

The **public sector Equality Duty** (Section 149 of the Equality Act) requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people carrying out their activities.

The Equality Duty supports good decision making – it encourages public bodies to be more efficient and effective by understanding how different people will be affected by their activities, so that their policies and services are appropriate and accessible to all and meet different people's needs. The City Council's Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) includes an assessment of the community safety impact assessment to comply with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and will enable the council to better understand the potential impact of the budget proposals and consider mitigating action.

Portfolio Reference No. AS10 – 2 Carer Packages	Proposal: Increase in income arising from changes to the Non Residential Care Charging Policy
Volumes (numbers of customers) and Profile	A snapshot of service users at August 2012 which was undertaken to consider the impact of proposals prior to public consultation showed that 105 individuals received a two carer package and 1 individual received a three carer package. This includes people with disabilities and illnesses, those with mental health issues and people with learning disabilities. 24 individuals would be affected. Of these, 18 contribute at full cost due to capital or refusal to disclose income. The average increase would be £5,498 per annum and the range is from £34 - £12,700 per annum.
Staffing and budget	Not applicable
Summary of Impact and Issues	Individuals who have 2 carer packages will require to pay the full cost of this care if assessed as able to contribute to this level
Potential	Supports the development of personalised approach to

Positive Impacts	<p>the delivery of social care.</p> <p>Ensures the policy meets revised Department of Health guidance.</p> <p>Ensures equitable treatment of those receiving social care.</p>
Responsible Service Manager	<u>C Valentine</u>
Date	<u>10.01.13</u>

Approval by Senior Manager	
Name:	<u>C Valentine</u>
Signature	
Date	<u>10.01.13</u>

Potential Impact

Group	Details of Impact	Possible Solutions & Mitigating Actions
<p>Age</p>	<p>The majority of social care users are over 65.</p> <p>Some individuals may be required to contribute more.</p> <p>Consultation responses suggested that this could result in some individuals only accessing care when they are at crisis point leading to higher use of residential care. The proposals were therefore felt to be counter intuitive to the prevention and health and well being agenda of the Council.</p> <p>Consultation responses highlighted a concern that asking individuals who could afford to do so to meet the costs of two carer domiciliary care packages would increase the burden of family carers, who would try to cope without a second carer. There was a concern that this was inequitable.</p>	<p>No one will ever be asked to pay more than they are assessed as being able to afford. Contributions are based on the individual's income and expenditure.</p> <p>Specific disability related expenses can be taken account of in financial assessment.</p> <p>Individual circumstances can be taken into account and a decision made to reduce or waive contributions in exceptional circumstances where there are welfare reasons for doing so.</p> <p>Since the policy is based on ability to contribute and individual circumstances, legal advice is that there is unlikely to be an issue of equity in the proposal to ask those who can afford it to contribute towards the costs of two carer packages.</p> <p>Carers needs can be assessed at any time and service arranged directly for the carer. It is proposed that services which are directly provided to the carer should be free of charge.</p> <p>If the Council does not take forward the proposals to increase</p>

		<p>income, other service reductions which would impact on residents would require to be considered such as the restriction of social care support to those with critical needs.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p>Social care users have critical or substantial needs generally associated with their disability.</p> <p>Some individuals may be required to contribute more.</p> <p>Consultation responses suggested that this could result in some individuals only accessing care when they are at crisis point leading to higher use of residential care. The proposals were therefore felt to be counter intuitive to the prevention and health and well being agenda of the Council.</p> <p>Consultation responses highlighted a concern that asking individuals who could afford to do so to meet the costs of two carer domiciliary care packages would increase the burden of family carers, who would try to cope without a second carer. There was a concern that this was inequitable.</p>	<p>No one will ever be asked to pay more than they are assessed as being able to afford. Contributions are based on the individual's income and expenditure.</p> <p>Specific disability related expenses can be taken account of in financial assessment.</p> <p>Individual circumstances can be taken into account and a decision made to reduce or waive contributions in exceptional circumstances where there are welfare reasons for doing so.</p> <p>Since the policy is based on ability to contribute and individual circumstances, legal advice is that there is unlikely to be an issue of equity in the proposal to ask those who can afford it to contribute towards the costs of two carer packages.</p> <p>Carers needs can be assessed at any time and service arranged directly for the carer. It is proposed that services which are directly provided to the carer</p>

		<p>should be free of charge.</p> <p>If the Council does not take forward the proposals to increase income, other service reductions which would impact on residents would require to be considered such as the restriction of social care support to those with critical needs.</p>
<p>Sex</p>	<p>More users of social care are female.</p> <p>Some individuals may be required to contribute more.</p> <p>Consultation responses suggested that this could result in some individuals only accessing care when they are at crisis point leading to higher use of residential care. The proposals were therefore felt to be counter intuitive to the prevention and health and well being agenda of the Council.</p> <p>Consultation responses highlighted a concern that asking individuals who could afford to do so to meet the costs of two carer domiciliary care packages would increase the burden of family carers, who would try to cope without a second carer. There was a concern that this was inequitable.</p>	<p>No one will ever be asked to pay more than they are assessed as being able to afford. Contributions are based on the individual's income and expenditure.</p> <p>Specific disability related expenses can be taken account of in financial assessment.</p> <p>Individual circumstances can be taken into account and a decision made to reduce or waive contributions in exceptional circumstances where there are welfare reasons for doing so.</p> <p>Since the policy is based on ability to contribute and individual circumstances, legal advice is that there is unlikely to be an issue of equity in the proposal to ask those who can afford it to contribute towards the costs of two carer packages.</p> <p>Carers needs can be assessed at any time and</p>

		<p>service arranged directly for the carer. It is proposed that services which are directly provided to the carer should be free of charge.</p> <p>If the Council does not take forward the proposals to increase income, other service reductions which would impact on residents would require to be considered such as the restriction of social care support to those with critical needs.</p>
Race		
Religion or Belief		
Marriage and Civil Partnership		
Pregnancy and Maternity		
Gender Reassignment		
Community Safety		
Sexual Orientation		
Poverty	<p>Many users of social care services are on fixed incomes such as pensions and disability benefits.</p> <p>Some individuals may be required to contribute more.</p> <p>Consultation responses</p>	<p>No one will ever be asked to pay more than they are assessed as being able to afford. Contributions are based on the individual's income and expenditure.</p> <p>Specific disability related expenses can be taken</p>

	<p>suggested that this could result in some individuals only accessing care when they are at crisis point leading to higher use of residential care. The proposals were therefore felt to be counter intuitive to the prevention and health and well being agenda of the Council.</p> <p>Consultation responses highlighted a concern that asking individuals who could afford to do so to meet the costs of two carer domiciliary care packages would increase the burden of family carers, who would try to cope without a second carer. There was a concern that this was inequitable.</p>	<p>account of in financial assessment.</p> <p>Individual circumstances can be taken into account and a decision made to reduce or waive contributions in exceptional circumstances where there are welfare reasons for doing so.</p> <p>Since the policy is based on ability to contribute and individual circumstances, legal advice is that there is unlikely to be an issue of equity in the proposal to ask those who can afford it to contribute towards the costs of two carer packages.</p> <p>Carers needs can be assessed at any time and service arranged directly for the carer. It is proposed that services which are directly provided to the carer should be free of charge.</p> <p>If the Council does not take forward the proposals to increase income, other service reductions which would impact on residents would require to be considered such as the restriction of social care support to those with critical needs.</p>
Staff		