



Norfolk County Council budget proposals 2017-2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

6 February 2017

For further information about this document please contact Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager, Tel: 01603 223816, email: jo.richardson@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Neil Howard on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (Textphone).

Contents

		Page
1.	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The legal context• Summary of main findings• The assessment process• Next steps	3
2.	Policy & Resources budget proposals 2017-2018	5
3.	Adults Social Care budget proposals 2017-2018	10
4.	Children's Services budget proposals 2017-2018	36
5.	Communities budget proposals 2017-2018	45
6.	Environment, Development and Transport budget proposals 2017-2018	52

Introduction

1. This report sets out the findings of equality and rural assessments of the Council's budget proposals for 2017-2018, with respect to:
 - Policy and Resources Committee
 - Adult Social Care Committee
 - Children's Services Committee
 - Communities Committee
 - Environment, Development and Transport Committee

The legal context

2. When setting the budget, the Council has a legal duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider the impact of proposals on people with 'protected characteristics'. It also looks at the impact on rural communities.
3. The Equality Act states that public bodies must pay due regard to the need to:
 - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act¹;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic² and people who do not share it³;
 - Foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it⁴.
4. The full Act is available [here](#).

Summary of main findings

5. Assessments of all relevant budget proposals for 2017-2018 were carried out on behalf of Policy and Resources Committee and all service committees (46 in total). This included an assessment of the proposal to increase Council Tax.
6. The majority of assessments did not indicate any potential detrimental impact, with the exception of two proposals. These related to Adult Social Care Committee:
 - Remodelling information, advice & advocacy services (ASC021)
 - Building resilient lives (ASC016/19)
7. This detrimental impact was identified because some older and disabled service users, including Blind and visually impaired people, Deaf and hearing impaired people, people with reduced mobility, people with mental health issues, people with learning difficulties and people with dementia, may no longer receive a service, or receive a service that differs significantly from the present time.
8. These two proposals may also have some impacts on people with other protected characteristics, which includes younger people (including care leavers, as users of some accommodation services), men (who are high users of some homelessness services) and Gypsies and travellers (as users of floating support services). People in rural areas may also be affected.

9. At the time of writing this report, the consultation and impact assessment process is still open for the proposal to make changes to disability related expenditure in adult social services. An initial equality and rural assessment, already published, suggests there may be detrimental impact on some disabled and older service users. The final assessment will be published when the consultation closes (9 February 2017) with any recommended mitigating actions to inform decisions on the budget at Full Council on 20 February 2017.
10. The assessment of the proposal to increase Council Tax found that on balance, the increase would primarily benefit vulnerable disabled and older people (and carers), as it would enable the Council to continue to protect essential social care services for the most vulnerable (this was well supported by the findings of public consultation).
11. Although no detrimental impact was identified for any of the other proposals, the assessment process did recommend that a number of actions be carried out, to monitor implementation and find opportunities to promote accessibility for older and disabled people. Mitigating actions are detailed in individual assessments as appropriate.
12. Broadly speaking, where no detrimental impact was identified, this was because the impact on service users was expected to be minimal, and no changes were proposed to service standards, eligibility thresholds or service quality. Clear reasons are provided in each assessment to show why, or why not, adverse impact has been identified, and the nature of this impact.

The assessment process

13. In carrying out an assessment, the Council reviews a wide range of evidence before drawing conclusions about likely impacts. For many proposals this involves reviewing, for example, data about people and services that might be affected, contextual information about local areas and populations and other data sources.
14. As such equality and rural assessments are directly informed by the findings of public consultation, and in particular feedback from people about the practical impacts that proposals might have. If the evidence indicates that the proposal may impact adversely on people with protected characteristics, mitigating actions are identified.
15. In addition, the early findings of assessments are reported to the Council's Strategic Equality Group, so that elected members can scrutinise the process, and highlight any specific issues that should be factored into the assessments.

Next steps

16. The aim of equality and rural assessments is to enable elected members to consider the potential impact of decisions on different individuals and communities prior to decisions being taken.
17. It is not always possible to adopt the course of action that will best promote the needs of people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas. However, assessments enable informed decisions to be made, that take into account every opportunity to minimise disadvantage.

Policy & Resources

Committee budget proposals

2017-2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning and Partnerships Manager, in consultation with Debbie Bartlett, Head of Business Intelligence and Performance Service & Corporate Planning & Partnerships, and Titus Adam, Financial Projects and Planning Manager.

Policy & Resources budget proposals 2017-2018

18. Policy and Resources Committee proposed seven budget savings for 2017-2018 which required an equality and rural assessment. These related to:
 - (1) Increase in Council Tax of 3% for Adult Social Care precept, and inflationary increase of 1.8% in 2017-18
 - (2) Opportunity to deliver parts of remaining Digital Norfolk Ambition (DNA project) more cost effectively (P&R072)
 - (3) Change IT equipment model – renew and upgrade server infrastructure (P&R073)
 - (4) Nplaw income growth –Alternative Business Structure (P&R074)
 - (5) Early payment rebate project (P&R075)
 - (6) Insurance Fund Contribution (P&R076)
 - (7) Implementation of Minimum Revenue Provision policy (P&R077)
19. The proposal to increase Council Tax was the only proposal deemed likely to have a significant impact on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. This is dealt with below.
20. Proposals 2 and 3 may have some lesser impacts on disabled people, relating to accessibility, and proposals 4 to 7 will not have any discernible impact. More details and mitigating actions are provided in Paragraph 36.

Council tax increase - summary of impact

Overview

21. The proposal to increase Council Tax by 3% for the Adult Social Care precept, and inflationary increase of 1.8% in 2017-18 will affect all residents eligible to pay Council Tax, including people with protected characteristics and people in rural areas.
22. At October 2016 there were 405,511 Council Tax 'chargeable dwellings' in Norfolk. Any County Council increase in Council Tax would be applied equally and proportionally to each household, meaning that higher-banded properties would pay a higher cash amount.

Concessions for people eligible for support, reductions or exemption

23. Whilst the impact of a Council Tax increase would affect almost all dwellings, concessions are in place that mean that many people who are older, live on their own or who have a disability are eligible for Council Tax support, reductions or exemption.
24. The table on the next page presents the proportion of people subject to some kind of reduction in each. Demographic factors mean that the proportion of people exempt in Norfolk's districts differs:

Table: The number of dwellings on the Council Tax valuation list, and percentages of Council Tax exemptions, by Norfolk district (October 2016)

	Total chargeable dwellings on valuation list	% Dwellings paying full Council Tax	% Dwellings subject to some kind of reduction in Council Tax
Breckland	58,523	68.41%	31.59%
Broadland	55,932	68.99%	31.01%
Great Yarmouth	47,019	58.16%	41.84%
Kings Lynn & West Norfolk	69,846	67.18%	32.82%
North Norfolk	53,142	58.22%	41.78%
Norwich	63,023	54.78%	45.22%
South Norfolk	58,026	66.99%	33.01%
Norfolk Total	405,511	63.43%	36.57%

25. In addition to these exemptions, district councils are responsible for local arrangements to provide help with Council Tax. These responsibilities cover what was known prior to 2013 as Council Tax Benefit, and mean that reductions are in place to support vulnerable working age and older people.
26. A range of factors may enable a household to qualify for discounts or exemptions. These include:
 - Someone's disability status, entitlement to certain benefits and presence of accessible features in their home;
 - If someone is a carer who, for at least 35 hours a week, is looking after someone in the same household (not including a spouse or child) who is entitled to certain benefits;
 - Households which consist only of students; and
 - Properties which are unoccupied for various reasons including residence in care provision.
27. These reliefs can help to alleviate Council Tax liabilities for certain households.
28. Whilst the local arrangements are at the discretion of each district, and so cannot be collated simply, the number of equivalent dwellings receiving this kind of support for working age people in Norfolk last year was 24,209, and for older people was 24,184.
29. District councils also have powers to reduce the amount of Council Tax payable for certain classes of dwelling including second homes, empty properties and properties undergoing major structural work, with legislation prescribing the level of discount the district council can offer. An increase in Council Tax may therefore have a reduced impact on properties within these categories, depending on the scheme adopted locally. These discounts are time limited except in the case of second homes.

Other issues to take into account

30. In considering an increase in Council Tax, it is pertinent to take other social factors into account, such as the impact of welfare reform. Although there is no major role for local authorities in much of the policy development and delivery of welfare reform, it will have a significant impact on Norfolk service users, residents and communities.

Some examples include the introduction of Universal Credit and the move from Disability Living Allowance (DLA) to Personal Independence Payment. Disabled people and their carers are particularly likely to be affected.

31. The impact will vary according to the circumstances of each individual, but there will be obvious implications for those who are already in receipt of benefits such as DLA or Employment and Support Allowance (the benefit which has replaced incapacity benefit) and who are at risk of losing their entitlement; and those who may need to move house.
32. Another issue to take into account is the potential impact on people in rural areas. Rural housing may be more expensive than urban properties, and may therefore tend to be in higher tax bands. However, people in rural areas would argue that being asset rich does not mean income rich, and in cash terms, rural areas may shoulder a larger percentage of the total Council Tax return.

Conclusions

33. It is likely that the financial impact of an increase in Council Tax would be reduced for vulnerable people and those on low incomes by existing Council Tax exemption mechanisms. It is important to note, however, that these provisions vary from district to district depending on the Council Tax support scheme provided, and will depend on people's individual circumstances.
34. Overall, the impact is likely to be greatest for households on a low, fixed income, but which are not eligible for Council Tax support. This may include disabled people who are in work, and this is important to note, given that disabled people are more likely to be low paid than their non-disabled counterparts, even when they share the same qualifications and other relevant characteristics⁵. The main reason cited for this is unconscious bias or unfair discrimination in recruitment and selection processes.
35. On balance, probably the greatest factor to take into account is that an increase in Council Tax will primarily benefit Norfolk's most vulnerable disabled and older people, and their carers. This is because it will enable the Council to continue to protect essential adult social care services for the most vulnerable in Norfolk. This is well supported by the findings of public consultation, and full details of the implications are set out in the report to Policy & Resources Committee on 6 February 2017 (Strategic and Financial Planning 2017-18 to 2019-20 and Revenue Budget 2017-18).

