

Appendix 3

Equalities and Diversity Impact Assessment Review of Access to and Provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres

Key Decision NS/08/11



Durham County Council – Altogether Better equality impact assessment form

NB: Equality impact assessment is a legal requirement for all strategies plans, functions, policies, procedures and services. We are also legally required to publish our assessments.

You can find help and prompts on completing the assessment in the guidance from page 7 onwards.

Section one: Description and initial screening

Section overview: this section provides an audit trail.

Service/team or section: Projects and Business services, Strategic Waste

Lead officer:

Head of Projects and Business Services

In attendance:

Policy and Planning Team Leader

Waste Strategy Team Manager

Start date:

Initial EqIA conducted 05-10- 2011

Reviewed 01-02-2012 (in the light of consultation results)

Reviewed 02-03-2012 (in the light of final report recommendations)

Subject of the Impact Assessment: (please also include a brief description of the aims, outcomes, operational issues as appropriate)

Background

This EqIA has been conducted over the proposal for 'Review of Access to and Provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres' across County Durham. This EqIA forms the 2nd review of an EqIA process that was initiated on 27th October 2011 in conjunction with a Cabinet report presented on this subject. The Cabinet report presented the results of a detailed review of the Council's current provision of 15 HWRCs. It included a site-by-site technical and strategic analysis where each current site was assessed against criteria including planning issues, licence and environmental issues, traffic issues, site layout, recycling performance, customer satisfaction, health and safety and asset condition in order to assess the viability of each site.

The initial review was also informed by provision thresholds provided by the National Assessment of Civic Amenity Sites which gives national standards for the 'drive-time' considered acceptable for access to an HWRC, together with the population that they should serve.

The assessment was used to inform the proposed closure of Broomsdene, Cragwood, Hett Hills, Stainton Grove, Thornley and Todhills sites as these sites attained the lowest scores.

In addition to consideration of potential site closure, the 27th October report also addresses the issue of permits for the use of trailers, vans, pick-ups and trucks, and proposes that these are reduced from 5 to 3 per month. It presents tightened criteria for the type of vehicles that are permitted to access the site with the aim of reducing deposited Trade / Commercial waste. It also presents revised Summer / Winter opening hours of Summer; 1st April until 15th October 9:00am until 6:00pm and Winter 9:00am until 3:30pm. These proposed policy changes do not disproportionately affect the protected equality groups.

Consultation

The proposals were subject to an extensive consultation exercise which ran from 28th October 2011 – 20th January 2012 which aimed to determine the impact the review of household waste recycling centres would have on service users and to consider, identify and target mitigating measures that could be put in place. The consultation also sought to engage service users in the development of the future mobile provision so that the information they provided could help shape this provision.

During the consultation exercise, information relating to the impact that the proposal would have on the protected equality groups was gathered, and this informed a further review of the impacts the proposed closures would have on the protected Equality groups. (EqIA review 01-02-2012)

EqIA Review 02-03-2012

The recommendations within the report to be presented to NSMT on 5th March 2012 have been revised to reflect community concerns and priorities identified during the consultation period and the findings of the EqIA conducted in the light of the consultation results.

The revised position for each affected HWRC site is as follows:

Hett Hills	Short Term: Remain open on reduced opening hours. Weekend and Bank Holidays only Long Term: Remain open on reduced opening hours. Weekend and Bank Holidays only.
Todhills	Short Term: Remain open on reduced opening hours as an interim measure. Weekend and Bank Holidays only Long Term: Seek capital to develop a new site in the Crook area in the future.
Stainton Grove	Short Term: Remain open on reduced opening hours. Weekend only and Bank Holidays only Long Term: Seek capital to develop a new site in the Stainton Grove Area
Craggswood	Close (Residents use Romanway or Stainton Grove)
Broomsdene	Close (Residents use Annfield Plain)
Thornley	Short Term: Remain open on reduced hours, while also reducing hours at Horden and Coxhoe. Subject to further consultation with affected residents. Long Term: Further review as part of the waste transfer station redevelopment.
Upper Weardale	Short Term: Mobile provision Long Term: Assess long term need if future development in Crook takes place.

