

# Review of in-house care services

## Equality Impact Assessment

# Review of in-house care services

**Contact:** Tony Ward – Principal Manager: Business Support – Community Support Services  
**Updated:** 09.03.2016

## 1. What type of proposal / decision is being assessed?

A review of current service provision

## 2. What is the purpose of this proposal / decision, and what change (to staff or the community) will occur as a result of its implementation?

Four decisions are required for each of the four existing in-house care services (Hafan Deg in Rhyl; Dolwen in Denbigh; Awelon in Ruthin; and Cysgod y Gaer in Corwen). A number of different proposals exist for each of the four sites, and each will result in different changes for staff and/or the community. The potential impact of the preferred options being put forward by the Elected Member Task & Finish Group are set out in sections 5, 6 & 7 below. The potential impact of the alternative options are set out in section 9 in order to enable Elected Members to make an informed decision about each establishment.

## 3. Does this proposal / decision require an equality impact assessment? If no, please explain why.

*Please note: if the proposal will have an impact on people (staff or the community) then an equality impact assessment **must** be undertaken*

<Please Select> Yes

## 4. Please provide a summary of the steps taken, and the information used, to carry out this assessment, including any engagement undertaken

*(Please refer to section 1 in the toolkit for guidance)*

We have undertaken a wide range of activities in order to help us understand the potential impact of each option on people who share protected characteristics. This has included:

- A pre-consultation “listening and engagement” exercise, which included an assessment (undertaken by an independent social worker) of all existing services users/residents of the four in-house care establishments. The assessments also looked into the potential impact on each individual of

changing the current service provision.

- Desktop research as part of the pre-consultation phase, including reviewing the materials available corporately within DCC to assist with Equality Impact Assessment.
- A review of all the comments received as part of the formal public consultation exercise, to identify any equality-related concerns raised. The consultation forms specifically invited respondents to identify any reasons why any of the proposals could have a negative or positive impact of people who share protected characteristics.
- 8 public meetings were held during the consultation process to explain the proposals to the public, and also to gather feedback and identify concerns about the proposals.
- Specific meetings were offered with the following groups/individuals as part of our attempts to engage with groups representing people with protected characteristics:
  - Older People's champions in Denbighshire and surrounding counties;
  - Older People's Commissioner's Office;
  - Unique Transgender Network;
  - VIVA LGBT group;
  - Autism Initiatives;
  - Learning Disability Planning Group; and
  - The Mental Health Planning Group.
- Meetings were held with the following groups/individuals to discuss the ways in which the proposals could have a negative or positive impact of people who share protected characteristics:
  - all tenants in Llys Awelon, Gorwel Newydd and Nant y Mor extra care housing schemes;
  - North Wales Deaf Association service users and staff;
  - Deafblind Cymru service users and staff;
  - 4 Age Connects' older people's 'hubhub' networks;
  - tenants at Cysgodfa, Llys y Faner and Llygadog Sheltered housing schemes;
  - members of the 'My Life My Way Group';
  - Community Support services staff, including those in the affected schemes;
  - BCUHB Head of Equality, Diversity & Human Rights, who in turn briefed the BCUHB Equality Stakeholder Group (members of the public who work with BCUHB to advice on equality issues);
  - Denbighshire Voluntary Services Council (DVSC)'s Health, Social Care & Wellbeing Forum;
  - the Chair of the North Wales LGBT Older People's network;
  - Age Connects' Advocacy officers and Community Navigators;
  - the Older People's reference group (including representatives of CSSIW, Red Cross, NEWCIS, Age Connect, Alzheimer's Society)

**5. Will this proposal / decision have a positive impact on any of the protected characteristics (age; disability; gender-**

## **reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation)?**

*(Please refer to section 1 in the toolkit for a description of the protected characteristics)*

The General Duty within the Equality Act sets out three main principles that public bodies like Denbighshire County Council must follow, i.e. public bodies must:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations between people of different protected characteristics

We have considered all of the information gathered as part of the pre-consultation and consultation exercises in order to ensure due regard to the General Duty. Section 6 considers whether the proposals may have a disproportionate negative impact on any of the protected characteristics, and this covers the part of the General Duty about “eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation”. Sections 7 and 8 also refer to “eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation”. Section 7 explains how the proposals have already been amended to eliminate or reduce any potential disproportionate negative impact. Section 8 considers any further actions to address and / or monitor any potential negative impact.

