

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented | Parking Fees and Charges proposals 2016/17 |
| Directorate / Service | Communities, Localities & Culture / Parking, Mobility & Transport Services. Public Realm |
| Lead Officer | Mirsad Bakalovic |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | Mirsad Bakalovic (08/10/15) |
| Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div>Proceed with implementation</div> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the fees and charges do not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment |
|----------|--|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | <u>Abandoned vehicle disposal</u> The proposal is to introduce a charge of £50 to customers who request us to dispose of vehicles; customers are most likely to be agencies that require a vehicle to be removed and disposed from private land. The service currently does not charge for the service and the proposed charge is to contribute towards the administrative costs of providing the |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|--|
| | | | <p>service.</p> <p><u>Charge for refunding returned permits</u> The proposal to introduce a charge of £25 for refunding returned permits will affect any customers who request this service. The service does not currently charge for refunds and the proposal will cover the administrative cost of providing the refund.</p> <p>The increases in existing fees and charges proposed are in line with inflationary pressures. It is assumed that increasing charges in line with RPI will keep parking demand at its current level and/or continue to cover the cost of providing a service. These increases are not expected to have any adverse effects on people who share protected characteristics.</p> |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | <p><u>Abandoned vehicle disposal</u> Customers such as housing associations who request the disposal of an abandoned vehicle from private estate land will be required to pay a nominal charge.</p> <p><u>Charge for refunding returned permits</u> Customers (residents, businesses, market traders, doctors) who return their permit and request a refund will be charged for the service.</p> |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | <p>Officers annually review parking charges/admin charges adopted by other London boroughs and will continue to monitor these.</p> <p>Currently very few members of the public request the disposal of an abandoned vehicle from private land. It is likely to be agencies that require the removal and subsequent</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|--|-----|---|
| | | | disposal of a vehicle to free up parking space and to maintain the quality of the environment. |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | The service monitor the service take-up. |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | Parking Policy, operational and finance officers have discussed the proposals |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | No | For the inflationary charge proposals we have not consulted stakeholders. The abandoned vehicle charge proposal is required to contribute towards our service delivery costs; if the proposal is approved officers will engage with the agencies that are likely to use the service. The permit refund proposal is required to cover the administrative costs of providing the service. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | <u>Abandoned vehicle disposal</u> It is likely to be agencies that require the removal and subsequent disposal of a vehicle to free up parking space and to maintain the quality of the environment. Currently very few members of the public request the disposal of an abandoned vehicle from private land. <u>Charge for refunding returned permits</u> Customers from all background may need to return permits. |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | <u>Abandoned vehicle disposal</u> It is likely to be agencies that require the removal and subsequent disposal of a vehicle to free up parking space and to maintain the quality of the environment. |

