## **Equality Impact Assessment**



Folkestone Hythe & Romney Marsh Shepway District Council

Date of initial assessment	01/12/2016 – Initial EIA	01/12/2016 – Initial EIA screening		
Service	Thanet District Council	Thanet District Council		
	Canterbury City Council			
	Shepway District Counci	Shepway District Council		
	Dover District Council			
Proposal to be assessed	A business case for the p	A business case for the potential creation of a single East Kent council		
New or existing policy or function?	New			
External (i.e. public-facing) or internal?	External			
Lead officer	Madeline Homer	Chief Executive	Thanet District Council	
	Colin Carmichael	Chief Executive	Canterbury City Council	
	Alistair Stewart	Chief Executive	Shepway District Council	
	Nadeem Aziz	<b>Chief Executive</b>	Dover District Council	

Please outline your proposal,	Summary:
including:	The Leaders of Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway and Thanet District Councils have undertaken a series of discussions
Aims and objectives	to examine options for closer collaboration, leading to a shared view that a merger of the five East Kent districts merits
Key actions	further serious consideration. The Statement of Intent confirmed the Leaders' thinking on the purpose of a merger and
Expected outcomes	the principles that would underpin evaluation of the business case. The creation of a new unitary council for East Kent is
• Who will be affected and	not under consideration.
how	In response to financial challenges facing local government and the opportunity to drive improvements and growth in the
How many people will be	East Kent area, during the summer of 2016 the five East Kent councils gave approval, based on the Statement of Intent,

affected	to explore the advantages and disadvantages of a merger of the five East Kent District Councils of:
anecieu	<ul> <li>Ashford;</li> </ul>
	Canterbury;     Dever:
	Dover;     Sharawayayayayayayayayayayayayayayayayayay
	• Shepway;
	Thanet;
	and to also examine how a single district council could operate.
	Ashford Borough Council has since announced that it no longer intends to pursue discussions on the proposed creation of
	a single East Kent district council. A formal report will be considered by Ashford Borough's Cabinet on 9 February 2017,
	followed by Ashford Borough's Full Council on 16 February 2017.
	Following Ashford Borough Council's decision to exit the discussions, an independent 'Four Way Business Case' was
	commissioned by the remaining four councils.
	The East Kent districts already have a well-established track record of collaboration and sharing services, which reflects a similar approach to delivery; for example:
	• East Kent Services (EKS) provides 'back-office' functions (such as HR and payroll) as well as customer contact and revenues and benefits (Canterbury, Dover and Thanet). Add level of savings delivered to date as an example, once received.
	• East Kent Housing (EKH), an arm's length organisation, provides services to Canterbury, Dover, Shepway and Thanet.
	• East Kent Audit Partnership, which is an in house shared service, supports Canterbury, Dover, Shepway and Thanet.
	• The East Kent Engineering Partnership involving Canterbury City Council, Thanet DC, Dover DC and Shepway DC.
	• East Kent Spatial Development Company (EKSDC), which was set up as an infrastructure, delivery and regeneration
	organisation to bring forward employment land where viability was an issue and/or there was a lack of private sector interest.
	Aims and Objectives:
	There is provisional evidence to suggest that creating a single East Kent district council could deliver savings as well as
	reinforcing the ability of local Government to provide better outcomes for the residents, businesses and visitors to the
	area. Historically, East Kent has worked well collaboratively on such issues and the work sought to build on these
	relationships for the benefits of our communities.
	With the aim to deliver:
	when the dail to deliver.

What relevant data or	Demographic data:	
	Council and Canterbury City Council have very similar different. If the schemes need to be merged (as well a	I as any possible harmonisation of council tax itself), there could be lation. Details at this stage are unknown, pending a decision
	<ul> <li>How many people will be affected?</li> <li>The total population of the East Kent districts (four councils) was 523,000 in 2015 and expected to rise to 553,100 by 2021. The impacts could possibly be further reaching than this.</li> <li>The council tax support scheme changes were the subject of an extensive Equalities Impact Assessment. Dover District</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>All Elected Members in the four districts</li> <li>Impacts against the relevant protected characteristics</li> </ul>	cs are not known at this stage.
	<ul> <li>Who will be affected and how?</li> <li>At this stage very high level information is known, for</li> <li>All residents living in the four districts</li> <li>All staff employed by the four councils</li> <li>All staff employed by organisations commissioned the four councils.</li> </ul>	or example: ed to carry out services/functions on their behalf by one (or more) of
	Expected Outcomes: To be confirmed after public engagement commencin	ing in March 2017
	The proposal aims to explore the benefits and savings Kent district council.	gs that could be achieved through the establishment of a single East
	<ul> <li>A reduction in the numbers of different managem</li> <li>Clarification of governance for clear decision for e</li> <li>Upwards and downwards devolution of services in</li> </ul>	
	A more effective local government that is lean and	

