

Equality & Health Impact Assessment (EqHIA)

Document control

Title of activity:	Review of pesticides used by Havering Council
Lead officer:	<i>Jacki Ager, Waste and External Contracts Manager Public Realm, Neighbourhoods.</i>
Approved by:	<i>Nicolina Cooper, Assistant Director, Neighbourhoods</i>
Date completed:	<i>10/02/2022</i>
Scheduled date for review:	<i>01/02/2023</i>

Please note that the Corporate Policy & Diversity and Public Health teams require at least **5 working days** to provide advice on EqHIAs.

Did you seek advice from the Corporate Policy & Diversity team?	Yes
Did you seek advice from the Public Health team?	Yes
Does the EqHIA contain any confidential or exempt information that would prevent you publishing it on the Council's website?	No

Please note that EqHIAs are **public** documents and must be made available on the Council's [EqHIA webpage](#).

Please submit the completed form via e-mail to EqHIA@haverling.gov.uk thank you.

1. Equality & Health Impact Assessment Checklist

Please complete the following checklist to determine whether or not you will need to complete an EqHIA and ensure you keep this section for your audit trail. If you have any questions, please contact EqHIA@havering.gov.uk for advice from either the Corporate Diversity or Public Health teams. Please refer to the Guidance in Appendix 1 on how to complete this form.

About your activity

1	Title of activity	Review of alternatives to pesticide use to control weed growth on the public highway		
2	Type of activity	<i>Review of current services</i>		
3	Scope of activity	To review the impact of existing weed control measures in Havering and compare the impact of alternative methods. The recommendation is to continue to use the current methods of weed control whilst reviewing options to reduce the use of herbicides where practicable to do so.		
4a	Are you changing, introducing a new, or removing a service, policy, strategy or function?	No	If the answer to <u>any</u> of these questions is 'YES', please continue to question 5.	If the answer to <u>all</u> of the questions (4a, 4b & 4c) is 'NO', please go to question 6.
4b	Does this activity have the potential to impact (either positively or negatively) upon people (9 protected characteristics)?	Yes		
4c	Does the activity have the potential to impact (either positively or negatively) upon any factors which determine people's health and wellbeing?	Yes		
5	If you answered YES:	Please complete the EqHIA in Section 2 of this document. Please see Appendix 1 for Guidance.		
6	If you answered NO:	<i>Please provide a clear and robust explanation on why your activity does not require an EqHIA. This is essential in case the activity is challenged under the Equality Act 2010.</i> <i>Please keep this checklist for your audit trail.</i>		

Completed by:	<i>Jacki Ager, Waste and External Contracts Manager, Public Realm, Neighbourhoods</i>
Date:	<i>10/02/2022</i>

2. The EqHIA – How will the strategy, policy, plan, procedure and/or service impact on people?

Background/context:

Havering Council currently uses herbicides to control weed growth on highways, council land, parks and open spaces. This allows the Borough to conform to both the Weeds Act (1959) and the Countryside Act (1981). Herbicides provide the most effective treatment for controlling weeds, however an integrated approach to weed control helps to limit their usage. Weeds are required to be controlled for a number of reasons, including aesthetic (they detract from the overall appearance of an area and trap litter) and structural (weed growth can destroy paving surfaces, force apart kerbs and crack walls, therefore increasing maintenance costs).

There have been conflicting reports on the health effects of Glyphosate. Some other studies have suggested that the chemical may have carcinogenic properties, and Glyphosate, as well as other herbicides and pesticides has been linked to other conditions such as asthma. However, in the case of Glyphosate the general binding theme in these studies is long term / high intensity exposure through agricultural use. Use in Havering is sporadic and targeted, thus exposure of both workers and members of the public to Glyphosate is minimal and low risk.

Many international bodies, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the European Food Safety Agency, report that Glyphosate is unlikely to cause cancer in humans, and in 2018 the EU renewed its license for 5 years following a review conducted by a scientific expert committee. The chemical is kept under regular review and the EU recommends minimising its use in public spaces such as parks, public playgrounds and gardens. Following the Motion to Council, LBH sought advice from Public Health England (PHE) who confirmed their advice to the public is also in line with EU protocols: “PHE acknowledges the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) recent declaration that glyphosate should not be classified as a carcinogen. The European Commission has subsequently renewed the licence for the use of glyphosate as an active ingredient. The public should continue to use weed killers containing glyphosate in accordance to manufacturers’ instructions.” Further advice in the UK is provided on the Health and Safety Executive website (<https://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/using-pesticides/general/glyphosate-faqs.htm> and <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides>). Glyphosate, it should be noted, is unlikely to enter ground water as it binds tightly with soil. Bacteria in the soil cause the Glyphosate to break down, and the average half-life of this is 47 days.

