Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

| | | egy Policy Service Function ess/procedure Programme Project Review nisational change Other (please state) oroach: Revision of an existing approach: Corporate requirements: Corporate requirements: Corporate requirements: Corporate state ort description, using the following as sub-headings: aims, objectives and activities | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subject of assessment: | ECS 18(A) Proposal to move to fortnig | ghtly general waste collections. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coverage: | Service Specific | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strategy | Policy | ⊠ Service | Function | | | | | | | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | ☐ Process/procedure | Programme | ☐ Project | Review | | | | | | | | | |
| | ☐ Organisational change | Policy Service Function Programme Project Review Other (please state) Revision of an existing approach: Cocal or corporate requirements: Collowing as sub-headings: Collections from the current weekly cycle to that of fortnightly. This will lead to a reduced service cost base financial saving to MBC of £322K. The financial saving is a key component in achieving the ECS 18 overall cycling rates Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Corporate requirement in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base in achieving the ECS 18 overall to a reduced service cost base i | | | | | | | | | | | |
| It is a: | New approach: | | Revision of an existing approach: | | | | | | | | | | |
| It is driven by: | Legislation: | | Local or corporate requirements: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Description: | Key aims, objectives and activities To change the residential refuse and subsequently contribute a first saving target by 2022. To increase Middlesbrough's recommon to support the Councils Emerging. Statutory drivers (set out exact refuse collections are a statutory. Differences from any previous application. Differences from any previous application. Every 4 weeks – 2% Every 3 weeks – 6% Every 2 weeks – 79% Every week – 13%. Please note that this change will weekly collection cycle. Key stakeholders and intended by The key stakeholders are Environ member/public consultation. Intended outcomes. To reduce the cost of service delithat residents will adopt improve 33.49% placing ourselves in 279th Media awareness campaigns & R | collections from the current weekly of nancial saving to MBC of £322K. The ycling rates g Green Strategy. eference) y requirement, though Local authority proach Authorities that continues to collect llections is shown below, indicating to mot apply to any residents who currently the same and external ast mental Services, Residents & Members of the same activities, leading to import of 345 Councils. Middle ecycling Roadshows all aimed towards. | financial saving is a key component in financial saving is a key component in the second of the control of the | ollections. Current Local Authority nority of 13%: acle, as these will remain on the following a process of nme. Additionally, it is expected Council's current recycling rate is of Educational Literature, Social approve our current recycling | | | | | | | | | |

| Live date: | 1 st April 2021 |
|----------------------|---|
| Lifespan: | From 1 st April 2021 onwards |
| Date of next review: | N/A |

| Screening questions | Respo | onse | | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|------|-----------|--|
| screening questions | No Yes Uncertai | | Uncertain | |
| Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?* | | | | There are no concerns that the proposals could impact adversely on human rights. Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of staff demographics, engagement to date with staff and analysis of current 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 Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires that when exercising its functions the Councils must have due regard to the need to: eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. In having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, the Council must consider, as part of a single equality duty: removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it; and encouraging people who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation is low. Service users — the proposal is potentially relevant to the age and or disability protected characteristics. If individuals holding those characteristics were less able to dispose of their waste, we would offer an assisted collection service where appropriate in line with existing policy. There would also be opportunity to dispose of bulk waste in way of logging a One Off Collection. There are no concerns that this could have disproportionate or adverse impact on these groups. All Refuse Service Staff are within the scope of the review. If implemented the proposal would result in a reduction of 12 posts. Relevant HR policies will also be applied to support staff and mitigate adverse impacts from this review including the ER/VR scheme, the redeployment policy, Reviews, Consultation and Redundancy Policy. The gender split of staff within the scope of the review have disability protected characteristic on the Council's HR system. However these staff have |

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

| Screening questions | Respo | onse | | Evidence | | | |
|---|---|------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?* | | | | Not applicable. There are no concerns that the proposal could have an impact on community cohesion. | | | |
| 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: | Andy Mace | Head of Service: | Andrew Mace | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Date: | 21 August 2020 | Date: | 21 August 2020 | | |

| Subject of assessment: | ECS 18(A) Proposal to move to fortnightly general waste collections. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Coverage: | Service Specific | ervice Specific | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strategy | Policy | ⊠ Service | ☐ Function | | | | | | | | |
| This is a decision relating to: | Process/procedure | Programme | 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 change the residential refuse collections from the current weekly cycle to that of fortnightly. This will lead to a reduced service cost base and subsequently contribute a financial saving to MBC of £322K. The financial saving is a key component in achieving the ECS 18 overall saving target by 2022. To increase Middlesbrough's recycling rates To support the Councils Emerging Green Strategy. Statutory drivers (set out exact reference) Refuse collections are a statutory requirement, though Local authorities determine the frequency of the collections. Differences from any previous approach Middlesbrough is one of the few Authorities that continues to collect residual waste on a weekly basis. The Current Local Authority nationwide make up of refuse collections is shown below, indicating that Middlesbrough sits within the minority of 13%: Every 4 weeks – 2% Every 3 weeks – 6% Every 2 weeks – 79% Every week – 13%. Please note that this change will not apply to any residents who currently utilise a communal waste receptacle, as these will remain on the weekly collection cycle. Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate) The key stakeholders are Environmental Services, Residents & Members. The service will be reviewed only following a process of member/public consultation. Intended outcomes. To reduce the cost of service delivery in order that a financial contribution is made toward Change Programme. Additionally, it is expected that residents will adopt improved recycling activities, leading to improved recycling rates. Middlesbrough Council's current recycling rate is 33.49% placing ourselves in 279th position out of 345 Councils. Middlesbrough council will roll out a series of Educational Literature, Social Media awareness campaigns & Recycling Roadshows all aimed towards greater resident participation to improve our current recycling status. In turn this is expected to co |
|----------------------|--|
| Live date: | 1 st April 2021 |
| Lifespan: | From 1 st April 2021 onwards |
| Date of next review: | N/A |

