g. Cleveleys – and about the difficulties this could create for service users who may find reaching premises by tram at present very easy, but may find it less easy in future to reach a childrens centre if this requires changing buses to complete a journey especially with a pram or buggy. There have also been concerns about whether facilities such as the sensory room in Fleetwood Childrens Centre (of particular value to disabled children) will be available in future provision.

Concerns have been raised by a wide range of consultees about the impact the proposal may have in advancing of opportunity amongst protected characteristic groups with specific mention made on the impact on children and young people if their access to literacy, education, information, stimulation and pleasure is reduced by a service no longer being available close to them. The proportion of children and young people who use libraries in particular is higher than for other age groups in the library users profile whilst they form a major focus of the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service 0-19+ work. The Wyre focus group were concerned that their children may not be as "school ready" and may be more socially isolated as a result of reductions in childrens centres.

Similarly, the availability of computers and the internet featured heavily in consultation responses. It was stated that job seekers, older people, children and young people and disabled people made use of these facilities in libraries and that for many of these people alternative digital access is not available locally, information from our Living in Lancashire residents panel also indicates that

disabled and older people are also less likely to have the internet at home. The proposals for Wyre include the loss of two large library service points in Cleveleys and Thornton which are well used.

Participation in public life was also raised as a concern for a number of consultation respondents in terms of both libraries and children's centres as where a local building is proposed to no longer deliver services consultees felt that for those who are pregnant or have very young babies, older people and disabled people, travelling to an alternative location would be more difficult than for other groups. This might lead many to stop using the service or to visit less frequently leading to isolation, loss of peer and other support.

A number of consultation respondents in the various methods of consultation – stakeholders, focus groups, staff structure consultations and the public consultation – have highlighted the importance of libraries and WPEHS/children's centres as community hubs and for bringing people of different backgrounds together. The provision of space for activities or groups to meet was also highlighted as contributing to this and there are concerns that any reductions in premises will adversely affect this in affected areas.

The nature of the property strategy means that some locations may retain premises whilst others will no longer have services delivered from a location or the location may change. There is a risk that members of some communities will perceive that a different community has fared better than they have – this might be based on perceptions of one area having a greater proportion of residents from a particular ethnic group or be based on geographic/traditional area rivalries within a District. Either could increase tensions within communities and adversely affect community cohesion/fostering good relations.

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.

Proposals contained within the Property Strategy have been developed in light of recent County Council budget proposals concerning the withdrawal of subsidised bus services, so the criteria relating to distance from a bus stop has taken into account changes in bus services which took effect from 3 April 2016. These service changes resulted from recommendations of a Cabinet Working Group on Bus Services as a result of which 40 previously subsidised services would be run commercially, 28 services would be supported by the County Council and 2 others by a combination of the County Council and Chorley Borough Council. A £3 million budget has been allocated to support this. In some cases this has led to the merging of some bus services and changes in route which may affect the ease with which people can travel to current and alternative premises. Changes relating to bus subsidies arrangements has significantly reduced evening and Sunday/Bank Holiday bus services which may combine with proposals in the Property Strategy to more adversely affect some communities and protected characteristic groups – e.g. young people, older people and disabled people who are over-represented amongst bus users.

For those older or disabled people who use Older Peoples Day Services or Adult Disability Day Services, this proposal may combine with the implementation from September 2016 of arrangements arising from the Transport to Day Services decision.

The proposal should also be viewed alongside others about the future delivery, need and use of services such as the Library Service, Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service and consultations on the County Record Office opening hours.

It should be noted that issues relating to the future of the Museums Service are being addressed by separate proposals and consultations.

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.

Mitigating issues already identified which are of particular relevance in relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty are:

- Cultural identifiers – whilst the IMD measure in the proposed calculation would take travel horizons into account to some extent, the calculation would not allow for the fact that communities recognise and take ownership of places through cultural identifiers. This can provide a barrier to needy communities in the ownership and access of services, and where possible this will be taken into account in making recommendations.
- The county council's Access Budget may be able to address any accessibility issues.
- Services reducing the number of premises will make greater use of outreach and mobile services – e.g. the Mobile Library Service will operate on 68 routes with 792 stops and Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service also have mobile facilities as part of their young people's offer.
- Availability of the Home Library Service for the collection and delivery of library materials to Lancashire residents who are eligible as because of age, disability or ill health they are unable to visit their library;
- There is evidence of an increasing move away from visiting some premises. Libraries and Registration Services are seeing increasing use of on-line visitors with Libraries having 1,473,938 visits to the services' website in 2015/16.
- As part of the Libraries digital offer there is a free e-books and e-audio books service which allows users to borrow books for the same loan period as physical books which can be played or easily accessed via e-readers, computers, tablets, smartphones and other devices;
- Some Neighbourhood Centres will offer increased flexibility such as extended opening hours, meeting rooms and private rooms for interviews and consultations;
- Consideration is still being given to expressions of interest for individual premises under the Community Asset Transfer Policy;

- Consideration is also being given to the possibility of independent community libraries offers in some areas.

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 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 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 the savings decisions taken by the Full Council in 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 regarding the future pattern of council services.

We acknowledge that some protected characteristic groups – e.g. those who are pregnant or on maternity leave, young people, older people and disabled people - may be negatively affected by the finalised Property Strategy (Neighbourhood Centres) however we have tried to minimise any negative impacts by developing as many mitigating actions as possible including

- using the agreed methods of scoring and weighting which reflect protected characteristics considerations for premises identified in the consultation
- documents.

- Availability of the Mobile Library Service and, for those eligible older and disabled people the Home Library Service;
- Offering free loans of e.books and e.audiobooks as part of the libraries service which can be downloaded on to a computer, e.reader. tablet or smartphone;
- Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service include outreach and detached services as part of their service offer;
- Neighbourhood Centres are being designed to accommodate the needs of services to be based within them wherever practicable including having meeting rooms, interview rooms and consultation rooms;
- The outcome of consideration of the expressions of interest associated with the Community Asset Transfer Policy and possibilities of consideration of independent community libraries offers.

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.

Appropriate monitoring procedures will continue following the implementation of this proposal based on the relevant protected characteristics affected and individual service arrangements. For example the Library Service reviews information on library issues and borrower registrations whilst the Wellbeing Prevention and Early Help Service collects information on the protected characteristics of service users.

Equality Analysis Prepared By Emma Pearse

Position/Role: Property Asset Manager (Review)

And Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head: Mel Ormesher Head of Asset Management

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