The risks associated with the use of pesticides in amenity areas such as parks are specifically considered as part of the authorisation process. Legally enforceable conditions of use are imposed on the way products can be applied, to ensure the public are not exposed to levels of pesticides that would harm health or have unacceptable effects on the environment. It is important that users (or those who cause or permit others to use pesticides) not only comply with the authorised conditions of use but also use products in a responsible and sustainable fashion. The responsible use of pesticides in amenity areas as part of an integrated programme of control can help deliver substantial benefits for society. These include: management of conservation areas, invasive species and flood risks; access to high quality sporting facilities; and safe public spaces (for example, by preventing weed growth on hard surfaces creating trip hazards), industrial sites and transport infrastructure.

Some local authorities have adopted the “precautionary principal”, and are investigating going herbicide-free, or reducing usage in particular land types. However, many of these boroughs are focusing primarily on parks and open spaces in the first instance, due to the practicalities, cost and risks associated with reducing their use on the public highway at present. Where alternative methods have been adopted on

the public highway, for example hot foam treatments, they have been considered less effective at eradicating weed growth and preventing regrowth.

Havering Council recently put its weed control service out to tender, and received only one quotation. This was for the continued targeted spraying of herbicides, containing the active ingredient glyphosate, on the public highway. This assessment acts to highlight the risks and mitigations required to safely continue with this method of weed control.

**Expand box as required*

Who will be affected by the activity?

Use of herbicides may have negative effects on those members of the community most vulnerable to airborne substances – in particular young children and elderly citizens. Havering permits targeted use of a clean label Glyphosate-based product. Limiting its use to targeted spots (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) greatly reduces any potential for contact.

A less effective treatment, or increased time period in-between treatments associated with non-pesticide alternatives would likely lead to higher rates of re-growth. This may cause structural issues such as an increase in cracked pavements, which would potentially have an adverse effect on all pavement users, but particularly those members of the community with mobility issues.

**Expand box as required*

Protected Characteristic - Age: Consider the full range of age groups

Please tick (✓)
the relevant box:

Positive

Neutral

Negative

Overall impact:

Occupational exposure to herbicides and pesticides is linked with higher rates of lung disease (University of Melbourne 2017). Whilst it may be argued that use of herbicides could impact upon those members of the community most vulnerable to airborne substances – in particular young children and elderly citizens, the sporadic and targeted (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) nature of the applications associated with non-agricultural use reduces this contact risk significantly.

Havering mitigates the potential for contact by allowing for targeted use of a clean label Glyphosate-based product which is concentrated at 480g glyphosate per litre, for use in public spaces as it has been classified as non-hazardous by COSHH and is approved for use in aquatic areas.

Limiting applications to targeted spots (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) greatly reduces any potential for contact, as does spraying at less busy times of day, when the teams are less likely to encounter pedestrians. Spraying is also not carried out in windy weather, where there is a greater potential for drift. Drift is further reduced through the use of low drift nozzles (air inclusion), which can reduce drift by up to 75% relative to a flat fan nozzle. Treatment applications are carried out on foot from footpaths and are scheduled so that areas of high footfall are carried out at times when it is least busy. This will also apply when carrying out treatments near to schools, to ensure that spraying is not carried out at peak school times (arriving and leaving).

