

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Driving Organisational Efficiency

Reference:	DOE001
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Support Planning, Reablement, Mental Health
Lead Member(s):	Councillor Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Increased use of direct payments
---------------------------	----------------------------------

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The objective is to increase the take-up of Direct Payments, where service users pay for their home care/community support through independent Personal Assistants or direct purchasing of support from providers, instead of the council purchasing this on their behalf. Direct Payments provide more choice for service users and offers them the option to increase the degree to which their care reflects their individual needs. Increasing the take-up of Direct Payments also places more responsibility and additional transactions on the service user or their carer, which may present challenges for some service users. However, Direct Payments remain a choice for service users and there are support services available and options for others to manage Direct Payments on their behalf to mitigate these challenges and ensure that it is possible to benefit from Direct Payments regardless of capability or equality characteristics.

Increasing uptake is needed as the council has a legal obligation as a result of the Care Act to consider individuals' wellbeing and provide more choice to allow for more personalised care. Additionally, increased use of Direct Payments will provide savings against the traditional model of delivering care at a time of increasing financial pressures for the council.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

This proposal affects adult residents who have eligible social care needs which the council has a duty to meet, as well as their families and carers. More personalised care has the potential to meet their needs more effectively, facilitate greater independence for longer and reduce the pressure on carers.

Brent Council Adult Social Care and Customer Services staff will be required to be active advocates for Direct Payments and take on more responsibility for understanding the Direct Payment process, how it affects residents and what form of care would be appropriate for service users.

The council engages an external provider to provide support services, Penderels Trust, and this proposal will result in higher demand for their services.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

Some aspects of Direct Payments may be more challenging for those with particular equality characteristics. The additional responsibilities, e.g. to act as an employer if service users wish to employ a Personal Assistant, can be more challenging for certain equality groups such as those with particular mental health issues, learning disabilities, or for some older residents. However, this is mitigated by several factors: Accepting Direct Payments is a choice for service users or their carers and traditional care remains an option; those who

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

wish to receive Direct Payments can choose to have someone else manage them on their behalf; if no friend or family member is available to do this, Penderels Trust can manage Direct Payments on their behalf instead; and finally, support commissioned from Penderels Trust is available to help service users get set up and assist them with Direct Payments at any point.

Direct Payments can be managed via telephone or an online portal, so those with visual or aural impairments should still find it possible to choose to receive them and manage Direct Payments themselves if desired.

The possibility of greater personalisation means that, for example, those with disabilities or different preferences relating to ethnicity, religion or cultural beliefs can choose services that are better suited to their needs, having a positive impact compared to traditional service provision.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

No, due to the mitigating factors listed above the proposal will not have a disproportionate impact when considered as a whole.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

No, these services are already offered.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

The Adult Social Care department by its nature deals with those with eligible needs, all of whom would fall under certain equality groups.

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

No, this is a continuation of existing policy that aims to provide greater choice and flexibility in the services offered.

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

Direct Payments relates to two objectives from Brent's Equality Strategy Action Plan.

Objective 2 is "to involve our communities effectively". When used creatively, Direct Payments can result in individuals feeling more involved in their community and better able to take part in civic and community life.

Object 4 is "to ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect". Direct Payments allows more responsive, individualised methods of meeting different needs.

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes/No

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	DOE002a
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP Efficiency savings - Early Help Transformation
---------------------------	--

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

Savings will be achieved through three main work-streams: 1. More effective co-ordination and signposting and to early intervention services delivered by partners including schools and the voluntary sector; 2. Improved use of research to ensure a greater strategic focus on high impact interventions and more effective assessment of individual need. Savings will be achieved by reducing delivery of low impact or repeat interventions; 3. Planned structural change across CYP. In the first instance this will enable the delivery of a more coherent offer which is expected to reduce demand for high cost services. Any reduction in demand will then enable a further reduction in headcount.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

Staff will be affected by a likely reduction in headcount and changes of line management and working practices.

Residents who use existing services may be affected. There could be positive effects as effective and co-ordinated early intervention which will build resilience and independence, which will in turn move cases out of high risk and high cost services. As far as possible there will be a one worker to one family approach.