Who are the main stakeholders: General public / Employees / Elected Members / Partners/ Specific audiences/Other (please specify) – County residents, AAP's, Elected Members, Town and Parish Councils, the Environment Agency, the voluntary sector and specific organisations eg Furniture Forums, the current operator (Premier waste), site staff

Is a copy of the subject attached? No

If not, where could it be viewed? Please contact Strategic Waste Manager

Initial screening

Impacts on Staff

Staff currently working on the HWRC sites are contracted to Premier Waste who provide this service on behalf of Durham County Council and an Equality and Diversity profile of these staff is not available. Potential closure of the 6 sites creates a risk for site staff that their contracts may not be continued, and Premier Waste would be expected to address this issue in accordance with UK employment law.

Impacts on Customers

Consultation in relation to this proposal included questions that enabled generation of an equalities profile of respondents, however it should be noted that this profile does not necessarily align with the actual profile of site users, and detailed customer profile information providing equalities profile information was not available as customers are not required to volunteer such information when visiting a site. The following information relates to general impacts that will be experienced by the protected strands across all sites, and a more specific site-by-site review is provided in the full assessment:

Gender

The consultation EqIA profile shows that some 64% of respondents were men and 36% are women. Therefore loss of sites and the consequent need to travel a greater distance by those living in proximity of a closed site, may have a disproportionate impact on male site users and this is given further consideration in the full assessment. Analysis of consultation also revealed that 61.5% of females valued having someone to help on site with off-loading difficult items and this compared to 31.3% of males.

Age

The consultation EqIA profile indicates that there are only a small percentage of site users in the younger age groups (18-34) and this percentage increases proportionately with age, peaking at age 55-64 which includes 28% of users, and dropping slightly to 23% for users at age 65+. However, it is considered this may reflect the increased opportunities older people may have to participate in consultation exercises and should not be used to infer an accurate age profile of customers. However, it should be noted that older people have generally reduced financial means and are therefore disproportionately affected by increased journey distances due to fuel costs; and that disaggregation of consultation results into age bands demonstrated that older age groups were most concerned about having to travel greater distances.

Disability

14% of survey respondents identified themselves as having a disability and this broadly aligns with the request to site staff for assistance by disabled people. In comparison, Office of National Statistics Data gained from the census 2001 informs that 20.1% of the residents of County Durham reported that they suffered from a long term limiting illness, however this figure does include a wider range of limiting conditions such as learning disabilities.

Given that all customers to HWRC sites need to arrive using personal transport, all current disabled site users would have access to personal transport. As assistance for unloading should be available on all sites, it is not considered that the increased journey distances incurred by possible site closures will disproportionately affect this group. However, a higher proportion of disabled people informed that they would put more rubbish out for collection, that they would recycle less, and that they would never use mobile provision as an alternative. In addition, significantly higher proportions of disabled people identified journey distance and the presence of helpful staff as very important issues. These responses clearly reflect the concerns that disabled people have over the accessibility of future fixed and mobile provision both in terms of distance and on-site provision for disabled people.

Discussion of the proposal at the Durham Disability Partnership meeting identified that though assistance should be available for disabled people at all sites, the level of assistance was patchy.

Religion / belief and sexual orientation

The numbers of consultation respondents fitting into these groups broadly relates to the census data provided by the Office of National Statistics. Current and proposed levels of service will ensure equal levels of access to people from these groups and the proposals create no disproportionate impacts.

Initial screening of the general impacts associated with this proposal identified potential impacts across the age, gender and disability equalities strands. The full assessment gives further consideration to potential impacts and proposes actions necessary to mitigate these impacts, together with a detailed assessment of the 6 individual HWRC sites affected by the proposal.