This section (5) considers whether the proposals may have a positive impact on any of the protected characteristics, and this is relevant to the General Duty to “advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people of different protected characteristics”. Any positive impact on people who share a particular protected characteristic will advance quality of opportunity. Section 8 also refer to ways in which the proposals could “advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people of different protected characteristics” because it considers the need to ensure that the care sector could improve training in relation to LGBT issues, which is an issue that was raised by one of the groups we engaged with as part of the consultation.

As highlighted in Section 2 above, each of the 4 care facilities has a number of different options, and there are therefore many elements to consider here. The potential impact of the alternative options are set out in section 10 in order to enable Elected Members to make an informed decision about each establishment. However, the potential impact of the preferred options being put forward by the Elected Member Task & Finish Group are set out below:

### **Hafan Deg (Option 1):**

- The main client group affected (from an equality perspective) would be older people. We would hope that there would be a positive impact on older people because there would be an expansion of day care services and other preventative activities to combat social isolation and support the principle of promoting independence.

- It could be argued that there would be a positive impact on older people in Denbighshire generally. This is because Option 1 would save the council money, and would enable the current services to be provided in a cheaper way. This reduces pressure generally on the community care budget, and helps the council to use its money in the most effective way to support all older people in Denbighshire who have care needs.

**Dolwen (Option 1): To enter into a partnership with an external organisation and transfer the whole service to them, while registering for EMH care.**

- The main client groups affected (from an equality perspective) would be older people and disabled people (particularly those with specialist mental health needs, such as dementia). Option 1 would result in a positive impact for people who share these protected characteristics, because it would result in a new offer of EMH residential provision in Denbigh. This means that people living in the Denbigh area would be able to continue to living in Denbigh, rather than having to move to an EMH residential care home in another area.
- Again, it could be argued that there would be a positive impact on older people in Denbighshire generally. This is because Option 1 would save the council money, and would enable services to be provided in a cheaper way. This reduces pressure generally on the community care budget, and helps the council to use its money in the most effective way to support all older people in Denbighshire who have care needs.

**Awelon (Option 1): The council will stop new admissions and work with the individuals and their families, at their own pace, to move them to suitable alternatives as appropriate and to enter into a partnership with the owner of Llys Awelon to develop additional Extra Care apartments on the site.**

- The council believes that there will be a positive impact for older people in the Ruthin area in the long-term (i.e. once the development of the new Extra Care apartments is complete). This is because research shows that Extra Care is a more enabling alternative to standard residential care, and that outcomes for people living in Extra Care developments are better than for people in standard residential care.
- The ability to provide additional Extra Care Housing would have a positive impact for people who are married or in a civil partnership, because a couple can move into an apartment together, even if one partner does not have social care needs. This is not the case in a residential care home.
- There could also be a positive financial impact for older people, because people will not have to sell their own property to pay for care home fees (as may be the case if a person moves into a residential care home. People may have to sell their property in order to be able to afford to buy an extra care apartment, but they can then retain ownership of a property.
- Again, it could be argued that there would be a positive impact on older people in Denbighshire generally. This is because Option 1 would save the council money, and would enable services to be provided in a cheaper way. This reduces pressure generally on the community care budget, and helps the council to use its money in the most effective way to support all older people in Denbighshire who have care needs.

**Cysgod y Gaer (Option 1): The council would enter into a partnership with**

**relevant stakeholders (including BCU and the 3rd sector) to develop the site into a 'support hub' offering both residential and extra care type facilities as well as an outreach domiciliary care and support service to the tenants of local Sheltered Housing Schemes and the wider population of Corwen and the surrounding area.**

- Option 1 will develop services that support independence and improved outcomes for older people in the local area. It will also bring together elements of external domiciliary care with residential services, creating a holistic support offer to a low demand area much more effectively.
- The council believes that there will be a positive impact for older people in the Corwen area in the long-term (i.e. once the development of the new Extra Care apartments is complete). This is because research shows that Extra Care is a more enabling alternative to standard residential care, and that outcomes for people living in Extra Care developments are better than for people in standard residential care.
- The ability to provide additional Extra Care Housing would have a positive impact for people who are married or in a civil partnership, because a couple can move into an apartment together, even if one partner does not have social care needs. This is not the case in a residential care home.
- There could also be a positive financial impact for older people, because people will not have to sell their own property to pay for care home fees (as may be the case if a person moves into a residential care home. People may have to sell their property in order to be able to afford to buy an extra care apartment, but they can then retain ownership of a property.

