

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Appendix 1 b

Department	Community Protection Service / Environment	Person responsible for the assessment	Paul Robertson
Section	Environmental Protection	Name of the Policy to be assessed	Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 – Dog Control Order covering Albert Park.
Date of Assessment	19 th May 2010	Is this a new or existing policy	Existing

1.	Describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy	To review the Dog Control Order to cover Albert Park, which excludes dogs from two fenced off play areas, requires dogs to be kept on a lead in three of the park's four quadrants, provides a dog exercise area in the south west quadrant, and prohibits dog fouling.
2.	Are there any associated objective of the policy, please explain	To help prevent dog fouling and other antisocial behaviour resulting from the actions of irresponsible dog owners. An equality impact assessment was completed prior to the general consultation exercise in 2005/6. This EIA assesses the impact of the current arrangements and the recommendations of the review.
3.	Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way	People who visit Albert Park. Improved environmental, safety and health controls in this Green Flag park. Grounds maintenance staff would be less likely to be hampered by faecal material when strimming and grass cutting. Lesser risk of loose dogs roaming about the water features and landscaped areas. Safer play areas for children.
4.	What outcomes are wanted from this policy?	Cleaner and safer areas in an improved environment. To improve environmental standards with a necessary and proportionate response. Park provision which successfully meets the needs of different users.

5.	What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Non-compliance with the Order resulting in dog related incidents and people feeling unsafe in the park.		
6.	Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy	All people who visit, work in, and pass through the areas covered by the order.		
7.	Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?	Streetscene Service with support from the Community Protection Service with the lead taken by the Environmental Protection Team.		
8.	Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups.		No	Since implementation of the original order, enforcement has been monitored to ensure there is no adverse impact because of someone's race.
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The Order would apply equally to all dog owners. This monitoring shows there is no evidence to indicate that the order has had a differential impact on people because of their race.		
9.	Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The Order would apply equally to all dog owners. This monitoring shows there is no evidence to indicate that the order has had a differential impact on people because of their gender.		

10.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact due disability		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	<p>Trained assistance dogs are exempted from the exclusion relating to the two play areas i.e. allowed in. There are legal exemptions under fouling legislation for disabled people and all enforcement staff are aware of this. Enforcement staff consider all circumstances, including health of the dog walker, when investigating offences to establish whether the legal defence of 'reasonable excuse' applies. As part of the review, a programme of consultation was undertaken. As the authority in control of the land, the Council can give consent to individuals to use the park in breach of the orders which would provide them with the legal defence. To date, 2 requests were received which were given serious consideration by the Council. Since the implementation, there are no particular concerns that people have been adversely affected because they have a disability.</p>		
11.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to sexual orientation		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	<p>The Order applies equally to all dog owners. There is no evidence to indicate that dog ownership by people in this group differs from the overall population. There is no evidence that they have been adversely affected.</p>		
12.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to their age		No	

	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The orders would apply to, and help all, equally in the geographic areas to which it applies. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of their age to date.		
13.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to their religions belief		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The Order would apply to, and help all, equally in the geographic areas to which it applies. There is no evidence to indicate that dog ownership by people in this group differs from the overall population. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of their religious belief to date.		
14.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The Order would apply to, and help all, equally in the geographic areas to which it applies. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of their caring responsibility to date.		
15.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to their offending past		No	

	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Anyone with an offending past would not be treated differently, although if people repeatedly breach a Dog Control Order this would be a material factor in the legal process as with any area of enforcement activity. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of their offending past to date.		
16.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to them being transgendered or transsexual		No	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The order would apply to, and help all, equally in the geographic areas to which it applies. There is no evidence to indicate that dog ownership with transsexual or transgender people differs from the rest of the population. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of their gender to date.		
17.	Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due issues surrounding poverty		<u>No</u>	
	What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	We always make provision to give an appropriate time extension for the payment of fixed penalty fines if low-income people are genuinely unable to pay the cost immediately. A publicity campaign will take place to ensure that the community is made aware of the legal requirements in the Order. The priority will be to help people comply with the Order rather than issue fixed penalties. There is no evidence that people have been adversely affected because of poverty to date.		
18.	Could the differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy		<u>No</u>	There is no differential impact because the order has been designed to be implemented whilst addressing the needs of groups such as those with a disability by making provisions for assistance dogs and placing the exercise area next to Albert Park's disabled car provision.

19.	Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason		<u>No</u>	There is no adverse impact on any group
20.	Should the policy proceed to a partial impact assessment		<u>No</u>	There is enough evidence available to assess the impact of this decision.
21.	If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA			Not required
22.	Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by			Not required

Signed (completing officer) _____ Paul Robertson _____ Signed (Lead Officer) _____ Paul Robertson _____