


# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Equality impact assessment is a legal requirement for all strategies, plans, functions, policies, procedures and services under the Equalities Act 2010. We are also legally required to publish assessments.

## Section 1: Description

Department	Childrens, Families and Adults		Lead officer responsible for assessment		Ann Riley	
Service	Adult Services		Other members of team undertaking assessment		Janet Broster David Laycock	
Date	13/05/13		Version		1	
Type of document (mark as appropriate)	Strategy x	Plan	Function	Policy	Procedure	Service x
Is this a new/existing/revision of an existing document (mark as appropriate)	New		Existing		Revision	
Title and subject of the impact assessment (include a brief description of the aims, outcomes , operational issues as appropriate and how it fits in with the wider aims of the organisation)  Please attach a copy of the strategy/plan/function/policy/procedure/service	<p><u>Care4CE Developments - Mountview</u></p> <p>Corporate priority 2 (Developing affordable models of sustainable local models of care for vulnerable children and adults) has a linked change programme: 2.2 'Next phase of development of Care4CE services'</p> <p>Part of this programme involves exploration of the options for the future of Mountview Community Support Centre in Congleton and the services provided there. These options will be informed by a consultation with service users, carers and other key stakeholders and will result in a decision paper being presented to cabinet</p> <p>The consultation information pack is attached below, this gives more information and background</p> <div style="text-align: center;">   Microsoft Word - Information Pack FIN. </div>					
Who are the main stakeholders? (eg general public, employees, Councillors, partners, specific audiences)	Mountview customers, their carers and families Mountview staff Local Community Groups					

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<b>Councillors</b> <b>Independent sector care providers</b> <b>Voluntary sector care providers</b>
--	--

### Section 2: Initial screening

<b>Who is affected?</b> (This may or may not include the stakeholders listed above)	All stakeholders listed above potentially
<b>Who is intended to benefit and how?</b>	Service users and carers could identify more personalised service options that better serve their needs The council is seeking to identify alternative service options delivering better value for money whilst continuing to meet its statutory duties and customer outcomes.
<b>Could there be a different impact or outcome for some groups?</b>	Yes Mountview currently delivers respite and daycare service to the following groups each of which will be affected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those with dementia</li> <li>• Those with Learning Disability</li> <li>• Older people</li> </ul> Carers - These respite services provide key support for carers so that they can continue to support their family member in the community
<b>Does it include making decisions based on individual characteristics, needs or circumstances?</b>	All social care services are offered on the basis of assessed eligible need. This work does not change the basis of those individual assessment decisions, these are in care plans. It may result in different support options being offered to individuals
<b>Are relations between different groups or communities likely to be affected?</b> (e.g. will it favour one particular group or deny opportunities for others?)	Yes – it will have the greatest impact upon people living in the Congleton area
<b>Is there any specific targeted action to promote equality? Is there a history of unequal outcomes (do you have enough</b>	No – although all decision and solutions will be based on a fully personalised approach

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

evidence to prove otherwise)?											
Is there an actual or potential negative impact on these specific characteristics? (Please tick)											
Age	Y		Marriage & civil partnership		N	Religion & belief		N	Carers	Y	
Disability	Y		Pregnancy & maternity		N	Sex		N	Socio-economic status	Y	
Gender reassignment		N	Race		N	Sexual orientation		N			
What evidence do you have to support your findings? (quantitative and qualitative) Please provide additional information that you wish to include as appendices to this document, i.e., graphs, tables, charts										Consultation/involvement carried out	
										Yes	No
Age			<p>In respect of the day care provided at Mountview the key characteristic of customers is that they are elderly although a small minority also have a Learning Disability</p> <p>As of 7/3/13 there were 5 out of 34 day care customers who also had a Learning Disability</p> <p>A similar picture applies to respite customers – of the 52 people registered for ‘One-Call’ respite services all are elderly, some with varying degrees of dementia. There are also 8 younger people with a Learning Disability registered to use the separate LD respite unit</p> <p>The remaining provision emergency respite primarily to the elderly, however where Mountview is unable to meet an individuals needs, or is full, then the Councils other Respite centres in Crewe and Macclesfield will be considered. The independent sector is also used as an alternative or where a person has nursing needs</p>						<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>		