**Consideration of particular protected characteristics:**

**1. Age:**

Age is specifically considered throughout this document because the evidence we have gathered suggests that the main protected characteristic affected by the proposals would be older people, particularly people over 85 years of age (as this is the general demographic for our in-house care services, particularly for residential care).

**2. Disability**

Although disability does not feature prominently within the evidence gathered during the consultation (because there was very little specific reference to the impact on disabled people within consultation responses), there is an assumption that older people (particularly the over 85 years age group) are more likely to be disabled than the general population, and therefore many of those older people will also share this protected characteristic. These two groups are therefore considered to be inextricably linked for the purposes of this exercise. Any perceived positive impact on older people would also apply to older disabled people, for example the benefits of Extra Care Housing over standard residential care would also apply to older disabled people.

### **3. Gender reassignment**

No current service users highlighted any potential benefits of the proposals in relation to gender reassignment, and we have not been advised of anything specifically relating to the options under consultation which would have a positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic. This may be because many older people may prefer not to share or discuss such information about themselves, perhaps because of previous negative experiences of doing so. However, no information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

### **4. Marriage and civil partnership**

There is a potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic, and this is highlighted within this section (above).

### **5. Race**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

### **6. Religion or belief**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

### **7. Sex**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

### **8. Sexual orientation**

No current service users highlighted any potential benefits of the proposals in relation to sexual orientation, and we have not been advised of anything specifically relating to the options under consultation which would have a positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic. This may be because many older people may prefer not to share or discuss such information about themselves, perhaps because of previous negative experiences of doing so. Although no information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact of the proposals on people who share this protected characteristic, Section 8 (below) does consider the need to ensure that the care sector could improve training in relation to LGBT issues, which is an issue that was raised by one of the groups we engaged with as part of the consultation. Progressing this as one of our further actions (Section 8) would advance equality of opportunity for people who share this protected characteristic and foster good relations between people of different protected characteristics.

### **9. Welsh Language**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential positive impact on people who share this protected characteristic. However, Welsh Language has rightly been identified as important issue by many people. Therefore, the council will ensure that any asset transfer agreements (or new contracts) with independent sector providers, which become necessary following Cabinet decisions, include strict requirements about the need to be able to provide care services through the medium of Welsh. This would advance equality of opportunity for Welsh speakers.

**6. Will this proposal / decision have a disproportionate negative impact on any of the protected characteristics (age; disability; gender-reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation)?**

As highlighted above, each of the 4 care facilities has a number of different options, and there are therefore many elements to consider here. The potential impact of the alternative options are set out in section 10 in order to enable Elected Members to make an informed decision about each establishment. However, the potential impact of the preferred options being put forward by the Elected Member Task & Finish Group are set out below:

**Hafan Deg (Option 1): To enter into a partnership with an external organisation and transfer the building to them, commissioning a day care service within the building and, in addition, enabling 3rd sector agencies to provide early intervention activities for older people that reduce social isolation, support independence and promote resilience.**

- The main client group affected (from an equality perspective) would be older people. We envisage that there would be no negative impact on this group because the building would continue to be used for the benefit of older people in Rhyl, including those with low level needs who currently attend, while enabling the existing group of service users to continue to attend together, with the same staff group.
- Staff would be transferred (via TUPE transfer) to the partner organisation. This may be seen by some as a potentially negative impact (because staff would generally prefer to remain as Denbighshire County Council employees). However, there are no tangible negative impacts for staff, because jobs would be protected, as would the terms and conditions of staff. If the decision was made to transfer the unit, a transfer plan would be agreed, subject to consultation and approval. Statutory consultation with staff would take place.

