

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)

Young People's Housing Related Support Schemes

April 2019

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

Following Cabinet approval on 3rd December the Council will be transferring the Woodleaze site in Yate, South Gloucestershire to Solon Housing Association who will be redeveloping the property. Working with a support provider who will be commissioned by the Council through a competitive tender process, the property will provide supported accommodation for up to 18 young people aged 16 – 25. Some of these young people are care leavers for whom Council are corporate parents for, and others are homeless 16 – 17 year olds who the Council have a statutory responsibility to ensure are adequately housed. Other young people whose needs are not able to be met in existing provision will also be accommodated here.

The 2019/20 commissioning intentions report recommended the re-commissioning of Southwold House and Andrew Millman Court supported accommodation following the support contract being split in 2018, and an interim contract being put in place. It was decided this take place at the same time as commissioning a support provider for Woodleaze.

A range of policies have informed the development of this new scheme including the Young Person's Housing Strategy, Care Leavers' Strategy and the Councils Homelessness Strategy.

There are currently 24 Care leavers in independent high cost provision with 1:1 support. The aim is that Woodleaze would help to reduce this number, and form of support as it is expensive, and often does not achieve the independent living skills needed to progress towards independent accommodation; and transition into adulthood. Woodleaze would also provide more, much needed units of accommodation to meet demand and reach a greater number of young people at risk of homelessness.

The scheme will support young people to manage and maintain their accommodation, and prepare them to move on to more independent living. The support provided will be intensive, and will focus on building confidence and independent living skills to ensure that the maximum level of independence is achieved.

There will be joint partnership working for those living at the Scheme with:

- The Transitions to Independence Team
- HomeChoice team
- Ongoing Social Worker involvement
- Partnership agencies including Health, Education, Police etc.
- Youth Housing Support Providers

SECTION 2 –RESEARCH AND CONSULTATION

In respect of protected characteristics key service users are –

- Young people

Local research data shows:

There are 197 looked after children in South Gloucestershire. Of these 53% are male and 41% female.

81% - White

2% - Mixed

3% - Asian or Asian British

3% - Black or black British

0% - Other ethnic group

12% - Not stated

52% of care leavers aged 17 – 18 and 11% aged 19 – 21 are not in suitable accommodation.

In 2017/18 there were 48 16 – 17 year olds, 56 18 -19 year olds and 69 20 – 24 year olds who approached HomeChoice as homeless and in need of supported accommodation.

Educational outcomes for Looked after Children are poor, with no young person gaining 5+ GCSEs A-C (including English and Maths) in either 2014 or 2015.

Only six per cent of care leavers are in higher education at 19, compared to roughly 30 per cent of young people nationally.

In South Gloucestershire 32% of care leavers aged 17 – 18 and 43% aged 19 – 21 are in employment, education or training.

Too many care leavers leave care with poor educational attainment and end up long term unemployed.

The population of young people age 16 – 25 in supported housing in South Gloucestershire who are not care leavers is in line with the general demographics of South Gloucestershire.

The accommodation provided at Woodleaze is aimed at addressing these evidenced needs.

National research shows:

- 20 per cent of young homeless people were previously in care
- 24 per cent of the adult prison population have been in care
- Care leavers are roughly twice as likely not to be in education training or employment at 19 than the rest of the population.

National research also demonstrates that care leavers are significantly more likely to experience significant mental health issues, drug and alcohol dependency, early pregnancy and experience significant loneliness and isolation in their transition to Independence. (Improving Life chances for Care Leavers, Centre for Social Justice 2014)

A consultation took place between 10 December 2018 – 11 March 2019 which involved an engagement event and a survey.

The consultation findings provide the information in appendix 1.

SECTION 3 - IDENTIFICATION & ANALYSIS OF EQUALITIES ISSUES AND IMPACTS

Overall the consultation showed high levels of positive responses in respect of the likely impact on young people leaving care.

In respect of impact on local area and local residents a lower positive response was received, however more consultees were positive rather than negative with the exception of people aged 45-64 and non-disabled people.

