

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>Approval to proceed with Structural Reinforcement Works at Brewster House and Malting House</p>
<p>Directorate / Service</p>	<p>Place/ Housing and Regeneration</p>
<p>Lead Officer</p>	<p>Karen Swift</p>
<p>Signed Off By (inc date)</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>	<p> An equality analysis quality assurance checklist concludes that the structural strengthening works at Malting and Brewster House should proceed. The following mitigation steps will be observed in the course of delivering the works.</p> <p><u>Works mitigation steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents Impact Assessments have been undertaken to identify those who are vulnerable ▪ Residents seen as vulnerable will continue to be visited during the works to ensure they are supported through the process and any addition needs met ▪ A decant mapping is in place to provide a visual display of where decant is necessary matched with resident needs and the planned programme of works. ▪ Tailored mitigations will be developed including decanting and respite measures. <p><u>Leasehold charges – mitigating steps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leaseholders will be recharged for costs resulting from the structural works; the Council has offered a range of support to leaseholders including payment options, voluntary buyback of leasehold properties, and restitution payments.

	Therefore, a full EIA will not be undertaken; the strengthening works will have no impact under the Council's Duties arising from the Equality Act 2010.
--	--

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	<p>Cabinet in June 2019 considered a report on structural reinforcement works at Brewster House and Malting House. That report set out the details and deliverability of the works and the impact to residents. The report also explained the likely cost to leaseholders. Cabinet resolved to defer decisions to allow for further discussion with residents and for further investigations of the structure.</p> <p>The discussion with residents has happened and further structural reports have been received. This report provides a final update on the structural works, seeks Cabinet approval of the decisions deferred in June 2019, and seeks approval for the voluntarily buy-back of leasehold properties at Brewster House and Malting House.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has offered a range of support to leaseholders to meet their portion of the cost for the structural works, these include payment options, voluntary buyback of leasehold properties, and restitution payments.</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	An impact assessment has been carried to determine the how programme affect all the residents. The assessment identified vulnerable residents for which tailored mitigations have been developed including decanting and respite measures. A decant mapping process is in place to provide a comprehensive view of the decant need matched against resident needs and the planned programme of works.

			<p>THH has engaged with residents and collected need data that will assist when assessing individual circumstances with regards to the works and allow THH to plan support packages to suit.</p> <p>The structural reinforcement works will benefit all residents at Malting and Brewster Houses, regardless of any protected characteristic they may identify with.</p>
2	Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation		
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Y	An impact assessment has been carried out. The assessment identified several residents for decanting to temporary accommodation. Most residents can remain in occupation with a range of respite facilities being provided.
	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?	Y	<p>There is some evidence of local/regional/national research to inform our assessment.</p> <p>The strengthening works are needed to address the structural integrity at Brewster House and Malting House; the two are Large Panel System blocks. This follows several communications from the MHCLG advising building owners to review the condition of their blocks that used Taylor Woodrow Anglian Large Concrete Panel System and to ensure that their structural integrity is sufficient and maintained.</p> <p>Other research includes analysis by BRE. THH commissioned structural studies identified that the concrete slabs do not meet current or existing standards for normal loads and need strengthening. The works proposed will address this.</p> <p>A methodology for the identified programmed works is informing the work with residents on decant and respite.</p>
b	Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Y	Relevant knowledge and expertise have been sought both internally and externally. Three sets of external structural engineering firms have been commissioned; two determine the need for the works, and one to independently validate the other report findings. Additionally, an independent cost consultant has been sourced to validate the projected works costs and to conduct

			<p>an audit following delivery of the works to ensure transparency particularly to leaseholders.</p> <p>The Resident Impact Assessments have been carried out by THH Resident Liaison Coordinator. The data has been checked with other members of THH Housing Management Team; Health & Safety Team and the Contractor's Resident Liaison Officer. Assessments have been made using a risk matrix provided by our Health and Safety Team. This work is still being reassessed by the teams to ensure we capture up to date information.</p>
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Y	<p>There has been extensive consultation with residents around the details, costs and deliverability of the works and the impact to residents. Further consultations will be carried with leaseholders as part of s20 consultations.</p> <p>Many of the residents first visited during the Impact Assessments have been revisited and we will continue to offer revisits to anyone that requests or is of high-risk impact from the works.</p>
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?	Y	<p>The strengthening works will have no impact on the Council's Duties under the Equality Act 2010. Following the Cabinet decision services to residents will remain the same as before and will not have a disproportionate impact on any of the residents THH serves on behalf of the Council.</p> <p>Assessments of need is ongoing across the key characteristics particularly age and disability.</p>
b	Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups?	Y	<p>Yes, vulnerable residents have been identified and tailored mitigations developed including decanting and respite measures. A decant mapping is in place to provide a visual display of where decant is necessary matched with resident needs and the planned programme of works.</p>
4	Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan		

a	Is there an agreed action plan?	Y	THH is in the process of mapping resident profiles based on the assessment data collected. This will include diagrammatic examples of 'a day in the life of', this will identify what additional care and support needs may be required.
b	Have alternative options been explored	Y	<p>The works are required as a result of a safety consideration that became apparent after the blocks were built – the Ronan Point explosion in 1968. Responsibility for repairs to this type of block fall upon the owners which includes leaseholders.</p> <p>Officers have considered the alternative option of demolition of Malting House and Brewster Houses and redevelopment of new homes on the estate. However, the considerable costs of rehousing residents, buying out and compensating leaseholders, demolishing the existing blocks and then constructing new buildings would make this option unviable in normal commercial development terms.</p>
5	Quality Assurance and Monitoring		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?	Y	The works will be delivered by THH and will be monitored and reviewed via the LBTH/THH clienting and governance regime including the Quarterly Strategic and Bi-monthly operational meetings. THH will have a dedicated Resident Liaison Coordinator and a Decant Coordinator based on site, together with housing management presence will monitor residents daily, adjusting care provisions as appropriate.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??	Y	See 5a above
6	Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	Y	

Appendix A

(Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria

Decision	Action	Risk
	Proceed with implementation	Green: 