

Appendix B:
Detailed new policy options

Budget Options Information

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

Policy Proposals:	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

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

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	£250	£350
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	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 genitourinary medicine (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.

Subregional contract award March 2017

Contract award for service (by City of London) March 2017

New service commences June 2017

Key consultations

Engagement with service users and clinicians is ongoing through the [London Sexual Health Transformation Partnership](#) (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

A full Equality Analysis was carried out as part of the decision-making and is available at: <https://www.brent.gov.uk/media/16406381/london-sexual-health-transformation-project-ea.pdf>. The relevant equality considerations are reflected in the tender specification and procurement process.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Public Health team
Deadline:	Completed
Lead officer for this proposal:	Melanie Smith, DPH

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD2
Service(s):	Adult Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Policy Proposals:	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

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

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

Budget implications

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

How would this affect users of this service?

A full Equality Analysis (EA) has been carried out to assess the impact on service users with protected characteristics. The EA and the final cabinet report were also informed by the findings of a 30 day public consultation and the production and agreement of a cabinet report earlier this year.

The findings of the consultation and the EIA show that 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

The Equality Analysis was carried out as part of the decision-making process and is available at: <http://democracy.brent.gov.uk/documents/s42560/charging-for-asc-app-eia.pdf>. The relevant equality considerations were reflected in the final decision.

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Adult Social Care
Deadline:	Completed
Lead officer for this proposal:	Helen Woodland

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD3
Service(s):	Adult Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Policy Proposals:	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

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

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	300	
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	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 a high quality 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
April 17 – Consultation with service users, families, unions and staff
Sept 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
July 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 as well as 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	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	No
Marriage / civil partnership	No

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Helen Woodland
Deadline:	February 2017

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

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD4
Service(s):	Adult Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Policy Proposals:	Extending NAIL provision for people in Nursing Care
--------------------------	---

Financial and Staffing Information

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

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	100	200
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	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 low needs placements.

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 Supported Living 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 New Accommodation for Independent Living (NAIL) units and ensuring the Clinical Commissioning Group (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

A full Equality Analysis was carried out in November 2014 to assess the potential / likely impact on service users with protected characteristics and is available at: <https://www.brent.gov.uk/media/16406380/new-accommodation-for-independent-living-ea.pdf> . It was subsequently updated to inform the final decision.

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	Yes
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	Yes
Marriage / civil partnership	No

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

Lead officer for this proposal:	Amy Jones
---------------------------------	-----------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD5
Service(s):	Adult Social Care
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Hirani

Policy Proposals:	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

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

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	500	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	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 Central and North West London.

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:	
	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

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Adult Social Care
Deadline:	February 2017

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

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD6
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood
Policy Proposals:	£0.25m from the collection of bulky waste items (This is a discretionary service)

Financial and Staffing Information

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

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

- We operate the charging mitigations based on the Garden Waste charging model
- 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
- a commercial offer is made available to landlords for the responsible removal of bulky household items, mitigating problems frequently associated with the dumping of items from rented properties.
- A 'linked' service for the collection of items specifically for re-use is made possible.

The service is currently free of charge to residents, offering 3 collections of up to 5 items per year.

Modelling shows that various service options may be possible, depending on the level of charge made and the anticipated waiting time.

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.

For the first time, a commercial service would be provided to landlords. This is intended to help resolve long-standing problems associated with the dumping of large household items from rented properties.

Key milestones

- Modelling of options – 2017
- 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 improve the customer offer. A reshaped service would also better address the problem of illegal rubbish dumping across the borough.

- 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 and a commercial offer to landlords would also better address the problem of illegal rubbish dumping across the borough, particularly with respect to waste from rented properties.
- Any charge will also help facilitate new 'linked' and separate arrangements for the collection of items specifically for recovery and re-use.
- It is envisaged any charge would help regulate demand for the service thus reducing the amount of waste presented overall. Environmentally, such an arrangement supports the universal principle of 'producer pays'.
- Whilst any charge may be unpopular initially, this service is a discretionary service for which the council is entitled to make a charge.
- Levels of dumped waste will be closely monitored and enforcement and communications will be targeted to resolve any 'hot spot' areas. Any surplus income generated could be re-invested if necessary to support this work and to enhance clear up operations.

- Charging for the collection of bulky household items is common practice. The council will consult other similar authorities to ensure proper communications and effective implementation. The council will reference best practice to ensure the benefits to the environment and for the customer are optimised.

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

A change has been made to the screening document upon review, in identifying that whilst there may be an impact upon certain groups mentioned above, it is not believed that the impact will be disproportionate for the following reasons:

- We believe the mitigating factor which will cause an impact but not disproportionately, is the consideration in the proposal to examine the retention of a free element to the service. These will be dependent on the final model.
- The decision to charge was previously publically consulted upon in 2014/15 and no issue was raised regarding sensitivity of introducing a charge for the service.