Potential impact of other Policy & Resources proposals

36. The proposals below will not have any detrimental impact on disabled and older people, people with other protected characteristics or in rural areas.
37. The reasons are provided here:

	Title of proposal	Description/impact
1.	Opportunity to deliver parts of remaining Digital Norfolk Ambition (DNA project) more cost effectively	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery. Proposals to use more technology and provide services

	Title of proposal	Description/impact
	(P&R072)	<p>online present both advantages and disadvantages for disabled users. It will be critical to ensure that technological solutions are accessible.</p> <p>There are continued opportunities for integrating accessibility into technology and ICT, and this is addressed in Action 2 below.</p>
2.	Change IT equipment model – renew and upgrade server infrastructure (P&R073)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.</p> <p>Proposals to use more technology and provide services online present both advantages and disadvantages for disabled users. It will be critical to ensure that technological solutions are accessible.</p> <p>There are continued opportunities for integrating accessibility into technology and ICT, and this is addressed in Action 2 below.</p>
3.	Nplaw income growth –Alternative Business Structure (P&R074)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.
4.	Early payment rebate project (P&R075)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.
5.	Insurance Fund Contribution (P&R076)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.
6.	Implementation of Minimum Revenue Provision policy (P&R077)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Timing
1.	Note the potential impact of an increase in Council Tax on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas	Policy & Resources Committee	Meeting 6 February 2017
2.	Continue to integrate accessibility across Digital Norfolk Ambition (DNA) and ICT infrastructure programmes, officers to report six monthly on progress to the Council's Strategic Equality Group.	Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager	From 1 April 2017

Adults Committee budget proposals 2017-2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2017

Lead officer – Jo Richardson, in consultation with Sera Hall (Head of Commissioning - Central), Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning), Jo Clapham (Commissioning Manager) and Maureen Begley (Commissioning Programme Manager Integrated MH, LD Team)

Adult Social Care Services budget proposals 2017-2018

1. Adult Social Care Committee has put forward six budget proposals for 2017-2018.
2. Evidence indicates that the four proposals below are unlikely to have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. More details about the proposals, and the reasons why no detrimental impact is anticipated, is provided on the following pages.
3. However two of the proposals, relating to Information, Advice and Advocacy Services, and Building Resilient Lives, are likely to have significant impacts, and these are dealt with separately on pages 11 and 20 respectively.

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	<p>Remodel contracts for support to mental health recovery (ASC020)</p> <p>2017/18 saving - £0.125m; full year saving £0.400m</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead we would still be spending in the region of £6.5m (gross) on contracts to support mental health service users</p>	<p>The proposal aims to deliver a more efficient and outcome focused service for mental health recovery, with no adverse impact for service users. Continued focus will be maintained on the performance and delivery of the supported living schemes combined with outreach. These services are key to ensuring that use of care home places are minimised.</p> <p>Historically Norfolk has had high numbers of people with mental health problems in permanent residential care compared with similar authorities and therefore the Council has recently focused on reducing the number of people in, and being admitted to, permanent residential care and sourcing quality alternatives. This has included finding ways to enhance the rehabilitative component of support to facilitate the care of people with more complex needs.</p> <p>As a result, numbers in long term residential care have reduced by 18% from 201 in March 2015 to 165 in March 2016 and the number of permanent admissions has fallen by 63% from 54 in 2014/15 to 21 in 2015/16 and is now more in line with those of other authorities.</p> <p>A number of key contracts, due to be re-let during 2017/18, offer an opportunity to continue reshaping the sector, to improve outcomes and efficiencies of operation.</p> <p>Whilst retaining a focus on supported living, an integrated community support service will also be developed. This will include current block contracts for supported living, the current block contract for housing related floating support, and spot contracts for personal assistant support. This will give a more flexible service and better coverage especially in rural areas. Revised specifications will focus on delivery models that facilitate recovery and move on into the community.</p> <p>We also currently provide community support through</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
		<p>domiciliary care, day care and personal assistants. A review will cover the functionality and outcomes of services provided and a fundamental shift in the way services are provided.</p> <p>The procurement approach that will be undertaken during 2017 is based on a competitive dialogue process. The aim is to encourage innovation to meet the challenges of improving outcomes around recovery, make greater use of community assets and provide services more efficiently and in a more integrated fashion.</p> <p>Combining personal assistant type support with supported living services and outreach support is forecast to deliver savings of £350k per annum by utilising block contracts, making use of economies of scale, greater flexibility and less transition between services. Most domiciliary support is commissioned through spot contracts. Increasing the use of existing block contracts will generate the remaining savings.</p> <p>The current annual spend on Supported Living (block contracts), Personal Assistants on spot contracts and floating support (which are the services covered by this project) is approximately £3.3m. A £350k savings target equates to a reduction of approx.10.6%. The remaining £50k savings will come from moving spot contracts for domiciliary care to existing block contracts which cost £870k per annum.</p>
2.	<p>Review of commissioning structure and opportunity to review staffing requirements (ASC022)</p> <p>2017/18 saving £0.155m</p> <p>If the proposal goes ahead we would still be spending in the region of £1.3m (gross) on this service</p>	<p>There is a Head of Locality Commissioning post vacant within the service. This post is a jointly funded post between the Council (76%) and Health (24%). In addition there are some vacancies within wider support teams. Although the current work levels remain, there is an opportunity to consider whether work could be aligned differently, particularly as there are now some changes within the health structure (e.g. a shared management structure between North and South CCGs) and a new aim to coordinate work programmes across Norfolk through both the Better Care Fund (BCF) and Sustainable Transformation Plans (STP), which could reduce the amount of separate schemes required.</p> <p>There would not be any redundancy implications.</p>
3.	<p>A consistent approach to specific laundry needs (ASC023)</p> <p>2017/18 saving</p>	<p>A residual linen service is still provided in three localities (East, Norwich and West), which includes provision of transport for laundry services. This service is commissioned from Norse, but is not provided consistently across the county and it is proposed to cease the service and through support planning ensure that the service is</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
	<p>£0.055m</p> <p>Note that both this proposal and ASC024 below would be taken from the overall 'purchase of care' budget which is made up of all activities/services we purchase from suppliers to help people with their care needs. If these proposals went ahead we would still be spending in the region of £240m (gross) on this overall budget.</p>	<p>provided within personal budgets through alternative means, where there are eligible unmet needs.</p> <p>Actions would require notification to the laundry provider and identification of alternative provision for all service users from within existing budgets. This work is already progressing in one of the localities.</p> <p>The reduction in the contract would not lead to any redundancy implications.</p>
4.	<p>Home care commissioning – deliver an improved framework for procuring home care services in Norfolk (ASC024)</p> <p>2017/18 saving £0.183m; full year saving £0.732m</p> <p>Note that both this proposal and ASC023 above would be taken from the overall 'purchase of care' budget which is made up of all activities/services we purchase from suppliers to help people with their care needs. If these proposals went ahead we would still be spending in the region of £240m</p>	<p>The aim of this proposal is to achieve more effective operation of the market, increase the availability of care to support people at home and improve quality of care. However, there is a need to recognise the wider issues facing the home care market and initiatives such as workforce development programmes will need to encourage workers into and to remain in the sector.</p> <p>The Council's existing homecare strategy advocates that using block strategies gains the authority a better unit price due to efficiencies of scale and business continuity. Currently between 50% and 60% of the Council's homecare business is purchased through spot contract arrangements and there is an opportunity to reduce this with an improved framework for purchasing homecare services in Norfolk.</p> <p>There is also an opportunity to work towards addressing wider issues affecting the homecare market, and whilst there are long range savings that could be expected through addressing these issues and adopting different approaches – such as a more reabling approach to home care, which could reduce care needs in the long term – there is an opportunity for more immediate benefits from a new procurement framework.</p> <p>Work with providers would be needed to review the current provision and support specification, with a full reprocurement of central services by May 2017 and new services in place by January 2018.</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
	(gross) on this overall budget.	

Who is affected?

38. These proposals will affect disabled and older people, as well as disabled and older people with other protected characteristics, and people in rural areas. Staff will also be affected:

People of all ages (particularly older people)	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Potential impact

39. These Adults budget proposals for 2017/18 will impact primarily on disabled and older people – which is inevitable, because disabled and older people constitute the majority of adult social care users.
40. However, these four proposals are unlikely to have any detrimental impact on disabled and older people, people with other protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reasons are provided here:

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
1.	Remodel contracts for support to mental health recovery (ASC020)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposal goes ahead, mental health recovery services will continue to provide support to those who need it, and no changes are proposed to service standards, the assessment process or eligibility of needs. • The proposal may lead to some changes in how or where mental health services are delivered, or who

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
		<p>delivers them, but these are not anticipated to have any significant impact on service users – e.g. service users, including service users in rural areas, will not be expected to make longer or more costly journeys to access services, and will not experience any changes in the quality of the service they currently receive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work will take place to draft the service specification from existing specifications (which have been developed with providers and service users), which will include service users with mental health issues. • The commissioning process will involve a competitive dialogue with prospective providers to explore how the proposed service will be delivered. Equality and rural considerations will be integrated into this phase so that any potential issues can be mitigated before the final invitation to tender (ITT) is issued. The equality and rural assessment will be revised during this process. • In the unlikely event that the revised assessment identifies any detrimental impact, it will be brought back to decision-makers for consideration before the final ITT is issued. • The proposal is underpinned by a principle of promoting independence, which disabled people routinely report in consultation is a priority.
2.	Review of commissioning structure and opportunity to review staffing requirements (ASC022)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No redundancies are proposed • Employees' existing working patterns (e.g. locations and basic terms of contract) will not change.
3.	A consistent approach to specific laundry needs (ASC023)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to the assessment process or to eligibility of needs. • The proposal may lead to some changes in how service users' needs are met, but it is not anticipated that this will have any significant impact on service users – e.g. it will not lead to new or increased costs for service users out of their current income. • The proposal will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for people in rural areas.
4.	Home care commissioning – deliver an improved	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with</p>

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
	framework for procuring home care services in Norfolk (ASC024)	<p>protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the proposal will impact on disabled and older service users, people will continue to receive support relative to their needs. No changes are proposed to service standards, the assessment process or eligibility of needs. • The proposal may lead to some changes in how home care commissioning services are delivered, or who delivers them, but these are not anticipated to have any significant impact on service users – e.g. service users, including service users from rural area, will not experience any changes in the quality of the service they currently receive or be disadvantaged in any way. • Work will take place to draft the service specification with input from providers and service users, with input from disabled service users/service users from rural areas. • The commissioning process will involve a competitive dialogue with prospective providers to explore how the proposed service will be delivered. Equality and rural considerations will be integrated into this phase so that any potential issues can be mitigated before the final invitation to tender (ITT) is issued. The equality and rural assessment will be revised during this process. • In the unlikely event that the revised assessment identifies any detrimental impact, it will be brought back to decision-makers for consideration before the final ITT is issued. • The proposal is underpinned by a principle of promoting independence, which disabled people routinely report in consultation is a priority.

