

*Report Number: SWT 109/22*

## **Somerset West and Taunton Council**

Community Scrutiny Cttee – 31<sup>st</sup> August 2022

### **CCTV Review and Upgrade**

**This matter is the responsibility of Executive Councillor Chris Booth**

**Report Author: Scott Weetch, Community Resilience Manager and  
Sally Parry, Community Engagement Lead**

#### **1 Executive Summary / Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 This is an information report to update on capital investment to replace 11 CCTV cameras in the 'spine' of Taunton's CCTV network from junction of Staplegrove Road with North Street, through Bridge Street, Fore Street and East Street. This will digitise and make wireless where applicable, the most commonly used cameras prior to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2023.
- 1.2 The report will also provide an update on background work on options to further invest/disinvest in the CCTV estate for consideration by the new Somerset Council.

#### **2 Summary**

1. The investment of £58,642 in the CCTV camera estate in 2022/23 from a maintenance reserve held at Sedgemoor District Council (SDC).
2. Digitally enhancing 11 cameras in the most critical part of Taunton.
3. To note the costed proposals available for consideration after April 2023 by the new Council.

#### **3 Risk Assessment**

- The following key Corporate, Directorate and Other risks have been identified.

Ref	Risk Title	Project relevance	Mitigation
CR 07	Procurement	Ensuring chosen supplier delivers value for money.	The project will strictly follow procurement and contract management process, and in delivery an experienced team will manage and monitor progress.
DPR2	Commercial Investment and Asset Management	Financially viable sites will be handed to Assets to manage.	Financially viable business cases will be managed from start to finish, and all asset management considerations will be taken into account.
CCTV1	GDPR Compliance risk through inappropriate collection and retention of personal data	Some existing cameras are deemed to not meet a pressing need and therefore could be challenged	Camera provision to be kept under review to only include those that have a pressing need and evidence shows data is used. Other compliance aspects (such as signage and retention) addressed through project

## 4 Background and Full details of the Report

### 4.1 Project Background

- 4.1.1 There are public space CCTV cameras covering the towns of Taunton, Wellington, Minehead and Watchet. This equipment requires updating in order to continue to comply with the law.
- 4.1.2 The Taunton and Wellington cameras are monitored and maintained via a Service Level Agreement with Sedgemoor District Council. The Minehead and Watchet cameras are monitored by Police volunteers.
- 4.1.3 Significant work has been undertaken to present a current picture. This work will be captured in a wider report to inform the new Council at the relevant time as the project would fall under Section 24 Regulations for Finance. It should also form part of a wider review into CCTV provision across the county.
- 4.1.4 Work is under way to deliver 11 digital cameras in the central 'spine' of Taunton, which will improve the evidential quality and service of the most used cameras.
- 4.1.5 After 2023, there are costed options to:
- Keep under review operational need for cameras and assess compliance.
  - Digitise all CCTV cameras in Minehead, Watchet, Wellington and Taunton to improve availability and the evidential quality of the images.

- Improve the appropriate mix of BT, fibre, and wireless solution for the transmission of data at all sites.
- Improve compliance.
- Link Minehead & Watchet to Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) CCTV Control room.
- Review the operating costs of CCTV.

## 4.2 CCTV work in progress

### 4.2.1 Deliverables:

- 11 digital cameras located across a predefined area of Taunton connected via fibre and wireless to the Sedgemoor Control Room.
- Update signage where required.

### 4.2.2 Pros and Cons of early delivery:

**Pros:** Improve resilience in a key part of the CCTV network and reduced risk of camera failure in this part of our district.

Reduced ongoing costs from improved data transmission.

Ability to deliver this upgrade this financial year using existing maintenance funds and maintenance contract.

**Cons:** Only delivers part of overall upgrades required across the estate.

### 4.2.3 Project outline and costs:

The Senior Management Team has agreed to contract our existing maintenance provider to upgrade 11 existing analogue cameras to digital at an estimated cost of £58,642 (excluding VAT) as part of business as usual maintenance to be delivered during 2022/23.

This will be funded by using SWT existing maintenance reserves held by Sedgemoor District Council.

11 Cameras Estimated Spend	22/23
Total	£58,642

There will be a small reduction in ongoing operational and monitoring costs by upgrading 11 existing cameras from analogue to digital. The estimated ongoing cost reduction from 2023/24 is shown in the table below.

