

**Appendix Three:**  
**Detailed new policy options**

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD1
<b>Service(s):</b>	Public health: Sexual health transformation
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Hirani

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Through participation in the London Sexual Health Transformation Programme including the London wide procurement of a 'front door' to sexual health services and a joint procurement with Ealing and Harrow of an integrated local sexual health service savings are anticipated through a diversion of activity to lower cost settings
--------------------------	---

## Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	5,616
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	0

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	£250	£350
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

## How would this affect users of this service?

Analysis of activity in current sexual health services and a waiting room survey indicates that not all current attendances at GUM clinics need that specialist service. Brent is participating in a London wide procurement of a new 'front door' to sexual health services. The front door into services will be web based, a single platform providing patients with information about sexual health, on line triage, signposting to the most appropriate service for their needs and the ability to order self-sampling tests.

## Key milestones

Dec 2015 Cabinet:

Agreed continued participation in the collaboration with other London boroughs in the London Sexual Health Services Transformation Programme with the intention of

procuring genitourinary medicine (GUM services) and Contraception and Sexual Health Service (CaSH) in a new collaborative commissioning model.

Contract award Sub regional integrated service Dec 2016 (subject to confirmation of Ealing's timelines)

Contract award for services: Feb 2017

Contract start 1 April 2017

### **Key consultations**

Engagement with service users and clinicians is ongoing through LSHTP

### **Key risks and mitigations**

The Programme Steering Group maintain an active risk log and review mitigating actions. The most significant risks relate to

- the collaborative nature of the programme including a failure to agree service models, to align decision making and to agree collaboration agreements
- a failure to change patient and / or clinician behaviour and so not achieve the diversion of activity on which savings are based

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Public health team
Deadline:	Dec 2016

Lead officer for this proposal:	Melanie Smith, DPH
---------------------------------	--------------------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD2
<b>Service(s):</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Hirani

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Income generation – The introduction of a provisional charge for Community Care and Accommodation based care will generate revenue earlier in the process and avoid people not contributing to service due to non-compliance with the financial assessment process. This provisional charge removes the inherent delay in assessing a client after the actual care package has commenced.
--------------------------	---

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>-7,038</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	£250	0
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

Savings of £0.25m generated from collecting income earlier in the process.

### How would this affect users of this service?

The impact on service users has been assessed through the production of an EIA, a full 30 day public consultation and the production and agreement of a cabinet report earlier this year. The impact is not significant as proposed charges should have been collected anyway, or if someone is not eligible to make a financial contribution, the charge will be re-paid to them. Feedback from the consultation process was mainly positive, with users expressing the view that a 'light touch' assessment process is positive and less intrusive, and expressing the view that the

Council collecting charges due to them is fair as long as there is a clear and consistent process for doing so.

### **Key milestones**

Light touch assessments were implemented at the end of August 2016.

### **Key consultations**

A 30 day public consultation was undertaken during June 2016.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Risk of actually collecting this income remains a problem in terms of debt recovery. Mitigation is to work closely with debt team to flag debt early.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	EIA has already been completed
Deadline:	<i>Completed</i>

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland
---------------------------------	----------------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD3
<b>Service(s):</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Hirani

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Direct Services – John Billam and New Millennium to become more inclusive services which bring in the community and additional income to make effective and efficient use of key assets.
--------------------------	--

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	4,059
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	112

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	300	
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

£0.3m achieved through more effective management of day centres, increasing income through additional use and reducing costs.

### How would this affect users of this service?

Service users and families would still continue to receive their service, but it would be part of a wider and more inclusive use of the building.

### Key milestones

Jan 17 – Building on previous work at New Millennium agree implementation plan  
Jan 17 – Consultation with service users, families, unions and staff  
March 17 – Implement changes to the service  
April 17 – Building on the lessons learnt at New Millennium, start co-production at John Billam to identify opportunities

June 17 – Agree implementation plan  
 October 18 – implement new model of service

**Key consultations**

Extensive consultation required with users and carers in both day centres would be required however the service developed, and with Unions, staff and with potential providers

**Key risks and mitigations**

Risk that users and carers will oppose the changes to the service – mitigated through extensive and ongoing communication and engagement  
 If the first risk becomes an issue, significant risk of adverse publicity and public protest – mitigated through extensive and ongoing communication and engagement  
 Risk that the council cannot generate the additional income and efficiencies – mitigated through financial modelling and change management  
 Risk that we will need to consider outsourcing as the way to drive the change.

**Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Yes
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Helen Woodland
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland
---------------------------------	----------------

### Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD4
<b>Service(s):</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Hirani

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Extending NAIL provision for people in Nursing Care
--------------------------	---

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>7,813</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	100	200
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

Proposal to move lowest need (c.20%) of clients currently in nursing care to Supported Living which would deliver a £0.3m saving. This is based on an analysis of nursing home placements, which suggest there are a number of placements at the simpler end.