**Dolwen (Option 1): To enter into a partnership with an external organisation and transfer the whole service to them, while registering for EMH care.**

- One area of concern identified during the consultation which could highlight a potential negative impact, is the perception (which seems to be widely held) that the general quality of care provision is much poorer in the independent sector than it is in the public sector. However, there is no real evidence to



back this view up, particularly in relation to our experience in Denbighshire. The vast majority (around 95%) of adult social care services in Denbighshire are already provided by the independent Sector. All providers are regulated and inspected by CSSIW, and they are all monitored by the council. Very few significant issues arise regarding the quality of care provided by the independent sector, and we have robust processes in place to deal with them when they do arise.

- Another area of concern raised during the consultation in relation to Dolwen is the provision of services through the medium of Welsh. The staff in Dolwen are currently able to deliver care through the medium of Welsh to cater for the needs of all the current residents who would request a Welsh-speaking service. Concerns were raised that there would be no requirement for an independent sector provider to continue providing services in Welsh. However, the council would be looking to develop a contract with an independent provider that would ensure that the new provider was required to meet the Welsh language needs of its residents.

**Awelon (Option 1): The council will stop new admissions and work with the individuals and their families, at their own pace, to move them to suitable alternatives as appropriate and to enter into a partnership with the owner of Llys Awelon to develop additional Extra Care apartments on the site.**

- In the short-term, there would be a negative impact on existing residents of Awelon (i.e. older people from an equality perspective) if the council was to insist that existing residents had to move to another home. However, it was identified within the pre-consultation stage that forcing people to move would have a negative impact on those individuals. Therefore, the council has already agreed that no individual service user will be required to move from their current home unless they wish to do so (as long as their current home is still able to meet their needs). This means that Option 1 should not have a negative impact on existing residents of Awelon.
- Existing staff would be at risk of redundancy, and this could be said to have a disproportionate impact on females as the vast majority of Awelon staff are female. However, there would be a planned progression from working for the Council due to the likely timescales involved. A closure plan would be agreed, subject to consultation and approval, and statutory consultation with staff would take place.

**Cysgod y Gaer (Option 1): The council would enter into a partnership with relevant stakeholders (including BCU and the 3rd sector) to develop the site into a 'support hub' offering both residential and extra care type facilities as well as an outreach domiciliary care and support service to the tenants of local Sheltered Housing Schemes and the wider population of Corwen and the surrounding area.**

- No potential negative impact has been identified with this option because individuals currently living in Cysgod y Gaer will be able to continue doing so.

**Consideration of particular protected characteristics:**

## **1. Age:**

Again, age is specifically considered throughout this document because the evidence we have gathered suggests that the main protected characteristic affected by the proposals would be older people, particularly people over 85 years of age (as this is the general demographic for our in-house care services, particularly for residential care). The Council considers that any potential negative impact on older people has been mitigated against within its preferred options, for example by making the commitment that current residents of residential care homes would not have to move if they did not wish to do so (as long as their current home was still able to meet their needs).

## **2. Disability**

Although disability does not feature prominently within the evidence gathered during the consultation (because there was very little specific reference to the impact on disabled people within consultation responses), there is an assumption that older people (particularly the over 85 years age group) are more likely to be disabled than the general population, and therefore many of those older people will also share this protected characteristic. These two groups are therefore considered to be inextricably linked for the purposes of this exercise. Any potential negative impact is therefore likely to have a disproportionate impact on older people and disabled people. However, the Council considers that any potential negative impact on older people or disabled people has been mitigated against within its preferred options, for example by making the commitment that current residents of residential care homes would not have to move if they did not wish to do so (as long as their current home was still able to meet their needs).

## **3. Gender reassignment**

No current service users have highlighted any potential concerns in relation to gender reassignment. Therefore, we have not been advised of anything specifically relating to the options under consultation which would have a negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic. This may be because many older people may prefer not to share or discuss such information about themselves, perhaps because of previous negative experiences of doing so. However, no information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