| | Impa | cts identif | fied | | | |
|--|------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| | | | Negative | | | Rationale and supporting evidence |
| Assessment issue | None | Positive | Justified | Mitigated | Uncertain | |
| Human Rights | | | | | | |
| Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy). | | | | | | No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element and no concerns have been raised in relation to human rights as a result of the consultation. |
| Equality | | - | | - | | |
| Age | | | | | | The Stage one impact assessment that was completed and submitted to Executive in September, seeking approval to consult on this proposal stated there were no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics. During the course of the consultation it became clear that there were some concerns from the public that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the elderly who might be less able to move a larger bins if they required one for a fortnightly collection. There were also concerns that those with a larger family would be less able cope with a fortnightly collection unless they had access to larger bins. To acknowledge this concern, a stage 2 has now been completed to explore those concerns. In relation to the elderly, if they require a larger bin because of their circumstances and they feel they are unable to manage this larger bin, they can apply to have an assisted bin collection (subject to assessment) which will mitigate the perceived negative impact the change could have on them. Alternatively they could maintain their current bin size if they would prefer this. There was also a concern that larger families would not be able to manage with the proposals. Again, they will have access to the larger/ additional bins which will ensure they have capacity to store waste. The council will continue to offer even larger bins where there is a medical need to do so. All residents can also request additional recycling bins. In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and the feedback, the Council considered whether it could avoid this perceived disproportionate impact. It is felt that it is not possible to continue to provide a weekly waste collection given spending pressures on the Council and the need to encourage greater recycling as analysis has shown that recyclable material is unnecessarily getting disposed of in general waste bins. In line with the PSE on larger than the perceived negative impacts should be fully mitigated. Evidence |

| | Impacts identified | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | Nama | Docitive | Negative | | 11 | Rationale and supporting evidence | | | |
| Assessment issue | None | Positive | Justified | Mitigated | Uncertain | | | | |
| | | | | | | The Stage one impact assessment that was completed and submitted to Executive in September, seeking approval to consult on this proposal stated there were no concerns that the proposal could have a disproportionate adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics. During the course of the consultation it became clear that there were some concerns from the public that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the disability protected characteristic, particularly those less able to manoeuvre a larger bin and those with a need to dispose of bulky medical waste. To acknowledge this concern, a stage 2 has now been completed to explore those concerns. | | | |
| Disability | | | | | | If someone requires a larger bin because of their circumstances and they feel they are unable manage this larger bin, they can apply to have an assisted bin collection (subject to assessment which will mitigate the perceived negative impact the change could have on them. Alternatively they could maintain their current bin size if they would prefer this. The council will continue to offer even larger/ additional bins where there is a medical need to do so. All residents can also request additional recycling bins. | | | |
| | | | | | | In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and the feedback, the Council considered whether it could avoid this perceived disproportionate impact. It is felt that it is not possible to continue to provide a weekly waste collection given spending pressures on the Council and the need to encourage greater recycling as analysis has shown that recyclable material is unnecessarily getting disposed of in general waste bins. In line with the PSED consideration was then given to whether the impact of the proposal could be mitigated to address the concerns. Given the adjustments that have been made to the proposal it is anticipated that the perceived negative impacts should be fully mitigated. | | | |
| | | | | | | Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the extensive consultation undertaken, analysis of recycling levels and analysis of fortnightly collections conducted elsewhere to inform the proposal. | | | |
| Gender reassignment | | | | | | | | | |
| Pregnancy / maternity | | | | | | No concerns were identified at stage one in relation to this element and no concerns were raised | | | |
| Sex | | | | | | during the consultation on this proposal that require further consideration. | | | |
| Race | | | | | | Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the extensive consultation undertaken, analysis of recycling levels and analysis of fortnightly collections conducted elsewhere to inform | | | |
| Religion or belief | | | | | | the proposal. | | | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | | | | | | | |

| Impacts identified | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|
| | None | Positive | Negative | | | | | |
| Assessment issue | None | Positive | Justified | Mitigated | Uncertain | | | |
| Marriage / civil partnership** | | | | | | | | |
| Dependants / caring responsibilities** | | | | | | | | |
| Criminal record / offending past** | | | | | | | | |

** Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

| | | sidentified | | | | Rationale and supporting evidence | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|----------|--|
| Assessment issue | None | Positive | Neg | Negative | | | | | |
| | | Positive | Justified | Mitigated | Uncertain | | | | |
| Community cohesion | Community cohesion | | | | | | | | |
| Individual communities / neighbourhoods | | | | | | No concerns were identified | | | |
| Relations between communities / neighbourhoods | | | | | | element and no concerns have been raised in relation to these as a result of the consultation. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Further actions | Further actions | | | | | | | Deadline | |
| Mitigating actions | | | | | | | | | |
| • Promotion of | Promotion of the changes along with the service adjustments that can be requested | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring and evaluation | | | | | | | | | |

Head of Service:

Date:

n/a

Assessment completed by:

Date:

Geoff Field

16 November 2020