

West Berkshire Council

Equity Impact Assessment

March 2023

Contents

Section 1: Summary details.....	2
Section 2: Detail of proposal	3
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics	6
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts.....	10
Section 4: Review.....	11

Section 1: Summary details

Directorate and Service Area	People (ASC) Adult Social Care – Resource Centres
What is being assessed (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).	West Berkshire Council to cease to operate the Resource Centres
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	New Policy
Summary of assessment Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).	West Berkshire Council to cease to operate the Resource Centres: Hungerford Phoenix Greenfields. The proposal is to transfer provision to an alternative provider.
Completed By	Richard Pask
Authorised By	Maria Shepherd
Date of Assessment	21.10.24

Section 2: Detail of proposal

<p>Context / Background</p> <p>Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.</p>	<p>West Berkshire Council is currently reviewing the services it delivers to ensure we can deliver value for money and meet the needs of our residents. The Council currently runs three Resource Centres for adults with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, frailty and dementia. The centres are open five days a week, Monday to Friday. We offer a range of occupational, creative and therapeutic activities with dedicated staff.</p> <p>The resource centres have always overachieved on budget, however on further review and looking at cost comparisons as well as the financial restraints within the local authority, moving these services to a 3rd party provider will provide a savings of £469K.</p> <p>Greenfield House Resource Centre is a service which we expect to be in high demand in the coming years. The property is owned by the Council and has a covenant which restricts use and access to business hours. The outturn occupancy in 2023-24 was 86% and the current occupancy is 110%.</p> <p>Hungerford Resource Centre is a service which there is a reducing demand despite trying to promote the Centre. The property is owned by the Council and has a covenant which restricts use to business hours. The outturn occupancy in 2023-24 was 56.1% and the current occupancy is 66%.</p> <p>The Phoenix Resource Centre is a service which we expect to be in high demand in the coming years. The property is owned by the Council and has a vacant parcel of land adjoining it. This building is the newest of the three centres. The outturn occupancy in 2023-24 was 83.7% and the current occupancy is 106%.</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Proposals</p> <p>Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.</p>	<p>To transfer provision to an alternative provider.</p> <p>This option will retain the use of the service for our residents, avoid potential staff redundancies and a potential income from the rental of the buildings.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence / Intelligence</p> <p>List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact on different individuals, communities or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.</p>	<p>Finance have been heavily involved with the modelling on our actual prices vs market prices to ensure a robust set of data is utilised.</p> <p>There is a precedent in situ due to the care market strategy which mitigates the supply vs demand impact in the market.</p>

<p>Alternatives considered / rejected</p> <p>Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.</p>	<p>Do nothing – although the Resource Centres are a valuable asset for its service users and overachieve on budget, this isn't value for money with public funds.</p>
--	---

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics

Protected Characteristic	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The age range of the service users within the resource centres vary:</p> <p>Phoenix have a variety of needs including learning disability, aged from 25 – 80years old.</p> <p>Greenfields have a range of needs need from low Learning Disability to frail services users, aged 25-80 years old.</p> <p>Hungerford have low needs, aged circa 85years old.</p>	<p>The impact will be dependent on the outcome.</p> <p>This will get more clarity on the consultation.</p>	Richard Pask	Tbc
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Dependent on the outcome of the consultation</p> <p>Alternative provision – It is anticipated this option provides the least resistance and reduces the impact on</p>	<p>The impact will be dependent on the outcome.</p> <p>This will get more clarity on the consultation.</p>		

				<p>the service users, Dementia clients may not respond well to a changing environment, due to higher levels of need and varying stages of support needed for its services users.</p> <p>If no alternative providers could be found and the Council determined that it was not directly providing this service, this would increase this impact as various national studies have shown the impact that moving environments can have upon a person with Dementia, including disturbed sleeping patterns, loss of appetite, an increase in negative behavioural issues and a permanent decline in their baseline presentations.</p>			
Gender Reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		
Marriage & Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		

Pregnancy & Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Most of the Council's care resource staff are female so this will need to be taken into account when supporting staff who may also have carer and parental responsibilities. It is unclear what the effects will be. The impact may be different for some staff depending on which option is followed:</p> <p>According to our full list of care staff across the services, 99% of resource staff in the Council's resource centres are female (HR data) and traditionally it is more likely that these staff also have caring responsibilities.</p>	<p>The impact will be dependent on the outcome.</p> <p>This will get more clarity on the consultation.</p>		
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		

Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A		
---------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----	-----	--	--

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (* Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Rural communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Areas of deprivation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Displaced communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Care experienced people	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This will be dependent on outcome,	The impact will be dependent on the outcome. This will get more clarity on the consultation.		
The Armed Forces Community	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Section 4: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

Review Date	21.10.24
Person Responsible for Review	Richard Pask
Authorised By	Maria Shepherd.