## **4. Marriage and civil partnership**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

## **5. Race**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

## **6. Religion or belief**

Some concerns were raised (mainly by existing residents of our existing residential care homes) that there could be a negative impact if the homes were to close and they would have to move to another home. This was on the grounds that their local religious representative (e.g. Minister) currently visits them in Dolwen, Awelon etc. and they may not be able to do so if they were required to move home. Residents were therefore concerned that their religious or spiritual needs would not be met as they are often not able to attend their preferred place of worship. There are two main strands to the mitigation against this potential negative impact. First, the Council has made a commitment that current residents of residential care homes would not have to move if they did not wish to do so (as long as their current home was still able to meet their needs). Therefore there should be no impact on the majority of existing residents for this reason. Second, in the longer-term, there is no reason why religious leaders cannot visit whatever care facilities exist as a result of the decisions made by Cabinet. For example, religious leaders could visit Dolwen if it were an independent sector EMH residential care home, and the same applies if Awelon is replaced by additional Extra Care Housing.

## **7. Sex**

No information was gathered as part of the consultation to suggest any potential negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic.

## **8. Sexual orientation**

No current service users have highlighted any potential concerns in relation to sexual orientation. Therefore, we have not been advised of anything specifically relating to the options under consultation which would have a negative impact on people who share this protected characteristic. However, we are aware that many older people may prefer not to share or discuss such information about themselves, perhaps because of previous negative experiences of doing so. We did receive some feedback from the Chair of the North Wales LGBT Older People's network that training should be provided for staff on LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans) issues (see Section 8 below for further details). This was a general point about the need for staff across the whole health and social care sector needing to receive such training, and it does not highlight a potential negative impact as a consequence of any of the options being put forward for our in-house care services. However, it is still an important point, and it referred to in more detail in Section 8 below in relation to potential mitigation.

## **9. Welsh Language**

Welsh Language has rightly been identified as important issue by many people, and some concerns were raised that some of the options being considered may have a negative impact on the Welsh Language. The main concern was that the Council takes the provision of care services through the medium of Welsh very seriously, and that this may not be the case if, for example, Dolwen was transferred to the independent sector. This is clearly an important consideration, and the Council

would have to ensure that any asset transfer agreements (or new contracts) with independent sector providers, which become necessary following Cabinet decisions, include strict requirements about the need to be able to provide care services through the medium of Welsh. This would therefore form part of the service specification for any future tender process, and the council would monitor compliance with these requirements rigorously. As highlighted in Section 7 below, the council has committed to re-invest an element of any savings to employ two additional contract monitoring officers in order to increase our capacity to monitor the quality of care provided by the independent sector.

**7. Has the proposal / decision been amended to eliminate or reduce any potential disproportionate negative impact? If no, please explain why.**

<b>Yes</b>	<p>The proposals being put forward by the Elected Member Task &amp; Finish have been amended and refined over the lifetime of this review. The main changes came about during the pre-consultation stage as a result of the information gathered by the “listening &amp; engagement” exercise. For example, the option to retain Cysgod y Gaer as a council-owned asset and develop it as a support hub came about because our pre-consultation work highlighted that no real alternatives existed in that area if Cysgod y Gaer was to close.</p> <p>Strategies to mitigate against any potential negative impacts were also developed during the pre-consultation stage, for example, the commitment from Cabinet that current residents of residential care homes would not have to move if they did not wish to do so (as long as their current home was still able to meet their needs). Furthermore, the commitment was made to re-invest an element of any savings to employ two additional contract monitoring officers in order to increase our capacity to monitor the quality of care provided by the independent sector.</p> <p>Reference to mitigation is also included wherever a potential negative impact on people who share a protected characteristic is highlighted within Section 6, above.</p>
------------	--

**8. Have you identified any further actions to address and / or monitor any potential negative impact(s)?**

<b>Yes</b>	<p>Following Cabinet decisions, a number of safeguards will be explored in relation to mitigating against the risk of any potential negative impact. This Equality Impact Assessment document will be reviewed again following the Cabinet decisions, and the further actions will be agreed. However, these actions will primarily focus on ensuring that any necessary asset transfer agreements, or contracts with independent sector providers,</p>
------------	---