There may also be negative impacts as existing services change, reducing both the way services are delivered and the resource that is available to deliver them.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

Yes it is likely that the greatest impact will be on children, women and those from lower socio economic groups. It is too early at this stage to determine if this will be positive or negative

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

Yes as above

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

It is likely that this will be the case although difficult to know until more detailed proposals are drawn up

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

Early Help services tend to focus on disadvantaged children and young people

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

It is too early to say at this stage

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect
- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Not at this stage. This will be reconsidered once more detailed proposals are put forward.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	DOE002b
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP efficiency savings – Signs of Safety and Social worker recruitment
---------------------------	--

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The proposal is to decrease the depts. reliance on agency social workers, replacing them with permanent staff who are less expensive and offer more continuity of care to the families with which they work. This is linked to improving the skills base of staff, through ongoing investment in the Signs of Safety approach

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

Service users are the main group affected by the proposed changes, but this will only be positively. All affected groups (service users, stakeholders, partners etc) will be positively affected by better continuity of staff and the stronger skills base of that group

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

No. There is no discernible difference in equality characteristics between agency and permanent social workers

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

No

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

No

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

No

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

No

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes

- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

No

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	DOE002c
Budget theme(s):	Driving organisational efficiency
Service(s):	Children & Young People
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Ruth Moher

Savings Proposals:	CYP efficiency savings – Regionalising Adoption
---------------------------	---

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The Education and Adoption Bill currently within parliament proposes the creation of regional adoption agencies. The London Adoption Board is leading the scoping arrangements to determine the future shape and scale of adoption work across London in order to respond to the requirements of the proposed legislation. It is likely that Brent's adoption service will be combined within a regional or sub-regional agency with the timeframe for achieving this to be determined by the end of this reporting year. A regional agency will provide a more streamlined marketing, recruitment and assessment process for adopters that will reduce timescales. A more co-ordinated offer regarding post-adoption support will ensure families receive services better tailored to individual need. A further intention of the creation of a regional agency will be to increase the timeliness of adoptive placements for children.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

Staff working within adoption services will be affected by the proposals as they are likely to result in a reduction in posts. Residents will not be affected by proposals as the same level of service will be provided, although delivered differently. External stakeholders (Voluntary Adoption Agencies) will be involved in the creation of regional adoption agencies and are partners in the creation of these bodies.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

No as there is no current proposal to reduce the current level of service to members of the public. Potential staffing reductions will have a disproportionate impact upon females who constitute the majority of staff working within adoption services.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted
See 3.1 above.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

Yes, adoption services for children and families will be delivered differently.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

No

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

This is unlikely. Further detail will be available once the plan to produce a regional adoption agency is known before the end of this reporting year.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect
- To develop and sustain a skilled and committed workforce able to meet the needs of all local people

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Not at this stage. This should be reconsidered once the regional adoption agency plan for London is completed.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Civic Enterprise

Reference:	CE001
Budget theme(s):	Civic Enterprise
Service(s):	Support Planning, Reablement
Lead Member(s):	Councillor Hirani

Savings Proposals:	Additional Continuing Health Care contributions
---------------------------	---

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The proposal is to deliver £400k efficiencies in 16/17 and 17/18 by securing Continuing Health Care (CHC) Funding for individuals currently funded by social care, where there needs have increase and they meet the CHC eligibility criteria.

Any impact would be positive as if full or part health funding is agreed, if the person is subject to paying a financial contribution this would reduce/stop.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

This relates to all adults who are eligible for social care who have/develop complex health needs.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

No

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

No

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

No

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

No

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

No

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

No

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	CE002
Budget theme(s):	Civic Enterprise
Service(s):	Across Departments
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Pavey

Savings Proposals:	<p>This saving proposal focuses on two key areas:</p> <p>Revenue Generation - to be sought from following areas:-</p> <p><u>Advertising</u> (£300K) – examination has identified opportunities to increase advertising and revenue through increasing the number of on street (large and small format) billboards, lamppost banners, advertising on the council’s website / intranet and roundabout sponsorship.</p> <p><u>Wireless</u> (£150K) – put in place concession contracts for the installation of wireless equipment on lampposts and spaces and review current position on rooftops.</p> <p>Fees and charges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A complete review of all fees and charges will be undertaken. • Recently published CIPFA guide on Income Maximisation will be used to assist to ensure that all costs that can be properly be levied are identified to ensure full cost recovery. • Review will include analysis to determine how Brent’s charges compare to other councils and other competitors in the market – initial study of 8 areas will be undertaken to show Brent’s relative positions.
---------------------------	---

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The objectives of the proposal include generating additional income of £300k from advertising and sponsorship through increasing the number of on street (large and small format) billboards, lamppost banner, advertising on the council's website/intranet and roundabout sponsorship.

