## Addressing Health Inequality - Mental Health Hub Subsidy Scheme 2025/26 – Tendring District Council

Assessment Framework		Recommended Evidence
A330	Component	
	Policy objective (Subsidy Control Principle A) Provide details of	<ul> <li>The policy objective is within the Council's Corporate Plan 2024-2028 which seeks to promote safer, healthier, well connected and inclusive communities by working with partners.</li> <li>Funding provision to Citizens Advice Tendring via a subsidy seeks the Manual Haalth Link will appreciable applied.</li> </ul>
	specific policy objective Establish the	<ul> <li>scheme for the Mental Health Hub will specifically seek to address poor mental health outcomes:</li> <li>Mental Health: The estimated prevalence for mental</li> </ul>
Step 1	existence and significance of the market failure and/or the inequality the subsidy seeks to address	disorders in Tendring is 17.1 compared to the regional figure of 14.9. The prevalence of anxiety and depression in over 18 year olds across North East Essex at 14.3% is higher than the rest of Essex and England and the prevalence for severe mental health as recorded on general practice disease registers is also significantly higher at 1.00 than the Essex (0.80) or England average (0.94) the prevalence of long term health conditions
	<ul> <li>Identify how the subsidy will remedy the market failure (i.e. provide a more efficient outcome) and/or address the equity objective (reduce an inequality)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>across North East Essex is also slightly higher than across Essex and similar to England. (<i>Page 81 Essex County Council Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2019 Tendring Local Authority Health Profile</i>)</li> <li>Health Inequality: Tendring is one of the 20% most deprived districts/unitary authorities in England. Approximately 24% (5,500) of children in Tendring live in low income families. Life expectancy in the most deprived areas of Tendring is 10.6 years lower for men and 7.8</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>State the desired outcome(s)</li> </ul>	years lower for women in than in the least deprived areas. In the most deprived areas people not only live shorter lives than average for England, but also experience worse health. Source: (Page 23, <i>Embedding</i> <i>the Marmot Principles in Tendring, Essex</i> , Ruth Bell, 30th July 2021)
		The scheme will effectively address and reduce the above identified inequalities by providing mental health support in a key area of mental health inequality and deprivation which will therefore address health inequality as part of the wider determinants of health. Outcomes from funding provision for the mental health hub will be provided and are to include addressing ongoing mental health concerns so as to reduce numbers of people requiring clinical interventions.
	Appropriateness (Subsidy Control Principle E) Justify why a subsidy is the most	This subsidy scheme is the most appropriate instrument for Tendring District Council to use to address the identified issues such as poor mental health. The main services offered in terms of mental health support are based in the second most deprived ward in Tendring where Pier Ward is the 14 <sup>th</sup> most deprived ward in England and so requires support to address health inequalities (Page 62 Essex
		1

Assessment Framework Component		Recommended Evidence
	appropriate instrument for addressing the identified policy objective and why other instruments have been set aside such as regulation, direct provision of the good or service by the authority, or loans or equity investment on commercial terms	County Council Changes in the Index of Multiple Deprivation for Essex: IMD 2019) and has significantly worsened from the previous figures. Citizens Advice Tendring have extended experience and existing provision around mental health support within Pier Ward and have access to partner funding to deliver the mental health hub work. This type of work is outside the scope of the provision that the Council would usually provide. The Council does not provide direct mental health services and does not have the skills to be able to deliver these services. Therefore, the services provided through use of the funding are bespoke to the capabilities of the organisation for example through the employment of qualified individuals for the provision of mental health support. The mental health hub is also supported by three other organisations which provide match funding and the service could not be provided without this.
Step 2	<ul> <li>Baseline no-subsidy scenario (Subsidy Control Principles C &amp; D)</li> <li>Set out the future scenario – over both the short and the long-term – In the absence of the subsidy</li> </ul>	The absence of a subsidy scheme may impact on the effective delivery of Tendring District Council's corporate priorities and in particular in relation to promoting safer healthier, inclusive and well connected communities. The Council is also an active member of the North East Essex Health and Wellbeing Alliance which brings wider partners together to address health and wellbeing issues and whose priorities include investing in prevention and work to reduce inequalities within and between local communities. As part of this Alliance the Council helps fund the Mental Health Hub along with other partners in the Alliance. Without this scheme, a service to improve people's mental health and prevent people from having to access acute settings in one of the most deprived areas in the country will be removed. This is likely to increase the numbers of people which need higher level services and as the mental health hub also provides volunteering opportunities as a first step to employment there is the potential that some support mechanisms to help deal with root causes of mental health will be removed. Not providing this funding may prevent Citizen's Advice Tendring from being able to continue their work or to be able to keep up with the growing level of demand for their services following the impact of the pandemic and the cost of living crisis. This would affect any progress to improve outcomes in the areas of inequality identified above.

