

Cumulative Impact Assessment Disability

This cumulative impact assessment needs to be read in conjunction with the IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY FOR 2011/12 BUDGET PROPOSALS which provides more detail of individual proposals and the actions that will be taken to mitigate their effects.

Item	Portfolio	total in 2011/12 (£'000)	Comments
Virtual health and social care ward to provide crisis and emergency support	ASCH2	100	This will have a positive affect on older people enabling them to stay in their own home rather than be admitted to hospital during crisis periods. A higher proportion of 85s are expected to need the service but not disproportionately so.
Reduction in Day Care Services	ASCH9	400	Review of contracted day services to reflect Fair Access to Care activity and increasing take up of Self Directed Support. Will affect people with mental health issues and alcohol problems.
Review of Meals on Wheels (MoW) provision	ASCH12	45	Around 90% of those receiving MoW are aged 65 and over. The majority are disabled or have age related frailty.
Non statutory voluntary sector services funding.	ASCH14	% of 776	Many of these services are specifically targeted at older people. Reducing access to mental health services generally will impact on a <u>disability</u> group who are known to experience prejudice and stigma from the general public. Some service provision targets people who are particularly vulnerable (Mayfield nursery) and it would be difficult to provide alternative provision.
Cease provision of later years service and support to partnership. This includes support for the third age centre.	ASCH16	239	This budget is for services and projects that are specifically targeted at older people and provide support and advice. This may impact on people with disabilities relating to old age though not universally the case.
Reorganisation of services to children, young people and families from across the Directorate	CSL 10	703	Limited impact due to all services being refocused. Less vulnerable children, young people and families might experience a reduction in generic services such as information, advice and guidance, youth support.
Prevention services provided by the third and private sector	CSL 11	600	Impact will be on vulnerable people, children, young people and families.
Reduction in bus subsidies affecting the 8/8A service, dial-a-ride, night bus marshals, the no 5 Sunday service, some city night buses and the no 7A service	E&T 44	90	Dial-a-ride is often used by older, more frail members of society, and those who are unable to use buses so a reduction could lead to some restrictions in travel. The proposals to Dial A Ride are not a reduction in service as they reflect a reduced demand and hence a reduced need for buses.
Itchen Bridge – reduction of toll concessions for disabled users	E & T 51	25	Many people with disabilities rely on the care for transport and do not have the option of public transport. However the impact is considered negligible. (Northam Bridge alternative route also available though not as convenient).
Implementation of 3 year library strategy	LCH 5	% of 246	Reduction in variety of materials would affect people with a visual impairment e.g. reduction in audio books and large print.
Public Toilets Closures in district and city centre	LSCS8	60	Any reduction in accessibility and convenience of public toilet provision will disproportionately affect older people, children and those with young families. Also those with health conditions that require immediate access to toilet facilities. Alternatives are being explored in identified areas.
Major review of remaining service and consolidation with other services and scaling back – communities team.	LSCS11	% of 98	There is the potential reduction in support for hate crime and harassment (including incidents against disabled people) and community tensions.
Review scope and delivery of Private Sector Housing Service on the basis of statutory provision	HOU 6	% of 54	Reductions in Fuel Poverty work would hit older people as would support to improve the quality of private sector housing. This could lead to additional health implications.
Impact as a result of reduction to grants and contracts in the voluntary sector	LSCS 13	% of 450	Impact dependent on final recommendations – appraisal of grant applications currently underway and IAs will be completed on the recommendations to Cabinet in new year.