		Havering Council provides an integrated approach to weed control, operating both a spray, and manual removal where appropriate through sweeping and hand pulling of weeds in addition to target herbicide applications. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Evidence: Studies point to more industrial sized applications rather than knapsack application occupational exposure being the main cause of higher concentrations of glyphosate in the body. <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-018-0435-5 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12940-018-0435-5 <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Disability: Consider the full range of disabilities; including physical mental, sensory and progressive conditions		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Occupational exposure to herbicides and pesticides is linked with higher rates of lung disease (University of Melbourne, 2017). Whilst it may be argued that use of herbicides could impact upon those members of the community most vulnerable to airborne substances, the sporadic and targeted nature of the applications associated with non-agricultural use reduces this contact risk significantly. In terms of disabilities, most susceptible to airborne substances may include those with lung conditions such as asthma, emphysema and cancer.
Positive		Havering mitigates the potential for contact by allowing for targeted use of a clean label Glyphosate-based product which is concentrated at 480g glyphosate per litre, for use in public spaces as it has been classified as non-hazardous by COSHH and is approved for use in aquatic areas. Limiting applications to targeted spots (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) greatly reduces any potential for contact, as does spraying at less busy times of day, when the teams are less likely to encounter pedestrians. Spraying is also not carried out in windy weather, where there is a greater potential for drift. Drift is further reduced through the use of low drift nozzles (air inclusion), which can reduce drift by up to 75% relative to a flat fan nozzle. Treatment applications are carried out on foot from footpaths and are scheduled so that areas of high footfall are carried out at times when it is least busy. The use of alternative methods such as hot foam may cause obstructions to the highway, whilst the strong smell associated with acetic acid may temporarily impact upon the comfort of those in the near vicinity of the treatment. Other treatments such as flame guns would pose too high a safety risk. Strimming would be considered a less impactful activity in terms of the low risk to health, however it may release airborne particles that may affect those particularly vulnerable to chest complaints, and it is a noisy activity and may cause a mess on the highway prior to the material being swept up. Strimming is also less effective at preventing re-
Neutral	✓	
Negative		

		growth, meaning an increased likelihood of trip hazards developing over time. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Evidence: Studies point to more industrial sized applications rather than knapsack application occupational exposure being the main cause of higher concentrations of glyphosate in the body. <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-018-0435-5 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12940-018-0435-5 <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Sex/gender: Consider both men and women		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Ethnicity/race: Consider the impact on different ethnic groups and nationalities		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Religion/faith: Consider people from different religions or beliefs including those with no religion or belief		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Sexual orientation: Consider people who are heterosexual, lesbian, gay or bisexual		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		

Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>

Protected Characteristic - Gender reassignment: Consider people who are seeking, undergoing or have received gender reassignment surgery, as well as people whose gender identity is different from their gender at birth		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Protected Characteristic - Marriage/civil partnership: Consider people in a marriage or civil partnership		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: None identified <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Sources used:
N/A
<i>*Expand box as required</i>

Protected Characteristic - Pregnancy, maternity and paternity: Consider those who are pregnant and those who are undertaking maternity or paternity leave		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Glyphosate exposure during pregnancy was found to correlate with shortened gestational length, however this was based on a small sample size of women in rural Indiana, with exposure through ingestion of food crops (S. Parvez, R. R. Gerona, C. Proctor, M. Friesen, J. L. Ashby, J. L. Reiter, Z. Lui, P. D. Winchester. Glyphosate exposure in pregnancy and shortened gestational length: a prospective Indiana birth cohort study. Environmental Health, 2018). Further studies are therefore needed to determine risks in suburban locations where targeted spraying of weed growth on hard surfaces is carried out. Where weeds grow through soil, Glyphosate is unlikely to enter ground water as it binds tightly with soil. Bacteria in the soil cause the Glyphosate to break down after a period. Additionally, the trained spray operatives are instructed not to over spray drains. Studies are linked to exposure however exposure in Public Realm situations is limited by mitigating exposure and spraying methods used. Havering mitigates the potential for contact by allowing for targeted use of a clean label Glyphosate-based product which is concentrated at 480g glyphosate per litre, for use in public spaces as it has been classified as non-hazardous by COSHH and is approved for use in aquatic areas. Limiting applications to targeted spots (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) greatly reduces any potential for contact, as does spraying at less busy times of day, when the teams are less likely to encounter pedestrians. Spraying is also not carried out in windy weather, where there is a greater potential for drift. Drift is further reduced through the use of low drift nozzles (air inclusion), which can reduce drift by up to 75% relative to a flat fan nozzle. Treatment applications are carried out on foot from footpaths and are scheduled so that areas of high footfall are carried out at times when it is least busy. This will also apply when carrying out treatments near to schools, to ensure that spraying is not carried out at peak school times (arriving and leaving). Havering Council provides an integrated approach to weed control, operating both a spray, and manual removal where appropriate through sweeping and hand pulling of weeds in addition to target herbicide applications. It should be noted that a less effective treatment, or increased time period in-between treatments associated with non-pesticide alternatives would likely lead to higher rates of re-growth. This may cause structural issues such as an increase in cracked pavements, which would potentially have an adverse effect on all pavement users, but particularly those members of the community with mobility issues.
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		

