



## Form to be used for the initial assessment

<b>Service Area:</b> Law and Governance	<b>Section:</b> Democratic Services	<b>Key person responsible for the assessment:</b> William Reed	<b>Date of Assessment:</b> 1 April 2011	
<b>Is this assessment in the Corporate Equality Impact assessment Timetable for 2008-11?</b>			Yes	No✓
<b>Name of the Policy to be assessed:</b> Democratic Arrangements - Changes			<b>Is this a new or existing policy</b>	New
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy</b>		To introduce better and more relevant, efficient and timely decision-making processes and (through area forums) engage more effectively with all sections of the community.		
<b>2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain</b>		Achieve savings both in time taken to reach substantive decisions and in the cost of the decision-making process		

<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way</b>	All users of Council services and all Council tax payers through streamlined and more effective and less costly decision-making processes.		
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in the cost of decision-making processes</li> <li>• Less planning decisions going to appeal and costs awarded against the Council</li> <li>• Better opportunity for public involvement (through local area forums).</li> </ul>			
<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>	<u>Contributors</u> – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forums more user-friendly, operating to no rigid rules of procedure but to local area needs.</li> <li>• Public participation and ownership</li> <li>• Immediacy of decision-making (subject to scrutiny)</li> </ul> <u>Detractors</u> – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased call in of executive decisions, thus slowing down decision-making</li> <li>• Lack of local involvement in area forums</li> <li>• Uncertainty about process</li> </ul>		
<b>6. Who are the key people in relation to the policy?</b>	Members of the Council Council officers Members of the public	<b>7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?</b>	Law and Governance Service Area Senior officers
<b>8. Could the policy have a differential impact on racial groups?</b>	Y	N ✓	

<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people.	
<b>9. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their gender?</b>	Y	N ✓
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people.	
<b>10. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their disability?</b>	Y	N ✓
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people. There is some slight degree of risk that fully accessible venues for local area forum meetings are not always available.	
<b>11. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their sexual orientation?</b>	Y	N ✓
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people.	
<b>12. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their age?</b>	Y	N ✓
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>	Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people. Area forums will take place locally. Committee meetings will take place in the Town Hall which is accessible by bus from all parts of the City.	

<b>13. Could the policy have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief?</b>		Y	N ✓			
<b>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</b>		Unlikely adversely to effect. Democratic decision-making will remain albeit decisions will be taken by different people. We will, as always, attempt to avoid holding meetings on faith days.				
<b>14. Could the negative impact identified in 8-13 create the potential for the policy to discriminate against certain groups?</b>	Y	N	There are no overriding negative impacts. Every attempt will be made by meeting organisers to minimise those possible impacts referred to above.			
<b>15. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason</b>	Y	N	<b>Please explain for each equality heading (question 8-13) on a separate piece of paper</b>  No overriding adverse impacts have been identified.			
<b>16. Should the policy proceed to a partial impact assessment</b>	Y	N✓	<b>If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA</b>	Y	N✓	
			<b>Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by</b>			
<b>17. Are there implications for the Service Plans?</b>	YES✓	NO	<b>18. Date the Service Plan will be updated</b>		<b>19. Date copy sent to Equalities Officer in Policy, Performance and Communication</b>	6 April 2011
<b>20. Date reported to Equalities Board:</b>			<b>Date to Scrutiny and EB</b>	13 April 2011	<b>21. Date published</b>	6 April 2011

Signed (completing officer) *\_William Reed*

Signed (Lead Officer) *\_William Reed*

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

Law and Governance

Jeremy Thomas

Dan Rawstorne

William Reed