Prompts to help you:

Who is affected by it? Who is intended to benefit and how? Could there be a different impact or outcome for some groups? Is it likely to affect relations between different communities or groups, for example if it is thought to favour one particular group or deny opportunities for others? Is there any specific targeted action to promote equality?

Is there an actual/potential negative or positive impact on specific groups within these headings?											
Indicate :Y = Yes, N = No, ?=Unsure											
Gender	?	Disability	?	Age	?	Race/ethnicity	N	Religion or belief	N	Sexual orientation	N
<p>How will this support our commitment to promote equality and meet our legal responsibilities?</p> <p>Reminder of our legal duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eliminating unlawful discrimination & harassment ○ Promoting equality of opportunity ○ Promoting good relations between people from different groups ○ Promoting positive attitudes towards disabled people and taking account of someone's disability, even where that involves treating them more favourably than other people ○ Involving people, particularly disabled people, in public life and decision making <p>The impact assessment aims to ensure any decision takes account of legal equality duties. There are specific issues regarding age and disability which will be covered in the full assessment.</p> <p>There is potential for negative impact across age, gender and disability characteristics given the nature of the proposal, however availability of information on religion or belief and sexual orientation is more limited than other characteristics. Further evidence is included in section two which considers the impact on individual sites.</p>											
What evidence do you have to support your findings?											
<p>Neighbourhood profiles obtained from the Office of National Statistics (National data). Details of proportion of communities with long term limiting illness as an indication of disability levels Equality profile information of respondents to the consultation exercise DCC Officers knowledge of HWRC staff and customers</p>											
Decision: Proceed to full impact assessment – Yes						Date: 02nd March 2012					
If you have answered 'No' you need to pass the completed form for approval & sign off.											

Section two: Identifying impacts and evidence- Equality and Diversity

Section overview: this section identifies whether there are any impacts on equality/diversity/cohesion, what evidence is available to support the conclusion and what further action is needed.

EqlA of Issues General to all centres

Introduction

This section begins with consideration of general impacts common to all centres, identified during the initial screening and identifies mitigating actions.

	Identify the impact: does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	<p><u>Impact on Staff</u></p> <p>Staff currently working on the HWRC sites are contracted to Premier Waste who provide this service on behalf of Durham County Council and an Equality and Diversity profile of these staff is not available. However, Durham County Council officers who manage this contract and regularly visit the site have informed that the large majority are male and include all age groups. Proposed closures and service reductions at the 6 sites create a risk for site staff that they may be re-deployed or their contracts may not be continued.</p>	<p>Information describing this situation has derived from the current contractor Premier Waste, and officers' knowledge of site staffing.</p>	<p>Premier Waste is statutorily bound by UK labour law and will treat current sub-contractors in accordance with its provisions.</p> <p>No DCC action</p>

	<p><u>Impact on Customers</u></p> <p>Loss of sites and the consequent need to travel a greater distance by those living in proximity of a closed site will have a disproportionate affect on male site users however this is not considered a significant negative impact due to the proximity of alternative facilities.</p> <p>When asked how important various issues were, twice as many women (61.5% of survey respondents) identified the availability of help for unloading as very valuable.</p>	<p>The consultation EqIA profile shows that some 64% of respondents were men and 36% are women, and officer's observations of customers also support the finding that the majority of site users are male.</p>	<p>When entering into a new contract for the provision of HWRCs, the council will ensure that the new contractor undertakes the following on-site activities for both fixed site and in particular for mobile provision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that site staff offer assistance pro-actively when a customer would appear to need help. 2. Ensure signage is sufficiently prominent on all sites encouraging visitors to ask for assistance if required.
<p>Age</p>	<p><u>Impact on Staff</u></p> <p>Available information does not show that staff within specific age groups will be disproportionately affected by the proposals.</p>	<p>Officers' knowledge of site staff working under contract to Premier Waste.</p>	<p>No DCC action</p>