*Expand box as required

Evidence: Glyphosate exposure during pregnancy was found to correlate with shortened gestational length, however this was based on a small sample size of women in rural Indiana, with exposure through ingestion of food crops (S. Parvez, R. R. Gerona, C. Proctor, M. Friesen, J. L. Ashby, J. L. Reiter, Z. Lui, P. D. Winchester. Glyphosate exposure in pregnancy and shortened gestational length: a prospective Indiana birth cohort study. <i>Environmental Health</i>, 2018). <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Sources used: S. Parvez, R. R. Gerona, C. Proctor, M. Friesen, J. L. Ashby, J. L. Reiter, Z. Lui, P. D. Winchester. Glyphosate exposure in pregnancy and shortened gestational length: a prospective Indiana birth cohort study. <i>Environmental Health</i>, 2018. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29519238/ Urinary glyphosate concentration in pregnant women in relation to length of gestation - ScienceDirect <i>*Expand box as required</i>

Socio-economic status: Consider those who are from low income or financially excluded backgrounds		
Please tick (✓) the relevant box:		Overall impact: Unless a person is considered to have more vulnerable protected characteristics, contact with airborne substances is unlikely to impact upon this group. The use of alternative methods to glyphosate that are generally deemed to have a lower efficacy at weed eradication (hot foam, acetic acid, strimming) would present a risk of faster and stronger regrowth, contributing to potential negative perceptions. <i>*Expand box as required</i>
Positive		
Neutral	✓	
Negative		
Evidence: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		
Sources used: N/A <i>*Expand box as required</i>		

Health & Wellbeing Impact: Consider both short and long-term impacts of the activity on a person's physical and mental health, particularly for disadvantaged, vulnerable or at-risk groups. Can health and wellbeing be positively promoted through this activity? Please use the Health and Wellbeing Impact Tool in Appendix 2 to help you answer this question.		
Please tick (✓) all the relevant boxes that apply:		Overall impact: Occupational exposure to herbicides and pesticides is linked with higher rates of lung disease (University of Melbourne, 2017). Whilst it may be argued that use of herbicides could impact upon those members of the community most vulnerable to airborne substances, the sporadic and targeted nature of the applications associated with non-agricultural use, under which weed control in Havering falls, reduces this
Positive		
Neutral	✓	

Negative	contact risk significantly. Application in non-agricultural areas also reduces risk because plants are not grown for consumption. Discussion is underway regarding edible planting/ greening as part of new developments in Havering and will be taken into account as appropriate in future reviews. In terms of disabilities, those people most susceptible to airborne substances may include those with lung conditions such as asthma, emphysema and cancer. Havering mitigates the potential for contact by allowing for targeted use of a clean label Glyphosate-based product which is concentrated at 480g glyphosate per litre, the optimised blend of surfactants which can be used in confidence in public spaces as it has been classified as non-hazardous by COSHH and is approved for use in aquatic areas. Limiting applications to targeted spots (i.e. only where weed growth is visible) greatly reduces any potential for contact, as does spraying at less busy times of day, when the teams are less likely to encounter pedestrians. Spraying is also not carried out in windy weather, where there is a greater potential for drift. Drift is further reduced through the use of low drift nozzles (air inclusion), which can reduce drift by up to 75% relative to a flat fan nozzle. Treatment applications are carried out on foot from footpaths and are scheduled so that areas of high footfall are carried out at times when it is least busy. This will also apply when carrying out treatments near to schools, to ensure that spraying is not carried out at peak school times (arriving and leaving). Havering Council provides an integrated approach to weed control, operating both a spray, and manual removal where appropriate through sweeping and hand pulling of weeds in addition to target herbicide applications. Targeted use of a clean label product will help to prevent vegetative highway obstructions. The use of alternative methods such as hot foam may cause obstructions to the highway, whilst the strong smell associated with acetic acid may temporarily impact upon the comfort of those in the near vicinity of the treatment. Other treatments such as flame guns would pose too high a safety risk, and require footway closures. Strimming would be considered a less impactful activity in terms of the low risk to health, however it may release airborne particles that may affect those particularly vulnerable to chest complaints, and it is a noisy activity and may cause a mess on the highway prior to the material being swept up. Strimming is also less effective at preventing re-growth, meaning an increased likelihood of trip hazards developing over time. Disabled people or parents of disabled children may benefit more from open/accessible entrances and even and unobstructed paths. Uneven or inaccessible pathways are a particular barrier to wheelchair users or people with physical and sensory impairments and their guardians/parents/carers. General perceptions of crime and safety can be improved with a clean, tidy environment. The killing of weeds in a way that slows down regrowth aids this and helps to prevent highway obstructions, making the footway safer for users. <i>*Expand box as required</i> Do you consider that a more in-depth HIA is required as a result of this brief assessment? Please tick (✓) the relevant box Yes ☐ No ☒
------------------------	---