Recommended actions

Home care commissioning – deliver an improved framework for procuring home care services in Norfolk (ASC024)

	Action	Lead	Timing
1.	Work with service users (including service users in rural areas) to develop a home care commissioning specification that addresses the issues highlighted in this equality and rural assessment		From January 2017
2.	Ongoing review of proposals put forward by providers in the competitive dialogue process to ensure equality and rural considerations are addressed and the equality/rural assessment is updated accordingly and any mitigating actions	Sera Hall, Head of Commissioning - Central	From 1 April 2017

	Action	Lead	Timing
	identified and adopted		
3.	In the unlikely event that the revised assessment identifies any detrimental impact, it will be brought back to decision-makers for consideration before the final ITT is issued.	Sera Hall, Head of Commissioning - Central	From 1 April 2017
4.	Ensure equality and rural access considerations are incorporated in the final documentation issued for the tender process	Sera Hall, Head of Commissioning - Central	From 1 April 2017

Remodel contracts for support to mental health recovery (ASC020)

	Action	Lead	Timing
1.	Work with service users (including service users in rural areas) to develop a new mental health recovery service specification that addresses the issues highlighted in this equality and rural assessment	Maureen Begley (Commissioning Programme Manager Integrated MH, LD Team)	January 2017
2.	Ongoing review of mental health recovery proposals put forward by providers in the competitive dialogue process to ensure equality and rural considerations are addressed and the equality/rural assessment is updated accordingly and any mitigating actions identified and adopted	Maureen Begley (Commissioning Programme Manager Integrated MH, LD Team)	From 1 April – August 2017
3.	In the unlikely event that the revised assessment identifies any detrimental impact, it will be brought back to decision-makers for consideration before the final ITT is issued.	Maureen Begley (Commissioning Programme Manager Integrated MH, LD Team)	From 1 April 2017
4.	Ensure equality and rural access considerations are incorporated in the final documentation issued for the tender process	Maureen Begley (Commissioning Programme Manager Integrated MH, LD Team)	July to August 2017

Title of proposal:	Remodelling information, advice & advocacy services
Reference:	ASC021
Lead Officer:	Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning), in consultation with Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager

The proposal

1. Recent work to review Promoting Independence has highlighted the need to provide the right information and advice to signpost people to community and wider support as early as possible, to help reduce or delay the need for people to require formal care assessment.
2. The aim of this proposal is to improve access to information, advice and advocacy services and simplify routes into services. Currently, information, advice and advocacy services in Norfolk are client specific with many access points. There are opportunities to merge some functions, and to build on the current partnership models to make it easier for people to access information and advice.
3. Norfolk County Council currently spends around £1.7m (gross including NHS funding) on information, advice and advocacy services, through a range of mainly voluntary sector providers. Some of the contracts will end during 2017/18, so the timing is right to take this proposal forward.
4. The target is reduce the net spend on these services by £0.250m, however due to the timing of the contracts it is envisaged that £0.063m of the saving can be realised in 2017/18 and a further £0.188m in 2018/19.
5. If the proposal goes ahead we would still be spending in the region of £1.45m (gross) on these services.

Information about the current areas of provision

6. In total, there are **four** different areas of provision in scope:
 - (a) **Specialist Information and Advice for people with disabilities, long term conditions and support needs.**
7. These specialist services work in partnership to offer targeted information and advice, share resources and make sure that disabled and older people receive information and advice from the organisation best placed to meet their needs.
8. One of the main aims of this approach was to utilise providers' expertise and knowledge in relation to particular disabilities.
9. The organisations in this partnership all provide information and advice in the following areas:
 - Debt including fuel and water

- Welfare rights including complex benefits advice and support to challenge decisions
- Social care including payment for care and support
- Support to access a wide range of help
- Health issues
- Legal issues including protection from abuse
- Support for carers
- Advocacy in respect of benefits and entitlements

10. The partnership comprises the following specialist services:

- Partnership lead – Age UK Norfolk
- Information and advice for older people (includes Money Matters practical support for older people) – Age UK Norfolk and Age UK Norwich
- Advice and support for people with dementia – The Alzheimer’s Society
- Information and advice for people with disabilities (includes complex welfare rights and Money Matters support for younger disabled people) – Equal Lives
- Information and advice for people with learning difficulties – Opening Doors
- Information and advice for people with mental health problems – Equal Lives
- Information and advice for people who are Deaf – Deaf Connexions and West Norfolk Deaf Advocacy

11. Each of these services also provides specialist information and advice which is tailored to the target needs that it is meeting, including overcoming communication barriers linked to particular disabilities. Opening Doors for example is expert in communicating with and supporting people with learning difficulties. Deaf Connexions engages British Sign Language Translators to effectively provide information and advice for Deaf people who often have other disabilities.

(b) Information, Advice and Support Service for People with Personal Budgets

12. This service enables people to manage personal budgets and direct payments. The priorities include:

- Enabling people to make informed choices
- Advice and information to help the development of support plans
- Developing options for support in the areas of employment and payroll of personal carers and monitoring of direct payment accounts.

13. This service is provided by Equal Lives.

(c) Generalist advice

14. The County Council holds or contributes to four agreements for the provision of generalist advice through the Citizen’s Advice Bureau. These are with:

- Diss and District Citizens Advice Bureau.
- Norfolk Citizens Advice Bureau.
- Mid Norfolk Citizens Advice Bureau.
- North Norfolk Citizens Advice service (North Norfolk District Council is the commissioning lead organisation).

15. The areas in which generalist advice is most commonly sought include:

- Household finances, reduce and manage personal debt
- Benefits entitlement and claiming benefits including tax credits
- Housing problems including preventing homelessness
- Employment rights
- Immigration rights
- Personal and family issues (such as relationship break down, domestic abuse or the local arrangements around social care assessment)
- Consumer rights
- Provision of web-based information available to support people to self-help and prevent problems recurring

(d) Statutory advocacy

16. The County Council is legally required to ensure the provision of different forms of specified advocacy, and therefore funds a number of statutory advocacy services. The types of statutory advocacy provided are:

- Independent NHS Complaints Advocacy – information and support for people who need to complain about their experience of using health services
- Independent Social Care Advocacy – for people who need support to be fully involved in decisions about their care
- Independent Mental Capacity Advocacy – to represent the interests of people who lack capacity
- Independent Mental Health Advocacy – to represent the interests of people who are subject to treatment under mental health law.

17. These advocacy services were recommissioned in 2016 against a new single specification with a new model to be in place from April 2017. Some of the required savings have been delivered through this process (around 1/5th of the savings requirement). The new model will ensure advocacy to the same number of people for less expenditure.

18. In addition to the savings achieved through this work, further savings will need to be achieved through reductions in the funding for information and advice services. In consultation and through discussion with stakeholders, the following areas have been identified as key considerations in the establishment of delivery arrangements:

- Linking County Council customer services more closely with information and advice, so that it is the first intervention that more people get through contact with Adult Social Care.
- Examining the benefits and impacts of continuing to commission specialist information and advice services, or whether a single point of access or hub approach might be more effective and easier for people to get the information they need.
- Building on the current models for delivering advice services such as the partnership for specialist advice, and Norfolk Community Advice Network internal referral mechanism which promotes the idea of no wrong door and allows people to be referred between agencies to the most appropriate provider without having to repeat their needs or make another contact.
- Looking at these services alongside other areas of provision where there is a significant information and advice element, to reduce duplication and ensure

that responses are as joined up as they can be. This requires developing the models for commissioned information and advice in close collaboration with carer and housing support. In all of these areas, Norfolk County Council will seek to plan responses jointly with district councils and Health both of which are major providers and commissioners of information and advice. There are many other key stakeholders whose views will need to be drawn on in more detail to shape future service delivery.

Who is affected?

19. The proposal will affect people with the following protected characteristics:

People of all ages	YES
A specific age group (please state): Older people particularly affected, and some younger people	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people with learning difficulties and people with dementia)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Analysis of the people affected

20. Overall, around 50,800 people in Norfolk currently use NCC commissioned information, advice and advocacy services. The vast majority of these are older people and disabled people, including people with learning disabilities and people with mental health issues, and some younger people.
21. Data about service users other characteristics is limited, but generally speaking, there is a fairly balanced gender split⁶, and the number of people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender is expected to reflect the wider population of Norfolk (around 7%).
22. Data on the ethnic background of people using advice services is not routinely collected. The breakdown on the next page shows the ethnic background of people using statutory advocacy services in 2015/16:

White - British	Total	Total (%)
White - Other	549	52.2%
Asian/ Asian British - Chinese	14	1.3%
Asian/ Asian British - Other	3	0.3%
Asian/ Asian British - Indian	1	0.1%
Black/ Black British - African	2	0.2%
Black/ Black British - Other	5	0.5%
Mixed - White & Black Caribbean	3	0.3%
Mixed - Other	1	0.1%
Gypsy/ Traveller	5	0.5%
Other ethnic group	1	0.1%
Prefer not to say	3	0.3%
<i>Unrecorded/ Not stated</i>	139	13.2%
Total	325	30.9%
	1051	

23. A detailed breakdown of the numbers of people accessing the four areas of provision described above are as follows:

(a) Specialist Information and Advice for people with disabilities, long term conditions and support needs.

24. In 2015/16, older people, including dementia sufferers, were the primary users (70%) of specialist information, advice and advocacy services. Data for other types of disability is set out below:

Older people	13,285
People with learning difficulties	3,747
People with dementia	2,075
People with disabilities including mental health related needs	1,815
People who are Deaf or Deaf and Blind	1,032
Total	21,554

25. By definition the people who use these services are very likely to have disabilities and long term conditions. Many people using these services have more than one disability or long term condition. Older people are the main recipients of advice and support through the dementia service, and will also use other services (for example older people with learning difficulties).
26. Very broadly, this is the breakdown for the total spend (health and social care) for specialist information and advice services, against different disabilities/age:

Older people	26%
People with dementia	23%
People with learning difficulties	11%
People with mental health related needs	19%
People who are Deaf or Deaf and Blind	5%
People with disabilities (overarching service)	16%

(b) Information, Advice & Support Service for People with Personal Budgets

27. During 2015/16, around 234 people were supported by Equal Lives who provided information and advice for people with personal budgets. See below for a breakdown by age of the total numbers of adults who received a direct payment or personal budget during 2015/16:

Age	%
18 - 64	49.9
85+	21.7
75 - 84	16.7
65 - 74	11.9

(c) Generalist advice

28. During 2015/16, around 18,000 people accessed Norfolk Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) for advice. Taking account of the half yearly reports from all of the generalist advice sessions the annual demand for generalist advice is around 28,000.
29. CABs are often used by people in work. A significant number of people (42%) using the largest volume generalist advice service have a disability or long term condition.

(d) Statutory advocacy

30. During 2015/16, statutory advocacy services supported 1051 people. See below for a breakdown of the ratio of younger and older people using the respective advocacy services:

Advocacy	Young and working age %	Older people %	Not known %
Health complaints	55	30	15
Social care	38	61	1
Mental capacity	35	58	6
Mental health	63	26	10

31. The disability status of people using the NHS health complaints advocacy service is not recorded. 88% of people using the other statutory advocacy services in 2015/16 had at least one disability or long term condition.

Potential impact

32. This proposal may have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on older and disabled people, including people with reduced mobility, Deaf and hearing impaired people, Blind and visually impaired people, people with learning difficulties, people with mental health issues, people with dementia and some younger people.
33. This is because these groups form the majority of service users, and if the proposal goes ahead, support may not continue to be delivered by providers which are as expert in working with people with these particular needs.