	<p><u>Impact on Customers</u></p> <p>All site closures will necessitate the need for travelling additional distances, however the maximum increased journey distance incurred by closure is 5 miles and this is not considered to represent a significant impact to customers.</p>	<p>When asked how important various HWRC issues were, 89.5% of users above 65 considered journey distance as the top priority. Indeed, this issue was considered the most important across all age groups, emphasising its relative importance to customers.</p>	<p>The Council will signpost affected users to alternative and mobile provision.</p> <p>The council will deploy mobile facilities to target communities most detrimentally affected by the closures in terms of the increased journey distances they have incurred. Frequency and opening hours of the provision will be informed by the frequencies and opening hours supported during consultation.</p> <p>The Council will publicise information on mobile provision describing frequency of opening, opening hours, facilities on site, provision for disabled and general availability of assistance.</p>
<p>Disability</p>	<p><u>Impact on Staff</u></p> <p>Available information does not show that disabled staff will be disproportionately affected by the proposals.</p>	<p>Officers' knowledge of site staff working under contract to Premier Waste.</p>	<p>No DCC action</p>

	<p><u>Impact on Customers</u></p> <p>Consultation information indicated that the proportion of HWRC users with a disability was largely the same as that which would be expected in the wider population, however a greater proportion of customers are within older age groups and so more likely to have a disability.</p> <p>The potential closure of sites should create no impact to disabled people other than the need to make longer journeys which proportionately affects all customers. However, a higher proportion of disabled people said they would never use mobile provision, and it is likely that this reflects their concern over the accessibility of this provision.</p> <p>Disabled people are currently able to request assistance from site staff for unloading, and should therefore face no on site barrier to the NWRC service however consultation with the Durham Disability partnership informed that provision was patchy and assistance was sometimes not offered.</p>	<p>Officer service knowledge and information yielded through consultation with the Durham Disability partnership.</p>	<p>When entering into a new contract for the provision of HWRCs, the council will ensure that the new contractor undertakes the following on-site activities for both fixed site and in particular for mobile provision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ensure that site staff offer assistance pro-actively when a customer would appear to need help. 4. Ensure signage is sufficiently prominent on all sites encouraging visitors to ask for assistance if required. <p>The Council will signpost affected users to alternative and mobile provision.</p> <p>The Council will publicise information on mobile provision describing frequency of opening, opening hours, facilities on site, provision for disabled and general availability of assistance.</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>Race/Ethnicity</p>	<p>HWRCs are equally accessible to all racial / ethnic groups.</p> <p>There is no evidence available of specific impact and no targeted provision in relation to ethnicity or race.</p>	<p>Usage figures were relatively low across centres.</p>	<p>See general actions above</p>
<p>Religion or belief</p>	<p>Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.</p> <p>There is no evidence available of specific impact and no targeted provision in relation to religion or belief.</p>	<p>Usage data on religion or belief is not routinely collected. Some community groups using leisure centres may be faith based.</p>	<p>See general actions above</p>
<p>Sexual Orientation</p>	<p>Centre activities are equally accessible regardless of sexual orientations.</p> <p>There is no evidence available of specific impact and no targeted provision in relation to sexual orientation.</p>	<p>Usage data on sexual orientation is not routinely collected.</p>	<p>See general actions above</p>

EqIA of Centre Specific Issues

Introduction

This section includes specific information on each HWRC site proposed for closure, in order to show particular impacts and mitigatory action related to the local community or provision.

Proposed operation of Hett Hills on reduced hours – EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Equalities Context

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 2001 inform that 27.1% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, there is a broadly even gender split, and 38% of the population are above the age of 50. The site therefore serves an immediate area with slightly higher levels of disability and an older population.

	Identify the impact : does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	None
Age	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to age.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.

