



Committee: CABINET

Date: TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2017

Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

Time: 6.00 P.M.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies

2. Minutes

To receive as a correct record the minutes of Cabinet held on Tuesday, 14 February 2017 (previously circulated).

3. Items of Urgent Business Authorised by the Leader

To consider any such items authorised by the Leader and to consider where in the agenda the item(s) are to be considered.

4. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

5. Public Speaking

To consider any such requests received in accordance with the approved procedure.

Reports from Overview and Scrutiny

None

Reports

6. **Property Level Resilience Grants, Lune Square and The Millrace (Pages 1 - 8)**
(Cabinet Member with Special Responsibility Councillor Hanson)
Report of Chief Officer (Regeneration & Planning)
7. **Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014: Fixed Penalty Notice Charges for Non-Compliance with Community Protection Notices (Pages 9 - 17)**
(Cabinet Members with Special Responsibility Councillors Hughes and Leytham)
Report of Chief Officer (Health & Housing)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Eileen Blamire (Chairman), Janice Hanson (Vice-Chairman), Darren Clifford, Brendan Hughes, James Leyshon, Karen Leytham, Margaret Pattison and Anne Whitehead

(ii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Liz Bateson, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582047 or email ebateson@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iii) Apologies

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk.

SUSAN PARSONAGE,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Thursday, March 9th, 2017.

CABINET

**PROPERTY LEVEL RESILIENCE GRANTS, LUNE
SQUARE AND THE MILLRACE
21ST MARCH 2017**

Report of Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To approve Property Level Resilience Grant allocations to Lune Square and The Millrace.			
Key Decision	X	Non-Key Decision	Referral from Cabinet Member
Date of notice of forthcoming key decision	22 nd February 2017		
This report is public			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COUNCILLOR JANICE HANSON

- (1) That a Property Level Resilience Grant of £96,240 be paid in relation to works to protect Lune Square, to be funded from Government grant.
- (2) That a Property Level Resilience Grant of £104,000 be paid in relation to works to protect The Millrace, to be funded from Government grant.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Following Storm Desmond on 5th December 2015 the Government allocated funds to properties affected by flooding to enable property owners to invest in property level resilience measures as part of repairs to recover from flood damage.
- 1.2 For houses and bungalows and other ground floor accommodation these include things like flood gates, basement pumps and non-returnable valves on WC's for example. The current scheme for which Government funding has been allocated to the City Council to administer allows for expenditure up to £5,000 for each flooded dwelling.
- 1.3 Allocating these funds in line with general guidance from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is undertaken by officers in Health and Housing/Regeneration and Planning/Resources under delegated powers.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 The flooding which impacted properties in the City Centre affected new build apartments as well as traditional house types. During the recovery phase of the emergency difficulties were experienced with classifications of properties which were flooded as opposed to those classified as affected because only gardens and outbuildings had water ingress.
- 2.2 Whilst the residential floor space in two particular apartment blocks was classed as affected rather than flooded the properties became uninhabitable because the ground floor areas contained essential services such as electricity, and pumping for water supply. These were flooded and ceased to operate. The loss of essential services meant that residents had to leave their homes and had to take up alternative accommodation for some time until repairs could be affected.
- 2.3 Dealing with eligibility for Property Resilience Grant has also required a flexible approach as the need to apply property resilience to these buildings differs from the conventional approach in the DCLG scheme which relates primarily to homes with ground floor and basement areas. Nonetheless discussions with DCLG liaison Officials has clarified that within the spirit of the scheme, and the funding envelope made available to local authorities, they (the local authority) are expected to use their discretion.
- 2.4 For Lune Square the number of properties which would be protected by a scheme to provide flood protection for the ground floor services would be 84. The grant being sought is for £96,240 (including £16,040 irrecoverable VAT) which equates to around £1,146 per property (NB: administratively only 20 applications are required from the 84 occupiers/leaseholders to fund the cost of this project at a maximum of £5000 per application/grant approval), being protected from future flooding events.
- 2.5 For the Millrace the number of properties which would be protected by a scheme to provide flood protection for ground floor services would be 25. The grant sought is for £104,000 (rounded, including approximately £17,300 irrecoverable VAT) which equates to around £4,160 per property being protected from future flooding events.
- 2.6 Both schemes have been designed by industry experts and officers are satisfied that they are appropriate for the buildings concerned. The aim is to ensure that future events should they occur do not result in these property owners having to be rehoused or supported by other public funding again.