34. No one disability is like another, and the different challenges that individual disabled and older people face may differ greatly. In addition, many local factors may act to compound the effects of someone's disability – for example, they may have more than one disability, including a mental health issue; they may find it difficult to travel to and access local services or communicate with service providers; they may be on a low income and they may lack the physical, financial and emotional resources to negotiate these challenges.
35. Advice given by providers who are disability/age related specialists could be critical to helping people maintain independence. In the worst case scenario, there is a possibility that advice, information and advocacy services offered to disabled and older people by a provider which does not understand these issues well, could result in poor or incorrect advice being given.
36. It is also important to note that, unless explicit specifications are built into service contracts, the proposal could reduce the ability of some disabled people (particularly Deaf and hearing impaired people, blind and visually impaired people and people with learning difficulties) to communicate their needs effectively with generalist service providers.
37. This is because staff within some specialist services are already trained to a high level to communicate with, for example, Deaf and hearing impaired people. Deaf people, blind people and people with learning difficulties have told us that generalist service providers sometimes say they do not have the funds to provide accessible information such as British sign language interpreters, easy read and braille. In view of this, if the proposal goes ahead, this must be addressed within the service specification.
38. Some people, especially people with learning disabilities, dementia, or those who have low literacy and communication needs may need an extended amount of time and resources to support them in understanding forms and letters and other issues. In addition, providing advocacy in an empowering way can be a time consuming process. Again, this would need to be built into the service specifications to ensure there is no negative impact on people needing this level of support.
39. People with mental health issues during crisis periods often need more intensive, nuanced support regarding information, advice and advocacy, as they may not be able to interact with others or feel sufficiently resilient to manage. Although some of the specialist information, advice and advocacy services addressed by this proposal do not cover mental health, it is recognised that many disabled people often have a secondary impairment which may be mental health-related. So, someone who is Deaf and who has a mental health issue may require significant support which is highly specialised in order to be effective.
40. It is recognised that due to persistent discrimination and difficulties accessing standard services, some disabled and older people may only approach organisations they know and trust. This is due to fears – and often experience - that generic service providers do not have the right knowledge in place to deal effectively with their query, or the appropriate access arrangements in place to accommodate their impairment. Some older and disabled people may be more reliant than others on the specialist help provided because of this. This may particularly be the case for people with reduced mobility, Blind, Deaf and hearing impaired people, people with learning difficulties and people with mental health issues.

41. Processes for accessing benefits and other areas of welfare provision are increasingly moving to online self-service, which may disadvantage Blind and visually impaired people, Deaf and hearing impaired people and people who need support to understand and give written information. It will be vital to ensure that any web based information is fully accessible.
42. There is some evidence to suggest that there could be a detrimental impact on people in rural areas. Ultimately, this will depend on whether the new service model disadvantages people in rural areas compared to those in urban areas, such as by increasing the cost or length of journey times. However, given that the proposal will reduce the capacity of the service, there may be less time for one-to-one appointments. This, combined with poor broadband in some rural areas and the points made elsewhere about the need for alternatives to online information and advice for some people, could impact negatively on service users in rural areas.
43. If so, disabled and older people living in rural areas would be at particular risk of disadvantage, because they are likely to have less access to alternative provision, have no or limited access to accessible transport, be on a low income (accessible transport may be costly), and less able to cope with longer journey times. If the proposal goes ahead, the remodelling of service provision will need to examine how best to ensure people in rural areas are not disadvantaged.
44. One crucial issue to note is that demand for information, advice and advocacy services is increasing⁷, and the current model is not financially sustainable. There is an imperative to design a new model, in order to continue to be able to provide essential advice, information and advocacy services to older and disabled service users.
45. In view of the issues highlighted in this assessment, if the proposal goes ahead, work must take place with both existing providers of services and service users to ensure that the new service model addresses the issues highlighted in this assessment, is fit for purpose, and that the potential risks associated with the proposal are mitigated.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Work with providers and service users (including service users in rural areas) to develop a new service specification that addresses the issues raised in this equality and rural assessment. Providers and service users representing older and disabled people, including but not limited to Blind and visually impaired people, Deaf and Hearing impaired people, people with reduced mobility, people with learning difficulties and people with mental health issues, as well as other disabilities, must be included.	Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning)	From 1 Feb 2017
2.	When the new model is developed, a further equality/rural assessment should be undertaken to examine whether it will inadvertently disadvantage or exclude any disabled or older people, or people in rural areas, so that every opportunity can be taken to find ways to mitigate	Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning)	From 1 Feb 2017

	or address this.		
3.	In the event that the revised assessment identifies any significant detrimental impact that it is not possible to mitigate, the proposed service model should be brought back to decision-makers for consideration, so that every opportunity can be taken to address this, prior to the model being adopted.	Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning)	From 1 April 2017
4.	Ensure effective transition plans are established for service users who may be affected by the proposals.	Rob Cooper (Head of Integrated Commissioning)	From 1 Feb 2017

Title of proposal:	Building resilient lives, reshaping our work with people of all ages requiring housing related support to keep them independent
Reference:	ASC016/19
Lead Officer:	Jo Clapham (Commissioning Manager), in consultation with Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager

The proposal

1. This proposal would see removal of half of the current funding for 'floating support' and accommodation-based housing related support. Work would then take place with district, community and health partners to plan how the County Council's continuing £4.7m annual investment could be used most effectively.
2. Norfolk County Council currently spends over £3.5m a year on 'floating support' and £6.5m on the accommodation-based services included in this proposal. The majority of these services facilitate access to non-specialist support for people in their own homes or in specific accommodation. This includes support for people who may not have access to statutory services, or who may be excluded from mainstream society. The aim is to help people to not require or to delay the need for formal care services and to remain independent in their communities.
3. The County Council is one of a number of organisations which fund housing related support services. Other partners, including district councils, community and health partners, also spend money on these types of services so we have always worked with them to plan and confirm how the £4.7m annual investment can be used most effectively alongside their investment to make the most impact.
4. The housing related support services within scope of this proposal are:
 - **Direct Access hostels for adults.** This is unplanned hostel accommodation for single people who are homeless.
 - **Hostel accommodation for adults.** This is planned hostel accommodation and support for up to 2 years for single people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.
 - **Move on accommodation for adults.** This is semi-independent accommodation and support for single people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.
 - **Hostel accommodation for young people (16-25).** Planned hostel accommodation and support for up to 2 years for young people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.
 - **Move on accommodation for young people (16-25).** Semi-independent accommodation and support for young people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.
 - **Supported Lodgings for young people (16-25).** Accommodation and support with a family or individual in a home-like environment for young people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.
 - **Support for older people living in sheltered accommodation.** Support to help people to live independently.
 - **Floating Support** - short term support that helps adults stay in their homes

5. The proposal does not currently include accommodation for those fleeing domestic abuse.

What would happen if the proposal goes ahead

6. If the proposal goes ahead, we would:
- Continue to invest £3.2m to maintain crisis accommodation for both young people and single adults who are homeless. This is a reduction of 32% on the current 16/17 investment.
 - Invest approximately £1.5m in a community outreach model that provides support both to older people and those at risk of homelessness. The service would be designed to work with local communities and provide a wider basis of support for older people who require it regardless of where they live. The specification and dimensions of this service would need to be co-produced with partners, users and providers.
 - Manage a phased withdrawal of funding for support for people living in sheltered housing in conjunction with housing benefit authorities, stock-holding housing authorities and registered social landlords to ensure that enhanced landlord support is maintained, in line with the responsibilities of these organisations as social landlords.
 - Reduce and remove funding from low level supported accommodation (move-on) and (peripatetic) floating support.
7. As part of this, a key action would be to engage with stakeholders, existing providers of services and service users (including service users in rural areas), to ensure that the remodelled services are fit for purpose, and the risks associated with the proposal as highlighted in this assessment are mitigated.
8. Priorities to be addressed by stakeholders, providers and service users would include:
- Consider the impact and direction of service transformation with a view to making clear recommendations on the shape of services, taking into account (amongst other things) the issues raised in this equality and rural assessment
 - Detailed implications would need to be identified and managed
 - Develop pathways that can be used by individuals and agencies to navigate systems and support to focus on maintaining individual independence, supporting community and individual resilience and assets.
 - Identifying any additional or alternative resources that could be used to support mainstream activities.
 - Examine how best to ensure people with protected characteristics and in rural areas are not inadvertently disadvantaged.
9. The Council consulted fully on the range of services that would be reviewed as part of the budget planning consultation for 2016/17. This proposal will therefore use these consultation results as well as some targeted new consultation to inform further work with the full range of stakeholders.

Who is affected?

10. The proposal will affect people with the following protected characteristics:

People of all ages	YES
---------------------------	------------

A specific age group (please state if so): older people (65+), young people (16-25)	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions, including but not limited to people with reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues and people with learning difficulties)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Analysis of the people affected

11. If the proposal goes ahead it would affect around 11,000 service users who currently get, or would be eligible to receive, housing-related support funded by the Council⁸. It would particularly affect older and disabled people, homeless people and young people because these groups form the majority of users of these services.
12. The proposal would also affect providers of housing-related services that are funded by the Council.
13. The majority of service users affected by the proposal (around 82%) are aged 60+⁹.
14. A significant number of service users (39.5%) have a disability¹⁰. However, a high proportion of service users (15.1%) have said that they “Don’t know” if they have a disability, so it is possible that the number of disabled people currently receiving the housing related support services in scope may be slightly higher than recorded¹¹.
15. Overall, slightly more men (51.3%) than women (44.6%) will be affected¹².
16. The majority of service users (89.6%) are White British, with 3.3% White Other. The remaining ethnic groups are made up of very small percentages, with a further 3% unknown¹³.
17. If the proposal goes ahead, funding would be reduced in consultation with district council partners and providers to minimise impact on people who use services. Services affected would be low level services where support levels are relatively low and people will already have achieved some level of independence.
18. The impact of reducing funding for low level homelessness services may result in more people losing their accommodation or being unable to access that accommodation.

19. Hostels may find it harder to move people on from high level placements due to a lack of low level supported accommodation or the withdrawal of this accommodation from the market by landlords. Private landlords in particular may be unwilling to rent to people who have been homeless without a support package in place.

20. A more detailed analysis is summarised below:

a. Adults who are homeless or at risk of homelessness

21. These services provide accommodation and support for adults who are homeless and are:

- a. direct access hostels
- b. hostel accommodation, and
- c. move-on accommodation

22. 1,404 people were supported by these services for the period October 2015 to September 2016.

23. In the last year¹⁴ the majority of service users (79.6%) were aged between 26 and 59. 19.1% of service users were younger people aged 16 to 25, and 1.4% were older people aged 60+.

24. A significant proportion of service users affected (33.2%) are recorded as having a disability (0.7% recorded as don't know).

25. 88.3% of service users accessing single homeless services were male. 11.3% were female (0.3% were unrecorded).

