

## People Impact Assessment (PIA)

<b>Policy/activity or service area to be assessed:</b>	Community Safety Offer	<b>Person completing assessment:</b>	Diane Dunlevey
<b>Reason for this assessment:</b> (new policy / review etc)	Consultation Proposal	<b>Date of assessment:</b>	July 2015

A PIA involves analysing the effect, or potential effect, of the way we do our business upon groups that share protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010. This requires us to look at the equality data which we capture or have access to and to consider the outcome of our community engagement. We need to assess whether our policies and practices show 'due regard' for the three aims (see below) of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). The analysis should highlight effects that *increase* equality, *decrease* equality or have *no impact* upon equality across the protected characteristics. Its purpose is not just to paint a picture, but to *identify practical steps* to improve our performance by:

- (a) Eliminating any unlawful discrimination,**
- (b) Advancing equality of opportunity and**
- (c) Fostering good relations between different groups.**

1. Briefly describe the purpose, aims and objectives of the policy/activity: <sup>1</sup>	<p>The purpose of the report being considered in this capacity is to provide details of the recommendations made to the Fire and Rescue Authority following work undertaken during our Community Safety Options consultation process. The report is structured to provide details on the individual recommendations and the associated implications of implementing them. In addition information is provided on the implications of implementing a combination of the recommendations in order to provide impact information at a countywide level.</p> <p>The Community Safety Options review commenced in January 2014 with the development of the 'Risk Profiling' work utilising the Insight team within Staffordshire County Council. The purpose of this work was to undertake a comprehensive risk profiling exercise to identify current and future demand, based on risk that would ultimately provide evidence on which recommendations could be made regarding alternative options for our service delivery model. This would support us ensuring we</p>
---	--

	provide safe, effective, efficient and resilient prevention, protection and response arrangements. The Insight team used a range of information in order to provide the risk profiling report that was included in the FRA report dated 16th February 2015. This information included the impact of future developments in business, housing and transport infrastructure. In respect of demand entering the Service a holistic approach has been taken to examining it that includes prevention, protection and response arrangements.
2. Who is the policy/activity aimed at: (communities, staff, partners etc)	Whole Service staff, partners, all community users
3. Who is responsible for the policy/activity: (Directorate/Department/individual)	Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Authority

## Equality Statement

Clearly explain and provide supporting evidence to show how the policy/activity satisfies the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and **DOES NOT** cause or have the potential to cause a **NEGATIVE** (detrimental) effect:

### Eliminating any unlawful discrimination

The options presented are the result of extensive analysis of the current working structure. The recommendations relate specifically to changes to the current response arrangements which will provide some of the financial savings required during this financial year. The recommendations are the least impact, proportionate options that support the red line of no compromise to firefighter or community safety. The Demand Analysis, undertaken by Staffordshire County Council Insight Team details the current demand on the service response arrangements using national research, local incident trends, defining response demand by:

- Single parent families
- Single person households
- Lone pensioners

- Rented accommodation
- Sickness and disability
- Population density

In addition data analysis takes in account;

- 65+ residents
- those on job seekers allowance
- Lone occupancy household.

The Service has been able to analyse these factors at a lower super output area (LSOA) and also take account of planned development and predicted demographic changes up until 2031. In terms of any evidence of discriminatory practice by the Service on a response basis we can confidently suggest that none exists. Nevertheless fire does discriminate by factors such as those listed above and where social inequality presides, as does increased risk from poor health, poor housing, contact with criminal justice agencies and increased levels of intervention from all agencies of the state and voluntary sector. Within the recommendations the following aspects which are recognised as contributory factors to risk have been considered:-

- Poor health, poor education and poor housing dynamics
- Mosaic data types relating to ethnicity, age, gender, religion and belief, sexual orientation, physical and mental health

These factors culminate in multiple service demand and the Community Safety Options proposal seeks to explore all possibilities of multi-agency and collaborative working with our partners and service providers.

The data sets as presented in the Fire and Rescue Authority Report are seeking approval for 10 Recommendations:-

Recommendation 1 which indicates that the new service delivery model should be discarded, as an option, owing to objectionable responses from the public consultation and the possible impact on increased risk to those most vulnerable as identified. This option would significantly impact on the Services ability to deliver prevention activities that drive down the demand for the emergency response arrangements within the Service. It would therefore be unsustainable in preventing fire and other incidents occurring and therefore may well be counterproductive from a financial and moral objective at this time.

Recommendations 2-5 are to maintain the response current provision until such times that the Staffordshire Efficient Response Option (SERO) has been fully evaluated and determined. The due regard demonstrated in this respect is to ensure firefighter and community safety is not compromised and this is in specific relation to those most at risk within our communities. The Prevent and Protect activity, which supports the

Community Safety Options, should be seen as an integral element for the Services ability to deliver the Community Safety Options in a sustainable and credible way.