Disability	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for disability given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Proposed operation of Todhills HWRC on reduced hours – EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 2001 inform that 22.4% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, there is a broadly even gender split, and 35% of the population are above the age of 50.

	Identify the impact : does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The consultation response was disaggregated in accordance with the gender of respondents and this did not identify any gender specific impact.	None

Age	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to age.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See also general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.
Disability	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Proposed Closure of Brooms Dene – EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Equalities Context

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 2001 inform that 20.9% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, that 52% of people in the local area are female and 48% male, and 37% of the population are above the age of 50. The site therefore serves a local population with a slightly higher proportions of females and people in older age groups.

	Identify the impact : does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The consultation response was disaggregated in accordance with the gender of respondents and this did not identify any gender specific impact.	None
Age	The largest user group for this site, identified through consultation, was the 45-54 age band. This demographic are more likely to have access to personal transport and therefore the proposed closure is not considered to disproportionately affect this equalities group.	44% of survey responses came from site users over the age of 55 indicating a high level of use by older age groups, but comparatively lower use than other sites.	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.
Disability	A greater proportion of disabled users from Brooms Dene responded to the consultation and this indicates the significance of this site to disabled users.	15% of those responding to the consultation from the Brooms Dene area considered themselves to have a disability and this is higher than average proportion responding across all sites (13%).	See general mitigation measures for disability given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	

Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Proposed operation of Stainton Grove HWRC on reduced opening hours – EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Equalities Context

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 2001 inform that 18.2% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, there is a broadly even gender split, and 43% of the population are above the age of 50. The site therefore serves a catchment with an ageing population.

	Identify the impact : does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The consultation response was disaggregated in accordance with the gender of respondents and this did not identify any gender specific impact.	None
Age	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.

Disability	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for disability given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Proposed Closure of Cragwood HWRC – EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Equalities Context

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 200 inform that 24.9% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, there is a broadly even gender split, and 47% of the population are above the age of 50. The site therefore serves a catchment with an ageing population, and of all HWRCs proposed for closure this site has a greater proportion of older people living within proximity.

	Identify the impact : does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The consultation response was disaggregated in accordance with the gender of respondents and this did not identify any gender specific impact.	None

Age	The relatively strong response to the consultation from older user groups, with regards this site, indicates higher levels of concern over its closure. However, given that the closure will create a maximum increased journey distance of 5 miles, the impact is not considered significant.	48% of survey responses came from site users over the age of 55 indicating a high levels of concern over closure from this group.	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.
Disability	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	11% of those responding to the consultation from the Cragwood area considered themselves to have a disability and this is significantly lower the average proportion of disabled respondents across all sites (13%).	See general mitigation measures for disability given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Proposed operation of Thornley Station HWRC on reduced opening hours– EIA of impacts to Customers / Stakeholders

Thornley HWRC shares the site of the Waste Transfer Station. This facility is due to be substantially re-developed in 2014/15 as part of the Council's overall waste solution. The nearest sites are Horden (five miles) and Coxhoe (six miles). As an alternative to closure it is proposed that the demand and site availability be balanced between the three HWRC sites in the area. To achieve this each of the three sites of Horden, Coxhoe and Thornley would continue to operate but on shortened hours. This EqlA will be reviewed following completion of the focussed consultation exercise to fully consider the impacts associated with operation of Coxhoe and Horden on reduced hours.

Equalities Context

Local (ward level) statistics available from the Office of National Statistics, and gained through the Census 2001 inform that 27.1% of residents local to this site report themselves as having a long term limiting illness and this compares to 24% across Durham, there is a broadly even gender split, and 38% of the population are above the age of 50.

	Identify the impact: does this increase differences or does it aim to reduce gaps for particular groups?	Explain your conclusion, including relevant evidence and consultation you have considered.	What further action is required? (Include in Sect. 3 action plan)
Gender	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to gender.	The consultation response was disaggregated in accordance with the gender of respondents and this did not identify any gender specific impact.	None
Age	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for age given on pages 11 and 12.