The proposal also includes putting in place concession contracts for the installation of wireless equipment on lampposts and review current position on rooftops and small spaces/buildings, to generate £210k.

In addition, a review of fees and charges will also be carried out to compare Brent to neighbouring authorities in order to bring our charges in line, including for services that were previously free, with a view to raising £1.99m of additional revenue.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

There are potential impacts for residents, local businesses and visitors to the borough. This includes both potential positive and negative impacts.

Additional advertising space will provide opportunities for local businesses and partners. Increasing advertising on the council’s website may have potential negative impacts for some web users using assistive technology as they may not view the browser in the same

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

format or find the display more difficult to navigate. This could potentially impact people with a learning disability or other disability. The website is a source of information and advice for local residents and different needs of individuals will be considered to minimise any potential negative impact in increasing advertising.

The proposal to install wireless equipment on lampposts will offer limited free access to wireless for residents and visitors to the borough in the area in which it operates, providing new opportunities to access the internet on a mobile basis.

A review of fees and charges could have potential negative impact for residents. Details of any potential equality impacts are not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review process.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

As outlined above, the proposal for advertising on the council's website could impact on people with a learning disability or other disability. Impacts of the review of fees and charges are not known at this stage and will be assessed through an individual EA carried out as part of the review process.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

The proposal could change fees and charges for services, including services currently offered at no charge to the service user. As the review has not commenced, the details are not known at this stage and an individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

It is not known at this stage. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? - Yes

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

An EA is not required for the wireless but will be carried out for the advertising. An individual EA and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each service area as part of the review of fees and charges.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	CE003
Budget theme(s):	Civic Enterprise
Service(s):	Digital Services
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Pavey

Savings Proposals:	Further IT sales
---------------------------	------------------

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

This saving proposal is themed under Enterprise and follows on from the successful bid to provide ICT services to the LGA. In addition, Brent is in the process of establishing a shared service with Lewisham which will formally commence in April 2016 covering infrastructure support and will be extended to other applications in 2017/18.

Digital Services are looking to offer ICT services on a commercial basis to other organisations. The service is already in discussion with a number of London boroughs that have expressed an interest in the type of services Brent could provide for them and are looking to develop these discussions with a view of having a tailored service in place for April 2018.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

No negative impact identified by the service. However, consideration should be given on the impact of staff both as service providers and clients, particularly where there is heavy reliance on self-service. This will be considered as part of the procurement process based on the type of service Brent will offer to individual boroughs.

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

Staff using AT, staff who have LDD and staff over 50 who are usually more affected from self-service.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

Age
Disability

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

The proposal would change the ways staff accessed services (see point 3.1 above).

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

No

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

See point 3.1 above

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? – N/A

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes/No

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	CE004
Budget theme(s):	Civic Enterprise
Service(s):	Parking and Lighting/Parking
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	Eliminate the additional overhead costs of the Serco parking contract incurred by LB Brent.
---------------------------	---

- 1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.**

The proposal is to renegotiate the allocation of overhead cost that is chargeable to each of the three client boroughs with respect to the Serco Parking Contract.

- 2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.**

This is a financial and contractual matter that affects no service users.

- 3. Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?**

No

- 4. Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?**

No

- 5. Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?**

No

- 6. Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?**

No

- 7. Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?**

No

- 8. Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives? – N/A**

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

No

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Making Our Money Go Further

Reference:	MGF001
Budget theme(s):	Making Our Money Go Further
Service(s):	Procurement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Pavey

Savings Proposals:	<p>The key area for savings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price reductions on contract renewal – 161 contracts in scope:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63 contracts above £500k with expiry dates between 2016/17 - 2018/19 will look to be renewed with a savings target of 10% • 98 contracts below £500k with expiry dates between 2016/17 - 2018/19 will look to be renewed with a savings target of 10% • Savings on end of street lighting PFI – the PFI street lighting contract contains clauses that require the contractor, on contract termination, to have lamppost columns in place which have a minimum 5 year life. Together with a programme, currently on-going, of installing LED lights and a central management system, this provides the opportunity to replace the existing contract requirements with a repairs only contract.
---------------------------	---

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The proposal is to apply a 10 per cent savings target against current contract prices. It is proposed that this will be applied to 161 contracts due for renewal over the next three years (2016/17 - 2018/19). This includes 63 contracts above £500k and 98 contracts below £500k. In addition savings to be achieved on the end of the Streetlight PFI contract by replacing the current contract requirements by a repairs only contract.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

The full details of the potential impacts are not known at this stage but relate to commissioned services, including Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's services. The proposal could therefore have potential impact on residents, staff and external providers.