26. 93.1% of services users were White British and 1.4% were Mixed: White and Black Caribbean (0.3% were unrecorded).

b. Young people aged 16-24 who are at risk of homelessness

27. These services help young people to make a positive transition into adulthood and independent living and are:

- a. hostel accommodation
- b. move on accommodation, and
- c. 'supported lodgings'

28. 592 young people were supported by these services for the period October 2015 to September 2016.

29. The majority of service users (70%) were aged between 18 and 25 and 30% were aged 16 or 17.

30. 50.2% of service users were male and 49.8% were female. 2.3% recorded themselves as having a disability. 89% of services users were White British, and 2.7% were Mixed: White & Black Caribbean.¹⁵

c. People living in sheltered housing

31. Primarily funded by local authorities and registered social landlords, sheltered housing funded by NCC forms only a small proportion of housing occupied by older people (around 3.4%).
32. The support offered varies depending on which sheltered housing scheme people live in, but will include things such as regular phone calls, welfare checks, and support to maintain a tenancy. This support does not include personal care, such as help with taking medication, washing or bathing but can help people to access care.
33. It is important to note that the purpose and function of sheltered housing has changed significantly over the last two decades. People currently receiving the service value it highly and feel it helps them maintain independence. However, increasingly, the majority of older people are likely to wish to remain in their own homes with support rather than move to specific accommodation for older people.
34. Sheltered housing providers funded by the County Council cover around 4,620 flats but it is difficult to say how many people currently in the service need the support available. Analysis shows that there may not be consistency across Norfolk regarding the type of sheltered housing provided, and eligibility thresholds.
35. 6,622 people were supported by these services for the period October 2015 to September 2016.

d. People at risk of losing their accommodation (floating support)

33. Floating support provides support for people across a range of client groups, including those at risk of homelessness, older people and those with low level mental health issues, who are at risk of losing their accommodation.
34. Support is provided on a basis of need and is generally provided in people's own homes. It often involves a support worker working on an individual basis to help people in need. Support offered can include help with managing finances, help setting up and maintaining a home or tenancy, or offering emotional support, counselling and advice.
35. The service is short (up to two years in duration) and is aimed at supporting people to maintain their own tenancies and independence and prevent people from becoming homeless.
36. We currently provide:
 - Generic floating support open to all adults who are at risk of being homeless or losing their tenancy. As well as offering support to people in general, this service also supports single homeless people, offenders or people at risk of offending. This support helps people to develop and maintain independent living skills.
 - Floating support specifically for older people
 - Floating support specifically for people with low-level mental health problems
 - Floating support specifically for Gypsy and Traveller families
 - Floating support specifically for older people in some sheltered housing schemes.

36. 4992 people were supported by these services for the period October 2015 to September 2016.
37. Detailed service user data is not generally collected for these services, but where this information was available, 42.1% of service users were aged 26 to 59. 41.5% were aged 60+ and 10.5% were aged 18-25. 51.9% of service users were female and 42.6% were male. A significant number - 44.9% were disabled¹⁶.

Potential impact

38. This proposal may have a disproportionate and detrimental impact on older and disabled people, including people with reduced mobility; Blind and visually impaired people; Deaf and hearing impaired people; people with mental health issues; people with learning difficulties; younger people (including care leavers) and homeless people. This is because these groups form the majority of service users, and if the proposal goes ahead, support currently being provided may be reduced or withdrawn.
39. The proposal may also impact on men (as high users of some homelessness services) and Gypsies and Travellers (as users of floating support services). The proposal may impact on carers, who may need to provide additional support.
40. Most of the people receiving services covered by this proposal are not eligible for adult social services or are on the margins of eligibility. Removing services could mean that more people go into crisis or become homeless and require other services, such as adult social care, children's services, housing and health services. It could lead to an increase in demand for adult social care and other services.
41. Older and disabled people – including older and disabled homeless people - may be particularly affected by any reduction or removal of services, because they may be more reliant than others on the help provided, and already find it challenging to maintain daily independence. Disabled and older people are particularly likely to be on a low income, and may lack the financial, emotional or physical resources to find alternative support.
42. People with mental health issues and learning disabilities are particularly at risk if support services are reduced, as they can often be isolated and have limited contact with other people. They may not have the confidence, skills or resilience to self-support regarding housing and other issues.
43. A further potential impact for disabled people is that the support currently provided may be based on adaptations in or the accessibility of their home, and help them live independently. If the support is removed, it may:
- Impact on their ability to maintain their current level of independence, which could mean further support is needed in regards to housing aids and adaptations/assistive technology
 - Tip people from managing their independence to needing formal social care support
 - Impact on the accommodation options offered to disabled people, thus reducing their options in a housing market with already very limited options.
44. Older and disabled people, especially people with mental health issues, learning disabilities, dementia and sensory impairments are at particular risk of fraud, mail and online fraud and rogue traders as they are often seen as easy targets. Support staff and

floating support will often act as gatekeepers in preventing these forms of abuse from taking place or able to identify at an early stage that someone is at risk.

45. Younger people may be particularly affected by any reduction or removal of services. This is because where services are provided in accommodation, such as young people's or homelessness hostels, the impact of reducing or removing funding on accommodation based services may be to make the service unsafe for service users (particularly the case for younger people) or financially unviable for providers (this is because supported accommodation is funded through a combination of rental income (Housing Benefit) and support funding (NCC's funding). Removal of one of these components may put the accommodation service at risk of closure.
46. From a Looked After Children and Leaving Care perspective, any reduction in funding that puts at risk the range and quality of existing hostel, move-on and supported lodgings accommodation for young people could significantly increase the risk of street homelessness and destitution for Norfolk's care leavers - and possibly lead to increased risk of institutional admittance, and increased risks of offending and mental illness linked with homelessness.
47. It should also be noted that there may be specific impacts on Gypsies and Travellers, as users of targeted floating support services. Many Gypsies and Travellers are reluctant to engage with generic service providers, and existing providers may have invested years in developing relationships and trust with families. This trust may be critical to supporting Gypsy and Traveller families to achieve the best possible outcomes in a wide range of areas, including health and the education of young people. If this support is removed, outcomes for Gypsies and Travellers in these areas may be reduced.
48. It should be noted that men are particularly high users of some homelessness services. Some men may find it challenging to ask for help, and may lack access to emotional support to help them maintain their independence.
49. Service users in rural areas may be particularly affected, because there may be few viable alternatives nearby. Even if there are alternatives available, access to these might be difficult, due to lack of accessible transport, or the increased cost or length of journey times. In view of this, people in rural areas may be at particular risk of exclusion and isolation. If the proposal goes ahead, the remodelling of service provision will need to examine how best to ensure people in rural areas are not disadvantaged.
50. One crucial issue to note is that demand for 'floating support' and accommodation-based housing related support is increasing, and the current model is not financially sustainable. There is an imperative to design a new model, in order to continue to ensure that vulnerable people in Norfolk can continue to benefit from floating-type support and accommodation-based support.
51. In view of the issues highlighted in this assessment, if the proposal goes ahead, work must take place with both existing providers of services and service users to ensure that the new service model addresses the issues highlighted in this assessment, is fit for purpose, and that the potential risks associated with the proposal are mitigated.

Action to address any negative impact

	Action/s	Lead	Date
1.	Work with providers and service users to	Jo Clapham,	From 1 April

	develop a new service specification that addresses the issues raised in this equality and rural assessment. Providers and service users representing affected service users, including service users in rural areas, must be included.	Commissioning Manager	2017
2.	When the new model is developed, a further equality/rural assessment should be undertaken to examine whether it will inadvertently disadvantage or exclude any particular groups of existing service users, or people in rural areas, so that every opportunity can be taken to find ways to mitigate or address this.	Jo Clapham, Commissioning Manager	From 1 April 2017
3.	In the event that the revised assessment identifies any significant detrimental impact that it is not possible to mitigate, the proposed service model should be brought back to decision-makers for consideration, so that every opportunity can be taken to address this, prior to the model being adopted.	Jo Clapham, Commissioning Manager	From 1 April 2017
4.	Ensure effective transition plans are established for service users who may be affected by the proposals.	Jo Clapham, Commissioning Manager	From 1 April 2017

Accessibility considerations

37. Accessibility is a priority for Norfolk County Council. Norfolk has a higher than average number of disabled and older residents compared to other areas of the UK, and a growing number of disabled young people.
52. Development of the new service models will take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service design.
53. Actions relating to business process re-engineering will take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service planning and design.
54. Proposals relating to contract review will also take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service design.

Evidence used to inform this assessment

- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Relevant business intelligence:
 - Quarterly Performance Indicators
 - Client record forms.
- Consultation last year on the removal of funding for services providing housing related support indicated that while a minority of respondents felt that the responsibility for funding should be spread more widely across the public sector (health, districts, criminal justice etc.) many felt that these are key preventative

services that support vulnerable people and therefore reducing funding was not possible.

- For mental health: data on the number of service users in receipt of mental health housing related floating support and spot contracted personal assistant services eg by postcode; information on hourly/unit costs for services commissioned by NCC; information from mental health social work teams on service shortfalls; survey of mental health social work teams on the differences between the community support services funded and outcomes delivered.

Children's Services budget proposals 2017- 2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2017

Lead officer: Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager (Jo Richardson), in consultation with Assistant Director Performance and Challenge (Don Evans), Assistant Director Early Help & Prevention (Sal Thirlway), Assistant Director Education (Chris Snudden)

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Corporate Planning & Partnerships team, email: cpp@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Children's Services 2017-2018 budget proposals

41. Children's Services budget proposals for 2017/18 will see an overall increase in investment in children's services. This reflects the continued high priority of improving children's social care and sustaining ongoing improvements in schools performance and educational achievements for Norfolk children and young people.