| | | | |
|----------|--|-----|---|
| | | | <u>Charge for refunding returned permits</u> Customers from all background may need to return permits. This will affect to everyone who would like to return permits regardless of their background. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | Yes | An action plan will be produced to initiate and communicate the charges if approved. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | Yes | Charges could remain at current levels; However it is recommended they are increased in line with inflation to contribute to the costs of providing the service. |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | The Parking, Mobility and Transport Services Management Team will review and monitor the implementation of the proposals |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | The Parking, Mobility and Transport Services Management Team will review and monitor the implementation of the proposals |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal) | Commercial Waste Fees and Charges 2016/17 |
| Directorate / Service | Communities, Localities & Culture / Clean, Green and Highways |
| Lead Officer | Liz Nelson |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | Liz Nelson (09/10/15) |
| Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities) | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: #00b050; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <p>Proceed with implementation</p> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the fee changes does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|--|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | As attached, various Commercial Fees and Charges to be changed. This increase is based on the Contract - the annual uplift for the collection of waste for the year 2016/17 is |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|--|
| | | | <p>anticipated to be 2.4% and this needs to be applied to ensure the recovery of collection costs. Alongside this charge for the disposal costs are due to increase by 2%. This also needs to be applied to ensure all costs related to the collection and disposal of commercial waste is recouped. The general increase is therefore 4.4%.</p> <p>There are some collection only costs which are only increased in line with collection contract increases at 2.4%</p> |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | <p>The Trade Waste Portfolio currently has 3,395 customers, these customers or potential new business customers have the opportunity to choose other service providers.</p> <p>D&R, which have corporate lead responsibility for Business related data capture, are currently reviewing the technical implications in developing an equalities strand of their business data base.</p> |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | The service maintains a Trade Waste Portfolio |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | See above |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | The service monitor and update the Trade Waste Portfolio on a regular basis. |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Yes | Following the agreement, the Service will send notification to existing customers outlining the change and allow them to have the opportunity to choose. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | <p>The Trade Waste Portfolio currently has 3,395 customers, these customers or potential new business customers have the opportunity to choose other service providers.</p> <p>D&R, which have corporate lead responsibility for Business</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|--|
| | | | related data capture, are currently reviewing the technical implications in developing an equalities strand of their business data base. |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | Every business has the opportunity to choose provider. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | Yes | Following the agreement, the Service will send notification to existing customers outlining the change and allow them to have the opportunity to choose. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | N/A | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | We are currently monitoring the Trade Waste Portfolio. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | See above. |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal) | Contaminated land searches – Fees and Charges report for 2016/17 |
| Directorate / Service | Communities, Localities & Culture / Consumer and Business Regulations |
| Lead Officer | David Tolley |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | David Tolley (09/10/15) |
| Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities) | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div>Proceed with implementation</div> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the charge does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|--|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | The service offer the contaminated land search to the public, who are buying property in the borough, as part of their environmental reporting for purchasing property. The service |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|---|
| | | | <p>users include residents, environmental consultants (as part of environmental due diligence audits), solicitors and anyone purchasing property within the borough.</p> <p>In 2015/16, the fee is £173. For 2016/17, it is proposed that the fee will be £173 plus inflation. If a service user requires information the service hold on the Council's Civica APP, additional £36 will be charged. Therefore, the cost for a service user of the Contaminated land search who requires the information on Civica APP will be £209 for 2016/17.</p> |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | <p>The service users are residents, solicitors and anyone purchasing property within the Borough. Below are the last three years' service take-up:</p> <p>2013/14: 48 2014/15: 83 2015/16 (up to 23 Sep): 26.</p> <p>All property buyers in the Borough will be charged equally. The number of service take-up depends on the market and activities in the market.</p> |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | As above, the service monitor and review records of the service provision. |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | See above. |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | The service monitor and review records of the service provision. |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | N/A | Following the agreement, the new fee structure will be implemented. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact | Yes | All property buyers in the Borough will be charged equally. The number of service take-up depends on the market and |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|---|
| | amongst the nine protected characteristics? | | activities in the market. |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | See above. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | Yes | Following the agreement, the new fee structure will widely communicated, including the Council website. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | Yes | No charge for the information provision was considered. |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | The service will continue monitoring the service provision. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | See above. |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal) | Idea Store and Idea Store Learning fees and charges 2016/17 |
| Directorate / Service | Communities, Localities & Culture / Idea Store |
| Lead Officer | Judith St. John |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | Shazia Hussain (11/11/15) |
| Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities) | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div>Proceed with implementation</div> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the policy does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|--|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | There are no increases in the library fees and charges. There are small increases in the Idea Store Learning fees and charges, which include fee remittance for low income groups. |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|
| | | | <p>Idea Store Learning is funded through a £2.5million contract with the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) to deliver both accredited and non-accredited adult and community learning. The SFA contract requires the Local Authority to introduce charges for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses, in line with charges for other types of courses. The SFA funding principle is that a financial contribution to provision of community learning is made by the provider and that the provider must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maximise access to community learning for adults, whatever people's circumstances • collect fee and income from people who can afford to pay and use where possible to extend provision to those who cannot. <p>The fees represent a balance between the requirement to charge those who can afford to pay a realistic fee whilst adhering to SFA funding requirements.</p> |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | <p>Learners who can afford to pay will be required to pay full fees which have been benchmarked against similar courses delivered by other learning providers in London.</p> <p>Fee remittance for low income groups is included in the proposals as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For those in employment: earning less than the gross London Living wage (£16,653 pa). • For those in receipt of Job Seeker's Allowance (JSA) or Universal Credit: in receipt of JSA or Universal Credit. • For those of pensionable age: in receipt of Pension Credit (guaranteed only). • For Adult and Community Learning (non- |