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<b>Disability</b>	<p>The main Mountview provision for the Learning Disabled is respite only. In respect of this respite care the small number of beds (3) have never been fully utilised due to a number of emergency situations. As a result families have used the various alternative provision.</p> <p>Any alternatives to Mountview provision need to offer similar or improved standards. In particular they can often demand different staff skills and higher staffing levels</p> <p>It is the case that the proposals could have a number of potentially negative impacts on people with disabilities. The extent of these impacts will depend on the type and level of their disability. Examples include; transport (inc. potential for reduced time in day care as a result of increased travelling time), facilities that can be accessed locally, disruption to wellbeing caused by change in location. The latter could be particularly detrimental to those with Learning Disabilities or dementia. These will need to be mitigated in alternative options considered.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<p>No recording of gender reassignment takes place on the Council's social care record system as such data on this is unavailable. However, there is no known element in these proposals which is likely to lead to discrimination of the basis of this protected characteristic.</p> <p>No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</b>	<p>There is the potential for a change in day service to impact on married couples, or couples in civil partnership, where one partner uses services as a result of the relocation of services. There are also impacts listed under the carers section.</p> <p>However no impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<b>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</b>	No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.	Yes A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13
<b>Race</b>	The current customers of Mountview are predominantly White British. However, there is no known element in these proposals which is likely to impact on customers as a result of their race. In total 98% are currently White British, 1% Other Asian Background and 1% unknown. These figures broadly correlate with what would be expected given the composition of Cheshire East (see appendix 2). Copies of the consultation information pack were circulated to a range of groups associated with this protected characteristic. No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process.	Yes A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13
<b>Religion &amp; belief</b>	The current customers of Mountview are predominantly Christian. However, there is no known element in these proposals which is likely to impact on customers as a result of their religion. In total 83% are Christian, see appendix 1 for details of other religions. These figures broadly correlate with what would be expected given the composition of Cheshire East (see appendix 2),  Copies of the consultation information pack were circulated to a range of groups associated with this protected characteristic. No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process.	Yes A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13
<b>Sex</b>	A breakdown of customers by gender finds that 37 customers are male and 66 are female. As such, although there is no known element in this project which will directly discriminate on the basis of gender, there could be perceived indirect	Yes A full, formal consultation process with all

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>discrimination on this basis.</p> <p>There is a much larger ratio of females to male service users in Cheshire East. This can largely be explained by the differences in life expectancy between the sexes. As such a greater proportion of female service users are likely to receive day and respite services. However, the proposals themselves are not deemed to have disproportionate effects for either gender.</p> <p>No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process.</p>	<p>stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p>There is also no evidence to suggest an impact is likely for this group</p> <p>No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<b>Carers</b>	<p>The Office of National Statistics estimates that 10% of the population are likely to be carers i.e. 36,500 people in Cheshire East.</p> <p>The proposals are likely to have an impact on a defined group of carers; those who care for people using respite or day services within the Congleton area.</p> <p>Particular concerns would be; changes to service location and its resulting transport requirements (this could bring about a reduction in the overall respite that was taken up by carers), increased pressure brought about on the caring role as a result of the disruption caused to customers. These will need to be mitigated in alternative options considered.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<b>Socio-economic status</b>	<p>Both people with a disability and those who support them are often cited to have reduced economic advantage compared to the overall population. For instance, the Cabinet Office Report, "Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People", states that</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A full, formal consultation process with all</p>

