

Equality Impact Assessment

Section: Tenancy Services Tenancy and Neighbourhood Services (Estate Management)		Officers undertaking assessment: Kathryn Walker (Neighbourhood Services Team Leader) Rachel Clark (Senior Housing officer) Elaine Claridge (Research & Information Officer) Amanda Bedford (Neighbourhood Services)
Name of policy, procedure etc: Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy	Date of Assessment: 11th March 2009	Is this a new or existing policy? New
Policy Aims		
<p>Briefly outline the policy/procedure/service by putting it into context and describe its aims, objectives and purpose</p> <p>The strategy is central to the council's approach to maintaining and enhancing the quality of life for our residents. It stresses that the tenancy agreement is our strongest tool for dealing with nuisance and anti-social behaviour and describes how we will enforce the conditions of tenancy.</p> <p>The main aim and purpose of this strategy is to outline how tenancy services will tackle and deal with anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>We recognise that anti-social behaviour can seriously affect the quality of life of residents through fear of crime and the long term effects of harassment and victimisation. This in turn can damage the sustainability of communities and can adversely affect our ability to let properties on our estates. Tackling anti-social behaviour is a key activity in regenerating and sustaining our communities.</p> <p>Our approach makes it clear that anti-social behaviour is not acceptable and will not be tolerated, we will take firm action to deal with it. We will however try to change behaviour using a variety of approaches and interventions and also give support to those who are willing to change their behaviour.</p>		
<p>Aims</p> <p>The aim of the service is to prevent and act against anti-social behaviour relating to breaches of the tenancy agreement. This will ensure that people living on and around our estates have and respect the right to quiet enjoyment of their homes,</p>		

feel safe and secure, and live in a community where clear standards of behaviour are understood.

Objectives

- **Prevention:** To reduce anti-social behaviour by identifying the causes and putting positive, joined-up solutions in place to prevent incidents in the first place or tackle them as soon as they happen.
- **Enforcement:** Demonstrate a commitment to tackling anti-social behaviour on our estates by delivering a rapid, robust and effective response and by using the full range of appropriate current legislative powers, which are targeted towards the more serious incidents of anti-social behaviour.
- **Rehabilitation:** Work with perpetrators of anti-social behaviour who want to change their behaviour by finding ways to help them to sustain their tenancy and keep to the tenancy agreement.

Who is intended to benefit from the policy?

All residents including tenants and those residing with or visiting; leaseholders; stakeholders of South Kesteven District Council (such as shop owners and the Police); staff and Members. Other organisations & partners listed below will also benefit from the new policy:

- Police
- Fire Service
- Social Services
- Youth Offending Service
- Connexions
- Education Welfare
- Schools
- Youth Service
- Sure Start
- AddAction
- SKDC – Community Safety Team
- SKDC – Street Scene Team
- SKDC – Healthy Environment Team
- Local Doctors, Hospitals and Clinics

Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?

The neighbourhood team from Tenancy & Neighbourhood Services implement the policy – the Service Manager for Tenancy & Neighbourhood Services and the Director of Tenancy Services are responsible for it.

Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?

Tenants, leaseholders and those agencies listed below.

Are there any other organisations or partners involved in the delivery of the service? Who is the lead or accountable body?

- Police
- Fire Service
- Social Services
- Youth Offending Service
- Connexions
- Education Welfare
- Schools
- Youth Service
- Sure Start
- AddAction
- SKDC – Community Safety Team
- SKDC – Street Scene Team
- SKDC – Healthy Environment Team
- Local Doctors, Hospitals and Clinics

When necessary we may ask other specialist agencies to help us deal with specific problems e.g. drugs, alcohol and mental health as people affected by these issues are often vulnerable and experience has shown they can also be victims of anti-social behaviour.

Lead Body: Tenancy Services, Neighbourhood Team

Does the policy contribute to the achievement of the Council's Equality and Diversity Policy? Can any aspects of the policy contribute to inequality? Please explain your answer.

Yes – by contributing to the **Corporate Equality Scheme**:

- By eliminating unlawful discrimination by tackling discrimination, harassment and bullying across all 6 strands of equality, race, age, gender

(including Transsexual and Transgender people), disability, Sexual Orientation and religion/belief.