Evidence:

N/A

**Expand box as required*

Sources used:

N/A

**Expand box as required*

3. Outcome of the Assessment

The EqHIA assessment is intended to be used as an improvement tool to make sure the activity maximises the positive impacts and eliminates or minimises the negative impacts. The possible outcomes of the assessment are listed below and what the next steps to take are:

Please tick (✓) what the overall outcome of your assessment was:

✓	1. The EqHIA identified <u>no significant concerns</u> OR the identified <u>negative concerns</u> have already been <u>addressed</u>		Proceed with implementation of your activity
	2. The EqHIA identified some <u>negative impact</u> which still needs <u>to be addressed</u>		COMPLETE SECTION 4: Complete action plan and finalise the EqHIA
	3. The EqHIA identified some <u>major concerns</u> and showed that it is <u>impossible to diminish negative impacts</u> from the activity to an acceptable or even lawful level		Stop and remove the activity or revise the activity thoroughly . Complete an EqHIA on the revised proposal.

4. Action Plan

The real value of completing an EqHIA comes from the identifying the actions that can be taken to eliminate/minimise negative impacts and enhance/optimize positive impacts. In this section you should list the specific actions that set out how you will address any negative equality and health & wellbeing impacts you have identified in this assessment. Please ensure that your action plan is: more than just a list of proposals and good intentions; sets ambitious yet achievable outcomes and timescales; and is clear about resource implications.

Protected characteristic / health & wellbeing impact	Identified Negative or Positive impact	Recommended actions to mitigate Negative impact* or further promote Positive impact	Outcomes and monitoring**	Timescale	Lead officer

Add further rows as necessary

* You should include details of any future consultations and any actions to be undertaken to mitigate negative impacts

** Monitoring: You should state how the impact (positive or negative) will be monitored; what outcome measures will be used; the known (or likely) data source for outcome measurements; how regularly it will be monitored; and who will be monitoring it (if this is different from the lead officer).

5. Review

In this section you should identify how frequently the EqHIA will be reviewed; the date for next review; and who will be reviewing it.

Review:

Annually

Scheduled date of review: 1st February 2023

Lead Officer conducting the review: Jacki Ager

**Expand box as required*

Please submit the completed form via e-mail to EqHIA@havering.gov.uk thank you.

Appendix 1. Guidance on Undertaking an EqHIA

This Guidance can be deleted prior to publication.

What is it?

The Equality & Health Impact Assessment (EqHIA) is a tool to ensure that your activity meets the needs of individuals and groups that use your service, whilst at the same time ensuring a person's chance of leading a healthy life is the same wherever they live and whoever they are. We want to ensure that the activities of the Council are 'fit for purpose' and meet the needs of Havering's increasingly diverse communities and employees. This robust and systematic EqHIA process ensures that any potential detrimental effects or discrimination is identified, removed, or mitigated and positive impacts are enhanced.

When to Assess:

An EqHIA should be carried out when you are changing, removing or introducing a new service, policy, strategy or function; for simplicity, these are referred to as an "activity" throughout this document. It is best to conduct the assessment as early as possible in the decision-making process.

Guidance: Equality & Health Impact Assessment Checklist

The Checklist in Section 1 asks the key questions,

4a) Are you changing, introducing a new, or removing a service, policy, strategy or function?

4b) Does this activity (policy/strategy/service/decision) have the potential to impact (either positively or negatively) upon people (9 protected characteristics)?

4c) Does this activity (policy/strategy/service/decision) have the potential to impact (either positively or negatively) upon any factors which determine people's health and wellbeing?

- If the answer to ANY of the questions 4a, 4b or 4c of the Checklist is 'YES' then you must carry out an assessment. e.g. Proposed changes to Contact Centre Opening Hours
'YES' = you need to carry out an EqHIA
- If the answer to ALL of the questions, 4a or 4b of the Checklist is NO, then you do not need to carry out an EqHIA assessment. e.g. Quarterly Performance Report
'NO' = you DO NOT need to carry out an EqHIA. Please provide a clear explanation as to why you consider an EqHIA is not required for your activity.