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>disabled people are more likely to be economically inactive, more likely to experience problems with housing and more likely to experience problems with transport.</p> <p>As such any proposals need to be carefully evaluated to understand the potential economic impact on these groups. Any option to relocate customers may entail increased transport costs on them and as such there is the potential for it to disproportionately impact on this group.</p> <p>Difficulties for carers in maintaining employment patterns could also be experienced if there was reduced local, full-time provision creating a greater transport burden on them. These will need to be mitigated in alternative options considered.</p>	<p>stakeholders was held during the period 7/3/13 to 25/4/13</p>
<p><b>Proceed to full impact assessment? (Please tick)</b>      <b>Yes</b>      <b>Date: 13/5/13</b></p>		

If yes, please proceed to Section 3. If no, please publish the initial screening as part of the suite of documents relating to this issue

## Section 3: Identifying impacts and evidence

This section identifies if there are impacts on equality, diversity and cohesion, what evidence there is to support the conclusion and what further action is needed

Protected characteristics	Is the policy (function etc....) likely to have an adverse impact on any of the groups?  Please include evidence (qualitative & quantitative) and consultations	Are there any positive impacts of the policy (function etc....) on any of the groups?  Please include evidence (qualitative & quantitative) and consultations	Please rate the impact taking into account any measures already in place to reduce the impacts identified High: Significant potential impact; history of complaints; no mitigating measures in place; need for consultation Medium: Some	Further action (only an outline needs to be included here. A full action plan can be included at Section 4)

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

			<p>potential impact; some mitigating measures in place, lack of evidence to show effectiveness of measures</p> <p>Low: Little/no identified impacts; heavily legislation-led; limited public facing aspect</p>	
Age	<p>Current local provision (both respite and day-care) can be under pressure at times. Further reductions could involve disruption in service delivery, consistency and availability with potentially increased travel times to alternative services.</p> <p>Greater use of the independent sector (which tends not to have a respite focus) to provide respite risks increasing dependency leading to permanent care. An example of this was specifically quoted during the consultation in respect of a carer's mother.</p> <p>The transfer of customers to alternative services options may involve an emphasis by the Council on care in an individual home via a PA or home care. This may result in less social interaction for the customer which in the longer term might</p>	<p>Current care provision at Mountview does not comply with current CQC standards for new buildings so alternatives could be developed that are more modern and spacious including the provision of en-suite facilities.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of current service provision might well lead to the development of more attractive service options which appeal to customers, their carers and families.</p> <p>There would also be promotion of the use of Direct Payments with customers and carers (although this would remain down to personal choice).</p>	High	<p>Any recommendations for future alternatives need to minimise these impacts as far as practically possible</p> <p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>Customers must have a viable transport option in order to get to a day centre. Assessment of viability of alternative options needs to be done carefully including taking income into account..</p>



# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>affect the customer's mental wellbeing. One comment was:</p> <p><i>"It is important for people to have the social contact that they wouldn't get if they had care in their own home. "</i></p> <p>It will be essential to consider whether there are sufficient facilities within the Borough (Council and independent sector) to cope with increasing demand for respite and day services caused by the ageing population.</p> <p>Use of independent options might result in respite care being taken in independent sector residential homes. This has the potential to be disruptive to both the longer term residents and short stay customers because of the difficulties of genuine integration and the lack of capability to offer bespoke respite care.</p> <p>Remarks were raised during the consultation about the quality of independent sector provision and whether this would be sufficiently well monitored. However there is lack of clear non-anecdotal evidence to support the argument that this offers a lower standard</p>	<p>However it should be recognised that the offer of choice is not always felt appropriate, as mentioned during the consultation:</p> <p><i>" 'Choice' pushes carers over the limit , it puts the responsibility back on families and carers when they are already at breaking point."</i></p>		
--	--	--	--	--