3.0 Details of Consultation

- 3.1 The principle of applying local authority discretion to Property Resilience Grant applications for these properties has been the subject of discussions with DCLG Flood Liaison Officials.

4.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

	Option 1: To approve the discretionary grant allocations for these properties	Option 2: Not to approve the discretionary grant allocations for these properties
Advantages	Property resilience put in place. Future events should not result in residents being displaced.	No property resilience in place. Residents at risk of being displaced in future events.
Disadvantages	None	Additional public expenditure may take place to support residents in the event of future flooding.
Risks	<p>Firstly, scheme could be deemed to be ineligible by DCLG. Although the guidance is not clear and is open to interpretation, DCLG stress that LA's have the discretion to apply grants as they see fit. DCLG have been asked to confirm it has no objections to the proposed course of action and they have re-iterated that LA's have flexibility to approve community schemes provided it protects the properties of all of the claimants and that we're satisfied the application meets the eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Secondly, deadline for submitting applications is 31 March 2017 and if a decision is not made at this time there is a risk that we will miss the deadline.</p>	Reputational damage to the local authority.

5.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

5.1 Option 1 is the preferred option.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 Cabinet are asked to authorise payment in these circumstances to ensure that these vulnerable properties are provided with an appropriate level of property resilience in line with the spirit of the Governments scheme.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Council takes an active role in protecting its residents and property from flood risk in line with national flooding policy and its duty to cooperate with the Lead Flood Authority.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, HR, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

The decision would provide future protection for 109 households from flooding events, reducing the risk of any need for rehousing.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

None. The Council administers the grants on behalf of the Government. No further legal implications.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The domestic element of the Property Level Resilience Grant allocation from the DCLG is £1.25M. The City Council has so far approved grant applications totalling £384K to date (of which £264K has been paid on completion of the works). Commitments will increase by around £200K to £584K if the officer preferred option is approved, which still leaves an unallocated balance of around £666K.

It should be noted that as the scheme is due to end by 31 March 2017, at which point no further new applications will be accepted/approved, it is not expected that agreeing to the proposed discretionary grant allocations will present any additional financial implications for the Council.

OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Human Resources:

None

Information Services:

None

Property:

None

Open Spaces:

None

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The s151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The published scheme for Property Level Resilience Grants

Contact Officer: Andrew Dobson

Telephone: 01524 582303

E-mail: adobson@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref:

Equality impact assessment form

An equality impact assessment should take place when considering doing something in a new way.

Please submit your completed form as an appendix to your committee reports for monitoring and publishing purposes to [‘report clearance’](#) (please refer to report writing guidance).

Please keep your answers brief and to the point. Consideration needs to be reasonable and proportionate.

Please also remember that this will be a public document – do not use jargon or abbreviations.

Section 1: Details

Service	Regeneration and Planning
Title and brief description (if required)	Property Resilience Grants, Lune Square and The Millrace - authority to approve grant.
New or existing	New
Author/officer lead	Andrew Dobson
Date	8 th March 2017

Does this affect staff, customers or other members of the public?

Yes

Section 2: Summary

What is the purpose, aims and objectives?

To approve Property Resilience Grant allocations for affected properties which are apartment blocks.

Who is intended to benefit and how?

The residents of those two apartment blocks will benefit from a higher level of flood protection if future incidents occur. The Taxpayer will benefit by potentially not having to provide further support for residents if future incidents occur.

Section 3: Assessing impact

Is there any potential or evidence that this will or could:		
• Affect people from any protected group differently to others?		No
• Discriminate unlawfully against any protected group?		No
• Affect the relations between protected groups and others?		No
• Encourage protected groups to participate in activities if participation is disproportionately low (won't always be applicable)?		No
• Prevent the council from achieving the aims of its' Equality and Diversity Policy?		No

If yes, please provide more detail of potential impact and evidence including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A brief description of what information you have and from where eg getting to know our communities data, service use monitoring, views of those affected ie discussions or consultation results? - What does this tell you ie negative or positive affect? 	
Age including older and younger people and children	
Disability	
Faith, religion or belief	
Gender including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	
Gender reassignment	
Race	
Sexual orientation Including Civic Partnership	

Rural communities	
People on low incomes	

Section 4: Next steps

Do you need any more information/evidence eg statistics, consultation? If so, how do you plan to address this?

