

Equality Impact Assessment

Introductory Information

Budget/Project name

Wording changes to Sheffield City Council's Allocations Policy

Proposal type

- ☐ Budget
☒ Project

Decision Type

- ☐ Cabinet
☐ Cabinet Committee (e.g. Cabinet Highways Committee)
☐ Leader
☒ Individual Cabinet Member
☐ Executive Director/Director
☐ Officer Decisions (Non-Key)
☐ Council (e.g. Budget and Housing Revenue Account)
☐ Regulatory Committees (e.g. Licensing Committee)

Lead Cabinet Member

Cllr Paul Wood

Entered on Q Tier

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

Year(s)

<input type="radio"/> 14/15	<input type="radio"/> 15/16	<input type="radio"/> 16/17	<input type="radio"/> 17/18	<input type="radio"/> 18/19	<input type="radio"/> 19/20	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 20/21	<input type="radio"/> 21/22
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------

EIA date

14/07/2020

EIA Lead

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Adele Robinson | <input type="radio"/> Ed Sexton |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Annemarie Johnston | <input type="radio"/> Louise Nunn |
| <input type="radio"/> Bashir Khan | <input type="radio"/> Michael Bowles |
| <input type="radio"/> Beth Storm | <input type="radio"/> Michelle Hawley |
| <input type="radio"/> Diane Owens | <input type="radio"/> Rosie May |

Person filling in this EIA form

Paul Crompton

Lead officer

David Wilkinson

Lead Corporate Plan priority

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> An In-Touch Organisation | <input type="radio"/> Strong Economy | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities | <input type="radio"/> Better Health and Wellbeing | <input type="radio"/> Tackling Inequalities |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

Portfolio, Service and Team

Cross-Portfolio

☐ Yes ☒ No

Portfolio

Place

Is the EIA joint with another organisation (eg NHS)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Brief aim(s) of the proposal and the outcome(s) you want to achieve

The proposal is to change or remove some of the wording to the current allocation policy, to bring the document in line with current Homelessness legislation and to omit obsolete narrative terms such as active and inactive applicants, top bandings etc. The outcome is to provide more clarity to our customers and bring the policy document up to date with government homelessness legislation.

Impact

Under the [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) we have to pay due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations

More information is available on the [Council website](#) including the [Community Knowledge Profiles](#).

Note the EIA should describe impact before any action/mitigation. If there are both negatives and positives, please outline these – positives will be part of any mitigation. The action plan should detail any mitigation.

Overview

Briefly describe how the proposal helps to meet the Public Sector Duty outlined above

The above proposal has no known adverse impact to the equality of its users. Taken from council's links above the following can be demonstrated.

Direct discrimination - The wording changes to the allocation policy do not treat anyone less favorably than others, other than those who have a more urgent need to be rehoused. This position was set out in the original policy and the updates to the policy are inline with Government Homelessness legislation. This legislation will have passed rigorous Government EIA scrutiny before becoming policy or housing law. Mitigation to allowing priority housing is that, the allocation policy still allows a degree of reasonableness for applicants using waiting time in Band D & E who wish to access Council or Social housing through the Choice based letting system. The one other change is to reinforce that 60+ properties are to be allocated for applicants of that age or older and are not accessible to younger applicants with mobility issues. This re-enforcement is mitigated against because a large proportion of general needs lower properties are still available for all mobility applicants throughout the city regardless of their age.

Indirect discrimination - As above; the rules (terms) of the allocation policy do not indirectly discriminate, other than more choice is given to those applicants awarded a priority over applicants in band D & E. This is mitigated in the offering of 1 in 4 properties to those applicants in band D & E who are bidding or accruing waiting which ever is their preference.

Harassment – The wording changes demonstrate no unwanted behavior that violates an applicant's dignity. The changes to the allocation policy do not create an offensive

environment for applicants and mealy provide more clarity in line with current Homelessness legislation and remove jargon that is no longer used within the terminology of the current rehousing process.

Victimisation – The changes to the wording within the policy are not in anyway based on treating applicants unfairly because they’ve complained about discrimination or harassment. The changes were not brought about because of complaints but are considered necessary so current legislation is nominated throughout the document.

Impacts

Proposal has an impact on

<input type="radio"/> Health	<input type="radio"/> Transgender
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Age	<input type="radio"/> Carers
<input type="radio"/> Disability	<input type="radio"/> Voluntary/Community & Faith Sectors
<input type="radio"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input type="radio"/> Cohesion
<input type="radio"/> Race	<input type="radio"/> Partners
<input type="radio"/> Religion/Belief	<input type="radio"/> Poverty & Financial Inclusion
<input type="radio"/> Sex	<input type="radio"/> Armed Forces
<input type="radio"/> Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Other

Give details in sections below.

Age

Staff

☐ Yes ☒ No

Impact

☐ Positive ☐ Neutral ☐ Negative

Level

☐ None ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Details of impact

Customers

☒ Yes ☐ No

Impact

☐ Positive ☒ Neutral ☐ Negative

Level

☒ None ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Details of impact

Age 60+ years properties will be allocated to applicants aged 60 or older as was initially intended in the original wording of the allocation policy.

Other - Homeless

Staff

☐ Yes ☒ No

Impact

☐ Positive ☒ Neutral ☐ Negative

Level

☒ None ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Details of impact

Customers

☒ Yes ☐ No

Impact

☐ Positive ☒ Neutral ☐ Negative

Level

☒ None ☐ Low ☐ Medium ☐ High

Details of impact

The changes bring the policy in line and describe in better detail the Homelessness Reduction Act which is already implemented and being followed by SCC .

Cumulative Impact

Proposal has a cumulative impact

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Year on Year

☐ Across a Community of Identity/Interest

☐ Geographical Area

☐ Other

If yes, details of impact

Proposal has geographical impact across Sheffield

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, details of geographical impact across Sheffield

Local Partnership Area(s) impacted

☐ All ☐ Specific

If Specific, name of Local Partnership Area(s) impacted

Action Plan and Supporting Evidence

Action Plan

Supporting Evidence (Please detail all your evidence used to support the EIA)

The allocation policy has been in place for several years. To my knowledge, no challenge regarding inequality issues regarding the policy has been forthcoming during this time. The wording changes do no present wholesale changes to the equality of the document, other than providing a degree of clarity with the terminology used and the homelessness housing legislation already implemented by SCC being followed and described in better detail in the document . Therefore the evidence supports that these minor wording changes and deletions support this EIA.

Consultation

Consultation required

☐ Yes ☒ No

If consultation is not required please state why

The Council is not required to consult on this proposal and as such, no consultation has been completed. The changes proposed are minor and do not alter the technical nature or intention of the provisions within the Policy.

Are Staff who may be affected by these proposals aware of them

☐ Yes ☐ No

Are Customers who may be affected by these proposals aware of them

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you have said no to either please say why

Summary of overall impact

Summary of overall impact

Overall there are no equality impacts, positive or negative, from this proposal. Access to social housing continued to be a critical area for the Council. These minor changes have no effect when compared to the original Allocation Policy document and will ensure that the Council's policy for allocating such accommodation continues to be clear, fair and equitable.

Summary of evidence

Changes made as a result of the EIA

None

Escalation plan

Is there a high impact in any area?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Overall risk rating after any mitigations have been put in place

☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low ☒ None

Sign Off

EIAs must be agreed and signed off by the equality lead in your Portfolio or corporately. Has this been signed off?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Date agreed

17/07/2021

Review Date

14/07/2021