Reduction in ongoing costs	2023/24
Digitisation of 11 cameras and comms network – reduction in BT costs	£4,218

## 4.3 Current position

### 4.3.1 Overview

- There are 92 cameras across SWT area, the vast majority are analogue. They are significantly beyond their recommended lifespan and are starting to fail.
- The quality of the analogue images received through the digitised Video Management Systems (VMS) is not good and therefore makes the case more pressing to move to digitising the CCTV cameras, which will be more compatible with the VMS system and produce vastly enhanced images.
- A CCTV camera review highlighted that 12 cameras should be considered for removal following a Data Protection/Privacy Impact Assessment these cameras are currently being monitored by SDC.
- A further 12 cameras in Paul Street car park (the multi-storey) were also highlighted as able to meet the 'Pressing need' as antisocial behaviour had occurred in the area, but the Consultant thought they should remain under review and recommended leaving them as analogue as car park crime had reduced significantly with a view to either removing or replacing them in the future depending upon their utilisation.
- The Authority continue to work with Sedgemoor Control Room to improve the compliance systems and process.

### 4.3.2 Value For Money

- During the project review and feasibility phase, significant savings have been realised. These amount to approximately £80k per annum in revenue cost reductions from the initial 2020/2021 baseline. As historically SWT has paid an annual contribution to Sedgemoor District Council for the maintenance and monitoring of the CCTV network in Taunton and Wellington of £315,142 per annum, a further £18,860 has been used to cover the West Somerset system and £5,365 for insurance making a total of £339,367 per annum for all cameras.
- There was £180k held in an earmarked reserve (now held on general reserve) to maintain/upgrade CCTV equipment.
- Analysis undertaken during the project has identified the opportunity to rationalise cameras. Some cameras have high 'active monitoring levels' (high utilisation); whereas others have negligible use (e.g., requests of analysis by police, security, businesses etc). The tailoring of 'active monitoring levels' will enable resources to be more effectively deployed and charged out accordingly. The new Video Management System will enable this to be reviewed annually, to ensure the benefits are maximised. The CCTV Teams would also always be available 24/7 to respond to immediate needs and requests from the Police to actively monitor cameras when the need arose.
- A recent review has highlighted the following areas of potential to improve efficiency:

- monitoring – adopting a tailored approach will reduce this cost and reflect the levels of active monitoring we currently receive.
- maintenance – moving to a formal ‘comprehensive’ maintenance agreement will provide greater transparency and predictability.
- Moving on to wireless communications, wherever it is safe and practical to do so, will remove the on-going data transmission maintenance charge currently paid to BT.
- A reduction in the number of cameras will reduce ongoing revenue costs across all fronts including insurance.
- These savings will enable SWT to deliver a CCTV monitoring service which reflects the needs and utilisation by the Police and key partners.

#### 4.3.3 Funding

- Apart from the capital funding to install CCTV from the Home Office and the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, operational costs have been almost wholly funded by the Council. Town Councils have historically provided some funding in the former West Somerset area.
- Significant savings have already been realised during the review phase as described above.
- The options being forwarded into Local Government Review recommend further significant investment into the CCTV estate. However, it will also be recommended that conversations are instigated with the three Town Councils in Wellington, Minehead and Watchet and any future Taunton Council to contribute a proportion of ongoing revenue costs for management, maintenance and monitoring.

### **Objectives for camera review**

- 4.4.1 To deliver a cost effective, integrated network of digital CCTV cameras that will compliantly deliver the current and future needs for communities and our key partners by:
- keeping only cameras which comply with Data Protection – Privacy Impact Assessment.
  - digitising all CCTV cameras in Minehead, Watchet, Wellington and Taunton to improve availability and the evidential quality of the images.
  - providing bespoke fibre and wireless data transmission/communication.
  - integrating Minehead & Watchet to the Sedgemoor Control Room.
  - reducing the operating costs of the CCTVs by tailoring the monitoring and maintenance service levels across the areas to the relative importance and profile of the cameras.
- 4.4.2 To deliver a modern, efficient, sustainable, cost-effective integrated network of digital CCTV cameras that would compliantly deliver the current and future needs for communities and key partners across our district.
- 4.4.3 There are four options under consideration. These are outlined in the section below.