No

How have you taken/will you take the potential impact and evidence into account?

N/A

How do you plan to monitor the impact and effectiveness of this change or decision?

N?A

Thank you for completing this equality impact assessment form, please submit your completed form as an appendix to your committee reports for monitoring and publishing purposes to [‘report clearance’](#) (please refer to report writing guidance).

CABINET

**Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014:
Fixed Penalty Notice Charges for Non-Compliance
with Community Protection Notices
21 March 2017**

Report of Chief Officer (Health & Housing)

PURPOSE OF REPORT			
To seek decisions for the level at which Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) charges will be set for failure to comply with Community Protection Notices under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014.			
Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Referral from Officer	X
Date of notice of forthcoming key decision		N/A	
This report is public.			

RECOMMENDATIONS OF

Karen Leytham, Cabinet Member – Health & Housing

Brendan Hughes, Cabinet Member – Community Safety & Clean & Green

- (1) That the level of charge for Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) issued for breach of Community Protection Notices under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 be set at £100 and payment be required within 21 days.
- (2) That the amount payable is reduced to £65 if payment is received within 14 days of the date of issue.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The council carries out a range of enforcement activities using FPNs. FPNs offer a faster, more efficient alternative to prosecution and one that is generally well accepted. It is generally a matter for individual local authorities to determine the level of penalty charge for enforcement of non-compliance with FPNs.
- 1.2 At this stage, this report is only seeking a decision about the level of charge for an FPN, however, this is to be viewed in the context that officers are working to develop an anti-social behaviour strategy in partnership with the police to maximise the outcomes from our limited resources.
- 1.3 The council is strengthening its operational capacity to tackle anti-social behaviour and intends to make strong use of Community Protection Notices (CPNs). CPNs were introduced by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 as an intervention/enforcement power. They can be issued to individuals, businesses or organisations responsible for anti-social behaviour affecting a community. The formal intervention process starts when an enforcement officer is satisfied that unacceptable anti-social behaviour has taken place for which it is legally appropriate to issue a CPN.

The pre-requisite in the 2014 Act is that a council must first issue a written Community Protection Warning. In cases where this warning is not complied with then a CPN can be issued. It is a criminal offence to fail to comply with the requirements of the CPN. Non-compliance is enforceable either by issuing a fixed penalty charge or by prosecuting in the Magistrates' Court. An appeal against a CPN can be made to a Magistrates' Court on a number of grounds within 21 days of the CPN being issued to the recipient.

- 1.4 Section 52 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 specifies a maximum £100 level of charge for FPNs issued for non-compliance with CPNs. Subject to this legal maximum, the council has discretion as to the amount set and also the level of any reduced amount acceptable if paid within a specified period not exceeding 14 calendar days.
- 1.5 Anecdotal evidence from Blackpool Borough Council, where use of formal community protection warnings and CPNs is well established, indicates that in 90% of cases where warnings are issued (1,050 warnings in 2016) it has not been necessary to proceed further and issue a CPN. Where CPNs are issued they seem to be effective, only a small percentage being contravened and resulting in FPNs being issued.
- 1.6 The issue of a FPN is just one of three options available for breach of a CPN. The others are that the council can undertake remedial works (for example to clear rubbish in a back yard) or prosecution. The use of FPNs is most appropriate to deal with 'low level' issues that do not warrant taking up resource in prosecution or where there are no works outstanding.
- 1.7 The legislation allows for Authorised officers of the council and Police Officers (including PCSOs if delegated) to issue CPNs and FPNs for non-compliance with CPNs.
- 1.8 FPNs will be issued by suitably trained council officers including our Anti-Social Behaviour Officer, Environmental Health Officers, Environmental Health Technical Officers and Dog Wardens. As appropriate they may be issued by a broader range of enforcement functions, for example littering, fly tipping, etc.
- 1.9 It is intended that FPNs will be issued where CPNs have been breached in relation to relatively low level offences that do not justify the resources required to proceed with a prosecution. For example small scale burning of waste, waste accumulations and littering, noise disturbance, youths congregating, etc.
- 1.10 The penalty fees will be collected through the existing arrangements used to collect existing FPN charges (e.g. for dog fouling offences).

