

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00004 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Development Services Environmental Services	Lead Officer Name:	Douglas Gardiner
		Team:	Waste Services
		Tel:	01324590437
		Email:	douglas.gardiner@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Removal of Community Safety Service	Reference No:	DV09

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	Yes	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
07/01/2019	Removing the team of 5 FTE from general services budget and the associated service provision releasing the current budget for savings.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	323	Net HRA and income from fines
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	323	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:	N/A	
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:	N/A	
	Expected Annual Income Total:	N/A	
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:	01/04/2019	
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)

A - Quantitative Evidence This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.

April 2016 – March 2017 – the Community Safety Team responded to 1471 calls.

B - Qualitative Evidence This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

Community Safety is considered an early prevention method to stop more significant anti-social behaviour activities and environmental crime. Stopping the service may increase the number of recorded anti-social behaviour and environmental crime incidents.

Communities and their quality of life will be impacted on by a reduction/removal of patrols. There would be no responsible person to assist with any antisocial behaviour and tasks would fall to Police Scotland.

Best Judgement:

Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Area Estates Coordinator.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Other Councils have altered their services and have information available as required.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Since June 2016 the Co-ordinator emailed those service users who had provided email addresses, a questionnaire. This was also completed by service users attending open days/community council meetings. The public were invited to comment on Council budget proposals .	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	Yes	Focus groups for Over 50's and visits to sheltered housing.
Survey	Yes	257 surveys emailed with 134 responses between June 2016 and December 2016. From the corporate online consultation in 2017 a total of 11 comments were received about these proposals, 8 against, 2 in favour and 1 neutral.
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	Yes	Open Days – attendees completed feedback surveys.
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, public protection etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age				Unknown.
Disability				Unknown.
Sex				Unknown.
Ethnicity				Unknown.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				Unknown.
Sexual Orientation				Unknown.
Transgender				Unknown.
Pregnancy / Maternity				Unknown.
Marriage / Civil Partnership				Unknown.
Poverty				Unknown.
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.				Unknown.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	Removal of the Community Safety Team may have an impact on the environment. The Community Safety Team carry out a range of duties including dog control, antisocial behaviour and issuing of fixed penalties in relation to litter offences. This will mitigated through education and awareness programmes promoted by the service and through continued close working with other agencies e.g. Police Scotland.			

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	Community Safety patrol business premises
Councils	Yes	No investigation into cross border issues in relation to environmental enforcement or no sharing of best practice, however fly tipping may become an issue.
Education Sector	Yes	The Community Safety Team delivers regular presentations in both primary and secondary schools regarding litter and antisocial behaviour. Lunch time litter patrols are undertaken with reparative sessions being managed by the team for offenders under 16 years of age – not currently subject to a fixed penalty.
Fire	Yes	Community Safety partnership agenda not undertaken.
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	Yes	Community Safety partnership agenda not undertaken
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Removal of service	Service users	Users will be directed to other agencies e.g. Police	F Cianni	01/04/2019	
Removal of service	Service users	Education and awareness programmes promoted by the service.	F Cianni	01/04/2019	

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?

Yes

If yes when and how ?

Budget report in February 2018 and full Council meeting in February 2019.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	No	
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	Yes	Service users will still have access to other agencies regarding public protection (Police).
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Carl Bullough</i>	Date:	07/01/2019
------------	----------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA: Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?	No
--	----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	This proposal will impact on people. While the service has information on the amount of work done it has not provided detail on the protected characteristics of service users. It is not possible therefore to know impact.	
--	--	--

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	No	If YES, please describe:
---	----	--------------------------

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	Not known
MEDIUM	Yes / No	Not known
LOW	Yes / No	Not known

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	<i>Rhona Geisler</i>	Date:	05/02/2019