Disability	There are no centre specific impacts identified in relation to disability.	The site is no longer recommended for closure	See general mitigation measures for disability given on pages 11 and 12.
Race/Ethnicity	Centre activities are equally accessible to all race / ethnic groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Religion or belief	Centre activities are equally accessible to all religion / belief groups.	Officers service knowledge	
Sexual Orientation	Centre activities are equally accessible to all sexual orientations.	Officers service knowledge	

Further Proposals

It is now proposed to reduce the hours of the HWRC sites at **Coxhoe** and **Horden**. This EqlA will be reviewed after a further consultation exercise is undertaken to identify any equality and diversity issues associated with the proposed reduction in hours.

How will this promote positive relationships between different communities?

NA

Section three: Review and Conclusion

Summary: please provide a brief overview, including impact, changes, improvements and any gaps in evidence.

This EqlA has been conducted over the proposal for 'Review of Access to and Provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres' across County Durham. The proposal was first reported to Cabinet on 27th October 2012 where 6 sites were identified for possible closure following a detailed technical and strategic analysis. This proposal was informed by consideration of the level of service provided by other Councils as well as national guidance on standards of provision – all of which demonstrated over provision. In addition to consideration of potential site closure, the 27th October report also addresses the issue of permits for the use of trailers, and proposes that these are reduced from 5 to 3 per month. It presents tightened criteria for the type of vehicles that are allowed to access the site with the aim of reducing deposited Trade / Commercial waste. It also presents revised Summer / Winter opening hours of Summer; 1st April until 15th October 9:00am until 6:00pm and Winter 9:00am until 3:30pm.

The proposals were then subject to an extensive consultation exercise which ran from 28th October 2011 – 20th January 2012 which aimed to determine the impact the review of household waste recycling centres would have on service users to inform mitigation measures and possible changes to the proposals. During the consultation exercise, information relating to the impact that the proposal would have on the protected equality groups was gathered.

The initial proposal for closure of 6 HWRCs has been revised in accordance with the information gathered through public consultation to form the revised proposals that have formed the subject of assessment in this EqlA.

Impact on staff

The proposals have no impact on employees of Durham County Council as staffing is organised by the Council's contracted provider Premier Waste. Possible site closure may result in redeployment of existing site staff or non-renewal of their contracts and this will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of UK employment legislation.

Impact on customers

The Equality Impact Assessment identified Age and Disability as primary areas of focus, identifying no disproportionate impacts in relation to Gender, Religion / Belief, Race / Ethnicity and Sexual Orientation. The assessment did not identify any disproportionate impact associated with the proposals on disability groups, however consultation responses revealed a greater level of concern from disabled and older site users regarding potential increased journey distances and various measures have been identified to support users with increased journey distances. A range of actions have been identified to address the concerns of disabled and older customers and these are presented below.

Site specific action for Cragwood			
Officers should give consideration to deployment of a mobile facility.	Head of Projects and Business Services	April 2013	Neighbourhoods equalities monitoring
When will this assessment be reviewed?	Date: April 2013		
Are there any additional assessments that need to be undertaken in relation to this assessment?	31 May 2012 (after a further consultation exercise)		
Lead officer - sign off: Head of Projects and Business Services			Date: 13 March 2012
Service equality representative - sign off: Policy Performance and Communications Manager			Date: 13 March 2012

Please ask us if you would like this document summarised in another language or format.

العربية (Arabic) (中文 (繁體字)) (Cantonese) اردو (Urdu)
 polski (Polish) ਪੰਜਾਬੀ (Punjabi) Español (Spanish)
 বাংলা (Bengali) हिन्दी (Hindi) Deutsch (German)
 Français (French) Türkçe (Turkish) Melayu (Malay)

ns.planningandpolicy@durham.gov.uk
 Tel: 0191 370 8951



Braille



Audio



Large Print