A total of 161 contracts will be affected, including:

Area	No. of Contracts	
	Above £500k (2016/17 to 2018/19)	below £500k (2016/17 to 2018/19)
Adults Social Care	16	12
Chief Operating Officer's Department	33	50
Children & Young People's Service	10	26
Public Health Grant	2	2

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Area	No. of Contracts	
Regeneration and Growth	2	8
TOTALS	63	98

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

It is not known at this stage. EAs and consultation will be completed as required during the contract negotiations. Relevant contracts must incorporate equality and diversity requirements, with monitoring arrangements in place.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

There is a potential that the proposal could change current commissioned services for Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's services but the details are not is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

It is not known at this stage. Individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

The proposal relates to the following equality objective:

- To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes - individual EAs and consultation (where relevant) will be completed for each contract negotiation.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Reference:	MGF002
Budget theme(s):	Making our money go further
Service(s):	Transportation
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Savings Proposals:	This saving is a 10% reduction in combined budgets for core highways maintenance work within the Lohac contract and for separate reactive maintenance work.
---------------------------	---

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The proposal is to make a saving of 10% in budgets for highways reactive repairs (roads, pavements, signs, street furniture, markings), gully cleansing, inspections and call outs. This will require reduced spend and fewer remedial works undertaken. It is intended to be countered by increased investment so that repairs are less necessary and less frequent.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

Any resident, business owner or visitor to the borough, particularly road users and pedestrians, who will have a concern about the state and condition of the borough's roads and pavements.

3. Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

Yes

- Age
- Disability
- Pregnancy/maternity

4. Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups?

Yes

Elderly and disabled pedestrians and road users rely on well maintained road and footway surfaces. Any deterioration can present safety hazards for these vulnerable users. Similarly, uneven surfaces will present access difficulties for those with small children and pushchairs, prams, etc. and for those who rely on mobility scooters for transport.

5. Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

No

6. Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

No

7. Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

Yes

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

8. Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

Yes

1. To know and understand our communities
2. To involve our communities effectively

To ensure local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect – Will ensure that a high quality service is provided that is mindful of equality considerations and meets the individual residents and visitors.

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

Yes

Council Tax Increase

Reference:	n/a
Budget theme(s):	Council Tax
Service(s):	All
Lead Member(s):	Councilor Pavey

Savings Proposals:	n/a
---------------------------	-----

Stage 1 Screening Data

1. What are the objectives and expected outcomes of your proposal? Why is it needed? Make sure you highlight any proposed changes.

The Council is faced with severe cuts in its budgets in the next two years and in order to help overcome this it is proposed:

1. Agree an overall 3.99% increase in the Council's element of council tax for 2016/17 with 2% as a precept for Adult Social Care and a 1.99% general increase.
2. Agree that if the 2% adult social care precept in the Council's element of council tax is rejected, Adult Social Care expenditure will be increased by £1.3m in 2016/17 rather than the increase proposed (£3.2m).

A major element of the Council's spend is on social care, and Brent faces considerable demographic challenges over the coming years. The Office for National Statistics projects that from 2015 to 2019 the number of residents over 75 years old in Brent will grow by nearly 8%, and the number of those under 15 years old by 4.5%. This is much

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

faster than the population as a whole, which is nonetheless forecast to grow by 3.5% at a time when the Council's funding is being significantly reduced. Officers estimate that by 2020 over half of the Council's budget will be spent on social care.

Without the proposed additional Council Tax increase of 2% described above the Adult Social Care budget will only be increased by £1.3m (instead of by £3.2m), which could pose challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. If the above proposal is approved, however, this will mean that for those households who do not receive any Council Tax support the Council Tax for a Band D property will increase by £23.30 annually, or by £1.94 per month, or by £0.45 per week. The increase in Council Tax will impact on all households, apart from those who receive 100% Council Tax support.

