

## Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

### Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

<b>Name of Policy/Project/Decision</b>	Bury Council Agreement in principle to enter into a partnership agreement with the GMCA and other GM Local Authorities for Project Skyline
<b>Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)</b>	Jeanette Richards
<b>Department/Team</b>	Children's Services
<b>Proposed Implementation Date</b>	4/12/24
<b>Author of the EqlA</b>	Robert Arrowsmith
<b>Date of the EqlA</b>	20/11/24

<p><b>1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?</b></p> <p>Proposal for Bury Council to approve in principle to enter into a Partnership Agreement for Project Skyline, with GMCA and other GM Local Authorities</p> <p>Project Skyline is a GM wide proposal to create supply of children's homes to increase availability of looked after child (LAC) placements in the GM region for some of our most vulnerable young people. This will see ten new homes that can accommodate 24 children with complex mental health issues or Emotional Behavioural Difficulties. GMCA is leading the procurement on behalf of the ten GM local authorities.</p> <p>Formally entering the partnership with all 10 GM authorities will enable Bury to participate in progressing plans to invest in new regional provision that will be protected for GM children and seek to develop a portfolio of new publicly owned residential provision to support children in care to GM authorities in need of residential provision.</p>
--

At its core, creating dedicated GMCA provision will mitigate the exposure to market forces. particularly the escalating cost of provision and sometimes sub-optimal outcomes for children. The partnership agreement is to establish 10 homes for 24 children and young people. Whilst this is a small number relative to the number of children in care to GM authorities in private sector children’s homes (slightly less than 600 currently), it represents an important shift and return to the children’s homes market for GM local authorities.

**Section 2 – Impact Assessment** (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

**2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?**

Employees: **No – the proposal is clearly aimed at supporting a defined group of GM residents**

Community/Residents: **Yes – potentially through enhanced residential options available for homes for children in care in need of such support.**

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **No – the proposal is clearly aimed at supporting a defined group of GM residents**

If the answer to all three questions is ‘no’ there is no need to continue with this analysis.

**2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation**

**Documentary Evidence:**

[The-independent-review-of-childrens-social-care-Final-report.pdf](#)

[cco-private-provision-in-childrens-social-care.pdf](#)

[Largest national providers of private and voluntary social care \(March 2022\) - GOV.UK](#)

[GM Sufficiency Programme - Greater Manchester Combined Authority](#)

**Data:**

[Cabinet report for Project Skyline \(GM Children's homes\).docx](#) – see paragraph 5.4 in the attached report link

More widely, there is national data showing the growth in the number of children placed at distance from home and placed in residential settings here: [Children looked after in England including adoptions, Reporting year 2024 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

**Stakeholder information/consultation: N/A**

**2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.**

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

<b>2.4 Characteristic</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	<b>Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact</b>	<b>Mitigations to reduce negative impact</b>	<b>Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative</b>
<b>Age</b>				
<b>Disability</b>				
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>				
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>				
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>				
<b>Race</b>				
<b>Religion and Belief</b>				
<b>Sex</b>				
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>				
<b>Carers</b>				

<b>Looked After Children and Care Leavers</b>	Additional options for residential care for children in care with the need for such support and accommodation.	Within Bury and GM more widely there is increasing dependence on the private sector to provide homes for children in of residential care. The partnership agreement proposes to establish 24 additional publicly owned residential beds across 10 homes for children in care within GM	N/A	Positive
<b>Socio-economically vulnerable</b>				
<b>Veterans</b>				

**Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis**

<b>2.5 Characteristics</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>

**Section 3 - Impact Risk**

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

### 3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

<b>Risk Level</b>	<b>No Risk = 0</b>	<b>Low Risk = 1 - 4</b>	<b>Medium Risk = 5 – 7</b>	<b>High Risk = 8 - 16</b>
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

<b>3.2 Level of risk identified</b>	0
<b>3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation</b>	The proposal is to develop 10 publicly owned residential homes offering a total of 24 beds for children in care within Greater Manchester, solely for children being cared for by GM local authorities. These homes will be available for a vulnerable group of young people already recognised by Bury council as having a protected characteristic. The proposal widens the range of existing options available for homes for children in care, while also seeking to mitigate the rising cost of residential provision available in the private sector.

### Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

<b>4.1 Analysis Decision</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Reasons for This Decision</b>
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	X	The impact of the decision is on children in care alone and it is positive.

There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		

**Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions** (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager			
Responsible Asst. Director/Director			
EDI	Lee Cawley	20/11/24	QA complete. Positive impacts only identified.

**EqIA Revision Log**

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details