



### Form to be used for the initial assessment

571

<b>Service Area:</b> Environmental Development	<b>Section:</b> n/a	<b>Key person responsible for the assessment:</b> John Copley	<b>Date of Assessment:</b> 25/8/11	
<b>Is this assessment in the Corporate Equality Impact assessment Timetable for 2008-11?</b>			n/a	
<b>Name of the Service/Policy to be assessed:</b> CEB/SMD report: Implementation of budget service reduction – Environmental Development Low Priority Service Requests.			<b>Is this a new or existing policy</b>	New
<b>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy</b>		The aim is make changes to service delivery to better prioritise growing service requests within the revised budget.		

<p><b>2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain</b></p>	<p>To ensure consistent handling of service requests falling within this category.</p>		
<p><b>3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way</b></p>	<p>The City Council and its service users through the reprioritised use of resources.</p>		
<p><b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?</b>                  Low priority service requests are handled in a uniform and consistent manner.                  Resources are employed in a prioritised way that conforms to policy.                  The Council achieves the sought budgetary saving.</p>			
<p><b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b></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 and how, so as to achieve the required reconfiguration.</p>		
<p><b>6. Who are the key people in relation to the policy?</b></p>	<p>All staff in Customer Services and in Environmental Development. All service users making calls in this category.</p>	<p><b>7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?</b></p>	<p>Helen Bishop – implementing officer                  John Copley – responsible officer</p>

572

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

579

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

574

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

575

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