4.4.4 The integration of Minehead and Watchet CCTV cameras into the Sedgemoor Control Room would level out the service across SWT. This equality of service would align the whole SWT CCTV network but will now need to be considered in the round with a countywide review. Integration would provide:

- enhanced evidential images
- targeted monitoring that reflects the location/profiling of the area
- improved cost effectiveness of data transmission
- improved maintenance agreement that covers parts and maintenance
- improved availability (up time) of cameras fully trained CCTV operators available 24/7 365 days of the year, to monitor and respond to Police and community concerns.
- improved compliance and reporting

4.4.5 This would be provided (subject to optional variations) -

- Existing camera locations have been reviewed, to ensure compliance with legislation and Code of Practice, by independent CCTV Consultants and through consultation with the local Neighbourhood Policing Teams and the Sedgemoor Control Room.
- External Supplier(s) would be sourced via open competition, to supply, install and commission the cameras and the wireless network.
- 12 Cameras deemed as no longer required, could be decommissioned.
- The Multi Storey Car Park retain their analogue cameras and the decision to replace or decommission them will kept under review with Car Parks service.
- Any other remaining cameras not upgraded as part of this project would be replaced as a separate project or assessed at the point of failure for replacement.
- All infrastructure would remain in place so that cameras removed could be recommissioned quickly and cost effectively, should it be required later.
- All contracts and service level agreements would be reviewed and updated, as would the published Codes of Practice. A framework of future management and monitoring arrangements would be instigated.
- Monitoring staff would continue to be fully trained in operational matters.

## 4.5

### Future Options

#### 4.5.1 Option 1: Digitisation of all cameras (except Multi Storey Car Park) and removal of obsolete cameras.

##### Project Deliverables:

- 68 digital cameras located across Taunton (40), Wellington (6), Minehead (13) and Watchet (9) connected via fibre and wireless to the Sedgemoor Control Room. (N.B. 3 digital cameras have already been installed as part of 2021/22 maintenance).

- Retention of 12 analogue cameras in the Multi Storey Car Park (Paul Street, Taunton).
- Removal of 12 cameras identified as “should be considered for removal”,
- Monitoring levels tailored to the profile of the cameras, but 24/7, 365 coverage of most utilised cameras and capability to monitor all incidents where required/ possible.
- A common maintenance agreement for all new cameras.
- Compliance with all relevant legislation including Data Protection Act, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Surveillance Camera Commissioner’s Code of Practice.

#### Pros and Cons

**Pros:** This would be a fully compliant resilient network, with up-to-date equipment all linked into SDC, providing consistent evidential quality images, recording and response across the whole SWT area. Would improve the cost effectiveness of operating the service.

**Cons:** This would require significant up-front costs  
Reduction in overall coverage due to removal of some existing cameras. However, these are justified, and could be reinstated if there became a requirement as the infrastructure would remain in place.

Budget based on Option 1; the project would require a budget of £374,532 (Including a 5% contingency fund – to be returned if not used).

#### Financial Implications:

The estimated cost to digitise the 68 cameras would be £374,532 and this was planned to be delivered during 2023/24 but will need to be considered by the new Council.

There would potentially be a minimal increase in ongoing operational and monitoring costs estimated at £2,880 for 2024/2025.

This option is viable if finance can be found. It delivers on the project aims and value for money over time.

#### **4.5.2 Option 2: Full digitisation of all cameras and retention of obsolete cameras.**

##### Project Deliverables:

- 92 digital (including 12 MSCP) cameras located across Taunton (60), Wellington (6), Minehead (17) and Watchet (9) connected via fibre and wireless to the Sedgemoor Control Room. (N.B. 3 digital cameras have already been installed as part of 21/22 maintenance)
- Monitoring levels – 24/7, 365 days of the year, except for the Multi Storey Car Park where 50% monitoring is already in operation (12 hours per day during car park opening hours).
- A common maintenance agreement for all new cameras.

- Compliance with all relevant legislation including Data Protection Act, General Data Protection Regulation and the Surveillance Camera Commissioner’s Code of Practice.

#### Pros and Cons

Pros: This would also be a resilient network, with up-to-date equipment all linked into Sedgemoor. Providing consistent evidential quality images, recording and response across the whole SWT area. Only partially compliant as it retains the 12 cameras identified as not having a “pressing need...should be considered for removal”.

Cons: Fails to adhere to Surveillance Camera guidelines/compliance. This is one of the least cost-effective options as it requires a higher capital outlay than Option 1 and is less cost-effective as ongoing costs are significantly higher due to increased maintenance and monitoring.