There was a good level of support for a local stakeholder engagement group and a joint commissioning approach.

More consultees favoured a single provider approach with the exception of people aged 45-64 and disabled people.

In line with the consultation feedback received it is anticipated that this new service would result in a positive impact, particularly in respect of the Protected Characteristic of age due to the scheme being for young people aged 16-25

The scheme would support young people to access Employment, Education and Training as well as health services through tailored support and partnership working.

The new scheme would allow more young people with higher needs to have a successful outcome by being suitably accommodated and receiving specialised support, and at the same time living in their own community.

Throughout the commissioning process, the South Gloucestershire Council Equalities in Procurement Guidance will be followed to ensure that the chosen provider has both the ability and capacity to deliver against the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.

SECTION 4 - EqIAA OUTCOME

| Outcome | Response | Reason(s) and Justification |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Outcome 1: No major change required. | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Outcome 2: Adjustments to remove barriers or to better promote equality have been identified. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | In line with the consultation feedback received it is anticipated that this new service would result in a positive impact, particularly in respect of the Protected Characteristic of age due to the scheme being for young people aged 16-25. Throughout the commissioning process, the South Gloucestershire Council Equalities in Procurement Guidance will be followed to ensure that the chosen provider has both the ability and capacity to deliver against the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty. |
| Outcome 3: Continue despite having identified potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality. | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Outcome 4: Stop and rethink. | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

SECTION 5 - ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THIS EqIAA

| Actions | Timescales |
|--|---|
| Ensure that the SGC Equalities in Procurement Guidance is followed and is an integral part of the commissioning process. | Ongoing throughout the commissioning process |
| Ensure that equalities monitoring is part of the final service specification and contract. | Ongoing throughout the contract monitoring process on a quarterly basis |
| Contract Manager will ensure analysis of equalities issues on a quarterly basis ongoing part of contract monitoring. | Ongoing throughout the contract monitoring process on a quarterly basis |

SECTION 6 - EVIDENCE INFORMING THIS EqIAA

Survey results and engagement event outcomes
South Gloucestershire JSNA
South Gloucestershire Children's Services Analysis 2018

Consultation Findings

How do you feel the use of Woodleaze for supported young people's housing is likely to impact young people leaving care?

| | Total | Sex | | Disability | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | | Wards | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Female | Male | Non Disabled | Disabled | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65+ | BAME & White Other | White British | Yate Central ward | Chipping Sodbury ward | All other wards |
| Base | 69 | 27 | 18 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 42 |
| Highly positive impact | 54% | 48% | 50% | 44% | 50% | 75% | 44% | 35% | 57% | 33% | 45% | 17% | 50% | 74% |
| Some positive impact | 29% | 26% | 28% | 33% | 33% | 25% | 33% | 35% | 21% | - | 33% | 43% | 50% | 19% |
| No impact | 1% | - | 6% | - | - | - | - | - | 7% | - | 2% | 4% | - | - |
| Some negative impact | 1% | - | 6% | 3% | - | - | - | 5% | - | 33% | - | 4% | - | - |
| Highly negative impact | 6% | 11% | 6% | 8% | 17% | - | 11% | 10% | 7% | 33% | 7% | 17% | - | - |
| Don't know | 6% | 11% | - | 8% | - | - | - | 10% | 7% | - | 7% | 13% | - | 2% |
| Total Positive | 83% | 74% | 78% | 77% | 83% | 100% | 77% | 70% | 78% | 33% | 78% | 60% | 100% | 93% |
| Total Negative | 7% | 11% | 12% | 11% | 17% | 0% | 11% | 15% | 7% | 66% | 7% | 21% | 0% | 0% |

How do you feel the use of Woodleaze for supported young people's housing is likely to impact the local area and local residents?