customers who may use this	Dover	113,200	121,400
service or could be affected?	Shepway	110,000	113,700
Please give details; for	Thanet	139,800	146,800
example "x% of customers are	Total East Kent population	523,000	553,100
female" or "x% of customers		323,888	555,100
are aged over 60"	All East Kent districts have identified si	ignificant common demographical	challenges:
	<ul> <li>in their 30s, 40s, and 50s but a were over 65; this is estimated</li> <li>Areas of multiple deprivation: Index of Multiple Deprivation within England's 10% most Folkestone and Dover, and Ca England.</li> <li>Overall, the East Kent economy has peparticularly strong performance in Can Overall, in common with much of the r working age people. East Kent exports a relatively high degree of 'self-contair of employment currently available acrosses</li> </ul>	higher proportion of people over to increase to one in four by 203 for example, Thanet remains Ke (IMD) 2015. Nationally, Thanet deprived authorities. There are anterbury district has ten areas t enformed relatively well compared aterbury and Dover showing the le rest of the South East, East Kent has significant labour outside the reg ment', with Canterbury providing oss the four districts are slightly di have started to recover after the 2	as seen population growth, particularly of ion, particularly to London. Notably, there is also g employment to the coastal districts. The types

Is the decision relevant to the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty, which are listed below?			
Guidance on the aims can be found in the EHRC's <u>PSED Technical Guidance</u>			
Aim	Yes/No Explanation		
Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation	n Yes Should the Single District go ahead there could be opportunities to		
	achieve this aim that should not be missed.		
<u>Staff</u>			

		The Business Case covers the workforce for each of the East Kent Councils which will, by the nature of the organisations, include individuals who are covered by one or more of the full range of protected characteristics, as defined within the Equalities Act 2010.
		Currently no significant detrimental impacts have been identified which cannot be readily mitigated through existing HR policies, enhancements to existing policies and protocols. If the decision outcome is to proceed with the creation of a new single East Kent district council, there could be some potential inequalities which may stem from the proposals if not proactively addressed.
Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who	Yes	Should the Single District go ahead the potential for consistency across the district and therefore advancement of equality of
do not share it		opportunity should be enhanced.
Foster good relations between persons who share a	Yes	Should the Single District go ahead the potential for consistency
relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not		across the district and therefore there could be opportunities to
share it		foster good relations which should not be missed

Assess the relevance of the proposal to people with different protected characteristics, and assess the impact of the proposal on people with different protected characteristics.

Protected characteristic	Relevance to proposal High/Medium/Low/None	Impact of proposal Positive/Neutral/Negative	Explanation
Age			Unknown at this stage
Disability			Unknown at this stage
Gender reassignment			Unknown at this stage
Marriage and civil partnership			Unknown at this stage
Pregnancy and maternity			Unknown at this stage
Race			Unknown at this stage
Religion or belief			Unknown at this stage
Sex			Unknown at this stage
Sexual orientation			Unknown at this stage

Other groups: for example –		Unknown at this stage
low income/ people living in		
rural areas/ single parents/		
carers and the cared for/ past		
offenders/ long-term		
unemployed/ housebound/		
history of domestic abuse/		
people who don't speak		
English as a first language/		
People without computer		
access etc.		

Are you going to make any changes to your proposal as a result of these findings, in order to mitigate any potential negative impacts identified?	Following a period of public engagement more information about how a potential Single East Kent District council will affect people with or without a protected characteristic will be collected and the Equality Impact Assessment will be updated with new information.
Is there any potential negative impact which cannot be minimised or removed? If so, can it be justified?	None identified at this stage. This will be reviewed following a period of public engagement

What additional information would increase your understanding about the potential impact of this proposal?	Separate conversations have continued to take place across the whole of Kent on the possibility of making a bid to Government for the devolution of powers and funding from Government to the public sector in Kent.
	The East Kent district councils, whilst being party to these discussions are also keen to build on the economic and social cohesion of the area of East Kent. In response to this, the districts have been engaging in further complimentary activity with the county, to explore devolution options around; Highways, Public Health and Community Safety. Strategically, a single East Kent district could enable the development of strong, strategic leadership at all levels throughout East Kent, offering economies of scale, greater resilience and the capacity and capability to further enhance and

improve the value for money and quality of the services delivered, placing East Kent in a stronger position as the discussions progress.
Information regarding the potential impact on people during a period of public engagement will also inform the EIA.

## Next stage:

itext stuge:	
Date of revised assessment	Click here to enter a date.
Have you made any changes to your initial	
assessment?	
Did you undertake consultation?	If a decision is taken to progress, the councils will carry out a programme of public and stakeholder
– if yes, give date and the consultation results:	engagement.
Do you have new information which reveals any	
difference in views across the protected	
characteristics?	
Can any new conclusions be drawn as to how the	
proposal will affect people with different	
protected characteristics?	
Are you going to make any changes to your	
proposal as a result of these findings, in order to	
mitigate any potential negative impacts	
identified?	
Is there any potential negative impact which	
cannot be minimised or removed? If so, can it be	
justified?	