Budget based on Option 2, and pro rata rate extended to additional cameras – the Project shall require a budget of £484,667 which includes a 5% contingency fund that will be returned if not used. Ongoing revenue costs are also significantly higher due to increased maintenance and monitoring.

#### Financial Implications:

The estimated cost to digitise the 92 cameras would be £484,667.

There would be an increase in ongoing operational and monitoring costs estimated as initially £99,195 per year from 2024/25 onwards.

This option should be rejected as it fails to deliver the project aims in respect of compliance or value for money.

### **4.5.3 Option 3: 28 new digital cameras and removal of obsolete cameras, upgrading Wellington cameras to digital and integrating Minehead and Watchet.**

#### Project Deliverables:

- 28 new digital cameras, across Minehead (13), Wellington (6) and Watchet (9) connected via fibre and wireless to the Sedgemoor Control Room.
- Removal of 12 cameras identified as “should be considered for removal” 4 in Minehead and 8 in Taunton.
- Leaving the remaining cameras to be replaced as a separate Project or as they fail/funds become available.
- Monitoring levels tailored to the profile of the camera's location, as Option 1.
- A common maintenance agreement for all new cameras.
- Compliance with all relevant legislation including Data Protection Act, GDPR and the Surveillance Camera Commissioner’s Code of Practice.

#### Pros and Cons



Pros: The upgraded elements would provide a resilient network, with up to date equipment all linked into Sedgemoor and consistent evidential quality images, recording and response across the whole SWT area. Costs to replace the remaining cameras could be drip fed over the next 2-4 years as funds become available, although at risk and at a higher cost per unit.

Cons: Only a partial solution as remaining 29 cameras in Taunton will require upgrading and benefits limited to those cameras which are upgraded. Quality of images from remaining analogue cameras will be less likely to be of evidential quality. The mixture of old and new cameras may lead to an increase in maintenance costs until the old ones are replaced. Frequent and significant camera failure may lead to reputational risk. Finances will still need to be allocated to cover replacement costs. Unable to fully maximise the potential cost savings from a revised network design.

Budget based on Option 3; the Project shall require a budget of £208,448 which includes a 5% contingency fund that will be returned if not used. It would also require significant, unspecified, future spending.

#### Financial Implications:

The estimated cost to digitise the 28 cameras and remove 12 cameras would be £208,448.

There will be a requirement to have an ongoing capital budget to allow the service to replace the remaining 29 cameras.

There will be an increase in ongoing operational and monitoring costs estimated initially as £13,582 per year from 2024/25 onwards.

This delivers on the project aims and it is therefore a viable option.

#### **4.5.4 Option 4: Do nothing option (replace when fail)**

What would have been delivered under option 4:

- Effectively leaving the equipment and not replacing it until it fails.
- The equipment will continue to degrade and be even less effective, eventually failing completely. This is likely within the next 1-5 years.
- Gaps in the system and coverage will emerge, increasing perceived and actual risk of crime and anti-social behaviour.
- Increasingly poor-quality images unfit for evidential purposes.

#### Pros and Cons

Pros: No upfront costs. Existing systems are known and understood.

Cons: Fails to adhere to Surveillance Camera Commissioner's Code of Practice. More expensive to change cameras out one at a time and increases the risks associated with cameras not working. Maintenance costs are likely to be higher and not cover replacement of unit. Finances will still need to be allocated to cover replacement costs i.e., a sinking fund. Analogue

cameras cannot transition to wireless communications which will reduce the on-going costs savings which could be made. Image quality will mean some cameras may not achieve the level of evidential quality. West Somerset will remain monitored by volunteers (as and when available) which means it is harder to demonstrate compliance.

Budget based on Option 4; This will require an estimated uplift to the ongoing budget to cover the increased costs of replacing the cameras. A contingency fund approach would be required as it is not possible to profile when the cameras would fail. Note the costs of cameras and installation have been based on an ad hoc installation completed this financial year and associated costs. It makes no allowance for increasing product costs or inflation.

### Financial implications

There will be a requirement to have an ongoing capital budget to allow the service to replace cameras as and when required. The current estimated spend per year is shown in the table below.

The Unitary Council would need to approve an ongoing capital budget from 2023/2024 for four years to be funded by general reserves and/or borrowing. This would need to be set against wider CCTV needs and provision in Somerset.

There would be an increase in ongoing operational and monitoring costs estimated as initially £18,073 per year from 2024/25 onwards.