Using the Checklist

The assessment should take into account all the potential impacts of the proposed activity, be it a major financial decision, or a seemingly simple policy change. Considering and completing this EqHIA will ensure that all Council plans, strategies, policies, procedures, services or other activity comply with relevant statutory obligations and responsibilities. In particular it helps the Council to meet its legal obligation under the [Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty](#) and its public health duties under the [Health and Social Care Act 2012](#).

Having Due Regard

To have due regard means that in making decisions and in its other day-to-day activities, the Council must consciously consider the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between different groups
- Foster good relations between different groups
- Reduce inequalities in health outcomes

Combining Equality and Health Impact Assessment:

[Equality Impact Assessments \(EIAs\)](#) provide a systematic way of ensuring that legal obligations are met. They assess whether a proposed policy, procedure, service change or plan will affect people different on the basis of their 'protected characteristics' and if it will affect their human rights. Currently there are **nine protected characteristics** (previously known as 'equality groups' or 'equality strands'): age, disability, sex/gender, ethnicity/race, religion/faith, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, and pregnancy/ maternity/paternity.

An activity does not need to impact on all 9 protected characteristics – impacting on just one is sufficient justification to complete an EqHIA.

[Health Impact Assessments \(HIAs\)](#) consider the potential impact of any change or amendment to a policy, service, plan, procedure or programme on the health and wellbeing of the population. HIAs help identify how people may be affected differently on the basis of where they live and potential impacts on health inequalities and health equity by assessing the distribution of potential effects within the population, particularly within vulnerable groups. 'Health' is not restricted to medical conditions, or the provision of health services, but rather encompasses the wide range of influences on people's health and wellbeing. This includes, but is not limited to, experience of discrimination, access to transport, housing, education, employment - known as the 'wider determinants of health'.

This [Equality and Health Impact Assessment \(EqHIA\)](#) brings together both impact assessments into a single tool which will result in a set of recommendations to eliminate discrimination and inequality; enhance potential positive impacts and mitigate where possible for negative impacts. In conducting this EqHIA you will need to assess the impact (positive, neutral or negative) of your activity on individuals and groups with **protected characteristics** (this includes staff delivering your activity), **socio-economic status** and **health & wellbeing**. Guidance on what to include in each section is given on the next pages.

Guidance: What to include in background/context

In this section you will need to add the background/context of your activity, i.e. what is the activity intending to do, and why?

Make sure you include the scope and intended outcomes of the activity being assessed; and highlight any proposed changes. Please include a brief rationale for your activity and any supporting evidence for the proposal. Some questions to consider:

- What is the aim, objectives and intended outcomes?
- How does this activity meet the needs of the local population?
- Has this activity been implemented in another area? What were the outcomes?
- Is this activity being implemented as per best practice guidelines?
- Who were the key stakeholders in this activity?

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Guidance: Who will be affected by the activity?

The people who will be affected may be

Residents: pay particular attention to vulnerable groups in the population who may be affected by this activity

Businesses/ manufacturing / developers / small, medium or large enterprises

Employees: e.g. Council staff for an internal activity, other statutory or voluntary sector employees, local businesses and services

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Guidance: What to include in assessing a Protected Characteristic e.g. AGE

Please tick (✓) the relevant box:

Positive

Neutral

Negative

Overall impact: In this section you will need to consider and note what impact your activity will have on individuals and groups (including staff) with protected characteristics based on the data and information you have. You should note whether this is a positive, neutral or negative impact.

It is essential that you note all negative impacts. This will demonstrate that you have paid 'due regard' to the Public Sector Equality Duty if your activity is challenged under the Equality Act.

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Evidence: In this section you will need to document the evidence that you have used to assess the impact of your activity.

When assessing the impact, please consider and note how your activity contributes to the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as stated in the section above.

It is essential that you note the full impact of your activity, so you can demonstrate that you have fully considered the equality implications and have paid 'due regard' to the PSED should the Council be challenged.