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 That the level of penalty charge be set at the maximum amount of £100 to be paid within 21 days.
- 2.2 Additionally, the amount payable reduces to £65 if paid within 14 days.
- 2.3 This falls into alignment with the FPN level recently agreed for non-compliance with the requirements of the Lancaster Public Space Protection Order and the existing dog-related FPNs, in terms of both payment timescales and early payment reductions.

2.4 Other Lancashire district councils responding to a recent enquiry have set the level of penalty charge at the maximum £100. Specifically:

- Fylde B.C. - £100 (no early payment reduction)
- South Ribble B.C. - £100 (reduced to £50 if paid within 14 days)
- West Lancs D.C. - £100 (no early payment reduction)
- Wyre B.C. - £100 (no early payment reduction)
- Preston C.C. - £100 (reduced to £75 for early payment)
- Pendle B.C. - £100 (no early payment reduction)
- Chorley B.C. - not agreed yet but officers are recommending £100

3.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

	Option 1: Set FPN at £100 to be paid within 21 days (with no early payment reduction).	Option 2: Set FPN at £100 (with an early repayment reduction to £65 if paid within 14 days)	Option 3: Set FPN at a lower level (to be decided by Cabinet)	Option 4: No FPN level set.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with levels set by the <i>majority</i> of Lancashire councils noted in this report. • The £100 maximum level of fixed penalty charge would provide the maximum deterrent effect. • Demonstrates that the council is maximising impact of FPNs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Lancaster PSPO & Dog-related FPNs. • The £100 maximum level of fixed penalty charge would provide the maximum deterrent effect. • Policy of offering early payment reduction would be aligned with a minority of Lancashire councils. • Demonstrates that the council is maximising impact of FPNs but offering a less costly option to avoid further action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people might opt to pay a lower level of penalty rather than risk being prosecuted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no obligation to issue FPNs for breaches of CPNs. Section 52 of ASBCPA 2014 states that an authorised person 'may' issue a FPN.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with PSPO & 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower deterrent 	

Disadvantages	<p>Dog-related FPNs as both offer early payment discount.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could result in higher levels of non-payment, substantially increasing the amount and cost of prosecution work. 		<p>effect than would be provided by a higher level of charge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with both existing PSPO and levels set by other councils in Lancashire. 	
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be perceived as 'harsh' compared to the councils identified as having set a lower level or an early payment reduction • Resources tied up in prosecutions due to non-payment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council could be criticised for offering a 'cheap' way out of formal action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council could be criticised for offering a 'cheap' way out of formal action. 	<p>Completely undermines the purpose of the legislation and would make to issuing of CPNs redundant.</p>

4.0 Officer Preferred Option (and comments)

- 4.1 The officer recommendation is Option 2 - that the level of charge for Fixed Penalty Notices issued for breach of Community Protection Notices under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014 is set at £100 payable within 21 days, and that the amount payable is reduced to £65 if payment is received within 14 calendar days of the date of issue.
- 4.2 This level of charge would provide the greatest deterrent available which complements the approach the council is taking to tackle ASB, whilst retaining an incentive to pay the FPN (and therefore avoid resource intensive court proceedings).

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 Setting the level of penalty charge for non-compliance with a CPN at the highest level available would:
- Send a clear message about how seriously the council is taking the issue of ASB seriously.
 - Provide the biggest available FPN penalty charge deterrent to perpetrators of ASB
 - Make the risk to an ASB perpetrator of receiving a CPN (and likely a

resulting penalty charge if they fail to comply) work as best it can for investigating and enforcement officers.

- 5.2 Aside from the message and deterrent effect that the amount of penalty charge would have, alternative levels of penalty charge below £100 would be equally enforceable.

RELATIONSHIP TO POLICY FRAMEWORK

Contributes to the Clean & Green Corporate Priority
Contributes to the Lancaster District Community Safety Strategy

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, HR, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)

Health & Safety – None arising directly from this report.

Equality & Diversity –No foreseeable equality or diversity impacts either arising from the use of fixed penalty notices (as this will be undertaken in an equitable way as per the Council's Enforcement Policies, FPNs already being used by a variety of council functions) or arising from the proposed level of charge.

Human Rights – None arising directly from this report.

Community Safety – Enforcement of Anti-Social Behaviour through the use of fixed penalty notices and charges is expected to have a significant positive impact on community safety.

HR - None arising directly from this report.

Sustainability - None arising directly from this report.