### How would this affect users of this service?

Clients would need to agree to the move and some may find moving traumatic. Families and carers may also be averse to disrupting stable placements. Some users may prefer a less institutional environment and regain independence and skills lost through being in nursing care.

### Key milestones

April 17 - Identification of lowest need nursing care clients

April-June 17 – identification of potential alternative SL placements



April – June 17 – Reassessment of clients’ needs  
 June – Ongoing – Discussion of reassessments with service users and families  
 July – ongoing – planned moves of identified clients who agree to move

**Key consultations**

Consultation with individual service users and families will be a key part of this process, but no formal consultation is required.

**Key risks and mitigations**

Risk of adding to the already challenging target of identifying further NAIL units and ensuring the CCG support this in terms of Nursing care contributions. This will be mitigated through early identification of resource requirements to identify placements and facilitate moves (although this will have a cost implication). Risks around health input will be mitigated by early and ongoing communication with health colleagues.

Risk that moves are subject to user and family co-operation and choice. Risk will be mitigated through communication with families, carers and users.

**Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Amy Jones
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this	Amy Jones
-----------------------	-----------

proposal:	
-----------	--

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD5
<b>Service(s):</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Hirani

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Mental Health Service – Further development of the recovery pathway, focusing on supported living and supporting the move to general needs housing and independence.
--------------------------	--

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>1,329</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>0</b>

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	500	0
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

£0.5m achieved through:

- enabling a more effective recovery pathway – better access to housing and employment will accelerate step down to general needs housing,
- Supported by ongoing negotiations with providers to manage costs and focus on the right support.

### How would this affect users of this service?

This would support the delivery of the current objectives of the service, supporting people to move towards independence, and further efficiencies would be achieved through negotiations, which would not mean a change in service.

## **Key milestones**

Ongoing process:

- Improving access to general needs housing
- Negotiation and provider development.

## **Key consultations**

None required, but changes to accommodation will be part of the care plan, and the support provided and managed by CNWL

## **Key risks and mitigations**

The significant housing pressures mean it is difficult to free up enough of the right kind of housing at the right price

Risk of being unable to achieve price reductions through negotiations. Risk mitigated through clear negotiation plan and strategy.

## **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	No
Particular ethnic groups	No
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	No
People of particular sexual orientation/s	No
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	No
People in particular age groups	No
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Duncan-Turnbull
---------------------------------	-----------------------

### **Budget Options Information**

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD6
<b>Service(s):</b>	Environmental Improvement
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood
<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	£0.25m from the collection of bulky waste items

### **Financial and Staffing Information**

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>29,000</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>35</b>

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	250	0
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### **Budget implications**

The proposal is about introducing a differentiated charging scheme for the removal of bulky items, retaining some level of free service, so that:

- operating costs are recovered
- a popular service can be sustained
- waste disposal volumes are better controlled
- demand is better regulated
- waiting times are reduced; and
- monies received can be re-invested in the service

### **How would this affect users of this service?**

Customers may notice altered operational arrangements and revised service terms and conditions. In some instances, service users would need to pay for the removal of bulky items or make alternative arrangements for disposal.

### **Key milestones**

- Modelling of options – 2016
- Decision on preferred option – 2017
- Implementation of revised charges- 2017

### **Key consultations**

No formal consultation is envisaged.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

- The proposal is about introducing a differentiated charging scheme for the removal of bulky items, with some level of free service being retained. Monies would be re-invested to sustain the service and to improve the customer offer. A reshaped service would also better address the problem of illegal rubbish dumping across the borough.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Y
Marriage / civil partnership	N

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this	C Whyte
-----------------------	---------

proposal:	
-----------	--

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD7
<b>Service(s):</b>	Regeneration
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Butt & Cllr Mashari

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Special Projects budget will be reviewed and efficiencies of £0.1m found.
--------------------------	---

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	300
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	9

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications: (Regeneration Only)</b>	100	0
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	2	0

### How would this affect users of this service?

There are no direct users of this service. The council will still need to resource new projects from time to time, but this will be done on a case by case basis rather than as part of an ongoing team.

### Key milestones

Agree alternative funding if appropriate

### Key consultations

Staff restructure



### **Key risks and mitigations**

With the alternative funding in place the key risk will be around uncertainty. As the founding sources identified above are directly linked to development activity.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	No
Disabled people	
Particular ethnic groups	
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	
People of particular sexual orientation/s	
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	
People in particular age groups	
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	
Marriage / civil partnership	

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Amar Dave
---------------------------------	-----------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD8
<b>Service(s):</b>	Regeneration and Environment
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Review of current staffing structure to reduce staffing costs in regulatory services
--------------------------	--

### Financial and Staffing Information

<b>2016/17</b>	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	2,341
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	78

	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	0	100
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	2

### Budget implications

Within Regeneration a manager post will be deleted from Trading Standards – Note under the trading standards agreement with Harrow 50% of the saving from the post will need to be offered to Harrow. In Environment, an option is to delete an existing vacant post.