42. In total there are 14 budget proposals for Children's Services. A summary is provided here:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Troubled Families grant income (CHL027)	<p>Increase grant income to reflect additional payment by results. Ensure that the national and local targets, for the payment by results, are met to meet this additional income target.</p> <p>This is a relatively challenging target as this relates to payment by results. There may be changes nationally relating to the Troubled Families programme which could reduce our ability to generate this extra income.</p>
2.	Education Psychology Service (CHL028)	Increase traded income with schools by reviewing charging mechanism and more efficient use of existing staff. Review charging mechanism and time spent by Education Psychologists on traded activities.
3.	Early Years Funding Panel (CHL029)	Reduce the level of funding. It is anticipated that we will either keep an open application process, but limit the amount that any provider can bid for or no longer have an open application process but move to a more targeted approach of allocating the funding. For example in circumstances where without the funding a setting would be forced to close, where an urgent Ofsted action means that funding is needed to make urgent improvements or there is a need to increase the number of high quality early education places available.
4.	East Coast Community Health Care Speech and Language contract (CHL030)	Reduce the budget in line with the actual spend on the Early Years Speech and Language contract.
5.	Woodside Norwich Early Years Hub (CHL031)	Increase income by charging for more training activities and maximising room usage at the Woodside Norwich Early Years Hub.
6.	Children's Homes (CHL032)	<p>Review the current provision and occupancy through a review of Looked After Children placements and improving staff to child ratios.</p> <p>All residential placements will be reviewed by the new planning and sufficiency panel chaired by the Assistant Director Performance and Challenge (see also the committee report concerning sufficiency strategy). This may require capital investment which could lead to savings in 2017-18 and a full impact in 2018-19</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
7.	Service Level Agreement efficiencies (CHL033)	Reduce the cost of Early Help Service Level Agreements through cost efficiencies. Reduce the budget in line with actual spend. This is a £30,000 saving on a £3.000m budget (i.e. 1%).
8.	Children's legal costs (CHL034)	Review the opportunity to reduce expenditure on Children's legal costs. Share best practice across Children's Services, resulting in less legal costs for advice.
9.	Performance and Challenge (CHL035)	Identify efficiency savings through our ongoing business process re-engineering activity.
10.	Children With Disabilities Short Term Breaks (CHL036)	Short breaks are commissioned in line with our legislative duty. This proposal is to reduce the budget in line with improvements in commissioned services that have already taken place that have led to better value for money.
11.	Early Years Setting Panel (CHL037)	Achieve savings through prioritisation and targeting resources. This proposal is linked to the Early Years Funding Panel Proposal.
12.	Norfolk Institute for Practice Excellence (NIPE) – reduce agency spend by moving NIPE trainees into posts one month earlier, reducing agency spend (CHL038)	Increase and embed the NIPE offer to include taking a more flexible approach which ensures that newly qualified social workers move into case accountable teams as soon as they are ready. This will reduce spend on agency social workers. Ensure that the NIPE social worker trainees are supported and managed when they transfer into vacant social worker posts.
13.	Refocus Education Service in light of Education White Paper (CHL039)	<p>Hold identified vacant posts and reduce Intervention funding pending a refocus the Education Service - in light of the Education White Paper, national consultation on role of Local Authorities (spring 2017) and a further Education Bill.</p> <p>To achieve the proposed savings seven existing vacancies in the education section will not be filled. These posts do not include any which are linked to local authority statutory duties. Furthermore as the role of the local authority in relation to intervention in schools is modified following the Education and Adoption Bill (2016) and the Schools Causing Concern Guidance (2016), £100,000 will be removed from the funding for Intervention Associates and the County Headteacher Service.</p> <p>The impending national consultation on the role of the Local Authority and a further Education Bill will support a wider review of the existing Education Services provided by the Local Authority</p>
14.	Review Early Help Services (CHL040)	Refocus Early Help services. It is clear that the delivery of the improvement for Children's Services cannot be secured without a strong Early Help Service. However it is right that services are periodically reviewed to ensure that they are still aligned to outcomes and deliver value for money. We will review Early Help arrangements to ensure preventative activity is best placed to support reduction in specialist

	Title of proposal	Description
		services.

Who is affected?

43. The proposals will affect staff, and children and young people and their families, and people with other protected characteristics:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

44. The proposals will also affect people in rural areas.

Potential impact

45. Overall, as in previous years, Children's Services budget proposals for 2017/18 will impact primarily on children and families – which is inevitable, because children and families constitute the majority of children's services users. However, there is no evidence to indicate that the proposals will have any detrimental impact on children and families, people with other protected characteristics or people in rural areas.

46. The one possible exception to this is the proposal to review Early Help. Whilst there is currently no evidence to suggest any detrimental impact, the delivery of this proposal, if it goes forward, will need to be monitored and a further equality/rural assessment completed at an appropriate stage. This is dealt with below.

47. A summary is provided here:

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
1.	Troubled Families grant income (CHL027)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.
2.	Education Psychology Service (CHL028)	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards or delivery.

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools/ Academies determine the level of additional education psychology services they wish to purchase, and thus spending decisions are managed from within schools/academies. The review will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for schools in rural areas, e.g. the Education Psychology service does not make additional charge to service rural schools/academies.
3.	Early Years Funding Panel (CHL029)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new targeted approach will apply equally to settings in both rural and urban areas (e.g. it will not inadvertently exclude early years settings in rural areas from applying for funding by targeting areas of deprivation only). Settings will continue to be able to apply for assistance with improvements that may relate to enhancing accessibility for disabled young people and their families or people with other protected characteristics. The reduced level of funding will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for settings in rural areas.
4.	East Coast Community Health Care Speech and Language contract (CHL030)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.</p>
5.	Woodside Norwich Early Years Hub (CHL031)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.</p>
6.	Children's Homes (CHL032)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.</p>
7.	Service Level Agreement efficiencies (CHL033)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The efficiencies achieved will be 'back office' efficiencies, and will not lead to changes in services or standards for people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. The reduced level of funding will not inadvertently lead to higher costs in rural areas.
8.	Children's legal costs (CHL034)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no</p>

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
		change to service standards or delivery.
9.	Performance and Challenge (CHL035)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.</p> <p>This is because with the exception of Note 1 below, there is no reason to expect that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately represented in any redundancy or redeployment figures, if business process reengineering leads to any posts being deleted. Current HR monitoring data confirms that the profile of redundancies remains in line with the overall workforce profile of the organisation. In going forward this will continue to be monitored.</p> <p>It should be noted that redundancy or redeployment may have different degrees of impact on staff, depending on their background or circumstances. Staff who are older, disabled or Black, Asian or minority ethnic may find it more difficult to find new employment compared to the population as a whole (with the same qualifications, experience etc). Staff aged 55+ may have been in post for a number of years and have no recent experience of job applications and interview.</p> <p>It should also be noted that some staff may have access arrangements in place to enable them to do their jobs effectively (for example, disabled parking and travel to work etc). Changes to these arrangements should be discussed with staff prior to any changes being proposed as a result of business process reengineering.</p> <p>Note 1: It should be noted that some services employ a higher number of women than men, or vice-versa¹⁷. This, combined with a potential decrease in the number of redeployment opportunities available, means that if a service employing a higher than average number of women (or men) changed, the profile of redundancies may not reflect the overall profile of the workforce. Also, older staff (the 55 – 64 age group) may sometimes be overrepresented in redundancy figures, due to older staff being particularly likely to opt for voluntary redundancy.</p>
10.	Children With Disabilities Short Term Breaks (CHL036)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget reductions will not lead to changes in the short break options available for disabled children or families with protected characteristics or in rural areas. • The reduced level of funding will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for children or families in rural areas.
11.	Early Years Setting	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
	Panel (CHL037)	<p>have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to service standards or delivery. • The new approach to prioritisation and targeting will apply equally to settings in both rural and urban areas and will not inadvertently exclude or disadvantage settings in rural areas (e.g. through inadvertently leading to higher costs in rural areas).
12.	Norfolk Institute for Practice Excellence (NIPE) – reduce agency spend by moving NIPE trainees into posts one month earlier, reducing agency spend (CHL038)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because there is no change to service standards or delivery.</p>
13.	Refocus Education Service in light of Education White Paper (CHL039)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A risk analysis has identified that the holding of the vacancies will not adversely affect service delivery. • No services will be cut as a result of this proposal. • The budget reductions will not lead to changes in current support for children or families with protected characteristics or in rural areas. • The reduced level of funding will not inadvertently lead to higher costs for children or families in rural areas. • The reduction in funding available to engage Intervention Associates and deployment of the small County Head Teacher Service will not affect the scale of intervention in schools currently needed, and will not disadvantage rural schools over urban schools.
14	Review Early Help Services (CHL040)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because if the proposal goes ahead, early help teams will continue to provide support to families and will continue to prioritise appropriate interventions for young people and families with protected characteristics and in rural areas.</p> <p>It is clear, however, that the proposal may result in an amended staffing cohort in 2018-19. There are significant implications arising from this in respect of the type and level</p>

	Title of proposal	Issues to note/potential impact
		<p>of activity that could be delivered, which could result in greater pressure on partners (such as schools and children's centre providers) to deliver more.</p> <p>It is possible that this could give rise to impacts on people with protected characteristics and people in rural areas that it is not possible to identify at this stage (e.g. it could lead to changes in the types of services delivered and delivery locations).</p> <p>It is also possible that the proposal could limit Childrens Service's capacity to deliver on emerging social mobility priorities. People with protected characteristics – particularly disabled and Black, Asian and minority ethnic people – and people in some rural areas tend to be in the lowest income groups and may face the greatest barriers to participation. Therefore people from these groups could potentially be disproportionately affected.</p> <p>In view of this, if the proposal goes ahead, at an appropriate stage when more information is known, a further equality/rural assessment should be carried out to identify any potential impacts to (a) enable decision-makers to assess this before moving forward, and (b) to enable any mitigating actions to be developed, if needed.</p>

Accessibility considerations

48. Accessibility is a priority for Norfolk County Council. Norfolk has a higher than average number of disabled and older residents compared to other areas of the UK, and a growing number of disabled young people.
49. Proposals relating to business process re-engineering will take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service planning and design.
50. Proposals relating to contract review will also take full opportunity to build accessibility considerations into service design.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.	HR shared Service	From 1 April 2017
2.	Where business process re-engineering impacts on staff working patterns, line managers to consult with staff about any proposed changes, prior to them being agreed. This will enable any access issues to be highlighted. Where issues are	Lead HR and OD Business Partner supporting Children's	From 1 April 2017

	Action	Lead	Date
	identified, appropriate solutions should be sought e.g. reasonable adjustments.	Services to ensure line managers are aware of their responsibilities in this	
3.	If the proposal to review Early Help goes ahead, at an appropriate stage when more information is known, a further equality/rural assessment should be carried out to identify any potential impacts to (a) enable decision-makers to assess these before moving forward, and (b) enable any mitigating actions to be developed, if needed.	Assistant Director, Early Help & Prevention	From 1 April 2017

Evidence used to inform this assessment

- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Relevant business intelligence

Further information

For further information about this equality impact assessment please contact Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager, Tel: 01603 223816, email: jo.richardson@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Neil Howard on 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (Textphone).