	<p>include safeguards about the future quality of care provided. This will include, for example, the need to offer (and provide where necessary) care services through the medium of Welsh.</p> <p>One additional point that was made by the Chair of the North Wales LGBT Older People’s network was that training should be provided for staff on LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans) issues, in line with a Stonewall report) called “Unhealthy Attitudes: the treatment of LGBT people in health and social care organisations in Wales”. This report shows gaps in the way LGBT staff are supported and how LGBT patients are cared for. It also shows the negative way in which LGBT people are talked about, and states that “<i>one in ten health and social care staff in Wales have witnessed colleagues expressing the dangerous belief that a person could be ‘cured’ of being gay, lesbian or bi</i>”.</p> <p>Although this does not necessarily identify a potential impact of any of the options presented for a decision by Cabinet, it does highlight an important issue that needs to be considered, regardless of what decisions are taken by Cabinet. Certainly all Denbighshire County Council staff are required to read the council’s mandatory equality training materials, which cover all the protected characteristics. There is also an expectation that all care providers in the independent sector provide adequate equality training for their staff. This is something that will be considered further as part of any contractual discussions that become necessary following decisions made by Cabinet.</p> <p>One final point to make is that this Equality Impact Assessment uses the information available (included any evidence gathered during the consultation) to predict the likely impact of all the options being put forward. Although this is a good exercise to undertake, it is not always possible to predict the actual impact of a change before the change is made. This is why it is essential to review the actual impact of any change at a point in time after the change has been made. It is therefore proposed that any change that is made as a result of any Cabinet decision is reviewed 6 months after implementation to establish the actual impact on people who share protected characteristics.</p>
--	---

Action(s)	Owner	By when?
This EqIA document to be reviewed following Cabinet decision in order to identify and agree the specific further actions that will be required. This is because the further actions will depend on the decisions made by Cabinet	Tony Ward	31.05.2016

Any change that is made as a result of any Cabinet decision will be reviewed 6 months after implementation to identify any unexpected and unintended disproportionate negative impact on people who share protected characteristics. Further mitigation will be then be agreed and implemented as required.	Tony Ward	tbc

The section below explores the potential impact (positive and/or negative) of the alternative options being put forward for Cabinet consideration. This is to enable Cabinet to make informed decisions which take protected characteristics into account and to demonstrate that due regard has been given to the duties of the Equality Act.

**9. Will the alternative options have a disproportionate negative or positive impact on any of the protected characteristics (age; disability; gender-reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation)?**

This section looks at each of the alternative options considered for each of the four in-house care services, and identifies any potential disproportionate (negative or positive) on people who share protected characteristics. This section mentions a particular characteristic where the council believes there is a potential disproportionate impact. Where particular protected characteristics are not mentioned, this is because the council has not received any evidence to suggest that there is a potential disproportionate impact on people who share that protected characteristic.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR HAFAN DEG:**

**Hafan Deg (Option 2): To re-provision services at Hafan Deg with the potential that the centre would close and the service users and their families be supported to find suitable alternative provision.**

**Potential Positive Impact:**

- This option would reduce the overall cost of providing day care and would generate a revenue saving for the service. It could therefore be argued that there would be a positive impact on older people in Denbighshire generally. This is because it would reduce the pressure generally on the community care budget, and help the council to use its money in the most effective way to support all older people in Denbighshire who have care needs.

#### Potential Negative Impact:

- The main client group affected (from an equality perspective) would be older people. Although the council would still be able to meet the current demand for day care, and therefore continue to meet the needs of all existing service users, this would be provided through different (independent sector) providers. This change would mean disruption for the current users of the centre. However, the council would carry out further individual assessments of every service user and find alternative provision in a sensitive and timely manner with the involvement of service users and families where possible. The council would ensure that it complies with all its legal duties to its service users. The views of current attendees would be sought and they would be helped to find suitable alternative provision that meets their needs. If the decision was made to close Hafan Deg it would not close until all the service users' needs had been fully reviewed and suitable alternative provision found.
- Hafan Deg staff would be at risk of redundancy. From an equality perspective, this would have a disproportionate impact because the majority of staff in Hafan Deg are female. If the decision was made to close the unit, a closure plan would be agreed, subject to consultation and approval. Statutory consultation with staff would take place. These processes are designed to try and mitigate against the impact on staff.

#### **Hafan Deg (Option 3): The council to continue to own and run Hafan Deg.**

#### Potential Positive Impact:

- This option would result in no change to the current service, and therefore there are no identifiable potential positive impacts.

