Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Refurbishment of Middlesbrough Bus Station Toilets								
Coverage:	State the extent or scope e.g. overarching/o	crosscutting or service-specific.							
	Strategy	Policy	Service	☐ Function					
This is a decision relating to:	Process/procedure	Programme	X Project	Review					
	Organisational change	Other (please state)							
It is a:	New approach:		Revision of an existing approach:	x					
It is driven by:	Legislation:		Local or corporate requirements:	x					
Description:	 Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings: Key aims, objectives and activities To refurbish and update Middlesbrough Council's Bus Station Toilets. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) None Differences from any previous approach At present charging does not apply for these facilities. It is proposed to introduce at small charge (20p) for the use of the facilities in order to fund the improvement of the facility. The charge will not be applied for the use of disabled toilets or the Changing Place within the Bus station. Bus station staff will also have the ability to access disabled toilets to support those with access needs who may not be in possession of a Radar key (required for access to these toilets) Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Users of Middlesbrough Bus Station. Intended outcomes. Improve the quality of toilet provision at Middlesbrough Bus Station. 								
Live date:	4 April 2016 onwards								
Lifespan:	n/a								

Date of next review:	A desktop review will be undertaken six months after implementation to assess whether there have been any unintended consequences	
Date of flext review.	from implementation of the proposal.	

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Screening questions		Yes		Lividence
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	\boxtimes			It is not anticipated that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human rights based on the evidence that has been gathered to inform the proposal and consideration of the individual human rights protections. Disabled facilities remain in place at no cost. Evidence used to inform this proposal includes access guidance and feedback from consultation undertaken to date.

^{*} Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of theses broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Respons	se	Evidence
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*			The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposal on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. Under the proposal all individuals wishing to access toilet facilities in the bus station will be required to pay 20p to enter the toilets. Disabled toilets will not be affected by the proposal. These will continue to be accessible using the national RADAR key system. The proposal will support work to address complaints around Anti-social behaviour in the toilets and complaints around the quality and cleanliness. Staff based on site will have the ability to access disabled toilets to ensure customers unable to use the barrier who may not have a radar key are still able to access facilities. Given this there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on a group or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic. Evidence used to inform this proposal includes analysis of access guidance and feedback from consultations undertaken to date.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*			There are no concerns that the proposal could impact negatively on relationships between different groups or communities of interest. Evidence used to inform this proposal includes analysis of access guidance and feedback from consultations undertaken to date.

Screening questions	Respo	onse		Evidence		
Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?*				Supports the vision as the investment will improve a well-used but neglected facility that is in need of significant refurbishment and is in line with the Mayor's aim that the town is clean, safe and healthy. Evidence used to inform this proposal includes analysis of access guidance and feedback from consultations undertaken to date.		
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its Change Programme?*				The proposal is in line with the direction of travel for the change programme. Evidence used to inform this proposal includes analysis of access guidance and feedback from consultations undertaken to date		
Next steps: If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed.						

⇒ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.

Assessment completed by:	Geoff Field	Head of Service:	Tony Parkinson
Date:	15.2.16	Date:	15.2.16

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	School crossing patrol – removal of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings								
Coverage:	Service specific								
	Strategy	⊠ Policy	⊠ Service	☐ Function					
This is a decision relating to:	Process/procedure	Programme	☐ Project	Review					
	Organisational change	Other (please state)							
It is a:	New approach:		Revision of an existing approach:						
It is driven by:	Legislation:		Local or corporate requirements:						
Description:	Insert short description, using the following as sub-headings: Key aims, objectives and activities To remove school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings in line with Road Safety Great Britain national guidance that school crossing patrols should not be provided at light controlled crossings unless there are exceptional circumstances as this is a duplication in provision and can be confusing for drivers. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Provision of school crossing patrols is discretionary. Differences from any previous approach Currently school crossing patrols are provided at a number of light controlled crossings. Under this proposal they would no longer be provided at these sites. Consultation was held from 15 th December until 31 st January. Four responses were received which objected to the removal of the crossing on Stokesley Road, this feedback was considered as part of the development of final proposals. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) Children using the crossings and their families, schools, nurseries and other users of the crossings. Intended outcomes. To align current practice with national guidance on provision of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossings.								
Lifespan:	April 2016 onwards (proposals will be subject to a phased implementation as staff retire or leave the service) n/a								
Date of next review:	n/a n/a								

Sergening questions	Response			Evidence	
Screening questions		Yes	Uncertain		
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*				There are no concerns that this proposal could adversely impact on human rights. The proposal is in line with Road Safety Great Britain national guidance that school crossing patrols should not be provided at light controlled crossings unless there are exceptional circumstances as this is a duplication in provision and can be confusing for drivers. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of national guidance, accident data and feedback from consultation.	