Despite the cautiousness of Recommendations 6-10, if accepted, these will enable the Service to provide the same level of initial response to those most at risk, and go some way to securing the short-term financial savings required during 2015/16. Coupled with the planned prevent and protect activity this would be a preferred and more realistic option from an Equality consideration point than to do nothing would be. To do nothing may result in the Service not being able to maintain the decreased level of demand it has established over the past decade. We are aware that due to risk, combined with a decreasing budget, may result in the Service not having the capacity to continue on its monumental journey in demand reduction which it has been able to do by understanding societal mores and sustaining its visionary insight into the future nature of that demand.

It is recognised that the removal of a resource will have an impact; however the recommendations do not leave any area of the Authority areas without a response resource. In all cases the first appliance in the recommendations remains in situ and the phoenix modelling that has been used to determine our ability to respond and has calculated that there will be a limited impact unless that first appliance is already deployed. In this instance, as is the case currently, the nearest appliance would be mobilised. It is also worth noting that on the occasions the second appliance, as in the case of Stone and Rugley, are mobilised these occurrences are decreasing and have decreased significantly over the previous 6 years. In both cases there is no change recommended to their neighbouring appliance complement. In the case of Burton and the removal of the TRV it should be noted that the TRV would not be deployed to a high risk incident. As is the case with the recommendations they are evidenced with current and future predicted demand and have the caveat of Prevent and Protect work increasing and the Service working with our partners. In the field of Protect the Service is compliant with the legislative changes in landlord responsibility and is supporting that work stream. The people who are most at risk, and protected under the Equality Act in this instance will be targeted with the use of bespoke risk profiling analysis. There is no change recommended in the areas of the Authority where risk factors are high and predicted to rise. When such times that SERO is applied then the same profiling and flexibility to targeting, preventing protecting and where necessary responding then SERO will fit that demand by design.

### **Advancing equality of opportunity**

Notwithstanding the above the Services ability to continue not to unwittingly fall short of its duty to prevent unlawful discrimination is significantly dependant on its Prevent and Protect activities. During 1999 the Service recorded 270 fire deaths or injuries; a decade later in 2009 this figure was 27, there is a caveat here as to how injuries are classified nevertheless this is an astounding improvement in outcomes for the communities of Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire during this time. The Recommendations will enable the Service to continue on this trajectory by applying resources to the areas which the Service has control over which is by working with partners on shared objectives and by utilising the flexibility of

SERO, and the data analysis of Mosaic, Exeter data and community engagement.

The Community Safety Options consultation was able to capture the views of residents from all sections of the Authority's diverse area and communities in addition some specific meetings were held with residents from an ethnic minority and minority religious perspective these were of all ages. And a groups of residents from a disability and they presented with learning, physical and ill mental health disabilities again all adult but from a broad age range. During the interviews these particular respondents did not indicate that their Protected Characteristic put them at a higher risk in this context. It should be noted that how people respondent in an interview, having limited time to consider the facts has to be validated alongside all the consultation returns in its varying methodologies. The evaluation of the whole consultation did indicate that the public did feel that the removal of a fire engine would put them at an increased risk. It is worth noting that often people who are at an increased vulnerability may not always recognise or articulate that in part due to a resistance to being viewed as 'less-than'. What these meetings did demonstrate was an absolute willingness and desire these groups and individuals have to work more closely with the Service. This will not be lost within the on-going prevent, volunteering and community engagement activity the Service has established and is continuing to develop.

The developing use of the 'three tiers of measures', and SERO providing a response most suitable to the environment, will secure a Service which is able to continue to advance equality of opportunity by identifying those most at risk and working with them before they fall victim to fire or other emergency incident. Moreover other work the Service is able to do with our health partners will support a reduction in partner demand and therefore the financial saving goes beyond that to be achieved by the Service by working towards a geographical impact with our partners. In the possible negative impact table below it has to be recognised that to stay the same may have a negative impact in terms of advancing equality of opportunity as the elderly and the infirm in particular are at an increasing risk and an increasing volume. For the Service to adapt to these changing demographics it is essential that we deliver our services differently by education and engagement and do all we can with our partners to keep the community and individuals of Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire safe.

The internal implication of reducing the size of the operational workforce due to the recommendations, by 22 operational posts, has a neutral equality impact due to the characteristics of the comparable number of the likely retirement profile being 21 individuals. The Authority should be mindful of the Services inability to have extensive recruitment campaigns within a shrinking budget and maintaining a fit for purpose organisation. It is therefore essential that all advertised posts and staff changes, development and opportunities are conducted under the positive action and human resources policies and procedures the Service has in place.