Communities Committee budget proposals 2017-2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2017

Lead officer – Sarah Rhoden, in consultation with the relevant senior managers (Steve Miller, David Ashworth, Dr Louise Smith and Ceri Sumner) & Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Corporate Planning & Partnerships team, email: cpp@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

Communities Committee 2017-2018 budget proposals

1. Communities Committee budget proposals for 2017/18 will see an overall saving of £0.615m in 2017/18, including a one-off saving of £0.090m.
2. There are seven new proposals in total:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Cross-cutting savings - using some Public Health grant to off-set cost of CES services	The Director of Public Health has identified an opportunity to use some of the ring-fenced Public Health grant to fund some existing services in CES which deliver Public Health priorities. Doing this means we can make a revenue saving.
2.	Vacancy management and deletion of vacant posts	We take a strong vacancy management approach in the department which means we have taken the opportunity to freeze posts as individuals leave, and change ways of working. This proposal relates to part of a post in the Resilience Service.
3.	Further reductions in back office spend	The Trading Standards and Resilience Services will reduce spend on transport and supplies and services.
4.	Bring forward part of CMM018 from 2018/19 to 2017/18 - Customer Service delivery re-design	Members have previously agreed a proposal to save £100k in 2017/18 and £100k in 2018/19 from the Customer Service area. This proposal brings forward this saving to deliver early. It will involve some staff reductions in the customer service centre, at management level posts, some changes to the mail room team and a re-design of the website team. A staff consultation has been carried out and some changes to the proposals have been made as a result of this and a further staff consultation carried out.
5.	Additional income generation (Museums, Records Office, Trading Standards)	These services already have targets to generate income. Based on current income levels, there is scope to increase our targets.
6.	Bring forward part of CMM023 from 2018/19 to 2017/18 - Fire service – reductions in back office support and running costs	Members have previously agreed £600k saving in 2018/19 for reductions in fire service operational support. This proposal brings forward some of this saving to deliver early. The saving relates to the deletion of two back office administration posts, and reductions in some back office running costs. For example, the fire service has signed up to the new NCC wide printing contract, which will enable some savings, and there has been some success in reducing the amount of business rates we pay on some sites. We can also make savings on some other similar running costs.
7.	One-off saving through re-setting budgets for leased equipment	This relates to Fire Service Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). PEE like gloves and helmets are leased from a third party. The current lease arrangement is coming to an end and is there is an opportunity to

	Title of proposal	Description
		extend the life of some equipment for a small period (around a year) to generate a one-off saving in advance of agreeing a new lease.
8.	Capitalisation of spend on library books to release a revenue saving	Increasing our capital funding to enable us to transfer some revenue costs to capital. Overall, there will still be the same level of budget available to spend on library books etc. and therefore no service reduction.

Who is affected?

3. The proposals could affect staff, residents, visitors and businesses in Norfolk. The proposals could also affect people in rural areas:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Potential impact

4. Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that the Communities Committee budget proposals for 2017/18 will have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.
5. A summary is provided here:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Cross-cutting savings - using some Public Health grant to off-set cost of CES services	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be no changes to service standards or delivery.
2.	Vacancy management and deletion of vacant posts	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-

	Title of proposal	Description
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This post is already vacant. • The deletion of this post will not lead to changes to service standards or delivery.
3.	Further reductions in back office spend	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no changes to service standards or delivery.
4.	Bring forward part of CMM018 from 2018/19 to 2017/18 - Customer Service delivery re-design	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no changes to service standards or delivery. • The number of Customer Service Assistants dealing with front line contacts and phone calls is unchanged. • The Social Care Centre of Expertise Team dealing with some of the most vulnerable calls/contacts is not affected. • The re-design of the website team is to ensure that we are best placed to develop and implement improvements to our website and associated electronic processes, as part of the Customer Service Strategy. This will make it easier and cheaper for customers to contact us electronically, potentially freeing up resource to focus on those people who are in most need of support. It is important to ensure that web design is accessible for disabled people, and this is dealt with in Action 2 below. • Whilst it is possible that the reductions in staff could impact on the responsiveness of the service for example answering calls during peak times, the impact is expected to be minimal as the main reduction relates to back office management and admin support roles. • Overall, the number of posts is reducing. With the exception of (note 1) below, there is no reason to expect that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately represented in any redundancy or redeployment position. Current HR monitoring data confirms that the profile of redundancies remains in line with the overall workforce profile of the organisation. In going forward this will continue to be monitored. • Whilst the overall reduction in the number of posts is around 5, there is a high number of temporary, acting

	Title of proposal	Description
		<p>up, secondment and similar arrangements in place within CES that provide a great deal of flexibility to manage the impact of the change and there will be a need for a much smaller number of redundancy or redeployments. Staff have also been given the opportunity to express an interest in voluntary redundancy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be noted that redundancy or redeployment may have different degrees of impact on staff, depending on their background or circumstances. Staff who are older, disabled or Black, Asian or minority ethnic may find it more difficult to find new employment compared to the population as a whole (with the same qualifications, experience etc). Staff aged 55+ may have been in post for a number of years and have no recent experience of job applications and interview. • It should also be noted that some staff may have access arrangements in place to enable them to do their jobs effectively (for example, disabled parking and travel to work etc). Changes to these arrangements will be discussed with staff prior to any changes being implemented. <p>Note 1: It should be noted that some services employ a higher number of women than men, or vice-versa¹⁸. This, combined with a potential decrease in the number of redeployment opportunities available, means that if a service employing a higher than average number of women (or men) changed, the profile of redundancies may not reflect the overall profile of the workforce. Also, older staff (the 55 – 64 age group) may sometimes be overrepresented in redundancy figures, due to older staff being particularly likely to opt for voluntary redundancy.</p>
5.	Additional income generation (Museums, Records Office, Trading Standards)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no changes to service standards or delivery. • This does not relate to new charges or increased charges. • Whilst there are risks associated with any income generation targets because we expose ourselves to market factors, current predictions are that achieving this level of income is possible.
76	Bring forward part of CMM023 from 2018/19 to 2017/18 - Fire service –	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
	reductions in back office support and running costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no changes to service standards or delivery. There will be no changes to front-line service delivery (retained and whole-time staff) and no changes to fire stations or fire operational delivery standards. • The Chief Fire Officer is satisfied that the proposals are deliverable and will not have any adverse impact on front line service delivery or responsiveness. • The proposal relates to the reduction in overall number of posts by two posts, one of which has been vacant for some time. • The potential impact in staffing terms is as set out in 4. above.
7.	One-off saving through re-setting budgets for leased equipment	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire professionals confirm that it is safe to extend the life of the equipment by around a year and that there is no adverse risk.
8.	Capitalisation of spend on library books to release a revenue saving	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because overall, there will still be the same level of budget available to spend on library books etc. and therefore no service reduction.</p>

Accessibility considerations

6. Accessibility is a priority for Norfolk County Council. Norfolk has a higher than average number of disabled and older residents compared to other areas of the UK, and a growing number of disabled young people.
7. The services reporting to the Communities Committee are community focussed and universal services in that they are used by all communities, residents and visitors in Norfolk. This includes providing emergency services.
8. Individuals with protected characteristics can often have a greater need for personal support, and/or be less able to travel to be able to access the things they need. In particular, disabled and vulnerable people (including older and young people). For example, some library visitors are able to self-service without any staff help or intervention, and others need individual support from front line staff to access services.
9. Accessibility considerations are taken into account as part of day to day processes and working. Because of the importance of ensuring that accessibility is integrated into ongoing service planning and commissioning of community services, consideration will be given to any opportunities for maximizing this in 2017.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.	HR Shared Service	From 1 April 2017
2.	Ensure maximum possible accessibility for disabled people in the re-design of the website team.	Equality & Cohesion Officer	From 1 April 2017
3.	Consider opportunities for maximizing accessibility in ongoing service planning and commissioning across community services and bring a report to Strategic Equality Group proposing possible options.	Corporate Planning & Partnership Manager, in consultation with Business Support and Development Manager	By 31 March 2018

Evidence used to inform this assessment

- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Relevant service specific Codes of Practice and national guidance

Further information

For further information about this equality impact assessment please contact Sarah Rhoden, Business Support and Development Manager, Email sarah.rhoden@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Sarah Rhoden on 0344 800 8020.

Environment, Development and Transport Committee budget proposals 2017-2018

Equality and rural assessments – findings and recommendations

January 2017

Lead officer – Sarah Rhoden, in consultation with the relevant Assistant Directors (David Collinson, Tracy Jessop and Vince Muspratt) & Jo Richardson, Corporate Planning & Partnerships Manager

This assessment helps you to consider the impact of service changes on people with protected characteristics and in rural areas. The assessment can be updated at any time to inform service planning and commissioning.

For help or more information please contact Corporate Planning & Partnerships team, email: cpp@norfolk.gov.uk or tel: 01603 222611.

EDT Committee 2017-2018 budget proposals

51. EDT Committee budget proposals for 2017/18 will see an overall saving of £3.934m in 2017/18, including a one-off saving of £1.500m.
52. There are eight new proposals in total:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Vacancy management and deletion of vacant posts	As a result of the strong vacancy management approach in the CES department, a number of posts have been frozen as individuals have left and new ways of working have been put in place to manage within a reduced number of posts. Where these arrangements are successful, the vacant posts can be deleted to provide a saving. The vacant posts being deleted under this proposal relate primarily to the internal Business Support service, with one post in the Waste Service.
2.	Further reductions in back office spend	Reducing a number of common/shared back office budgets to deliver a saving, and where work has already been carried out to reduce costs. This includes savings in our printing and post budgets; new processes and equipment have been introduced that will enable a saving, for example laptop issued to staff as standard and increased ability to process contacts electronically through web forms etc.
3.	Reduction in Economic Development project fund	There is a small project fund allocation in the economic development service. This reduces the fund by £10k, but there will continue to be provision of around £70k. We will continue to support projects. In practice, we already seek alternative forms of funding to support new projects and so the project fund allocation is not always needed, and this will continue to be the approach.
4.	Waste – efficiency savings through robust management of costs	This relates to contracts we have in place for our recycling centre services. As with all other services, there are ongoing discussions with service providers as part of our day to day contract management to ensure that opportunities for efficiencies can be identified and progressed. There would be no change in service standards, opening times etc.
5.	Rationalise our highway depot provision and change inspection frequency for main roads	<p>There are three main elements to this proposal. The first is moving from an operational model with four area offices, to three area offices. In practice, we will close our office at Caister, but those in Ketteringham, King's Lynn and Aylsham will continue. The Caister site will continue to be used as a muster point for roadworkers and the salt dome on site will also continue to be used for winter gritting. Highway area office buildings are operational only and not intended to be publically accessible.</p> <p>The second element is changes to the staffing structure</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
		<p>at highway area offices, with an overall reduction in staff in both the highways and business support teams. The reduction in resource is on the basis of re-drawing working 'patches' to reflect the new three area model, more efficient working practices and arrangements and introducing more multi-functional roles. This includes introducing a universal area based inspector role to cover the full range of highway inspections, for example they will inspect culverts which means that specialist bridges staff based at County Hall will no longer need to do that. The main ICT system used by highways staff has been re-procured and a new system is in place. This has enabled some new, more efficient, processes to be put in place along with new equipment like tablets for staff who spend most of their time away from the office. A staff consultation on the changes has been carried out and some changes made to the proposed structure as a result.</p> <p>The final element is a change in the inspection frequency for main roads (principal main distributor and HGV access routes). This will increase from four weekly to six weekly. The new Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance allows a risk based approach rather than prescribing a standard frequency for highway inspection. The professional officer view is that the proposed change is low risk.</p>
6.	Implement new national guidance for winter maintenance	New National guidance is being issued that means we can make a small change to the temperature thresholds we work to when making a decision about whether to grit the roads. This means we will go out less, but the change will only affect marginal decisions and officers will continue to closely review information on weather and road conditions in making decision. We will still treat the roads when needed, and the network of roads gritted remains unchanged.
7.	Further capitalisation of highways maintenance activities to release a revenue saving	Increasing our capital funding to enable us to transfer some revenue costs to capital. Overall, there will still be the same level of budget available to spend on highways projects and therefore no service reduction.
8.	One off saving - Further capitalisation of highways maintenance activities in 2016/17, to release a revenue saving to carry forward to 2017/18	As 7. above.
9.	One-off saving - capitalisation of	Increasing our capital funding to enable us to transfer some revenue costs to capital. Overall, there will still be

	Title of proposal	Description
	recycling centre equipment spend to release a revenue saving	the same level of budget available to spend on recycling centres and therefore no service reduction.
10.	Additional income (Scottow Enterprise Park)	The service already has a target to generate income. Based on current income levels and site occupancy, there is scope to increase the target.