### How would this affect users of this service?

This proposal should not have a direct impact on users of the service.

### Key milestones

### Key consultations

Staff

**Key risks and mitigations**

Harrow may not agree

**Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	Aktar Choudhury
---------------------------------	-----------------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD9
<b>Service(s):</b>	Parking and Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	£1.0m from additional parking charges
--------------------------	---------------------------------------

### Financial and Staffing Information

2016/17	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>Income £19.9m</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>23</b>

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	0	1,000
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

This is an exercise to account for the parking pressures that are expected to arise from an increase in the borough's population. Regeneration and increased development may result in additional cars and increased parking pressures. This creates the need to provide parking restrictions that meet current and future demand, with the revenue paying for the service and any additional revenue being reinvested in the service. This exercise will consider residential parking permits and some car parking tariffs but will not include a review of visitor parking charges.

### How would this affect users of this service?

Some parking charges may increase although visitor parking charges will not be considered.

### Key milestones

- Preparation of new parking tariffs - 2017
- Consultation on new parking tariffs - 2017
- Decision to increase parking charges – 2017
- Implementation of revised parking charges - 2018

### **Key consultations**

Consultation on increased parking charges – 2017

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Any increase in parking tariffs may be unpopular initially. However, this will serve to mitigate parking congestion and will create more sustained environmental benefits. The revenue received will pay for the service, with any additional revenue being reinvested in the service.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	C Whyte
---------------------------------	---------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD10
<b>Service(s):</b>	Environmental Improvement
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	£900k from efficiencies in the Public Realm contract operation.
--------------------------	---

### Financial and Staffing Information

2016/17	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>29,000</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>35</b>

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	450	450
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

This proposal generates £900k from operational efficiencies within the Public Realm Contract. These will rationalise operational arrangements so they better manage and properly resolve hot spots and other persistent problems.

### How would this affect users of this service?

Service users may see revised working practices and operational schedules.

### Key milestones

Service review – 2016  
Negotiation with Veolia 2016  
Implementation of service changes – 2017-2018

### Key consultations

No formal consultation envisaged.

### **Key risks and mitigations**

Any change in operations may be noticeable to residents used to familiar and established working practices. However, these changes are specifically intended to improve environmental standards overall. They will ensure the most persistent and most noticeable problem areas are eliminated once and for all.

### **Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	Y
Particular ethnic groups	Y
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Y
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	Y
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	Y
Marriage / civil partnership	N

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	C Whyte
---------------------------------	---------

## Budget Options Information

<b>Reference:</b>	1718BUD11
<b>Service(s):</b>	Parking & Lighting
<b>Lead Member(s):</b>	Cllr Southwood

<b>Policy Proposals:</b>	Maximise the potential of the soon-to-be operational Central Management System to maximise street lighting energy efficiencies.
--------------------------	---

### Financial and Staffing Information

2016/17	
<b>Total budget for the service(s) £'000:</b>	<b>3,200</b>
<b>Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):</b>	<b>3</b>

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
<b>Budget implications:</b>	0	100
	FTE	FTE
<b>Proposed staffing reduction</b>	0	0

### Budget implications

The Central Management System for street lighting, which the council is currently procuring, provides the opportunity to review street lighting levels at a micro-level. Although deployment of the System will already be contributing to the agreed £0.75m p.a. saving expected from street lighting, it is considered that an additional £0.1m p.a. could be saved through a rigorous review of lighting levels at a highly localised level across the borough.

### How would this affect users of this service?

Some users may notice marginally lower lighting levels than expected at certain locations. However any impact would not be sufficient to affect lighting levels required for road safety, or to meet expectations of community safety.

### Key milestones



Procurement of CMS – 2016-17  
 CMS fully operational – 2017  
 Complete review and implement detailed Lighting Plan - 2018

**Key consultations**

N/A. Resident and visitor feedback on lighting levels could be acted on quickly.

**Key risks and mitigations**

Some users may notice marginally lower lighting levels than expected at certain locations. Should the lighting level not be acceptable at a specific location the CMS does allow corrective adjustments to be made rapidly.

**Equality impact screening**

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes/No
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	N
People of particular sexual orientation/s	N
People who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing or have undergone a process or part of a process of gender reassignment	N
People in particular age groups	N
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

*If the screening has identified a potentially disproportionate adverse impact, you will need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment.*

EIA required?:	No
EIA to be completed by:	
Deadline:	

Lead officer for this proposal:	C. Whyte, Operational Director, Environment
---------------------------------	---