



Form to be used for the initial assessment

43

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|-----|
| Service Area: Environmental Development | Section: n/a | Key person responsible for the assessment: John Copley | Date of Assessment: 25/8/11 | |
| Is this assessment in the Corporate Equality Impact assessment Timetable for 2008-11? | | | n/a | |
| Name of the Service/Policy to be assessed: CEB/SMD report: Environmental Development Service Reconfiguration – forthcoming changes to low priority service request handling. | | | Is this a new or existing policy | New |
| 1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy | | The aim is make changes to service delivery to implement the savings agreed by Council. | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain</p> | <p>To ensure consistent handling of service requests falling within this category.</p> | | |
| <p>3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way</p> | <p>The City Council and its service users through the reprioritised use of resources.</p> | | |
| <p>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy? The Council achieves the sought budgetary saving. Low priority service requests are handled in a uniform and consistent manner.</p> | | | |
| <p>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</p> | <p>Due to the number and diversity of service requests received this will be a complex saving to deliver. All parties including officers and Members will need to be clear about what services will be delivered so as to achieve the target savings.</p> | | |
| <p>6. Who are the key people in relation to the policy?</p> | <p>All staff in Customer Services and in Environmental Development. All service users making calls in this category.</p> | <p>7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?</p> | <p>Helen Bishop – implementing officer John Copley – responsible officer</p> |

44

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| <p>8. Could the policy have a differential impact on racial groups?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | |
| <p>9. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their gender?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | |
| <p>10. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their disability?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | |
| <p>11. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their sexual orientation?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | |

45

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|----------|----------|
| <p>12. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their age?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | | | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | | | |
| <p>13. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief?</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | | | |
| <p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> | <p>The mix of service users is expected to be unchanged from those currently accessing services.</p> | | | | |
| <p>14. Could the negative impact identified in 8-13 create the potential for the policy to discriminate against certain groups?</p> | | <p><u>n/a</u></p> | <p>Please explain No negative impact identified,</p> | | |
| <p>15. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason</p> | | <p><u>n/a</u></p> | <p>Please explain for each equality heading (question 8-13) on a separate piece of paper No, no adverse impact identified.</p> | | |
| <p>16. Should the policy proceed to a partial impact</p> | | <p><u>NO</u></p> | <p>If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA</p> | <p>Y</p> | <p>N</p> |

46

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|---|-------------|--|---------|
| assessment | | | Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 17. Are there implications for the Service Plans? | <u>YES</u> | | 18. Date the Service Plan will be updated | For 2012/13 | 19. Date copy sent to Equalities Officer in Policy, Performance and Communication | 25/8/11 |
| 20. Date reported to Equalities Board: | N/A | | Date to Scrutiny and EB | 12/9/11 | 21. Date published | |

47

Signed (completing officer): Michelle Green Signed (Lead Officer) John Copley.

Please list the team members and service areas that were involved in this process:

John Copley, Head of Environmental Development.

This page is intentionally left blank