Equality Impact Assessment – Ref 1059

Introductory Information

Project name

Planning Service Income Activities

Decision Type

- Cooperative Executive
- Cabinet Committee (e.g. Cabinet Highways Committee)
- $\bigcirc \ \text{Leader}$
- O Individual Cabinet Member
- $\odot~$ Executive Director/Director
- Officer Decisions (Non-Key)
- Council (e.g. Budget and Housing Revenue Account)
- Regulatory Committees (e.g. Licensing Committee)

Lead Cabinet Member Mazher Iqbal

Year decision being made

| • 21/22 | 0 22/21 |
|---------|---------|
| | · |
| | |
| | |

EIA date 12.01.2022

| EIA Lead | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| O Adele Robinson | ○ Ed Sexton |
| Annemarie Johnston | O Louise Nunn |
| O Bashir Khan | James Henderson |
| O Bev Law | |
| | |
| Person filling in this EIA form | Accountable officer |
| Lucy Bond | Michael Johnson |
| | |

Lead Corporate Plan priority

| An In-Touch Organisation | Strong Economy | Thriving Neighbourhoods | Better Health and | Tackling Inequalities |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | and Communities | Wellbeing | |

Portfolio, Service and Team

| Cross-Portfolio | | Portfolio |
|-----------------|----|-----------|
| ○ Yes | No | Place |
| | | Page 99 |

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

It is proposed to update Planning Service discretionary fees and charges to more closely reflect the actual cost of the service provided (balanced against a benchmarking exercise to ensure that the charges are not at odds with the charges levied in other Core Cities) and to build in a mechanism to update the fees on an annual basis in line with inflation.

In relation to Neighbourhood Planning, it is proposed to update the funding arrangements in order to support a full-time post dedicated to the development of Neighbourhood Plans by seeking approval to use Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income to provide dedicated neighbourhood planning support to local communities to develop their neighbourhood plans. This represents the implementation of the Cabinet decision 8.2(a) taken on 17 October 2018. (This element of the proposals has already undergone an EIA – reference 286 – which should be read in conjunction with this EIA). The updated CIL decision supports the positive impacts identified in the original CIL EIA.

Public Sector Equality Duty Impact

Under the <u>Public Sector Equality Duty</u> we have to pay due regard to the need to:

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

Public Sector Equality Duty Overview

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

In supporting an FTE Principal Planning Officer to support Neighbourhood Planning the Service will be better equipped to help local communities develop their own plans, particularly those that do not have the same resources as the communities which have already delivered Neighbourhood Plans (such as Dore and Broomhill).

The discretionary charges levied for pre-application advice and other enhanced services will still cost less than they are to deliver and charges for disabled people wanting to improve their own homes to meet their needs will be waived.

Good relations will be fostered with the development sector because we will be able to provide an improved service to them.

Impacts

Proposal has an impact on

| O Health | O Transgender |
|--|---|
| ○ Age | O Carers |
| Disability | Voluntary/Community & Faith Sectors |
| O Pregnancy/Maternity | O Cohesion |
| O Race | ○ Partners |
| O Religion/Belief | O Poverty & Financial Inclusion |
| ○ Sex | O Armed Forces |
| Sexual Orientation | Other |

Give details in sections below.

More information is available on the <u>Council website</u> including the <u>Community</u> <u>Knowledge Profiles</u>.

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.

| Disability | / | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--------|
| Staff O Yes | ● No | Impact O Positive | O Neutral | Negative | |
| | | Level O None | ○ Low | O Medium | ⊖ High |
| Details of | impact | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | _ | Impact | | | |
| Customer ● Yes | O No | Positive | Neutral | ○ Negative | |
| | - | - | NeutralLow | NegativeMedium | O High |
| | 0 No | Positive Level | | | O High |

| Voluntary, Community & Faith Sector | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|----------------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------|
| Staff O Yes | ● No | Impact O Positive | O Neutral | Negative | |
| | | Level O None | ○ Low | O Medium | ⊖ High |
| Details of i | mpact | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Customers ● Yes | ○ No | Impact ● Positive | O Neutral | Negative | |
| | | Level O None | • Low | O Medium | ⊖ High |

| Service wil those that | ng an FTE Princ I be better equip do not have the | cipal Planning Officer t oped to help local com same resources as th h as Dore and Broom | munities dev e communiti | elop their own plans | s, particularly |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Other | | | | | |
| Staff O Yes | ○ No | Please specify | | | |
| | | |) Neutral | Negative | |
| | | Level O None C |) Low | O Medium | ⊖ High |
| Details of | Impact | | | | |
| Customer ● Yes | rs ○ No | Please specify Accessibility of s | service | | |
| | | Impact O Positive | Neutral | Negative | |
| Details of | impact | Level ● None C | D Low | O Medium | ⊖ High |
| Within the | Planning and B | uilding Control Service the administration fee | | | |

Official – General

| | Cumu | lative | Im | pact |
|--|------|--------|----|------|
|--|------|--------|----|------|

Proposal has a cumulative impact

• Yes O No

| • Year on Year | Across a Community of Identity/Interest |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Geographical Area | ○ Other |

If yes, details of impact

Year on Year fees increase due to proposal to build in a mechanism to update the fees on an annual basis in line with inflation.

Local Partnership Area(s) impacted

• All O Specific

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

Action Plan and Supporting Evidence

Action Plan

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

Consultation

Consultation required ● Yes ○ No

If consultation is not required please state why

If there is consultation, please provide details

Consultation on the CIL funding for Neighbourhood Planning has already been undertaken and received a positive response.

In relation to increases in discretionary charges, the Sheffield Property Association and Planning Agents Forum have long recognised the need to increase charges to provide a properly resourced service and the fee increase is an integral part of MER476 which has already been consulted on and is being implemented.

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 O Yes • No

If you have said no to either please say why

Planning Service customers already have to pay for discretionary areas of service and the charges have not been increased since 2015. They will be given one month's notice via the Agents Forum and the Sheffield Property Association before the new charges are launched. Customers are not obliged to access the services offered. They are discretionary.

Summary of overall impact

Summary of overall impact

Overall there are no significant differential, positive or negative, equality impacts identified.

There are positive impacts in relation to Neighbourhood Planning already identified in EIA 286 (low-level positive impact on disabled people, the health of residents and the VCF sector).

With regard to the charges and fees, disabled people wishing to improve their own home to improve their living environment will continue to be exempt from any pre-application charging (and are also exempt from the subsequent planning application fee).

No negative impacts are identified.

This EIA will be reviewed and updated, where relevant, following the consultation.

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 | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| | be agreed and signed off by the equality lead in your Portfolio or . Has this been signed off? | |
| • Yes | ○ No | |
| EIA Lead: An | nemarie Johnston | |
| Date agreed | 12/01/2022 | |



This page is intentionally left blank