For the most financially vulnerable families the Council Tax support scheme will act as a significant mitigation to the impact of increased Council Tax. Those claimants of pensionable age may be entitled to council tax support equating to 100% of their council tax liability, whereas working age claimants may be entitled to up to 80% of their council tax liability. For those working age claimants (who are not receiving full exemption due to disability or carer status) in receipt of maximum council tax support they will only be required to pay 20% of the full bill, and so the cost of the increase will be £0.09p per week at Band D. However, some households on low incomes who fall outside the Council Tax support threshold could potentially be affected by the Council Tax increase.

This Equality Analysis is looking at the impacts of the proposal (both positive and negative) on affected groups with protected characteristics.

2. Who is affected by the proposal? Consider residents, staff and external stakeholders.

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is approved, the budget of Adult Social Care services will be increased by further £1.9m (from £1.3m to £3.2m) which will enable the service to meet increasing demand of current and future service users who are among the most vulnerable members of Brent's community.

If the additional 1.99% additional Council Tax increase is approved, this generate an additional £1.9m. Given that the council faces reductions in spending, this additional money is effectively being used to reduce the amount of savings that need to be found in 2016/17 and future years. If rejected, the council's budget would be reduced by £1.9m from the proposal, and additional reductions in expenditure would need to be identified. This could impact residents, staff and external stakeholders.

However, if this proposal is approved, it will affect all households in Brent (117,140) that will see their Council Tax bills increase, unless they are eligible for 100% Council Tax support. Currently, 25% (29,100 households out of the 117,140) of households in Brent receive full or partial Council Tax support, which means that they will receive full or partial protection for the increase. In addition those households where there is only one adult resident receive a 25% reduction in their bill so will therefore see a weekly increase of £0.34 rather than £0.45 at band D; there are over 34,500 households receiving a 25% discount

3.1 Could the proposal impact on people in different ways because of their equality characteristics?

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is approved, the budget of Adult Social Care services will be increased by further £1.9m (from £1.26m to £3.16m) which will have a positive impact on the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, (particularly women who have longer life expectancy, but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities), and disabled people.

If the additional 1.99% additional Council Tax increase is approved, this will generate an additional £1.9m. Given that the council faces reductions in spending, this additional money is effectively being used to reduce the amount of savings that need to be found in 2016/17 and future years. If rejected, the council's budget would be reduced by £1.9m from the proposal, and additional reductions in expenditure would need to be identified. This could impact residents, staff and external stakeholders. The groups that are most likely to be affected by a reduction in the proposed budget are children and young people, older people and women.

The proposed Council Tax increase will affect households in Brent in different ways based on their financial circumstances. However low income households are likely to be protected as they will see increases in their Council Tax support which will either offset in full or partially this increase.

3.2 Could the proposal have a disproportionate impact on some equality groups? If you answered 'Yes' please indicate which equality characteristic(s) are impacted

Yes – both positively and negatively

Positive impact on Adult Social Care service users: older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

A major element of the Council's spend is on social care, and Brent faces considerable demographic challenges over the coming years. The Office for National Statistics projects that from 2015 to 2019 the number of residents over 75 years old in Brent will grow by nearly 8%. This is much faster than the population as a whole, which is nonetheless forecast to grow by 3.5% at a time when the Council's funding is being significantly reduced. Officers estimate that by 2020 over half of the Council's budget will be spent on social care.

If the 2% additional Council Tax increase for Adult Social Care is not agreed then the budget for the Adult Social Care department will need to be reduced by £1.9m, which could pose significant challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. Adult Social Care service users are some of the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy, but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, and some residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

The increase in council tax for general use should have a positive impact on some equality groups as it prevents an additional reduction of £1.9m in the council's budget. Without a specific alternative proposal the exact benefit to specific groups of residents, staff and external stakeholders is uncertain.

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Negative impact on households living on low incomes that fall outside of the threshold for Council Tax support (socio-economic disadvantage)

The proposal will increase the financial pressure on those households, particularly working age men and women in single or multiple households, earning just above the threshold to qualify for Council Tax and/or Welfare Assistance support. Brent Council does not hold detailed data on the incomes of council tax payers. It is therefore difficult to predict the impact on most of the equality groups as for many households with reasonable incomes, £0.45 a week at band D will have minimal impact.