53. In addition to the eight new proposals above, it is also proposed to bring forward part of the following budget saving from 2018/19 to 2017/18. This saving has already previously been approved by Members, having considered the results of the public consultation and equality impact assessment:-

Bring forward part of EDT032 – implementing a new waste strategy - from 2018/19 to 2017/18. The full agreed saving for 2018/19 is £2.000m, and we are proposing to bring forward £0.250m to 2017/18.

Who is affected?

54. The proposals could affect staff, residents, visitors and businesses. The proposals could also affect people in rural areas:

People of all ages	YES
Disability (all disabilities and long-term health conditions)	YES
Gender reassignment (e.g. people who identify as transgender)	YES
Marriage/civil partnerships	YES
Pregnancy & Maternity	YES
Race (different ethnic groups, including Gypsies and Travellers)	YES
Religion/belief (different faiths, including people with no religion or belief)	YES
Sex (i.e. men/women/intersex)	YES
Sexual orientation (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual people)	YES

Potential impact

55. Overall, there is no evidence to suggest that the EDT Committee budget proposals for 2017/18 will have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or people in rural areas.
56. A summary is provided here:

	Title of proposal	Description
1.	Vacancy management and deletion of vacant	There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas.

	Title of proposal	Description
	posts	<p>This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These posts are already vacant • The deletion of these posts will not lead to changes to service standards or delivery.
2.	Further reductions in back office spend	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The back office spend reductions will not lead to changes to service standards or delivery.
3.	Reduction in Economic Development project fund	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will continue to be budget available to fund projects, and we will continue to seek funding from alternative sources. • The remaining fund will be equally accessible to groups in both rural and urban areas. • The budget being reduced is currently unallocated and therefore not linked to any specific project or area of work.
4.	Waste – efficiency savings through robust management of costs	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This relates to ‘back office’ efficiencies, and will not lead to changes to service standards or delivery.
5.	Rationalise our highway depot provision and change inspection frequency for main roads	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only change in service standard or delivery is the change of inspection frequency for main roads, which is considered to be low risk. This impacts similarly on both rural and urban areas. There are no changes to other service standards or delivery. • The overall budget available for highway maintenance and improvements will not change. • Whilst the office at Caister will close, it was not a public facing building and therefore did not receive visitors. The site will continue to be used by roadworkers. Staff will continue to work out and about

	Title of proposal	Description
		<p>in Caister and the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area based staff will continue to be allocated to work on a specific 'patch', enabling them to focus on a particular area of Norfolk and build up relationships etc. with key stakeholders within the area to ensure we can best understand local needs. • The introduction of more generic roles, like the streetscene inspector, should lead to an improved service in both rural and urban areas as individuals carrying out the role will be able to answer queries and offer support on a wider range of services, needing to refer less to colleagues. • Overall, the number of posts is reducing. With the exception of (note 1) below, there is no reason to expect that staff with protected characteristics would be disproportionately represented in any redundancy or redeployment position. Current HR monitoring data confirms that the profile of redundancies remains in line with the overall workforce profile of the organisation. In going forward this will continue to be monitored. • Whilst the overall reduction in the number of posts is around 30-35, there is a high number of temporary, acting up, secondment and similar arrangements in place within CES that provide a great deal of flexibility to manage the impact of the change and there will be a need for a much smaller number of redundancy or redeployments. Staff have also been given the opportunity to express an interest in voluntary redundancy. • It should be noted that redundancy or redeployment may have different degrees of impact on staff, depending on their background or circumstances. Staff who are older, disabled or Black, Asian or minority ethnic may find it more difficult to find new employment compared to the population as a whole (with the same qualifications, experience etc). Staff aged 55+ may have been in post for a number of years and have no recent experience of job applications and interview. • It should also be noted that some staff may have access arrangements in place to enable them to do their jobs effectively (for example, disabled parking and travel to work etc). Changes to these arrangements will be discussed with staff prior to any changes being implemented. <p>Note 1: It should be noted that some services employ a higher number of women than men, or vice-versa¹⁹. This, combined with a potential decrease in the number of redeployment opportunities available, means that if a service employing a higher than average number of</p>

	Title of proposal	Description
		women (or men) changed, the profile of redundancies may not reflect the overall profile of the workforce. Also, older staff (the 55 – 64 age group) may sometimes be overrepresented in redundancy figures, due to older staff being particularly likely to opt for voluntary redundancy.
6.	Implement new national guidance for winter maintenance	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is about improving our decision making process so that we only grit the network when it is needed. This would apply equally to both urban and rural areas. • There is no change to the road network covered by the gritting service.
7.	Further capitalisation of highways maintenance activities to release a revenue saving	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall budget available for highway maintenance and improvements will not change. • The process for assessing, prioritising and planning out highway maintenance works and improvements – including accessibility considerations for disabled people, and improvements in rural areas - will not change.
8.	One off saving - Further capitalisation of highways maintenance activities in 2016/17, to release a revenue saving to carry forward to 2017/18	As 7. above.
9.	One-off saving - capitalisation of recycling centre equipment spend to release a revenue saving	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall budget available for recycling centres will not change.
10.	Additional income (Scottow Enterprise Park)	<p>There is no evidence to indicate that this proposal would have any detrimental or disproportionate impact on people with protected characteristics or in rural areas. This is because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no changes to service standards or delivery.

	Title of proposal	Description
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does not relate to new charges or increased charges. Whilst there are risks associated with any income generation targets because we expose ourselves to market factors, current predictions are that achieving this level of income is possible.

Accessibility considerations

57. Accessibility is a priority for Norfolk County Council. Norfolk has a higher than average number of disabled and older residents compared to other areas of the UK, and a growing number of disabled young people.
58. The services reporting to the EDT Committee are universal services in that they are used by all residents and visitors in Norfolk. Individuals with protected characteristics can often have a greater reliance on the availability of the physical infrastructure, for example the highway network, to access the things they need day to day. In particular, disabled and vulnerable people (including older and young people).
59. Accessibility considerations are taken into account as part of day to day processes and working. Because of the importance of ensuring that accessibility is integrated into ongoing service planning and commissioning of EDT services, consideration will be given to any opportunities for maximizing this in 2017.

Recommended actions

	Action	Lead	Date
1.	HR Shared Service to continue to monitor whether staff with protected characteristics are disproportionately represented in redundancy or redeployment figures, and if so, take appropriate action.	HR shared service	From 1 April 2017
2.	Identify potential opportunities for maximizing accessibility in ongoing service planning and commissioning across EDT services and bring a report to Strategic Equality Group proposing possible options.	Corporate Planning & Partnership Manager, in consultation with Business Support and Development Manager	By 31 March 2018

Evidence used to inform this assessment

- Equality Act 2010
- Public Sector Equality Duty
- Relevant service specific Codes of Practice and national guidance

Further information

For further information about this equality impact assessment please contact Sarah Rhoden, Business Support and Development Manager, Email sarah.rhoden@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Sarah Rhoden on 0344 800 8020.

¹ Prohibited conduct:

Direct discrimination occurs when someone is treated less favourably than another person because of a protected characteristic they have or are thought to have, or because they associate with someone who has a protected characteristic.

Indirect discrimination occurs when a condition, rule, policy or practice in your organisation that applies to everyone disadvantages people who share a protected characteristic.

Harassment is “unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual”.

Victimisation occurs when an employee is treated badly because they have made or supported a complaint or raised a grievance under the Equality Act; or because they are suspected of doing so. An employee is not protected from victimisation if they have maliciously made or supported an untrue complaint.

2 The protected characteristics are:

Age – e.g. a person belonging to a particular age or a range of ages (for example 18 to 30 year olds).

Disability - a person has a disability if she or he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

Gender reassignment - the process of transitioning from one gender to another.

Marriage and civil partnership

Pregnancy and maternity

Race - refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins.

Religion and belief - has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (such as Atheism).

Sex - a man or a woman.

Sexual orientation - whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes.

3 The Act specifies that having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity might mean:

- Removing or minimizing disadvantages suffered by people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of others;
- Encouraging people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such people is disproportionately low.

4 Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between people and communities involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to (a) tackle prejudice, and (b) promote understanding.

5 The same is also true for women, and some Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) people— particularly BAME women.

6 The gender breakdown of people using the largest CAB provision for the first half of 2016/17 was 53% women : 47% men. In respect of advocacy there was an almost equal proportion of men:women using services (46.9:45.8) with a very small number identifying as intersex or transgender.

7 The impacts of welfare reform, the introduction of Universal Credit, changes to how DWP engages with people and the move from DLA to PiP, and reduction in support services are cited amongst the reasons for this.

8 This is based on the number of clients that were supported by Direct Access Hostels, Single Homeless Hostels, Young People Hostels, Single Homeless Move On, Young People's Move On, Supported Lodgings, Sheltered Housing and Floating Support services between 1 January and 30 April 2016.

9 This is based on the number of current clients in older people's services, as a percentage compared to all services in the proposals.

10 Data for the 12 months from 01.10.15 to 30.09.16. This does not include older people sheltered services.

11 Note this does not include older people sheltered services. The percentage is based on an estimate calculated on Client Record Form returns for those services (other than sheltered) in the proposal for the 12 months from 01.10.15 to 30.09.16.

12 This does not include older people sheltered services. It should also be noted that the gender of 2.5% of service users using services between 01.10.15 to 30.09.16 was unrecorded.

13 Again, this does not include older people sheltered services.

14 From 01.10.15 to 30.09.16

15 From 01.10.15 to 30.09.16

16 Client Record Form returns for 1st April 2015 to 31 March 2016.

17 This is due to a number of reasons, e.g. it has been well documented that different genders have traditionally been attracted to specific career choices, or because women are more likely than men to want to work part time or flexibly to accommodate parenting responsibilities.

18 This is due to a number of reasons, e.g. it has been well documented that different genders have traditionally been attracted to specific career choices, or because women are more likely than men to want to work part time or flexibly to accommodate parenting responsibilities.

19 This is due to a number of reasons, e.g. it has been well documented that different genders have traditionally been attracted to specific career choices, or because women are more likely than men to want to work part time or flexibly to accommodate parenting responsibilities.