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The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to

* eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
* advance equality of opportunity between different groups; and
* foster good relations between different groups

# Section 1: What is being assessed?

**1.1 Name of proposal to be assessed.**

Establish in-house delivery of private dropped crossing delivery.

**1.2 Describe the proposal under assessment and what change it would result in if implemented.**

Current arrangements for the approval of private dropped crossings use a technical approval process whereby applications for crossings are assessed for technical compliance by Council engineers and if acceptable a licence to construct the crossing is issued. This service is chargeable. However, this leads to confusion and complaints from residents who do not appreciate that the process requires them to appoint a competent contractor to construct the crossing.

The proposal is that the private dropped crossing application process becomes a ‘turn-key’ process whereby the Council will not only conduct the current technical approval checks but will also deliver the construction of the dropped crossing using its own resources. This process will therefore remove the confusion and frustration experienced by some applicants. However, as the construction costs for the crossing would become part of the overall chargeable service the cost of applying for a crossing would increase significantly from the current £75 technical approval charge.

# Section 2: What the impact of the proposal is likely to be

* 1. **Will this proposal advance equality of opportunity for people who share a protected characteristic and/or foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those that do not? If yes, please explain further.**

The proposed change itself will advice equality of opportunity and in terms of access to the service as the requirement for residents to be competent to appoint a reputable contractor to construct their dropped crossing will be transferred to the Council.

* 1. **Will this proposal have a positive impact and help to eliminate discrimination and harassment against, or the victimisation of people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.**

As stated above, the removal of the need for residents to appoint their own reputable contractor for the construction of their dropped crossing will also eliminate discrimination and potential victimisation of residents who appoint disreputable contractors to provide this service.

* 1. **Will this proposal potentially have a negative or disproportionate impact on people who share a protected characteristic? If yes, please explain further.**

The biggest impact of this proposal on protectect characteristics will be financial in that the cost for the service being provided by the Council will increase to include construction costs of the crossing itself.

**2.4 Please indicate the level of negative impact on each of the protected characteristics?**

(Please indicate high (H), medium (M), low (L), no effect (N) for each)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Protected Characteristics:** | **Impact**  (H, M, L, N) |
| Age | L |
| Disability | N |
| Gender reassignment | N |
| Race | N |
| Religion/Belief | N |
| Pregnancy and maternity | N |
| Sexual Orientation | N |
| Sex | N |
| Marriage and civil partnership | N |
| **Additional Consideration:** |  |
| Low income/low wage | M |

**2.5 How could the disproportionate negative impacts be mitigated or eliminated?**

(Note: Legislation and best practice require mitigations to be considered, but need only be put in place if it is possible.)

The disproportionate impacts can be mitigated somewhat by providing costs of the end-to-end process from the outset based on a ‘standard’ crossing specification with any variation to this being quoted separately (due to increased / decreased construction costs of larger/smaller crossings).

# Section 3: Dependencies from other proposals

**3.1 Please consider which other services would need to know about your proposal and the impacts you have identified. Identify below which services you have consulted, and any consequent additional equality impacts that have been identified.**

There are no impacts with other associated services as a result of this proposal. All services would be provided by the highways function of Planning, Transportation & Highways.

# Section 4: What evidence you have used?

**4.1 What evidence do you hold to back up this assessment?**

Feedback from users of the technical approval process currently operated for private dropped crossings.

**4.2 Do you need further evidence?**

No

# Section 5: Consultation Feedback

**5.1 Results from any previous consultations prior to the proposal development****.**

There has been no previous consultation on this proposal as the proposition has been developed from the perspective of feedback on the current system by service users.

**5.2 The departmental feedback you provided on the previous consultation (as at 5.1).**

Not applicable

**5.3 Feedback from current consultation following the proposal development (e.g. following approval by Executive for budget consultation).**

No equality feedback received

**5.4 Your departmental response to the feedback on the current consultation (as at 5.3) – include any changes made to the proposal as a result of the feedback.**

Not applicable