| | Total | Sex | | Disability | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | | Wards | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Female | Male | Non Disabled | Disabled | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65+ | BAME & White Other | White British | Yate Central ward | Chipping Sodbury ward | All other wards |
| Base | 69 | 27 | 18 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 42 |
| Highly positive impact | 19% | 15% | 22% | 10% | 50% | 75% | 22% | 15% | - | 33% | 12% | 4% | - | 29% |
| Some positive impact | 25% | 30% | 22% | 28% | - | - | 33% | 20% | 36% | - | 29% | 22% | 50% | 24% |
| No impact | 17% | 15% | 28% | 18% | 17% | - | 11% | 20% | 29% | - | 21% | 17% | 25% | 17% |
| Some negative impact | 20% | 19% | 11% | 21% | 17% | - | 11% | 25% | 14% | 33% | 17% | 30% | - | 17% |
| Highly negative impact | 10% | 19% | 11% | 15% | 17% | - | 22% | 20% | 7% | 33% | 14% | 22% | - | 5% |
| Don't know | 9% | 4% | 6% | 8% | - | 25% | - | - | 14% | - | 7% | 4% | 25% | 10% |
| Total Positive | 44% | 45% | 44% | 38% | 50% | 75% | 55% | 35% | 36% | 33% | 41% | 26% | 50% | 53% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|
| Total Negative | 30% | 38% | 22% | 36% | 34% | 0% | 33% | 45% | 21% | 66% | 31% | 52% | 0% | 22% |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|

To what extent do you agree with the proposal for a local stakeholder liaison group?

| | Total | Sex | | Disability | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | | Wards | | |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|------|--------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|-----|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Female | Male | Non Disabled | Disabled | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65+ | BAME & White Other | White British | Yate Central ward | Chipping Sodbury ward | All other wards |
| Base | 69 | 27 | 18 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 42 |
| Strongly agree | 36% | 37% | 33% | 33% | 17% | 50% | 33% | 35% | 29% | 67% | 31% | 30% | - | 43% |
| Tend to agree | 32% | 33% | 28% | 31% | 50% | 50% | 33% | 30% | 29% | - | 36% | 35% | 25% | 31% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9% | 7% | 17% | 8% | 17% | - | 22% | 5% | 14% | - | 12% | 9% | 25% | 7% |
| Tend to disagree | 4% | 7% | 6% | 5% | 17% | - | - | 15% | - | - | 7% | 9% | - | 2% |
| Strongly disagree | 4% | 7% | 6% | 8% | - | - | 11% | - | 14% | - | 7% | 4% | 25% | 2% |
| Don't know | 13% | 7% | 6% | 13% | - | - | - | 10% | 14% | 33% | 5% | 13% | 25% | 12% |
| Total Agree | 68% | 70% | 61% | 64% | 67% | 100% | 66% | 65% | 58% | 67% | 67% | 65% | 25% | 74% |
| Total Disagree | 8% | 14% | 12% | 13% | 17% | 0% | 11% | 15% | 14% | 0% | 14% | 13% | 25% | 4% |

To what extent do you agree with the proposal for the Housing Support Provider to be jointly commissioned by Solon Housing Association and South Gloucestershire Council?

| | Total | Sex | | Disability | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | | Wards | | |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|------|--------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|-----|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Female | Male | Non Disabled | Disabled | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65+ | BAME & White Other | White British | Yate Central ward | Chipping Sodbury ward | All other wards |
| Base | 69 | 27 | 18 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 42 |
| Strongly agree | 33% | 22% | 33% | 26% | 17% | 50% | 22% | 30% | 21% | 33% | 26% | 26% | 25% | 38% |
| Tend to agree | 25% | 30% | 17% | 28% | 17% | 50% | 11% | 20% | 36% | 33% | 24% | 13% | 25% | 31% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 22% | 30% | 33% | 23% | 67% | - | 44% | 30% | 29% | - | 33% | 35% | 25% | 14% |
| Tend to disagree | 1% | 4% | - | 3% | - | - | - | 5% | - | - | 2% | 4% | - | - |
| Strongly disagree | 7% | 11% | 6% | 10% | - | - | 11% | 10% | 7% | 33% | 7% | 13% | - | 5% |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Don't know | 10% | 4% | 6% | 8% | - | - | 11% | - | 7% | - | 5% | 9% | 25% | 10% |
| Total Agree | 58% | 52% | 50% | 54% | 34% | 100% | 33% | 50% | 57% | 66% | 50% | 39% | 50% | 69% |
| Total Disagree | 8% | 15% | 6% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 15% | 7% | 33% | 9% | 17% | 0% | 5% |