qualification) courses, the above fee waivers will only apply to LBTH residents only. Therefore, no or little impact on the socio-economic group is expected.

The proposed fees are:

- £1.25 per hour for non-accredited ESOL courses for those in receipt of Universal Credit
- £2.50 per hour for non-accredited ESOL courses for full fee payers
- £4.00 per hour for accredited ESOL courses for full fee payers. These accredited ESOL courses are free for those in receipt of specified benefits
- £0.00 - £2.50 per hour for non-accredited courses (except ESOL courses) for those in receipt of specified benefits
- £2.75 - £4.50 per hour for non-accredited courses (except ESOL courses) for full fee payers


There is detailed equalities data on existing learners in relation to age, gender, ethnicity, level of income, postcode, faith, sexual orientation and disability. This profile data is used throughout the year to track the types of learners who are accessing Idea Store Learning courses and the level of fees which they pay or don't pay (see Section 2 below). For example, 85% of the current Idea Store learners come from disadvantaged postcodes and approximately 90% of ESOL and Basic skills learners come from those postcodes.

Whilst it is not possible to state that future learners will have exactly the same characteristics as the current cohort, the assessment of the data around the protected characteristics listed above, suggests that most of the future learners within these groups are likely to experience little or no impact from the proposal.

| | | | |
|----------|--|-----|---|
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | Data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly analysed. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | Fees and charges are set using benchmark information from other comparable providers |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | Data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly analysed. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Yes | The consultation on this proposal has been ongoing. Also, data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly analysed. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | See the section 1-b above. Data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly analysed. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | Data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly analysed. The data show that the learners reflect the range of residents of the Borough. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | Yes | Curriculum planning meetings are held throughout the year at which the data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses is regularly reviewed. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | Yes | Do nothing option is considered. However, a 'Do nothing' option will result in loss of funding. The proposals reflect the criteria set by the Skills Funding Agency criteria. |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | The income will be monitored regularly. The service take-up will also be regularly monitored and analysed through data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |

| | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | Equalities data on the service users will continue to be monitored through data on learners participating in Idea Store Learning courses. It is also reviewed through the annual Self Assessment Report. |
| 6 Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | It is also contained in the Self Assessment Report. |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)</p> | <p>Inflationary increases & Other increases in line with principles of cost recovery</p> |
| <p>Directorate / Service</p> | <p>Development & Renewal / Planning & Building Control, Land charges</p> |
| <p>Lead Officer</p> | <p>David Williams / Owen Whalley</p> |
| <p>Signed Off By (inc date)</p> | <p>Owen Whalley (09/10/15)</p> |
| <p>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities)</p> | <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Proceed with implementation</p> </div> <p>Based on the findings of the QA checklist it is clear that the proposal the policy, project or function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share Protected Characteristics and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> <p>The tariff is applied as a result of inflation and to cover recovery costs. As the service is a universal service open to all residents who choose to make an application regardless of equality characteristic. The increase will only apply to those choosing to make a development application/land searches in the Borough. Looking at those whom the policy will impact upon, it is unlikely there is any variation across boroughs/ nationally with any sharing of protected characteristics are likely to be a result of the wider industry.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|---|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | Developers submitting planning applications, those undertaking land searches. The development process is a universal service open to anyone wishing to make a development application within the borough. The charge has been evidence based and will only apply to those who wish to make an application. |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | Yes, only those submitting development applications/land searches will be affected by the increase covering inflation and cost recovery charges, the charge of which is minimal. There may be some shared characteristics of those impacted upon largely as a result of shared characteristics of those who work within the wider development industry (largely in relation to gender, ethnicity and age) |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | Limited data exists however, informal knowledge of those making applications would suggest this would be replicated across London / Nationally as a product of the development industry |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Yes | Inflationary increases are a standard annual procedure with the industry. Those impacted upon by the change in policy will be notified. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact | Yes | Due to the universal nature of the policy, and the voluntary nature of making an application, there is no major adverse |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|--|
| | amongst the nine protected characteristics? | | impact of the policy upon any of the 9 protected characteristics. |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | Yes, although as the tariff is applied to cover costs and are applied to all making a development application, if there was to be an unequal impact it is because developers within the borough are over represented amongst particular characteristics. In this circumstance, little can be done to modify the audience who are making application so as to have a more equal impact. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | No | The price increase is in line with inflation and cost recovery principle the service applies. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | No | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | Levels of applications received will be monitored to review the impact of the policy. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)</p> | <p>Introduction of new Pre-application fees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duty Planner Site Visits • Informal EIA screening/ scoping opinion • Bespoke Pre-application service for large strategic sites |
| <p>Directorate / Service</p> | <p>Development & Renewal / Planning – Development Control</p> |
| <p>Lead Officer</p> | <p>Paul Buckenham / David Williams / Owen Whalley</p> |
| <p>Signed Off By (inc date)</p> | <p>Owen Whalley (09/10/15)</p> |
| <p>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities)</p> | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <p>Proceed with implementation</p> </div> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist, the policy, project or function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> <p>The tariff is applied to recover costs associated with activities undertaken to deliver the Council's pre application process. As the service is a universal service open to all residents who choose to make an application regardless of equality characteristic, the increase will only apply to those choosing to make a Development Pre application.</p> <p>Looking at those whom the policy will impact upon, it is unlikely there is any variation across boroughs/ nationally with any impact upon those sharing of protected characteristics (Age, Gender, Ethnicity) likely to be a result of the wider development industry.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|---|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | Developers seeking pre application advice. The pre app service is a universal service open to anyone wishing to make a development application and seeks pre app advice. . The charge has been evidence based and will only apply to those who wish to make an application |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | Yes, only those using the pre app service will be affected by the increase which is evidenced based and calculated to cover itemised service costs. There may be some shared characteristics of those impacted upon largely as a result of shared characteristics of those who work within the wider development industry (largely in relation to gender, ethnicity and age) |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | Limited data exists however, informal knowledge of those making applications would suggest this would be replicated across London / Nationally as a product of the development industry |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Yes | Those impacted upon by the change in policy will be notified. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | Due to the universal nature of the policy, and the voluntary nature of making an application, there is no major adverse impact of the policy upon any of the 9 protected characteristics. |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|---|
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | Yes, although as the tariff is applied to cover costs and are applied to those seeking DC Pre application advice. If there was to be an unequally impact it is because developers within the borough are over represented amongst particular characteristics. In this circumstance, little can be done to modify the audience who are making application so as to have a more equal impact. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | No | The price increase is in line with an evidence base concerning service activities. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | No | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | Levels of applications received will be monitored to review the impact of the policy. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |


EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)</p> | <p>Increasing element of Street Naming and Numbering Fees</p> |
| <p>Directorate / Service</p> | <p>Development & Renewal / Planning & Building Control</p> |
| <p>Lead Officer</p> | <p>Martin Fahey</p> |
| <p>Signed Off By (inc date)</p> | <p>Martin Fahey (08/10/15)</p> |
| <p>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities)</p> | <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <p>Proceed with implementation</p> </div> <p>Based on the findings of the QA checklist it is clear that the proposal function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.</p> <p>The tariff is applied to recover costs associated with activities undertaken to deliver the Council's SNN Function. Any impact of proposals upon protected characteristics is derived through industry factors as the service is only open to those seeking to develop in the borough and require the creation of addresses. The increase will only apply to those choosing to make a Street Naming and Numbering application. Looking at those whom the policy will impact upon, it is unlikely there is any variation across boroughs/nationally with any sharing of protected characteristics are likely to be a result of the wider industry.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|---|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | Developers submitting a street naming and numbering application. The development process is a universal service open to anyone wishing to make a development application within the borough. The charge has been evidence based and will only apply to those who wish to make an application. |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | Yes, only those submitting street naming and numbering application will be affected by the increase covering inflation and cost recovery charges, the charge of which is minimal. There may be some shared characteristics of those impacted upon largely as a result of shared characteristics of those who work within the wider development industry (largely in relation to gender, ethnicity and age) |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | Limited data exists however, informal knowledge of those making applications would suggest this would be replicated across London / Nationally as a product of the development industry |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | No | Those impacted upon by the change in policy will be notified. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | No | Due to the universal nature of the policy, and the voluntary nature of making an application, there is no major adverse impact of the policy upon any of the 9 protected characteristics. |

| | | | |
|----------|---|-----|---|
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | No | Yes, although as the tariff is applied to cover costs and are applied to all making an SNN application, if there was to be an unequally impact it is because developers within the borough are over represented amongst particular characteristics. In this circumstance, little can be done to modify the audience who are making application so as to have a more equal impact. |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | No | The price increase is in line with an evidence base concerning service activities. |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | No | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | Levels of applications received will be monitored to review the impact of the policy. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Yes | |

EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal) | Fees and Charges for the Saturday Music Centre (THAMES) |
| Directorate / Service | Children's Services / Arts and Music |
| Lead Officer | Karen Brock – Head of Tower Hamlets Arts and Music Education Service (THAMES) |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | Karen Brock (12/10/15) |
| Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities) | <div style="text-align: center;">  Proceed with implementation </div> <p>The Saturday Music Centre has had its fees for the Saturday Centre frozen for the past five years. In that time THAMES (which is only funded by the DfE and who receive no money from the Council) has had their budget cut by one third. In addition the fees are the lowest in London and as many of the families who attend are able to afford to pay the fees we need now to raise them for the first time in many years. There is a comprehensive remissions policy and any pupils whose parents are unable to pay receive free tuition. About a third of the pupils who attend do not pay. The modest rise in a weekly fee is now essential for the Service.</p> <p>There are 153 pupils who attend the Centre and 18 pupils who are in receipt of full remission. No child is excluded from the Centre on the basis of cost. The Centre is open to all pupils in Tower Hamlets. The pupils who are taught through THAMES do not have to pay hire fees for instruments and therefore the current costs for the Centre are incredibly low.</p> |

| Stage | Checklist Area / Question | Yes / No / Unsure | Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify) |
|----------|---|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Overview of Proposal | | |
| a | Are the outcomes of the proposals clear? | Yes | |
| b | Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those affected? | Yes | The fees are not payable by any pupils whose parents are in receipt of income support, free school meals etc. |
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation | | |
| a | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Yes | |
| b | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Yes | THAMES has the lowest fees in London (the highest fees in London can be as much as £15-20 a week). As the Council does not provide any additional monies these fees need to increase to provide much needed income. |
| c | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Yes | |
| d | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Yes | We have consulted with the Parents Association in previous years. |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| a | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Yes | |
| b | Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups? | Yes | |
| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | |
| a | Is there an agreed action plan? | Yes | |

| | | | |
|----------|--|-----|--|
| b | Have alternative options been explored | Yes | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | |
| a | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Yes | Each term the THAMES management team looks at impact on pupils' attendance or otherwise. |
| b | Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?? | Yes | |
| 6 | Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan | | |
| a | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | N/A | |