Currently, 25% (29,100 households out of the 117,140) of households in Brent receive full or partial Council Tax support, which means that they will receive full or partial protection for the increase. Those households who receive partial Council Tax support will see pro rata increases in their Council Tax. Working age claimants who receive 80% Council Tax support, for example, will see an increase in their bills equivalent to 20% of the increase, i.e. £4.66 for a Band D property or nine pence a week.

The remaining households who are not in receipt of Council Tax support will see a weekly increase in their Council Tax bills ranging from £0.30 for Band A property to £0.89 for Band H property.

The households who are not eligible for Council Tax support will see the Brent Council element of their bill increase by 3.99%. However this will be offset by a reduction in the GLA precept, so the net increase is not 3.99% but 1.72%. This equates to £23.30 annually for a Band D property, or £1.94 per month, or by £0.45 per week. If they are also in receipt of a 25% single person discount this will reduce the increase by 25%

The table below shows the increase for each Council Tax band:

Band	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Annual Increase	£15.53	£18.12	£20.71	£23.30	£28.46	£33.66	£38.83	£46.60
Weekly Increase	£0.30	£0.35	£0.40	£0.45	£0.55	£0.65	£0.75	£0.89
No of properties	4,391 3.7%	12,822 10.9%	34,935 29.8%	33,316 28.4%	21,816 18.6%	6,263 5.3%	3,348 2.9%	249 0.2%
No. receiving a 25% discount	2,215	6,676	13,490	7,487	3,594	814	371	13
Accounts subject to recovery (sample)	11.6%	16.2%	35.0%	21.3%	10.3%	2.9%	2.4%	0.3%

The table above shows that almost two thirds (72.8%) of households will see a weekly increase of £0.45 or less. It should be noted, however, that the analysis of a random sample of accounts subject to recovery action shows that proportionately more accounts in Bands A,

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

B and C are subject to recovery action. This would suggest that households living in lower banded properties find it more difficult to pay and so, although the proposed increase for these property bands is £0.40 or less per week (or £20.71 or less annually), these households could potentially be more affected by the increase in Council Tax if they are not in receipt of Council Tax support.

Those households living in Bands D – H will in most cases be in a better position to manage the proposed Council Tax increase, although there might be a minority of households on low incomes who fall outside the Council Tax support threshold and could therefore be affected by the increase.

A key limit on the negative impact on particular groups is that so many households will contribute a small amount extra each week, as shown by the figures above.

3.3 Would the proposal change or remove services used by vulnerable groups of people?

The additional 2% increase in Council Tax will help maintain Adult Social Care services used by the most vulnerable members of Brent's community, and will help ensure that the increasing demand on those services is met.

If the proposal is rejected, the overall expenditure for Adult Social Care will be reduced by £1.9m, which could pose challenges to the service to meet growing demand of current and future service users. Failure to meet the increasing demand and diverse needs of current and future service users would have a potential negative impact on those most at need.

The increase in council tax for general use should have a positive impact on some equality groups as it prevents an additional reduction of £1.9m in the council's budget. Without a specific alternative proposal the exact benefit to specific groups of residents, staff and external stakeholders is uncertain, but a reduction in budget at short notice will limit the scope of the council to reduce the impact on services used by vulnerable groups of people.

While the Council Tax proposal will increase the financial pressure on some households, the Council Tax support scheme will partially or fully mitigate this impact for those households who are living on low incomes and are eligible for Council Tax support. Further, single households will have the impact mitigated by the 25% reduction for single households

Further detail on the specific impact with regard to council tax support:

- In 2015-16, it was expected that the average weekly amount a working age council tax support claimant would pay towards their Council Tax was under £5.32 per week (£278.16 per year). Of the three working age Council Tax Support groups, only the Vulnerable group would not see any change to the amount they pay in the event that their council tax liability were to increase (due to them being eligible for a 100% reduction). However, the other two groups, Working Age Other and Working Age Employed, would see a £0.09 weekly increase alter the amount they contribute to £5.67 and £9.12 respectively. This is illustrated in table X below:

Scheme Type	2015/16 Expected Average Contribution	New Contribution based on £0.09 Increase (Band D Average)
Vulnerable	£1.30	£1.30