### **Fostering good relations between different groups**

Notwithstanding that the recommendations would enable the Service to build on and increase its relationships with the public and partners due to our commitment to prevention and protection; this is not the specific meaning of 'fostering good relations' as specified by the duty. Fostering

good relations in these terms is meant by the service supporting relationships with people who share and do not share protected characteristics.

The recommendations do not go into specific detail about the Community Fire Stations functions and purpose in these respects neither does it make specific reference to the work of Staffordshire Safer Community Interest Company. Nevertheless it is with these areas of work and developing opportunities that will support the recommendations moving forward.

Where the policy/activity **DOES** or has the **POTENTIAL TO** have a **NEGATIVE** (detrimental) effect indicate which of the Protected Characteristics **MUST** be considered:

Describe the <b>NEGATIVE</b> (detrimental) effect and provide supporting evidence for your rationale *	
<b>Age</b>	We know that the biggest risks to fire and other incidents is age. Old age is a contributory factor in the case of slips trips and falls, isolation, poor health and fire. We also know that the largest proportions of road traffic collision deaths are in the 'youth' profile. Both age categories are also more likely to have safeguarding needs. The recommendations have taken account of these factors and it is imperative that the Service is able to work differently to enable it to have the financial resource to work with age as a characteristic to continue to drive down incidents. The recommendations support our directions of travel to work with these groups.
<b>Disability</b>	Disability is a factor not just in terms of fire but a significant resource demand on our partners. If the Service is able to support our partners and people with disability in the field of prevention and protection then their risk of needing a response intervention is reduced. Again this is financially more sustainable and without that capability by balancing our resources and working differently these groups of people are at serious risk.
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Potential risks of isolation we need to have the financial resource to work more closely with partners. The recommendations therefore allow us some flexibility here.
<b>Marriage or civil partnership</b>	
<b>Pregnancy or maternity</b>	The Service needs to be able to have the resources to access this group.



<b>Religion or belief</b>	Varying increased risks due to festival practices. The Service is exploring ways to work with religious leaders of all faiths. We need to have the resources to do this and the recommendation related to the use of part-time staff to undertake prevention activities will provide an alternative method of undertaking this work
<b>Race</b>	Being of an ethnic minority may have an increased vulnerability associated with it. For the Authority area this needs to be monitored particularly in terms of an aging population which may become increasingly isolated if families assimilate to indigenous mores. Also ethnic minorities are more likely to be living in poor housing and poverty and therefore come into our risk profiling ability.
<b>Sex</b>	Likely in fire deaths in the elderly having a disproportionate risk to women. However this is in part possibility due to longer life expectancy which advancements in medical technology may stabilise in the future.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Associated risk factors, by small pockets of life style and isolation, needing prevention activity to be built on understood and maintained.
<b>Socio-economic disadvantage 2</b>	One of the biggest risk factor associations of service users across all public sectors.

\* **NOTE:** Where any **NEGATIVE** (detrimental) effects are likely to occur:

- (a) For the policy/activity to continue corrective actions/amendments **MUST** be taken to prevent/minimise unlawful discrimination
- (b) An action plan **MUST** be completed (next section)
- (c) Where a negative (detrimental) effect can not be avoided, continuation of the policy/activity (with or without amendment) **MUST** be justified

## Action plan


This action plan **MUST** accompany the policy/activity and be used continually to assess any negative (detrimental) effects resulting from the delivery of or amendments to the policy/activity based on customer feedback and evaluation.

Negative/detrimental effect	Action needed to prevent/minimise it	By who	By when	Complete (tick)
All protected characteristics as identified above may be	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The FRA accept the Recommendations</li> </ul>	FRA Members	13 July 2015	

<p>at an increased risk of an existing vulnerability if the Service is restricted in its ability to continue with its Prevention and Protection activity whilst maintaining a fit for purpose Response capability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the SERO work is progressed and bespoke to applicable areas</li> <li>• That performance measures continue to be aligned to activity and development</li> <li>• The Prevention and Protection are further developed and embedded across the whole Service in terms of purpose.</li> </ul>	<p>Service</p> <p>BIT/CRR</p> <p>Service</p>	<p>Flexible. Revisit SDB September and report at all SDB thereafter</p> <p>Continuous further development and Service understanding within Directorate and delivery of CSP</p> <p>Continuous further development and Service understanding within Directorate and delivery of CSP</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

All Completed PIA's should be submitted to E&D team for approval.



Signed:  (E&D)

Name: Diane Dunlevey

Date: 10 July 2010