- By working with perpetrators in order to try and break the cycle and re-occurrence of anti-social behaviour with a view to creating a sustainable tenancy. This includes working with other agencies and local communities in order to consider the impact to the communities' well being when rehabilitating perpetrators of anti-social behaviour.
- By increasing public involvement and empowerment in tackling anti-social behaviour:
 - Seeking feedback from customers and involving them in the development of our policies and procedures.
 - Ensuring customers are involved in monitoring and reviewing the delivery and performance of the anti-social behaviour service.

The policy also contributes to the **Tenancy Services Equality & Diversity Policy** by:

- Recognising that all citizens, from whatever background, should enjoy equal treatment in the provision of housing and its related services and should not feel threatened in their own home.
- Recognising that everyone should have an equal chance to live free from discrimination, harassment, bullying and prejudice
- Working with others to stamp out harassment and intimidation

There is no evidence to suggest that the Anti Social Behaviour Strategy would contribute to inequality. All anti social behaviour allegations are thoroughly investigated.

Evidence

What are the existing sources of evidence and mechanisms for gathering data?

- Satisfaction surveys are sent out to both complainants and perpetrators.
- The Estate Management Working Group has recently been set up made up of a broad spectrum of tenants.
- Attendance at the Joint Agency Meetings and the Joint Agency Group

- The Anite Estate Management Module (IT database) allows us to gather data from post tenancy visits, occupancy checks to a property and any cases of anti social behaviour.

What monitoring data is available on the number of people who use the service or are affected by the policy? Who holds this information?

An anti social behaviour survey is sent out after each case is closed to the complainant and perpetrator(s) involved. This data is held by Tenancy Services and reported on quarterly.

As discussed above, The Anite Estate Management module holds information on and allows us to monitor all cases reported - from post tenancy visits, occupancy checks to a property and any cases of anti social behaviour.

In addition, information from the Tenant Census gives us a 73% demographic profile of tenants. It is possible to profile a majority of complainants and perpetrators to see if there are any trends. However, this is a reporting exercise yet to be carried out.

If no monitoring has been undertaken, will this be done in the future? If so, specify what arrangements you intend to make. If you do not intend to do any monitoring, please provide your reason for this decision.

Monitoring is already in place as detailed above

What are the key performance indicators and targets attributed to the policy?

The following performance indicators are also produced on a monthly basis:

- % of ASB cases successfully resolved per month
- Number of ASB cases opened by category per month
- Number of occupancy checks attempted per month
- % of occupancy checks successful per month
- Number of ASB complainants who receive monthly feedback on current cases
- % of void garages from the total stock

We will also use the tenants' magazine, Skyline, to inform tenants about our performance and plan to publish this information on the website.

What consultation has been carried out with stakeholders and service users previously about the policy?

All stakeholders have been invited to comment on the strategy
Tenants have been consulted via the Estate Management Working Group and the Housing Consultative Group (consisting of Tenants, staff and councillors)

Is there any evidence that different groups have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to the particular policy or function? Please explain your answer.

Yes via the Tenant Census, post sign up survey we are aware of those people with visual impairments, learning difficulties, mental health issues, substance abuse, or no reading or writing skills have different needs. These tenants are given additional support including information in large print, audio and different languages.

People with poor literacy skills are offered tape recorders to verbally record diaries.

We would work closely with other agencies to ensure all residents have the correct support in place to help them to sustain their tenancy, for example a person with Touretts syndrome who may cause offence inadvertently to their neighbours

Is there any informal feedback from managers, staff or voluntary organisations?

Yes – staff involvement and feedback at the team meeting. More is on its way from stakeholders those involved in the Estate Management working group.

Is there a complaints system? If yes, are complaints monitored by race, gender and disability as a minimum?

Yes there is a system, but no, it is not currently monitored as above. This is under review at the moment.

What further evidence is needed to understand the impact upon equality?

Demographic profiling of victims and perpetrators of anti social behaviour is

needed to see if there are any particular groups being victimised or carrying out anti social behaviour.

Impact

Does the data show different impacts upon different groups? What existing evidence is there for this?

At this time there is no evidence to suggest different impacts upon different groups. We do have a demographic profile of tenants as detailed below and further work will be carried out with our ASB surveys.

The demographic profile of Complainants does not indicate that a particular group or groups are being targeted for antisocial behaviour. However about 36% of complainants have not filled in a Census form and therefore there are some gaps in our knowledge about their profile

Race As at April 2009 the current ethnicity of Tenants is predominantly white British at 80.1%. BME groups (including white Irish) 2.7% . We have no ethnicity information for 17.2%.

