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) | Agreement with London Mayor's Office for Police and Crime (MOPAC) to provide Police resources on LBTH housing estates and in principle agreement to recharge for the cost of additional services. | |
|---|---|--|
| Directorate / Service | Place/ Housing and Regeneration | |
| Lead Officer | Karen Swift | |
| Signed Off By (inc date) | | |
| 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) | This report considers the likely impact of a proposed service charge rise of £1.20 or £61 a year to tenants for the provision of additional services relating to ASB An equality analysis quality assurance (EAQA) checklist, has been conducted to determine the impact of the proposal on protected groups under the Equality Act 2010. The analysis has shown that the impact of the proposal is broadly equivalent to all the groups. Furthermore, within these categories most residents are protected from the proposed service charge introduction through the benefit system. The analysis also points out that the proposals may have an impact on a small number of working residents who may be working but fall outside the benefits systems. However, financial advice will be available through THH and other agencies for these categories of residents, and where applicable, their eligibility to benefits re-assessed. The presence of a Police team with powers to arrest and able to target ASB hot spots have already resulted in positive outcomes which has been reassuring to residents. | |

| The EAQA is as shown in appendix 1. | |
|---|--|
| See appendix 2 for a breakdown of possible impact based on protected characteristics. | |

| 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 3 rd June Cabinet will consider a proposal to enter into a further agreement with MOPAC to provide a 14 strong Police team to tackle serious ASB based on LBTH housing estates. This scheme which will begin in September 2020 will follow the expiry of the current Metpatrol agreement which was successful in tackling drug related ASB on THH estates However, it is recommended that the cost for these additional ASB services which also includes community re-assurance services provided by Parkguard are passed on to tenants and leaseholders. As is consistent with the requirements of the lease, these charges have already been billed to Leaseholders. However, the report which supports the principle of recharging also recommends that this should be passed on to Tenants in a weekly charge of about £1.20 or £61 a year The EIA therefore focuses on the impact that the proposed increase in charges will have on tenants. |
| 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 | Yes | The increased charges are for all 11306 current tenanted properties. Of these, 7743 were in receipt of full/partial HB |

| | affected? | | or Universal Credit (68.5% of all tenanted Households). This means that almost 69% of tenants will not experience the full impact of the proposed additional costs - 2167 of these households are in receipt of full HB and will not be impacted at all (19.2% of all tenanted Households). There is information about the equality profile of those affected because THH regularly collects such performance information. In addition, under this proposal, THH must consult with residents and in the process will collect further data that may assist when assessing individual circumstances. |
|---|--|---------|--|
| 2 | Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data ar | nd Cons | |
| а | Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts? | Y | An initial assessment has been carried out but further analysis will take place following the consultation process that must take place over the proposed rent/service charge |
| | Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis? | Y | The analysis relies on internal data held by THH which reports on numbers of tenants on Housing Benefit and utilises information held on protected characteristics. |
| b | Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis? | Y | It is accepted that a fuller analysis may occur when carrying out the required consultation over the proposed rent/service charge increase. This initial assessment has included THH Business Analysts, THH client team and Finance |
| С | Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal? | Y | Under the 1985 Housing Act, THH are required to fully consult regarding the proposal to increase charges and this will follow the in principle agreement that is sought from the Cabinet |
| 3 | Assessing Impact and Analysis | | |
| а | Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics? | Y | We have carried out an assessment using information held about housing benefit take up and broken this down into nine protected characteristics-see appendix The results show that the protected groups are more likely to |

| | | | be protected from the increase in charges through claiming HB or Universal Credit Key highlights to this show; Women- hold 56% of LBTH tenancies but that • 58% of those on full HB are women • 59% of those on partial HB are women • 55% of those on Universal Credit are women Age-those between 30 and 54 hold 54% of LBTH tenancies but • 40% of those on full HB are between 30 and 54 • 50% of those on partial HB are in this age group • 68% of those on Universal Credit are also in this category Disability-19% of residents have 1 or more disabilities Of those; • 36% of those claiming full HB come from this group • 24% of those claiming Partial HB have a disability • 13% of those claiming Universal Credit have a disability |
|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | The analysis demonstrates that those from protected groups are more likely to be able to claim benefit coverage for the additional charge and there is a relatively equal impact from across groups from this rise. It is however accepted that there may be an impact on a minority that fall within a specific socio economic groupworking but failing the parameters of being able to claim benefits. In these circumstances, THH offer a range of financial and benefit advice and where appropriate will refer to other agencies who can carry out re-assessments as to whether these increased charges now fall within the benefit threshold. |

| 4 | Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| а | Is there an agreed action plan? | Y | A full action plan will be agreed and communicated following the outcome of the resident consultation relating to the increased charge. In addition, arrears will be monitored, and debt support provided and referred as appropriate, to agencies to mitigate impact. | |
| b | Have alternative options been explored | Y | An option exists not to pass on the service charge rise to tenants. However, the impact of this will be that other key services to residents may have to be cut or reduced. | |
| 5 | Quality Assurance and Monitoring | | | |
| а | Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal? | Y | A fuller assessment will occur following responses to the resident consultation process | |
| 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 | | | |
| а | Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment? | Y | See above | |

Appendix A

(Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria

| Decision | Action | Risk |
|----------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | |
| | Proceed with implementation | Green: |