Rural proofing - None arising directly from this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

No further implications other than those arising from the use of the legislation referred to throughout this report. Legal Services has been consulted on this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

It is not anticipated that there will be any significant financial implications arising as a result of the proposal. Fine income from FPN's is expected to be relatively low and will be used to cover the associated costs of implementing the proposal, i.e. CPN / FPN stationary costs with enforcement costs being met from within existing staff resources.

OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Human Resources:

None arising directly from this report.

Information Services:

None arising directly from this report.

Property:

None arising directly from this report.

Open Spaces:

None arising directly from this report.

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no comments to add.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact Officer: Richard Walsh, Public Health & Protection Manager
Telephone: 01524 582848
E-mail: RWalsh@lancaster.gov.uk
Ref: C135

Equality Impact Assessment

This **online** equality impact assessment should:

An equality impact assessment should take place when considering doing something in a new way. Please submit your completed EIA as an appendix to your committee report. Please remember that this will be a public document – do not use jargon or abbreviations.

Service Environmental Health (Health & Housing Services)

Title of policy, service, function, project or strategy

Decision on the level of fixed penalty notice charges for Community Protection Notices

Type of policy, service, function, project or strategy: Existing ☐ New/Proposed ☒

Lead Officer Richard Walsh, Public Health & Protection Manager

People involved with completing the EIA

Nick Howard, Public Protection Group Manager

Step 1.1: Make sure you have clear aims and objectives

Q1. What is the aim of your policy, service, function, project or strategy?

To decide on the level of fixed penalty notice charges for Community Protection Notices

Q2. Who is intended to benefit? Who will it have a detrimental effect on and how?

Tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) benefits the entire community. It specifically benefits any person who may as a result of any diversity or vulnerability factors be targetted or the focus of bad behaviour . Enforcement of Community Protection Notices, one of the key ASB tools, by way of fixed penalty notice charges provides a measured and efficient approach to enforcement which avoids escalating every instance of offending to prosecution in the Magistrates Court - which benefits the offender (who still has the right not to pay the FPN and instead by dealt with in Court). Some people in our communities who as a result of serious mental health issues or substance abuse perpetrate anti-social behaviour may be caught by this type of enforcement however this is not an equality issue and there will be appropriate safeguarding, signposting and referral mechanisms put in place (in addition to Legal Services scrutiny of enforcement cases escalated to prosecution).

Step 1.2: Collecting your information

Q3. Using existing data (if available) and thinking about each group below, does, or could, the policy, service, function, project or strategy have a negative impact on the groups below?

Group	Negative	Positive/No Impact	Unclear
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faith, religion or belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender including marriage, pregnancy and maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual orientation including civic partnerships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Equality Impact Assessment

Other socially excluded groups such as carers, areas of deprivation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rural communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Step 1.3 – Is there a need to consult!

Q4. Who have you consulted with? If you haven't consulted yet please list who you are going to consult with? Please give examples of how you have or are going to consult with specific groups of communities

No consultation is necessary or appropriate. We have researched charging levels in other local authorities as detailed in the report.

Step 1.4 – Assessing the impact

Q5. Using the existing data and the assessment in questions 3 what does it tell you, is there an impact on some groups in the community?

Age: No adverse impact. Enforcement in relation to young offenders (under 16s) will be addressed in a dedicated anti-social behaviour enforcement policy.

Disability: No adverse impact.

Faith, Religion or Belief: No adverse impact.

Gender including Marriage, Pregnancy and Maternity: No adverse impact.

Gender Reassignment: No adverse impact.

Race: No adverse impact.

Sexual Orientation including Civic Partnership: No adverse impact.

Rural Communities: No adverse impact.

Step 1.5 – What are the differences?

Q6. If you are either directly or indirectly discriminating, how are you going to change this or mitigate the negative impact?

There will be no discrimination arising from this decision.

Q7. Do you need any more information/evidence eg statistic, consultation. If so how do you plan to address this?

No.

Step 1.6 – Make a recommendation based on steps 1.1 to 1.5

Q8. If you are in a position to make a recommendation to change or introduce the policy, service, function, project or strategy, clearly show how it was decided on.

No equality impacts arising. The basis for the decision is fully detailed in the report.

Q9. If you are not in a position to go ahead, what actions are you going to take?

N/A

Equality Impact Assessment

Q10. How do you plan to monitor the impact and effectiveness of this change or decision?

No equality impacts arising and no monitoring proposed.