#### Potential Negative Impact:

- The council would not realise the available revenue saving on the current running costs, which would create a financial pressure on the service. As proposed by UNISON, the revenue shortfall could be mitigated (at least for 2016/17) by an additional increase in council tax. It could be argued that this may have a negative impact on council tax payers in Denbighshire who would be effectively subsidising relatively expensive council-run day services for a minority of service users from Hafan Deg. This would therefore have a disproportionate impact on people over 18 years of age, as people under 18 years old do not pay council tax.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR DOLWEN:**

**Dolwen (Option 2): To lease or sell Dolwen for another purpose. The home would close and the service users and their families be supported to find suitable alternative provision.**

#### Potential Positive Impact:

- This option would reduce the overall cost of providing residential care and would generate a revenue saving for the service. It could therefore be argued that there would be a positive impact on older people in Denbighshire generally. This is because it would reduce the pressure generally on the community care budget, and help the council to use its money in the most effective way to support all older people in Denbighshire who have care needs.

Potential Negative Impact:

- This option would mean disruption for current residents and their families, and this means a potential negative impact for older people (mainly 85+ years old). The council would carry out further individual assessments of every service user and find alternative provision in a sensitive and timely manner with the involvement of service users and families where possible. The council would ensure that it complies with all its legal duties to its service users. The views of attendees would be sought and they would be helped to find suitable alternative provision that meets their needs. Dolwen would not close until all the service users' needs had been fully reviewed and suitable alternative provision found. Furthermore, the council has already agreed that no individual service user will be required to move from their current home unless they wish to do so (as long as their current home is still able to meet their needs).
- Existing staff would be at risk of redundancy. From an equality perspective, this would have a disproportionate impact because the majority of staff in Dolwen are female. However, staff would be able to have a planned progression from working for the Council due to the likely timescales involved. If the decision was made to close Dolwen, a closure plan would be agreed, subject to consultation and approval. Statutory consultation with staff would take place. These processes are designed to try and mitigate against the impact on staff.

**Dolwen (Option 3): The council to continue to own and run Dolwen.**

Potential Positive Impact:

- This option would result in no change to the current service, and therefore there are no identifiable potential positive impacts.

Potential Negative Impact:

- The council would not realise the available revenue saving on the current running costs, which would create a financial pressure on the service. As proposed by UNISON, the revenue shortfall could be mitigated (at least for 2016/17) by an additional increase in council tax. It could be argued that this may have a negative impact on council tax payers in Denbighshire who would be effectively subsidising relatively expensive council-run residential & day care services for a small number of service users at Dolwen. This would therefore have a disproportionate impact on people over 18 years of age, as people under 18 years old do not pay council tax.

**ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR AWELON:**

**Awelon Option 2: To work in partnership with a registered social landlord, health services and the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector to develop a range of services, transferring half of the**



**building to develop additional extra care flats, possibly as an extension to Llys Awelon, while using the remainder as a small residential unit which could be used to meet the increasing need for respite care and to ensure that no existing resident would need to move unless they chose to.**

Potential Positive Impact:

- No potential positive impacts (from an equality perspective) have been identified with this option.

Potential Negative Impact:

- Only a proportion of the potential annual revenue saving and the annual maintenance saving (achievable via Option 1) would be realised. Therefore it could be argued that the council is creating an unnecessary pressure on the community care budget by selecting this option, which means that less money is available to meet the needs of all people in Denbighshire with care and support needs. This could be argued to have a disproportionate impact on older people and disabled people in Denbighshire generally, because other services may be put under pressure.

**Awelon Option 3a (UNISON): The UNISON proposals are explored/explained in detail within the full UNISON response, but essentially their proposal is for the council to continue to own and run Awelon, and for this to be funded with an additional increase in Council Tax.**

Potential Positive Impact:

- This option would result in no change to the current service, and therefore there are no identifiable potential positive impacts.

Potential Negative Impact:

- The council would not realise the available revenue saving on the current running costs, which would create a financial pressure on the service. As proposed by UNISON, the revenue shortfall could be mitigated (at least for 2016/17) by an additional increase in council tax. It could be argued that this may have a negative impact on council tax payers in Denbighshire who would be effectively subsidising relatively expensive council-run residential & day care services for a small number of service users at Awelon. This would therefore have a disproportionate impact on people over 18 years of age, as people under 18 years old do not pay council tax.

**Awelon Option 3b (Elected Member): The council to build additional Extra Care Housing on one of the potentially vacant school sites in Ruthin (following school re-organisation). This would satisfy the demand for additional Extra Care Housing in Ruthin, and enable the Awelon site to continue as it currently is.**

Potential Positive Impact:

- The demand for additional Extra Care Housing in Ruthin would be met, which would have a positive impact on outcomes for older people in the Ruthin area because

research shows that outcomes for people living in Extra Care developments are better than for people in standard residential care.

- The ability to provide additional Extra Care Housing would have a positive impact for people who are married or in a civil partnership, because a couple can move into an apartment together, even if one partner does not have social care needs.
- There could also be a positive financial impact for older people, because people will not have to sell their own property to pay for care home fees (as may be the case if a person moves into a residential care home). People may have to sell their property in order to be able to afford to buy an extra care apartment, but they can then retain ownership of a property.

#### Potential Negative Impact:

- This is a much more expensive way of meeting the unmet demand for Extra Care Housing in Ruthin (compared with Option 1). The council would not achieve the revenue and annual maintenance savings achievable via Option 1, and the council could also lose out on a significant capital receipt from the sale of the alternative site. As argued previously, this could be argued to have a negative impact on people with care and support needs in Denbighshire because it creates an unnecessary financial pressure and limits our ability to use the community care budget in the most effective way to support people with care and support needs. This would have a disproportionate impact on older people and disabled people.
- The location of the potential alternative sites are not ideal, and would not afford the same opportunities for residents to maintain links to the local community (as with Option 1). This represents a negative impact if compared to the opportunities presented by Option 1.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR CYSGOD Y GAER:**

**Cysgod y Gaer Option 2: The council would stop new admissions and work with the individuals and their families at their own pace to move them to suitable alternatives as appropriate and to enter into a negotiations with registered social landlords to develop Extra Care apartments on the whole site.**

#### Potential Positive Impact:

- It would enable the demand for additional Extra Care to be met if a registered social landlord would agree to develop such a provision. This would have a positive impact on outcomes for older people in Corwen and the surrounding area because research shows that outcomes for people living in Extra Care developments are better than for people in standard residential care.
- The ability to provide additional Extra Care Housing would have a positive impact for people who are married or in a civil partnership, because a couple can move into an apartment together, even if one partner does not have social care needs.
- There could also be a positive financial impact for older people, because people will not have to sell their own property to pay for care home fees (as may be the case if a person moves into a residential care home). People may have to sell their property in

order to be able to afford to buy an extra care apartment, but they can then retain ownership of a property.

Potential Negative Impact:

- Existing staff would be at risk of redundancy. From an equality perspective, this would have a disproportionate impact because the majority of staff in Cysgod y Gaer are female. However, staff would be able to have a planned progression from working for the Council due to the likely timescales involved. If the decision was made to close Cysgod y Gaer, a closure plan would be agreed, subject to consultation and approval. Statutory consultation with staff would take place. These processes are designed to try and mitigate against the impact on staff.
- This option would mean disruption for current residents and their families, and this means a potential negative impact for older people (mainly 85+ years old). The council would carry out further individual assessments of every service user and find alternative provision in a sensitive and timely manner with the involvement of service users and families where possible. The council would ensure that it complies with all its legal duties to its service users. The views of attendees would be sought and they would be helped to find suitable alternative provision that meets their needs. Cysgod y Gaer would not close until all the service users' needs had been fully reviewed and suitable alternative provision found. Furthermore, the council has already agreed that no individual service user will be required to move from their current home unless they wish to do so (as long as their current home is still able to meet their needs).

## 10. Declaration

Every reasonable effort has been made to eliminate or reduce any potential disproportionate impact on people sharing protected characteristics. The actual impact of the proposal / decision will be reviewed at the appropriate stage.

<b>Review Date:</b>	30.05.2016
---------------------	------------

<b>Name of Lead Officer for Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<b>Date</b>
Tony Ward, Principal Manager: Business Support	09.03.2016

**Please note you will be required to publish the outcome of the equality impact assessment if you identify a substantial likely impact.**