^{*} Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response		•	Evidence
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*				The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals. Service users – The proposal is relevant to the age protected characteristics because of the nature of the service. The proposal would ensure the Council's discretionary school provision aligns with national guidance in relation to provision of school crossing patrols at light controlled crossing. Consultation feedback comprised of 4 responses concerned at the impact of removal of the patrols from Stokesley Road. Guidance identifies that the presence of a school crossing patrol and a light controlled crossing can be confusing to drivers and result in increased likelihood of accidents. Guidance that both should not be provided unless there are exceptional circumstances was considered. There is no evidence to suggest that there are exceptional circumstances which would apply to this site. Staff – there are no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on groups or individuals because they hold a protected characteristic. Implementation of this proposal will be supported by HR policies which have been separately impact assessed. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of national guidance, accident data and feedback from consultation.
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*				The discretionary service will continue to be provided at current locations that do not have a light controlled crossing. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on community relationships. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of national guidance, accident data and feedback from consultation.

Screening questions Response			Evidence		
Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?*	\boxtimes		0	The proposal is relevant to the vision that children and vulnerable adults are safeguarded. This discretionary service will continue to be provided at other sites where there are no light controlled crossings. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on achievement of the Mayor's vision. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of national guidance, accident data and feedback from consultation.	
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its Change Programme?*	\boxtimes			The proposal is in line with the Council's direction of travel in relation to the Change Programme. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on this programme. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of national guidance, accident data and feedback from consultation.	
Next steps: If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.					

Assessment completed by:	Sharon Thomas	Head of Service:	n/a
Date:	15.2.16	Date:	n/a

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Improved quality assurance in assessment and review of individuals to provide greater use of personalised care.								
Coverage:	Cross-cutting								
	Strategy	⊠ Policy	⊠ Service	☐ Function					
This is a decision relating to:		Programme	☐ Project	Review					
	Organisational change	Other (please state)							
It is a:	New approach:		Revision of an existing approach:						
It is driven by:	Legislation:		Local or corporate requirements:						
Description:	cost of meeting that need. Statutory drivers (set out exact real the services provided by Adult Social the Health and Social Act 2005. Differences from any previous application of the service and frameworks will incorporates better use of least improves the way in which in Key stakeholders and intended by Social Care customers within the scope intended outcomes. To maintain current service standards	meet identified needs within existing eference) Care are prescribed by a range of leg opproach continue to be applied, however the ower cost / no cost solutions to meet needs are assessed and reviewed to eneficiaries (internal and external as the of the proposal and potential future.	way in which needs are met may cha t identified needs where appropriate ensure greater consistency in applicati appropriate) re customers.	clusive to): the Care Act 2014 and nge as the Council:					
Live date:	April 2016 onwards								
Lifespan:	n/a								
Date of next review:	n/a								

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
osi coming queodions	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*				Services which support individuals and their families will continue to be provided at current levels, however the way in which needs are met may change as a result of this proposal. There are no concerns that the proposal could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current cost of provision, analysis of the marketplace and feedback to date from staff and service users on service provision.
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*				The Council has a duty to consider the impact of the proposed decision on relevant protected characteristics to ensure it has due regard to the public sector equality duty. The duty means the Council must have due regard when taking decisions to the need to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. Consideration of this duty has shaped the proposals. Service users – The proposal is relevant to the age and disability protected characteristics. The proposals would not impact on the threshold of access to services or on the level of support that is provided once the threshold is met, however they may result in changes to how services are met where there are opportunities to ensure needs continue to be met, within a different package of care, where it is appropriate to do so. There are therefore no concerns that the proposals could result in an adverse impact on current or future service users. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of current cost of provision, analysis of the marketplace and feedback to date from staff and service users on service provision.

^{*} Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance appendix for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*		The continued and expanded use of personalised care, where appropriate for individuals, will have a positive impact on community cohesion, supporting more individuals to access care / support that meet
the town:		their needs in community settings, providing them with an opportunity to commission care which enables access to local communities and engagement. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes, contract monitoring, market monitoring of prices and feedback from customers.
Middlesbrough 2020 – Our Vision Could the decision impact negatively on the achievement of the vision for Middlesbrough?*		Supports Middlesbrough Council's vision aim that children and adults are safeguarded while also supporting them to live longer and healthier lives. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes, contract monitoring, market monitoring of prices and feedback from customers.
Organisational management / Change Programme Could the decision impact negatively on organisational management or the transformation of the Council's services as set out in its Change Programme?*		The proposal will reduce the costs of the current service provision, this will be a saving to the Council, while it will also ensure that identified needs of customers continue to be met effectively. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes, contract monitoring, market monitoring of prices and feedback from customers.

Assessment completed by: Erik Scollay Head of Service: n/a Date: 15.2.16 Date: n/a

⇒ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.