

INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section: Partnerships and Community Safety		Names of those undertaking assessment: Mark Jones Carol Drury Sandy Kavanagh	
Name of Policy/Procedure to be assessed: Designated Public Places Order	Date of Assessment: 19.3.08	Is this a new or existing policy/procedure? New	
<p>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure:</p> <p>The objective of the enforcement of the DPPO is to reduce the incidence of disorder, anti- social behaviour and public nuisance arising from alcohol consumption in public places. The powers available to a Police Officer, PCSO and other authorised persons can be used at their discretion. It is totally acceptable for groups of people to congregate on public places. Many people often enjoy meeting friends and family in public places, such as parks, outside public buildings, and both inside and outside shopping parades and arcades. Providing they do so within the law and without causing fear, alarm and distress to others there is no reason to assume that confiscation should be automatic. It is important not to alienate the public and for example, it would be inappropriate to challenge individuals having a quiet picnic with a glass of wine or a can of beer in one of the Districts open spaces. There are now over 400 DPPO schemes being used throughout the country, with Boston Borough Council being the closest DPPO area to South Kesteven. The Boston scheme has been operating since December of last year and has proved to be a valuable tool for the Police and PCSO's who patrol the area.</p>			
<p>2. What are the key performance indicators?</p> <p>No specific BVPI's are available for this scheme; however the community safety team in conjunction with the community safety partnership will be closely monitoring incidents of alcohol related crime in order to gauge the effectiveness of this order.</p>			
<p>3. Who will be affected by this policy/procedure?</p> <p>The communities inhabiting, visiting and working within Grantham town, Bourne town, Stamford town and the Deepings.</p>			
<p>4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?</p> <p>As 3</p>			
<p>5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service?</p> <p>Lincolnshire Police – South Division</p>			
<p>6. What outcomes are required from this policy and for whom?</p> <p>The DPPO as an additional tool to be used by the police and other authorised</p>			

officers to target alcohol problems as and when appropriate. The introduction of such areas will reduce crime and disorder, have a positive impact upon those affected by street drinking and its associated problems and also offer assurance to our residents and visitors that we as an Authority take our responsibilities in relation to crime and disorder seriously. Making the district and the communities within it safer.

7. What factors/forces could contribute/dettract from the outcomes?

Active and effective partnership working, proactive approaches to target identified hotspots in order to reduce alcohol related anti-social behaviour and crime and disorder

8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy/procedure?

SKDC, Lincolnshire Police, South Lincolnshire Community Safety Partnership.

9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy/procedure?

SKDC is responsible for the procedure and Lincolnshire Police will be responsible in partnership with the district council in implementing it.

10. Are there concerns that the policy/procedure could have a differential impact on different racial groups? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

There is a possibility that this procedure could be seen to have a differential impact on different racial groups. Anecdotal evidence through the police and community safety team suggests that Eastern European migrants are amongst the highest group of street drinkers. This is not to say that they are singled out as being responsible for alcohol related anti-social behaviour or crime and disorder but it needs to be considered and investigated.

11. Are there concerns that the policy/procedure could have a differential impact on men and women? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

12. Are there concerns that the policy/procedure could have a differential impact on disabled people? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

13. Are there concerns that the policy/procedure could have a differential impact on the grounds of sexual orientation? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

14. Are there concerns that the policy/procedure could have a differential impact on the grounds of age? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No – although intelligence suggests that many of the identified incidents are connected to young people within the district

15. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of religious belief? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

16. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on any other groups of people eg those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgendered or transsexual people. If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access?

Taking into consideration point 10 one may have to question whether language could be an issue – again this requires investigation.

18. Where do you think improvements could be made?

This is a new procedure and as such requires testing before this question can be answered effectively.

19. Are there any unmet needs or requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups. If yes, please give details.

No

20. Is there a complaints system?

Yes Flare System (Home Office approved, secure, encrypted investigation system)

21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?

If relevant

22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?

We have consulted with relevant officers within the district (151, monitoring, relevant service managers) council and police.

23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?

Parish Council and a number of community groups have been consulted with positive feedback from all areas.

24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view?

The Community Safety team have researched this type of order extensively and have looked at models of good practice from across the country with similar demographic to South Kesteven.

25. Could the differential impact identified in 8 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy/procedure?

No

26. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure?

Yes. Further consultation coupled with education, with people of other nationalities who have migrated to South Kesteven will need to be carried out. The Partnerships and Community Safety officers have excellent connections within many of these communities.

27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?

Potentially – this could be a race issue, however, see 26 for potential solution

28. Should the policy proceed to a full impact assessment?

Yes

29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by

25 April 2008

Signed (Lead Officer): ... Mark Jones, Carol Drury, Sandy Kavanagh

Date: ...19.3.08.....