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

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

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD7
Service(s):	Regeneration
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Butt

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

Financial and Staffing Information

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

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

Not Applicable

Key risks and mitigations

A case by case approval may introduce delays in project commissioning, to mitigate against this we will agree the projects to be commissioned at the start of the year and seek bulk approval at the start of the year.

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	

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

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

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD8
Service(s):	Regeneration and Environment – Trading Standards
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Tom Miller

Policy Proposals:	Review of current staffing structure to reduce staffing costs in regulatory services
--------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

2016/17	
Total budget for the service(s) £'000:	2,341
Total post numbers in the services(s) (FTE):	9 FTE

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	100	0
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	1	0

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.

How would this affect users of this service?

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

Key milestones

This post is currently vacant.

Key consultations

Harrow Council
Staff

Key risks and mitigations

Harrow may not agree the proposed arrangement – offer up 50% savings to Harrow

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

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

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

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD9
Service(s):	Parking and Lighting
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Policy Proposals:	Additional income may arise from a planned review by the Parking and Lighting Service within Regeneration and Environment of the use of parking charges to cover cost and mitigate parking pressure. It is estimated that the review may lead to increased income of £1.0m. Any additional income above that needed to cover costs would not be available to meet other budget pressures and can only be re-invested in line with the provisions set out in the Traffic Management and Road Traffic Regulation Acts.
--------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

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

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

Budget implications

The Regeneration and Environment Department is planning an exercise to establish any unresolved and escalating parking pressures that can be mitigated by an increase in the cost of resident parking permits and other parking charge increases. The review will seek to address parking pressures in the context of an increase in the borough's population. Increases in resident and business permit costs above inflation may be justified if it is established that the costs of managing and enforcing parking restrictions are not currently being fully covered. Regeneration and increased development may result in additional cars and increased parking pressures. This creates the need to match parking charges to current and future demand, with the revenue cost of the service and investment in it. This exercise will consider residential parking permits and some car parking tariffs including a review of Pay and Display charges, but will not include a review of visitor parking charges.

How would this affect users of this service?

- Those paying for parking, including resident and business permit holders, would be subject to higher charges.
- Differential charging could see different areas of the borough subject to different pay and display tariffs.
- 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.

Increases in resident and business permit costs above inflation may be justified if the council can demonstrate that the costs of managing and enforcing parking restrictions are not currently being fully covered.

Increased pay and display charges would mitigate parking congestion and create more sustained environmental benefits.

Evidence from the 2011 Census and resident permit sales does not currently suggest there is significant growth in vehicle ownership in CPZ areas.

The legislative framework does not allow authorities to increase permit prices for the purpose of raising revenue – they are a charge made to vehicle owners for the service of managing and enforcing CPZs. For any increase in permit charges to be valid, the council must therefore set out clear evidence that the costs of managing and enforcing CPZs are not currently being fully covered. The proposal is that any revenue received would pay for the service. Any additional income above that needed to cover costs would not be available to meet other budget pressures and can only be re-invested in line with the provisions set out in the Traffic Management and Road Traffic Regulation Acts.

Any proposal to increase pay & display charges or to introduce differential charges must similarly show evidence of congestion in parking bays. Officers must therefore undertake an exercise to establish whether a new demand has emerged since the last review 12 months ago, which Cabinet endorsed in March 2016. Again, the legal framework does not permit authorities to increase on-street parking charges simply for the purpose of raising revenue.

Local authorities do not have powers to seek to deter car ownership by increasing resident and business permit prices.

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
---------------------------------	---------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD10
Service(s):	Environmental Improvement
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

Policy Proposals:	£900k from efficiencies in the Public Realm contract operation
--------------------------	--

Financial and Staffing Information

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

	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000
Budget implications:	450	450
	FTE	FTE
Proposed staffing reduction	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	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
---------------------------------	---------

Budget Options Information

Reference:	1718BUD11
Service(s):	Parking & Lighting
Lead Member(s):	Cllr Southwood

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

Financial and Staffing Information

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

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

Budget implications

The Central Management System for street lighting (CMS) 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

Street lighting contributes to road safety and reducing the fear of crime, and lighting levels need to be set with these objectives in mind. Young adults are more likely to be active outside the home between the hours of midnight and 6 am; and adults working or travelling to work during these hours might also be impacted. Girls and women are perceived to be more likely to have concerns about potential crime during the hours of darkness. The proposal to introduce a Lighting Strategy would however provide the potential to mitigate any disadvantage to specific groups. Should the Council decide to introduce a Lighting Strategy with an element of noticeable light dimming, a full Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the design of the Lighting Strategy and action plan in due course.

Is there potential for the proposed policy to have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the following groups:	
	Yes
Disabled people	N
Particular ethnic groups	N
Men or Women (include impacts due to pregnancy/maternity)	Yes
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	Yes
Groups with particular faiths/beliefs	N
Marriage / civil partnership	N

EIA required?:	Yes
EIA to be completed by:	Parking & Lighting Service
Deadline:	December 2017

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