Assessment Framework		Recommended Evidence
Component		
	Additionality Assessment (Subsidy Control Principles C & D) For schemes, please provide details of how it has been designed to exclude any groups of beneficiaries where it can be reasonably determined in advance that there is unlikely to be additional benefits that wouldn't have otherwise happened in the absence of the subsidy. Please provide appropriate justification where it has not been possible/reasonable to identify and exclude these groups.	To receive this funding Citizen's Advice Tendring have to be able to show that they have applied and secured match funding for the mental health hub. This demonstrates that the applicant has explored alternative funding opportunities and that additional support from the Council is necessary in order to be able to deliver their proposed work in its entirety and that without this support, the work would not be able to commence. This provides reassurance that this subsidy scheme will be providing beneficial support that would otherwise not have been available.
Step 3	Proportionality and Minimising Distortion (Subsidy Control Principle B & F) Demonstrate how the subsidy is proportionate and has been designed to minimise any negative effects on competition and investment within the UK whilst still allowing it to meet the policy objective. This should include details how you have considered the following subsidy characteristics (where relevant): • The nature of the instrument • The breadth of beneficiaries and the	The subsidy scheme is designed so that funding can be provided to an organisation that is a trusted organisation in the community, which residents regularly access for support, is located close to areas of significant deprivation and can provide outreach if necessary. In addition it has access to significant match funding which delivers outcomes aligned with the Council's corporate objectives and aligns with Alliance objectives which the Council is part of. The organisation receiving the funds also has to be able to demonstrate significant experience in terms of delivering mental health support work and be able to undertake this work competently. Due to the specific requirements of the work in terms of it needing to be undertaken by a trusted local organisation with relevant experience which is highly accessible this is unlikely to adversely affect competition locally. Although the breadth of beneficiaries is restricted to one this is based on the organisation's standing and trusted nature in the community which residents routinely access and can demonstrate the potential of attracting match funding and can demonstrate delivery over an extended period. The subsidy is provided for one year to cover provision of a mental health hub which provides professional advice, support and a volunteering opportunity to help resolve individuals mental health issues. The recipient must provide a report on the progress of their funded work on a regular basis and have monitoring, evaluation and clear

Assessment Framework		Recommended Evidence
Component		
	selection process The size of the subsidy The timespan over which the subsidy is given The nature of the costs being covered The performance criteria Ringfencing Monitoring and evaluation	outcomes as part of their delivery. The monitoring and evaluation carried out must provide evidence of success achieved against the outcomes and case studies. This provides evidence that the subsidy has had a positive impact on the ability of the organisation to deliver community work in Tendring that it otherwise would not have had the opportunity to do.
Step 4	<ul> <li>Balancing Exercise (Subsidy Control Principle G)</li> <li>Set out details of the expected benefits of the subsidy (as they relate to the specified public policy objective) and its anticipated negative effects, including in particular any negative effects on competition and investment within the UK, and international trade and investment. This should also include any geographical and distributional impacts. Justify why the negative effects are outweighed.</li> <li>Please note that it will not always be possible to quantify every element of the assessment, and therefore the balancing</li> </ul>	The expected benefits of the subsidy will be to ensure people are supported in terms of their mental health which will provide the ability to be seen by a professional, receive signposting and access volunteering as a precursor to employment. Although there are no significant obvious negative impacts the funding is currently offered on a year by year basis so there may be a reduction in service if further funding is not allocated. As there is need in the community currently the positive impacts of this subsidy will outweigh any negative impacts. Any negative impact on competition are limited as this needs to be a particular organisation undertaking this work and there are no other local organisations that could fit this remit. Therefore any negative impacts are outweighed by the positive impact that the subsidy scheme can have. As it is unlikely that another provider is in a position to provide these services on a local basis as a trusted provider by the community and it will help address the poor mental health conditions and health inequalities in the area it is appropriate to provide the subsidy.

Assessment Framework Component	Recommended Evidence
exercise may need to include both quantitative and qualitative elements.	