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>of care. Standards of care would need to be maintained.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> During the consultation transport was cited as a key issue for the elderly, particularly those very frail individuals who would be unable to cope with travelling significant distances</p> <p>The consultation also identified that travel to more distant provision would be both unpopular and impractical, particularly in relation to daycare. The issue was less significant for those receiving respite care.</p> <p>In addition to increased journey times, increased cost and the potential problem of travel not even being possible at all due to the individual's disabilities or medical condition were cited. It was also viewed that carer's visits might be reduced/might completely stop due to the amount of travel required. The need to access a GP/local health services was also stated.</p>			
<b>Disability</b>	<p><u>Learning Disability</u> Opinion expressed during the consultation and through expert knowledge states that people with complex learning disabilities can find moving to a new building (or the</p>	Current care provision at Mountview does not comply with current CQC standards for new buildings so alternatives could be developed that are more modern	Low - medium	<p>The number of customers with Learning Disabilities is quite small hence a lower level of overall impact</p> <p>Changes in service demand should be monitored and service planning adjusted</p>

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>transfer of other customers from or to the building they are in) stressful to their wellbeing. Any proposals put forward may lead this to occur in a number of instances. A number of carers/families have put this issue forward as a potential problem. Continuity of staffing and other attendees has been cited as another issue that is important to individuals from this group</p> <p><u>Dementia</u></p> <p>A new environment can be challenging for a person with dementia. Although this point should be tempered by research that has shown that it generally takes a person less than three months to adjust to their new surroundings (depending on the level of their dementia)<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>Continuity of staffing was particularly stressed during consultation in connection with the latter.</p> <p>Comments received during the consultation illustrate these elements:</p> <p><i>"Father does not like going to new places, as such closing Mountview would create damaging disruption to his wellbeing"</i></p> <p><i>"Generally people who attend Mountview do not like change, they build friendships and relationships that would cause them a</i></p>	<p>and spacious including the provision of en-suite facilities. This may particularly benefit customers with physical disabilities as a result of an environment more in keeping with their needs.</p> <p>Re-evaluation of current service provision might well lead to the development of more attractive service options which appeal to customers, their carers and families</p> <p>However comments received during the consultation suggested that independent sector provision was not available in the area – especially for those with high levels of need. However some took a slightly different view:</p> <p><i>"I think that providing the option of funding (towards) care in the private sector is available then this will provide a flexible, local solution. If this option is not available, then losing a facility in Congleton will mean greater travelling for carers in our area."</i></p>		<p>where practicable. This would aim to ensure that customer choice was maintained i.e. that there would be sufficient supply of internal places for customers to meet demand.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Michigan Department of Community Health, Moving Persons with Dementia, <http://www.dementiacoalition.org/resources/pdfs/Caring6.pdf>

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p><i>lot of upset if it changed.”</i></p> <p><u>Physical Disability</u> A limited number of customers of Mountview have physical disabilities. The impact on this group is likely to be more substantial due to the need for more specialised transport to alternative service options.</p> <p><u>Mental Health Disabilities</u> A limited proportion of customers with mental health disabilities use Mountview services. Respondents did state the importance of social interaction for customer’s mental wellbeing although there were no specific impacts identified for this group.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> During the consultation transport was cited as a key issue for <u>all</u> disability groups. In addition to increased journey times, increased cost and the potential problem of travel not even being possible at all due to the individual’s disabilities or medical condition were stated. Transport issues can also impact people’s ability to continue attending local day care whilst in respite should that respite be</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>some distance away – impacting on other daycare provision or increasing travel time and costs for return travel to Congleton. The need to access a GP/local health services was also stated.</p> <p><u>Provision</u> It will be essential to consider whether there are sufficient facilities within the Borough (Council and independent sector) to cope with increasing demand for respite and day services for disabled people caused by population increases and improvements in health care.</p> <p><u>Respite</u> Use of independent options might result in respite care being taken in independent sector residential homes. This has the potential to be disruptive to both the longer term residents and short stay customers because of the difficulties of genuine integration and the lack of capability to offer bespoke respite care.</p>			
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.		None	
<b>Marriage &amp;</b>	No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the		None	

### APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<b>civil partnership</b>	consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.			
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	Pregnancy was referenced to once during the consultation feedback although without a specific detailing of what the impact would be. There is the potential for a pregnant carer to have greater difficulties in providing support e.g. with transport. However, these issues are felt best picked up generally in the carers section.		None	
<b>Race</b>	No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.		None	
<b>Religion &amp; belief</b>	No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process. There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.		None	
<b>Sex</b>	Whilst arguably it is the case that, due to the greater proportion of service users who are female, these proposals could have a potential to disproportionately impact on this group, it is currently felt that any issues are covered in the categories of disability and age		Medium	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>		No impacts were recorded on this protected characteristic during the course of the consultation process.	None	

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

		There is also no other evidence to suggest an impact is likely. As such, the effect of the proposals is deemed neutral on this protected characteristic.		
<b>Carers</b>	<p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>During the consultation Carers cited transport as a significant issue for them in any relocation of day service. This was due to pressure carers felt they would be under to provide transport to the new centre which might be located further away. This would mean extra time and cost would be incurred. The lack of adequate public transport was also cited:</p> <p><i>"To expect family members/carer friends to travel to other towns to see their loved ones is impractical. Public transport is just not good enough. Taxis would be exorbitant. Not everybody has their own transport and many carers are elderly and frail themselves."</i></p> <p><i>"I would personally be deterred by the necessity to drive (from journeys each session) particularly in the winter time."</i></p> <p>It was also remarked that if a customer was located further away visits to them when they were in respite may need to be reduced/ stopped due to difficulties with</p>	<p>Re-evaluation of current service provision could lead to the development of more attractive service options which appeal to customers, their carers and families</p> <p>However the offer of choice is not always felt appropriate:</p> <p><i>" 'Choice' pushes carers over the limit it puts the responsibility back on families and carers when they are already at breaking point."</i></p>	<p>High – for day-care users</p> <p>Medium – for respite care users</p>	There is the potential for CEC to 'block-book' independent sector beds in order to ensure consistency and certainty of provision within the same locality

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>transport.</p> <p><u>Respite</u></p> <p>The importance of a respite break to carers is significant and gives them support in their continuing caring role. Concern was expressed during the consultation that this support might disappear</p> <p><i>“Many carers rely on the service provided by Mountview myself included and it is the only time that we can get a break from the trying time of constantly being with someone suffering from dementia”</i></p> <p><i>“I couldn’t cope with her at home every day. If Mountview closed she would have to go into a care home.”</i></p> <p><i>“Closure would be a short-sighted decision because any removal of this local service will lead to the Council having to intervene more often as the carers themselves start to suffer burnout and stress. “</i></p> <p>Use of independent sector providers might adversely affect carers’ ability to plan ahead by booking breaks at their preferred time rather than when beds are available</p> <p>Another factor mentioned by several during the consultation was the importance of having local provision that they might get</p>			
--	--	--	--	--



# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

	<p>to quickly in the event of an emergency</p> <p><u>Reassurance</u> A number of carers talked about the trust they had in Mountview and the concerns they would have in the cared for transferring to alternative services. As such, any decommissioning of Mountview could result in greater time needing to be taken by carers in the short term, to investigate and gain reassurance that alternative provision would be of sufficient quality and appropriateness.</p>			
<b>Socio-economics</b>	<p>As detailed in the initial assessment there are potential issues with greater costs being incurred because of increased transport cost for some customers and carers.</p> <p>Locating services further away may make it more difficult for carers to balance work and transport responsibilities impacting on their earning capability</p> <p>Customers/carers may feel a greater inclination to take up more expensive independent sector options as an alternative to increased travelling.</p>	None	Low	The cost of transport needs to be one of the issues that are monitored when transport assessment is conducted. This should apply both to costs incurred by customers and potentially by carers who may be in a lower socio-economic bracket.