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

Working Age Employed	£9.03	£9.12
Working Age Other	£5.58	£5.67

- Like the Working Age Vulnerable Group, the Council Tax Support Pensioner group - who had on average £3.16 per week to pay – would remain unaffected by an increase to their liability as they too are eligible for a 100% reduction to their bill. This is a significant mitigation of the impact upon this group.
- The Vulnerable group, which includes carers and people who claim disability benefits, or who have partners who claim disability benefits, are entitled to further reductions in council tax through council tax support, and had an average liability of £1.30 per week in 2015-16. This would be unchanged by the proposed change.
- The gender of the working age claimant caseload is as follows (note that either partner in a couple may make the Benefit claim, but there may be a disproportionate number of one gender making claims for couples which could potentially affect this data):

Gender	Vulnerable		Working Age Employed		Working Age Other		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
FEMALE	3068	54%	2576	46%	4645	61%	10289	54%
MALE	2579	46%	2991	54%	3020	39%	8590	46%
Total	5647	100%	5567	100%	7665	100%	18879	100%

- In terms of Ethnicity, 14% of working age claimants were Asian (compared to 27% of Brent population), 24% of working age claimants were Black (21% of Brent population), 3% of working age claimants were mixed background (4% of Brent population), 20% of working age claimants were white (43% of Brent population), and 4% of working age claimants belonged to another group (5% of Brent population). However, 36% of claimants did not disclose their ethnicity which makes further analysis complicated.
- Single people form the largest group of council tax support claimants by family status, followed by lone parents. However, the structure of council tax and council tax support mean that these groups are more likely to pay between £0 and £5 per week than other groups:

Weekly CTAX Payment 2015-16	Couple No Dependents		Couple with dependents		Lone Parent		Single		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
£0.00	330	45%	684	17%	1,083	19%	2,886	35%	4,983	26%
£0.01-£5.00	168	23%	931	23%	3,046	52%	3,437	42%	7,582	40%
£5.01-£10.00	95	13%	1,239	30%	759	13%	857	10%	2,950	16%
£10.01-£15.00	59	8%	524	13%	578	10%	581	7%	1,742	9%
£15.00+	84	11%	732	18%	365	6%	441	5%	1,622	9%
Total	736	100%	4,110	100%	5,831	100%	8,202	100%	18,879	100%

The existing single person's discount offers significant mitigation of the impact of the proposed council tax increase for this group.

- No data is held on council support claimants with respect to: gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; religion or belief; and sexual orientation. However, there is no strong evidence that these groups will be

Equality Analysis Screening Forms

significantly adversely affected by the proposed increase, and the protections described above will apply to these groups.

Finally, were a group to be significantly adversely affected in way that is currently unforeseen, existing powers under Section 13A of the Local Government Act 1992, allow the reduction of council tax by up to 100%. The process for applying is detailed on the Council's internet site.

3.4 Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?

There is a relatively high proportion of older people living with income deprivation in Brent. The borough is 14th worst in the country (326 local authorities) for older people affected by income deprivation.

The additional 2% increase in Council Tax will help maintain Adult Social Care services used by the most vulnerable members of Brent's community such as older adults, particularly women who have longer life expectancy but are also more likely to have caring responsibilities, disabled people, residents on low incomes who might be experiencing multiple disadvantage.

Many of the council's services are targeted towards vulnerable groups, therefore the 1.99% rise in council tax will help to maintain these services, and reduce the impact of cuts to local government funding on service users.

The proposal, on the other hand, will increase the financial pressure on those households, including working age men and women in single or multiple households, earning just above the threshold to qualify for Council Tax and/or Welfare Assistance support. However the impact on pensioners, disabled people and working age households who currently receive 100% or partial Council Tax support will be mitigated due to the corresponding increases in the support provided to them.

3.5 Is the proposal likely to be sensitive or important for some people because of their equality characteristics?

Yes

3.6 Does the proposal relate to one of Brent's equality objectives?

Yes

Objective 4: To ensure that local public services are responsive to different needs and treat users with dignity and respect

Recommend this EA for Full Analysis?

No - the costs of the council tax increase will be spread widely between households across the borough, and there is already significant mitigation in place to protect the most vulnerable groups, for example: council tax support, single person's discount, and discounts for some disabled people. Demographic pressures in the form of rising numbers of children and older people in the borough combined with reductions in funding from central government mean serious risk of a significant increase in inequality falling disproportionately on some protected groups, especially older people, women, and disabled people if council tax is not raised. Finally, existing safeguards include the ability for the council to reduce council tax liabilities, were an unforeseen problem to be identified.