- If you have identified a **positive impact**, please note this.
- If you think there is a **neutral impact** or the impact is not known, please provide a full reason why this is the case.
- If you have identified a **negative impact**, please note what steps you will take to mitigate this impact. If you are unable to take any mitigating steps, please provide a full reason why. All negative impacts that have mitigating actions must be recorded in the **Action Plan**.
- **Please ensure that appropriate consultation with affected parties has been undertaken and evidenced**

Sources used: In this section you should list all sources of the evidence you used to assess the impact of your activity. This can include:

- Service specific data
- Population, demographic and socio-economic data. Suggested sources include:
 - o Service user monitoring data that your service collects
 - o [Havering Data Intelligence Hub](#)
 - o [Office for National Statistics \(ONS\)](#)

If you do not have any relevant data, please provide the reason why.

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Guidance: What to include in assessing Health & Wellbeing Impact:

Please tick (✓) all the relevant boxes that apply:

Positive

Neutral

Negative

Overall impact: In this section you will need to consider and note whether the proposal could have an overall impact on, or implications for, people's health and wellbeing or any factors which determine people's health.

How will the activity help address inequalities in health?

Include here a brief outline of what could be done to enhance the positive impacts and, where possible, mitigate for the negative impacts.

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Do you consider that a more in-depth HIA is required as a result of this brief assessment? Please tick (✓) the relevant box

Yes ☐ No ☐

Evidence: In this section you will need to outline in more detail how you came to your conclusions above:

- What is the nature of the impact?
- Is the impact **positive** or **negative**? It is possible for an activity to have **both positive and negative impacts**. Consider here whether people will be able to access the service being offered; improve or maintain healthy lifestyles; improve their opportunities for employment/income; whether and how it will affect the environment in which they live (housing, access to parks & green space); what the impact on the family, social support and community networks might be
- What can be done to mitigate the negative impacts and/or enhance the positive impacts?
- If you think there is a **neutral impact**, or the impact is not known, please provide a brief reason why this is the case.
- What is the likelihood of the impact? Will the impact(s) be in weeks, months or years? In some cases the short-term risks to health may be worth the longer term benefits.
- Will the proposal affect different groups of people in different ways? A proposal that is likely to benefit one section of the community may not benefit others and could lead to inequalities in health.

Please use the Health & Wellbeing Impact Tool in Appendix 2 as a guide/checklist to assess the potential wider determinants of health impacts.

This tool will help guide your thinking as to what factors affect people's health and wellbeing, such as social support, their housing conditions, access to transport, employment, education, crime and disorder and environmental factors. It is not an exhaustive list, merely a tool to guide your assessment; there may be other factors specific to your activity.

Some questions you may wish to ask include:

- Will the activity impact on people's ability to socialise, potentially leading to social isolation?
- Will the activity affect a person's income and/or have an effect on their housing status?
- Is the activity likely to cause the recipient of a service more or less stress?
- Will any change in the service take into account different needs, such as those with learning difficulties?
- Will the activity affect the health and wellbeing of persons not directly related to the service/activity, such as carers, family members, other residents living nearby?
- If there is a short-term negative effect, what will be done to minimise the impact as much as possible?

- Are the longer-term impacts positive or negative? What will be done to either promote the positive effects or minimise the negative effects?
- Do the longer term positive outcomes outweigh the short term impacts?

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Sources used: In this section you should list all sources of the evidence you used to assess the impact of your activity. This could include, e.g.:

Information on the population affected

- Routinely collected local statistics (e.g. quality of life, health status, unemployment, crime, air quality, educational attainment, transport etc.)
- Local research/ Surveys of local conditions
- Community profiles

Wider Evidence

- Published Research, including evidence about similar proposals implemented elsewhere (e.g. Case Studies).
- Predictions from local or national models
- Locally commissioned research by statutory/voluntary/private organisations

Expert Opinion

- Views of residents and professionals with local knowledge and insight

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Guidance: Outcome of the Assessment

On reflection, what is your overall assessment of the activity?

The purpose of conducting this assessment is to offer an opportunity to think, reflect and **improve** the proposed activity. It will make sure that the Council can evidence that it has considered its due regard to equality and health & wellbeing to its best ability.

It is not expected that all proposals will be immediately without negative impacts! However, where these arise, what actions can be taken to mitigate against potential negative effects, or further promote the positive impacts?

Please tick one of the 3 boxes in this section to indicate whether you think:

1. all equality and health impacts are adequately addressed in the activity – proceed with your activity pending all other relevant approval processes
2. the assessment identified some negative impacts which could be addressed – please complete the Action Plan in Section 4.
3. If the assessment reveals some significant concerns, this is the time to stop and re-think, making sure that we spend our Council resources wisely and fairly. There is no shame in stopping a proposal.