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<p><b>Is this project due to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors? If yes, please indicate how you have ensured that the partner organisation complies with equality legislation (e.g. tendering, awards process, contract, monitoring and performance measures)</b></p> <p><b>No – all work will be done internally</b></p>				

### Section 4: Review and conclusion

<p><b>Summary: provide a brief overview including impact, changes, improvement, any gaps in evidence and additional data that is needed</b></p> <p><u>If implemented</u> the proposals to offer alternatives to existing services are likely to cause negative impacts on customers and carers although they can be mitigated to an extent by following the prescribed actions listed.</p> <p>Further engagement with customers and carers would be crucial in any transition process.</p>			
Specific actions to be taken to reduce, justify or remove any adverse impacts	How will this be monitored?	Officer responsible	Target date
Work should be conducted to manage any transition process in a person centred way. Sufficient time should be also given for the transition to be take place.	Customer complaints, detailed documentation of transition plans for day-care, monitoring of reviews of customers social care needs	DW/ PK	Dependent on timescales of customer transfers
The Council transport policy should be applied in full so that it is ensured that customers have a viable transport option to get to a day centre. Financial Assessment should take into account the full range of the individuals and carers circumstances. Any extra travel support by carers should be mutually agreed and deemed manageable.	Customer complaints, issues raised during review by customers	JB/AMc	Dependent on timescales of any customer transfers
An up to date assessment of a person's needs should be in place in order to inform decision making over whether the individual might be suitable for other options. This should be conducted in conjunction with a carer's assessment.. Advocacy should be available where	Procedure documents, existence of social care review records	Individual Commissioning Senior Managers/ Care4CE Resource Managers	Dependent on timescales of any customer transfers

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

necessary.			
Changes in service demand should be monitored and service planning adjusted where practicable. This would aim to ensure that customer choice was maintained wherever possible	Monitoring of take up of internal and external services through business activity reports	Individual Commissioning Senior Managers	Ongoing (to be carried out on a minimum of an annual basis)
<b>Please provide details and link to full action plan for actions</b>	To be confirmed following Cabinet decision		
<b>When will this assessment be reviewed?</b>	Review of EIA to take place six months after Cabinet if any proposals are adopted		
<b>Are there any additional assessments that need to be undertaken in relation to this assessment?</b>	No		
<b>Lead officer signoff</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Head of service signoff</b>		<b>Date</b>	

Please publish this completed EIA form on your website

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

### Appendix 1 – Mountview-Specific Data

Customers by Age								
Customers using both Day Care & Respite Care:			Day Care Users:			Respite Care Users:		
Age Range	Total Users		Age Range	Total Users		Age Range	Total Users	
0-59	0		0-59	0		0-59	10	
60-69	2		60-69	3		60-69	3	
70-79	4		70-79	6		70-79	14	
80-89	7		80-89	7		80-89	25	
90-120	1		90-120	8		90-120	17	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	

Customers by Client Type								
Customers using both Day Care & Respite Care:			Day Care Users:			Respite Care Users:		
Primary Client Group	Total Users		Primary Client Group	Total Users		Primary Client Group	Total Users	
Frail/Temporary Illness	3		Frail/Temporary Illness	13		Frail/Temporary Illness	40	
Hearing Impairment	0		Hearing Impairment	0		Hearing Impairment	1	
Learning Disability	4		Learning Disability	1		Learning Disability	8	
Mental Health - Dementia	2		Mental Health - Dementia	1		Mental Health - Dementia	4	
MH Other than Dementia	1		MH Other than Dementia	2		MH Other than Dementia	2	
Other Phys/Sens Loss inc Disability	0		Other Phys/Sens Loss inc Disability	6		Other Phys/Sens Loss inc Disability	11	
Other Vulnerable	0		Other Vulnerable	0		Other Vulnerable	2	
Visual Impairment	0		Visual Impairment	1		Visual Impairment	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

Customers by Ethnicity					
Customers using both Day Care & Respite Care:		Day Care Users:		Respite Care Users:	
Ethnic Group	Total Users	Ethnic Group	Total Users	Ethnic Group	Total Users
White – British	10	White – British	24	Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	Other Asian Background	1
				White – British	67
				<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>

