

## APPENDIX FOURTEEN: EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

<b>Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented</b> (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)	<b>Additional Licensing of the Private Rented Housing Sector</b>
<b>Directorate / Service</b>	<b>Place/ Public Realm</b>
<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>David Tolley, Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards</b>
<b>Signed Off By (inc date)</b>	
<b>Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A)</b> (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; gap: 10px;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; border-radius: 50%;"></div> <div> <p><b>Proceed with implementation</b></p> <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> <p>As the report identifies, equalities considerations will be reviewed as the project progresses.</p> </div> </div>



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)
<b>1</b>	<b>Overview of Proposal</b>		
a	Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?	Yes	This report considers the outcome of the consultation process undertaken for 12 weeks from 1st March 2018 on the possible for the introduction of a HMO licensing scheme for

			<p>the private rented sector. Cabinet is asked to:</p> <p>Note the results of the consultation undertaken in relation to the proposed Additional Licensing Scheme as summarised in the report.</p> <p>Designate all wards in the Borough as subject to Additional Licensing under section 56(1) of the Housing Act 2004 in relation to smaller multiple-occupied premises occupied by three or more persons in two or more households where some or all the facilities are shared. Such designation to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 and to last for five years, however, excluding the current area subject to a Selective Licensing Scheme.</p> <p>Agree the fee structure for the Additional Licensing Scheme as set out.</p> <p>Agree that the Additional Licensing Scheme licence conditions, fit and proper person protocol and amenity standards as detailed. The amenity standards will also apply to the existing Mandatory licensed Houses in Multi-occupied and Selective Licensing Scheme from the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2019 and to the Additional Licensing Scheme from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019.</p> <p>Agree to delegate to the Corporate Director of Place to issue the required statutory notifications in relation to the commencement of the Additional Licensing Scheme designation.</p> <p>To agree that no further exemptions to the scheme should be considered in addition to the statutory exemptions.</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	Yes	If the proposal is agreed and implemented, residents/tenants and landlords of the Additional Licensing Area will be

	there information about the equality profile of those affected?		affected.
<b>2</b>	<b>Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation</b>		
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Yes	Yes, from the Mayhew and Harper report, approximately 9000 properties
	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?	Yes	The service conducted a consultation from 1st March 2018 for 12 weeks.
b	Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Yes	The extensive consultation was undertaken.
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Yes	The consultation consisted of information about the scheme being placed on line, accompanied with an on-line questionnaire, public meetings, landlords, managing agents, adverts placed in local and neighbouring Boroughs newspapers and direct letters to landlord and tenant groups and neighbouring local authorities.  The online questionnaire was aimed at three distinct groups; landlords/managing agents/agent – tenants/residents – businesses or service providers.
<b>3</b>	<b>Assessing Impact and Analysis</b>		
a	Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics?	Yes	The support for licensing across the wards was neutral
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 – on those that rent within the HMO sector and relevant landlords and managing agents
<b>4</b>	<b>Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan</b>		
a	Is there an agreed action plan?	Yes	The report identifies steps following the approval of a designation
b	Have alternative options been explored	Yes	See 'Options' in the report.
<b>5</b>	<b>Quality Assurance and Monitoring</b>		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the	Yes	Once the scheme is implemented, it will be monitored and

	implementation of the proposal?		reviewed.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??	Yes	The scheme will be reviewed.
<b>6</b>	<b>Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan</b>		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	Yes	Yes

## Equality Assessment Criteria

Decision	Action	Risk
As a result of performing the QA checklist, it is evident that due regard is not evidenced in the proposal and / or a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . It is recommended that the proposal be suspended until further work or analysis is performed – via a the Full Equality Analysis template	<b>Suspend – Further Work Required</b>	<b>Red</b> 
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	<b>Proceed with implementation</b>	<b>Green:</b> 

actions are recommended at this stage.		
----------------------------------------	--	--