*Note that the boxes will expand as required

Guidance: Action Plan

For each protected characteristic/health & wellbeing impact where an impact on people or their lives has been identified, complete one row of the action plan. You can add as many further rows as required.

State whether the impact is Positive or Negative

Briefly outline the actions that can be taken to mitigate against the negative impact or further enhance a positive impact. These actions could be to make changes to the activity itself (service, proposal, strategy etc.) or to make contingencies/alterations in the setting/environment where the activity will take place.

For example, might staff need additional training in communicating effectively with people with learning difficulties, if a new service is opened specifically targeting those people? Is access to the service fair and equitable? What will the impact on other service users be? How can we ensure equity of access to the service by all users? Will any signage need changing? Does the building where the service being delivered comply with disability regulations?

Guidance: Review

Changes happen all the time! A service/strategy/policy/activity that is appropriate at one time, may no longer be appropriate as the environment around us changes. This may be changes in our population, growth and makeup, legislative changes, environmental changes or socio-political changes.

Although we can't predict what's going to happen in the future, a review is recommended to ensure that what we are delivering as a Council is still the best use of our limited resources. The timescale for review will be dependent on the scale of the activity.

A major financial investment may require a review every 2-3 years for a large scale regeneration project over 10-15 years.

A small policy change may require a review in 6 months to assess whether there are any unintended outcomes of such a change.

Please indicate here how frequently it is expected to review your activity and a brief justification as to why this timescale is recommended.

Appendix 2. Health & Wellbeing Impact Tool

Will the activity/service/policy/procedure affect any of the following characteristics? Please tick/check the boxes below

The following are a range of considerations that might help you to complete the assessment.

Lifestyle YES ☐ NO ☐	Personal circumstances YES ☐ NO ☐	Access to services/facilities/amenities YES ☐ NO ☐
☐ Diet ☐ Exercise and physical activity ☐ Smoking ☐ Exposure to passive smoking ☐ Alcohol intake ☐ Dependency on prescription drugs ☐ Illicit drug and substance use ☐ Risky Sexual behaviour ☐ Other health-related behaviours, such as tooth-brushing, bathing, and wound care	☐ Structure and cohesion of family unit ☐ Parenting ☐ Childhood development ☐ Life skills ☐ Personal safety ☐ Employment status ☐ Working conditions ☐ Level of income, including benefits ☐ Level of disposable income ☐ Housing tenure ☐ Housing conditions ☐ Educational attainment ☐ Skills levels including literacy and numeracy	☐ to Employment opportunities ☐ to Workplaces ☐ to Housing ☐ to Shops (to supply basic needs) ☐ to Community facilities ☐ to Public transport ☐ to Education ☐ to Training and skills development ☐ to Healthcare ☐ to Social services ☐ to Childcare ☐ to Respite care ☐ to Leisure and recreation services and facilities
Social Factors YES ☐ NO ☐	Economic Factors YES ☐ NO ☐	Environmental Factors YES ☐ NO ☐
☐ Social contact ☐ Social support ☐ Neighbourliness ☐ Participation in the community ☐ Membership of community groups ☐ Reputation of community/area ☐ Participation in public affairs ☐ Level of crime and disorder ☐ Fear of crime and disorder ☐ Level of antisocial behaviour ☐ Fear of antisocial behaviour ☐ Discrimination ☐ Fear of discrimination ☐ Public safety measures ☐ Road safety measures	☐ Creation of wealth ☐ Distribution of wealth ☐ Retention of wealth in local area/economy ☐ Distribution of income ☐ Business activity ☐ Job creation ☐ Availability of employment opportunities ☐ Quality of employment opportunities ☐ Availability of education opportunities ☐ Quality of education opportunities ☐ Availability of training and skills development opportunities ☐ Quality of training and skills development opportunities ☐ Technological development ☐ Amount of traffic congestion	☐ Air quality ☐ Water quality ☐ Soil quality/Level of contamination/Odour ☐ Noise levels ☐ Vibration ☐ Hazards ☐ Land use ☐ Natural habitats ☐ Biodiversity ☐ Landscape, including green and open spaces ☐ Townscape, including civic areas and public realm ☐ Use/consumption of natural resources ☐ Energy use: CO2/other greenhouse gas emissions ☐ Solid waste management ☐ Public transport infrastructure