Cumulative Impact of Proposals on Disabled People:

Background

1. The Council has a duty under the Equality Act 2010 (in force from 1st October 2010) not to discriminate against any person on the basis of a protected characteristic (such as disability). This includes discrimination by way of less favourable treatment (direct discrimination) or by introducing a rule, policy or practice that applies to everyone but particularly disadvantages people who have a protected characteristic (indirect discrimination). Direct discrimination will always be unlawful. Indirect discrimination will not be unlawful if it can be justified, i.e. it can be shown that the rule, policy or practice was intended to meet a legitimate objective in a fair, balanced and reasonable way.
2. In considering whether or not any indirect discrimination is justified, the council must consider whether or not there is any other way to meet their objective that is not discriminatory or is less likely to disadvantage those with protected characteristics. This may well mean setting out clearly whether or not consideration has been given to other ways of achieving these savings (such as raising charges across the board, cutting other services).
3. While the general equality duty is not currently in force, the relevant duties from previous legislation are 'held over' and the Council still therefore must show that it has 'had regard' to the impact of its decision on its equality duties and the need to advance equality of opportunity between people who have protected characteristics and those who do not.

Access / Transport

4. A number of the proposals identified in the table impact on the ability of disabled people to travel and access services. The proposals to remove concessions to cross the Itchen Bridge for approximately 2,500 people increase costs for disabled people, many of whom are on low incomes. This needs to be considered alongside the proposal to remove an alternative to driving into the City for disabled people, dial-a-ride, and the potential impact of expected reduction in the council's grants budget on the City Shopmobility service. However, the proposals to Dial A Ride are not a reduction in service as they reflect a reduced demand and hence a reduced need for buses.
5. When considering these proposals collectively it could represent a significant negative impact for disabled people, particularly for the relatively small number who will feel the impact of all the above proposals. It could lead to some disabled people to withdraw from community involvement, engagement and activity due to access issues and could choose not to spend in the city due to transport and access issues.
6. The savings proposals also have some potential to affect other council activities and funding. For example, some disabled people may be eligible for social care services and by introducing or increasing charges they may have less disposable income available to contribute to care packages. This may mean there could be a need to factor a percentage reduction of loss of income in to another part of the council's business. The potential increased social isolation could also have health and cost implications for the City Council and other public sector organisations.

Mitigation

7. Other alternative accessible transport options could be reviewed as part of the engagement process, but this could be difficult given the need for specially adapted vehicles.
8. If the grant for City Shopmobility is withdrawn there is the opportunity to influence the service provided by West Quay Shopmobility.
9. Publicity to explain the rationale behind the proposals.

Mental Health

10. Overall reduction in alcohol and mental health service levels will reduce ability to respond to a range of diversity issues. People with serious alcohol problems often develop long term health conditions and limiting access to services as early as possible (e.g. through the Day Centre) may increase the likelihood of people developing more serious problems. Some service provision targets people who are particularly vulnerable (Day Centre, Heavy Drinkers Unit) or who have a variety of problems and act as a gateway to other services. Services for people with alcohol problems are limited so any further reduction will have additional impact. Closure of the Day Centre will remove a gateway to services for a hard to reach group and it is likely that many will not access a service at all.

Mitigation

11. Those with eligible needs will be offered a personal budget and supported to secure appropriate solutions that meet their needs in culturally and age appropriate ways.
12. Community Mental Health teams will pick up people with serious problems/risk – though this will impact on other services and budgets
13. Assessments will be undertaken on people accessing services which are too close to identify on-going need – though this may reduce savings achieved
14. Revisions to the Homelessness grant and the refocusing of the priorities of the Street Homelessness Prevention Team present opportunities to take mitigating action relating to the impact on street drinkers.

Other Factors to Consider:

15. This assessment needs to be read alongside the assessments for age.
16. The cumulative impact of these proposals needs to be considered alongside other factors that may impact on disabled people in Southampton. These include:
 - National changes to welfare benefits
 - Budget saving proposals relating to older people - Older disabled people could be impacted upon by these proposals in addition to the ones identified above.

Next step:

A joint discussion between the relevant Heads of Service or their nominated representatives on the potential impact and any mitigating action

Action: Jane Brentor, Stephanie Ramsey, Mick Bishop, Paul Nichols, and Alison Alexander