Customers by Religion					
Customers using both Day Care & Respite Care:		Day Care Users:		Respite Care Users:	
Religion	Total Users	Religion	Total Users	Religion	Total Users
Christian	9	Christian	24	Other Religion	1
Not known	1	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	Buddhist	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>			Christian	52
				None	2
				Not known	13
				<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>

Customers by Gender					
Customers using both Day Care & Respite Care:		Day Care Users:		Respite Care Users:	
Gender	Total Users	Gender	Total Users	Gender	Total Users
Female	9	Female	14	Female	43
Male	1	Male	10	Male	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>

## APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

### Appendix 2: Cheshire East and UK Statistics

#### Ethnicity (2001 Census)

	<b>Cheshire East Unitary Authority</b>	<b>North West Region</b>	<b>England Country</b>	<b>Cheshire East % Unitary Authority</b>	<b>North West % Region</b>	<b>England % Country</b>
<b>All Ethnic Groups</b>	360,700	6,864,300	51,092,000	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>White</b>	347,600	6,324,600	45,082,900	96.4	92.1	88.2
<b>White: British</b>	337,000	6,137,800	42,736,000	93.4	89.4	83.6
<b>White: Irish</b>	2,800	69,800	570,500	0.8	1.0	1.1
<b>White: Other White</b>	7,700	117,000	1,776,300	2.1	1.7	3.5
<b>Mixed</b>	3,300	85,400	870,000	0.9	1.2	1.7
<b>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</b>	1,100	27,800	282,900	0.3	0.4	0.6
<b>Mixed: White and Black African</b>	400	13,300	114,300	0.1	0.2	0.2
<b>Mixed: White and Asian</b>	1,000	25,200	260,900	0.3	0.4	0.5
<b>Mixed: Other Mixed</b>	800	19,100	212,000	0.2	0.3	0.4
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>	5,000	304,200	2,914,900	1.4	4.4	5.7
<b>Asian or Asian British: Indian</b>	2,300	99,900	1,316,000	0.6	1.5	2.6

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

<b>Asian or Asian British: Pakistani</b>	1,500	143,900	905,700	0.4	2.1	1.8
<b>Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi</b>	500	34,800	353,900	0.1	0.5	0.7
<b>Asian or Asian British: Other Asian</b>	700	25,600	339,200	0.2	0.4	0.7
<b>Black or Black British</b>	2,000	75,200	1,447,900	0.6	1.1	2.8
<b>Black or Black British: Caribbean</b>	800	25,500	599,700	0.2	0.4	1.2
<b>Black or Black British: African</b>	1,000	42,600	730,600	0.3	0.6	1.4
<b>Black or Black British: Other Black</b>	200	7,000	117,600	0.1	0.1	0.2
<b>Chinese or Other Ethnic Group</b>	2,700	74,900	776,400	0.7	1.1	1.5
<b>Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Chinese</b>	1,600	46,200	400,300	0.4	0.7	0.8
<b>Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Other Ethnic Group</b>	1,200	28,700	376,100	0.3	0.4	0.7

# APPENDIX 3 - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM

## Religious Belief (2001 Census)

	Cheshire East Unitary Authority	North West Region	England Country	Cheshire East Unitary Authority%	North West Region %	England %
<b>All People</b>	351,817	6,729,764	49,138,831	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>Christian</b>	282,432	5,249,686	35,251,244	80.3	78.0	71.7
<b>Buddhist</b>	551	11,794	139,046	0.2	0.2	0.3
<b>Hindu</b>	617	27,211	546,982	0.2	0.4	1.1
<b>Jewish</b>	562	27,974	257,671	0.2	0.4	0.5
<b>Muslim</b>	1,375	204,261	1,524,887	0.4	3.0	3.1
<b>Sikh</b>	170	6,487	327,343	0.0	0.1	0.7
<b>Any other religion</b>	593	10,625	143,811	0.2	0.2	0.3
<b>No religion</b>	42,757	705,045	7,171,332	12.2	10.5	14.6
<b>Religion not stated</b>	22,760	486,681	3,776,515	6.5	7.2	7.7