To what extent do you agree with the proposed commissioning of support services for young people across all three supported housing schemes to a single provider?

| | Total | Sex | | Disability | | Age | | | | Ethnicity | | Wards | | |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | Female | Male | Non Disabled | Disabled | 16 - 24 | 25 - 44 | 45 - 64 | 65+ | BAME & White Other | White British | Yate Central ward | Chipping Sodbury ward | All other wards |
| Base | 69 | 27 | 18 | 39 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 20 | 14 | 3 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 42 |
| Strongly agree | 22% | 22% | 17% | 13% | 33% | 100% | 22% | 15% | - | 67% | 14% | 9% | - | 31% |
| Tend to agree | 20% | 11% | 28% | 21% | - | - | 22% | 10% | 36% | - | 21% | 26% | - | 19% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 26% | 37% | 22% | 33% | 17% | - | 33% | 30% | 36% | - | 31% | 22% | 75% | 24% |
| Tend to disagree | 12% | 7% | 17% | 8% | 33% | - | - | 20% | 7% | - | 12% | 9% | - | 14% |
| Strongly disagree | 10% | 15% | 11% | 13% | 17% | - | 22% | 15% | 7% | 33% | 12% | 22% | - | 5% |
| Don't know | 9% | 7% | - | 10% | - | - | - | 5% | 14% | - | 7% | 13% | 25% | 5% |
| Total Agree | 42% | 33% | 45% | 34% | 33% | 100% | 44% | 25% | 36% | 67% | 35% | 35% | 0% | 50% |
| Total Disagree | 22% | 22% | 28% | 21% | 50% | 0% | 22% | 35% | 14% | 33% | 24% | 31% | 0% | 19% |

Note:-

- Data highlighted in red denotes a figure that is 10% or more lower than the overall results received.
- Data highlighted in green denotes a figure that is 10% or more higher than the overall results received.
- Where the base number of respondents in the tables is given in red text, this denotes a base size too small to be reliable representation of people with this characteristic in South Gloucestershire.
- Figures may not sum because of rounding.

A number of free text questions were asked as part of the consultation and the following are comments received which relate to equalities issues.

What, if anything, is missing or could be improved in what's currently provided to young care leavers with higher needs?

- Access to emergency accommodation, either to prevent street homelessness or stays in foster care, and to provide a place of 'respite' from chaotic situations.
- Adapted, accessible housing with supported accommodation such as halfway/second step housing with support work.
- Care leavers with higher needs require a highly co-ordinated service offer with a range of options for those that cannot cope in a shared supported housing setting. The high support flats that are provided currently help to meet this need. Some young people's behaviour or vulnerability is such that a shared living environment will not cater for their needs. Woodleaze support housing project would be another key part of a joined up service currently missing in the offer for young people including care leavers – we welcome the proposals for Woodleaze.
- More mental health support.
- more support around mental health and more thorough planning of their long term goals
- Multi-agency approach for holistic young people's wellbeing e.g. sexual health outreach, YP drug and alcohol services, trauma informed services, OTR counselling.

Please describe what kind of impact you imagine the use of this site having on residents or organisations in area near Woodleaze?

- opportunities for people of different ages and backgrounds to get together in various ways, greater understanding

What suggestions do you have for how the local community could improve the offer available to young people at Woodleaze?

- Inclusion in groups and activities; employment opportunities; local community able to help at the centre on voluntary or paid basis;

What kind of individuals, professionals or groups should be included in the local stakeholder liaison groups

- Cross section of the community
- Disabled people mainly residents and funding authority