The profile of complainants indicates that 1.8% come from BME groups. However, we do not have the ethnicity for 31% of the complainants.

The profile of perpetrators indicates that 2% come from BME groups but we do not have the ethnicity for 49% of perpetrators.

In conclusion the information suggests that there is no evidence to support any particular racially motivated anti social behaviour is taking place. However due to the fact that many complainants and perpetrators have not completed the census we will need to continue to monitor these trends.

Gender

As at April 2009 the gender split of male to female tenants is as follows:

Male 39% Female 61%

The profile of complainants is 71% female and 29% male. In relation to the general profile of tenants the complainants are more heavily weighted towards women.

The profile of perpetrators shows that 31.5% were men and 68.5 were women

Given the ratio of the gender split perpetrators are fairly equal. However the majority of complaints are from female residents.

Age

As at April 2009 age groups of tenants is

Under 20 1% 20 – 29 11% 30 – 39 13% 40-49 13% 50 – 59 12%

60+ 44% we have no information for 6% of tenants

The profile of complainants is under 35 yrs 19.5% 35 – 64yrs 45% over 65yrs 21.5% unknown 14%

The profile of perpetrators is under 35yrs 45% 35-64 yrs 42% over 65yrs 7% and unknown 6%

This shows us that 35-64 years seems to be the most common complainants over the past year however perpetrators seem to be fairly even ranging from under 35 to 64 years.

Religion

Not known fully – but some data has been collated.

As at April 2009 the religion of tenants is as follows:

Christianity 52.5% Other religions (includes, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, Sikhism, Pagan, Spiritualist) 0.5% No religion 9.4% Prefer not to say 8.6% We have no information for 29%

The profile of complainants is 45% Christianity, 9.5% No religion, 7.4% prefer not to say, 0.6% other religions 37.5% unknown. None of the complainants have identified a religion other than Christianity

The profile of perpetrators 24% Christianity, 9.5% No religion, 12% prefer not to say and 51.5% unknown

Due to the majority preferring not to give the information it is difficult to gather a full profile.

Disability

As at April 2009 those tenants who consider themselves to have a disability or long term illness (includes learning difficulties) is 36.5%. Those who do not regard themselves as having a disability is 63.5%

Then as above.

The profile of complainants indicates that 39.6% do not consider themselves to have a disability or long term illness and 28.4% do consider themselves to have a disability or long term illness. We do not know about 32% of the complainants

The profile of perpetrators indicates that 32.5% do not consider themselves to have a disability or long term illness, 16.5% do consider themselves to have a

disability or long term illness and 51% is unknown.

Again the information does not indicate any trend in this area

Sexual Orientation

Because the majority have preferred not to tell us their sexual orientation, further consultation with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender groups will be necessary.

According to the limited statistics from government and Stonewall the LGB population in Britain is approximately 5-8%. It is fair to assume that this figure would be reflected amongst our tenant population.

Do these differences amount to an adverse impact?

At this moment we cannot say but we will be putting measures in place to find out and will be consulting our service users.

Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on any other groups of people e.g. those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgender or transsexual people.

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Please explain your answer.

We do not think that there would be a differential impact on any other group because we work closely with various groups including Social Services, Mind, Homelessness Forums, Shelter, and AddAction.

Transgender – no evidence either presumed or otherwise.

Are there any factors that might account for differential impacts or non-achievement of the policies outcomes, such as barriers that prevent people from fully accessing the service? For example, communication difficulties, physical access, information not being accessible, use of language, childcare responsibilities?

No – leadership, training and development would prevent such barriers in the first place (one good example would be the equality & diversity Grass Roots training completed by all the team) However, it may be that specialist staff training is needed on different diversity strands.

Future Actions

Should the policy or function proceed to a Full Impact Assessment? (Please explain your reasoning)

The policy does not need to progress to a Full Impact Assessment if the action plan outlined below is implemented.

ACTION PLAN

- Update strategy – already complete
- Involve staff at this stage and the working group. Do differences amount to adverse impact? Consider ASB demographic profile
- Review the strategy in 12 months time
- Consult all stakeholders and agencies

Date Full Impact Assessment should commence

- Not applicable because we are already monitoring and consulting with service users.

Review Date **April 2010**

Review Date

Review Date

Signed:

Date: