

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Screening

Title of Policy:	PLC POL 018 Garden Waste Permit Scheme
Service:	Place
Team:	Waste Services

Will the policy have to go to Council or committee for approval	Yes
Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?	Yes
Does it relate to functions that previous involvement activities have identified as being important to particular protected groups?	No
Does it relate to an area where the Council has set equality outcomes?	No
Does it relate to an area where there are known inequalities?	No
Does it relate to a policy where there is significant potential for reducing inequalities or improving outcomes?	No

IF YES TO ANY - Move on to an Equality & Fairer Scotland Assessment

IF NO - Explain why an Equality & Fairer Scotland Assessment is not required

APPROVAL		
NAME	DESIGNATION	DATE
Garry Dallas	Strategic Director	February 2019

NB This screening exercise is not to be treated as an assessment of impact and therefore does not need to be published. However, if you decide not to assess the impact of any policy, you will have to be able to explain your decision. To do this, you should keep a full record of how you reached your decision.

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Scoping

Purpose of the proposed policy or changes to established policy
<p>The purpose of the change is to ensure that Clackmannanshire Council is able to set a balanced budget, as required by statute, for the year 2019/20.</p> <p>Introduce a charging regime for the collection of Garden Waste would require residents to pre-purchase a permit prior to their brown bin (garden waste) being collected at kerbside. Those that do not choose to participate (or are unable to do so) would require to dispose of any garden waste (if applicable) by home composting or bringing to Forthbank HWRC</p>
Which aspects of the policy are particularly relevant to each element of the Council's responsibilities in relation to the General Equality Duty and the Fairer Scotland Duty?
General Equality Duty -
➤ Eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other prohibited conduct
Impacts if any are likely to be minimal.
➤ Advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not
Increases in fees and charges may have a impact on those on low incomes, including some elderly people and some of those with disabilities. There is mitigation in that many low income households do not generate significant garden waste due to the nature of their properties. Additionally there is a possibility that Council tenants could have the permit service provided through the HRA. Further work is required to determine whether this is feasible and to outline how many additional affected people within the Groups would be affected.
➤ Fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
Impacts if any are likely to be minimal.
Fairer Scotland Duty -
➤ Reducing inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage
<p>Some aspects of the budget proposals may have significant impacts on people who already experience socioeconomic disadvantage. The mitigation is similar to above but further work is required to identify if significant numbers of people, in at risk groups, would not be covered.</p> <p>However the proposed scheme has the advantage of providing a sustainable garden waste collection service that otherwise may be removed completely.</p>

To which of the equality groups is the policy relevant?		
Protected Characteristic	Yes/No*	Explanation
Age	Yes	The charge would be levied against all groups however some older people may be on very low incomes and may not be able to afford this service.
Disability	Yes	The charge would be levied against all groups however some older people may be on very low incomes and may not be able to afford this service.
Gender Reassignment	No	
Marriage and civil partnership	No	
Pregnancy and Maternity	No	
Race	No	
Religion and Belief	No	
Sex	No	
Sexual Orientation	No	

* Delete as required

What evidence is already available about the needs of relevant groups, and where are the gaps in evidence?

Health inequalities continue to present challenges for our older population, and those with disabilities. We know that the communities of Coalsnaughton, Fishcross and Alloa South and East experience longstanding challenges associated with deprivation; there is a possibility, given the profile of proposals that these communities may be affected although the garden waste service may be retained from the majority through the HRA.

Further engagement with groups and communities is required to understand the nature of the socioeconomic impact arising from the proposals and any mitigating actions.

Which equality groups and communities might it be helpful to involve in the development of the policy?

Older people – liaise with CTSI to understand most effective engagement approach.

People with disabilities - liaise with CTSI to understand most effective engagement approach

Next steps

Face to face engagement will be arranged during January 2019 to enable impacts to be better understood. An online consultation will also be available from 9th January 2019 allowing for comments and feedback on the proposals. Following these engagement events, we will update this equality and fairer Scotland impact assessment

Equality and Fairer Scotland Impact Assessment - Decision

Evidence findings		
<p>Proposals relating to waste and recycling were mixed with some respondents feeling that a reduction may lead to environmental problems, flytipping and more household waste going to landfill. Implementing fees and charges/full cost recovery models may have an impact on those on low incomes, including some elderly people and some of those with disabilities but the equalities and poverty implications as generally assessed as being low. This is on the basis that many low income households do not generate significant garden waste due to the nature of their properties, and/or may have access to the permit service provided through the HRA.</p> <p>The proposal was assessed as having a low equalities/poverty impact.</p>		
Details of engagement undertaken and feedback received		
<p>Detailed feedback from budget engagement exercise for 2019/20 comprising online comments/feedback and representations made at budget engagement events held as part of the overall exercise.</p>		
Decision/recommendation		
<p>Having considered the potential or actual impacts of this policy, the following decision/recommendation is made:</p>		
Tick	Option 1: No major change	
✓	<p>The assessment demonstrates that the policy is robust. The evidence shows no potential for unlawful discrimination and that all opportunities have been taken to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.</p>	
	Option 2: Adjust the policy	
	<p>– this involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance equality or to foster good relations. It may be possible to remove or change the aspect of the policy that creates any negative or unwanted impact, or to introduce additional measures to reduce or mitigate any potential negative impact.</p>	
	Option 3: Continue the policy	
	<p>– this means adopting or continuing with the policy, despite the potential for adverse impact. The justification should clearly set out how this decision is compatible with the Council's obligations under the duty.</p>	
	Option 4: Stop and remove the policy	
	<p>– if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, consideration should be given to stopping the policy altogether. If a policy leads to unlawful discrimination it should be removed or changed.</p>	
Justification for decision		
<p>The Council met on 6th March 2019 and set the budget for 2019/20. This included the approval of this policy.</p>		
APPROVAL		
NAME	DESIGNATION	DATE
Garry Dallas	Strategic Director	24 th April 2019