This has been discounted as an option as it does not deliver on the project aims.

## **6 Link to Corporate Strategy**

- 6.1 The published Corporate Plan for 2021/22 included a delivery requirement within the Housing and Communities corporate priority to “Review and improve the Council’s CCTV to provide a more effective service and better value for money”.

## **6. Finance / Resource Implications**

- 6.1 The agreed upgrade can be met within an existing reserve held at Sedgemoor District Council.
- 6.2 In 2021/22 Somerset West and Taunton Council (SWT) paid an annual contribution to Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) for the maintenance and monitoring of the CCTV network in Taunton and Wellington, plus a contribution into a Sinking Fund, of £315,142 per annum. A further £18,860 was spent to cover the West Somerset system and £5,365 for insurance. This gives a total of £339,367 spend for all cameras in 2021/22.

- 6.3 During 2021/22 SWT were refunded £319,495 of their prior year contributions from the surplus maintenance funds held by SDC. Of this, £139,495 has been accounted for as a cost reduction in the financial year 2021/22, as per the approved budget for 2021/22, and £180,000 has been allocated to general reserves.
- 6.4 The budget and expected cost for 2022/23 is £240k. This is a reduction on previous years' budget allocations as this is based on recent cost estimates from SDC and a recognition of a historical underspend on maintenance.
- 6.5 There is no commentary on ongoing revenue costs as this will be a matter for the new Council to consider in the round with CCTV provision across the county and alongside whichever option may be taken forward.

### Table 1: Capital Investment Appraisal

The table below shows indicative capital costs for each of the options outlined.

Option	22/23 £	23/24 £	24/25 £	25/26 £	26/27 £	Total £
Digitisation and wireless set up of 11 core cameras in Taunton.	61,574	0	0	0	0	61,574
<b>Post April 2023: for illustration only</b>						
1 - Digitisation of all cameras (except Paul Street Car Park) and removal of obsolete cameras	0	377,532	0	0	0	374,532
2 - Full digitisation of all cameras and retain obsolete cameras	0	484,667	0	0	0	484,667
3 - 28 new digital cameras; removal of obsolete cameras and gradual replacement of remaining cameras to digital over time	0	208,448	0	0	0	208,448
4 - Do nothing option (replace when fail)	0	109,446	138,740	116,240	63,740	428,166

## 7 Unitary Council Financial Implications and S24 Direction Implications

7.6 Replacing 11 cameras can be delivered within existing means and within the limitations of the Section 24 agreement and therefore no further permissions will be required from the new Council.

7.7 There are no ongoing financial/resource commitments for the new Council beyond existing obligations. Any request to the new Council will be brought forward post vesting day.

## **8 Legal Implications**

8.1 The procurement process will be compliant with relevant legislation

8.2 The project will improve compliance with GDPR and CCTV monitoring legislation.

## **9 Climate, Ecology and Sustainability Implications**

9.1 A negligible impact. There will be a minimal increase in electricity use to support the wireless connectivity.

9.2 There will be some unavoidable travel for contractors going to and from site, requests for plans to minimise this can be included in the tender evaluation.

9.3 Ability to demonstrate sustainability in the supply chain and in the disposal of equipment will be included as part of the evaluation criteria in the tender.

## **10 Safeguarding and/or Community Safety Implications**

10.1 CCTV forms part of a range of measures that the Council undertakes to enhance community safety. CCTV that complies with best practice and can be used evidentially by the police improves our ability to safeguard our community.

## **11 Equality and Diversity Implications**

11.1 The Equality Impact Assessment highlights that some groups with protected characteristics are more likely to be a victim of crime and therefore the improved CCTV estate (including image quality that can be used evidentially for prosecution) will provide greater protection overall to the public generally and groups with protected characteristics. We will ensure contractors comply with equalities legislation.

## **12 Partnership Implications**

12.1 As we move to forming a Unitary Authority, the partnership approach with SDC on the Control Room will help future-proof the CCTV offer.

12.2 The Police are key partners in delivering community safety and the CCTV estate is a highly valued tool in their armoury to detect and prevent crime.

### **13 Health and Wellbeing Implications**

- 13.1 The CCTV network of cameras significantly contribute to the Health and Wellbeing of the Public by improving safety and the perception of safety which in turn enables people to engage in activities within their communities and access the day and night-time economy with confidence.
- 13.2 CCTV is used to help protect vulnerable groups and individuals. Examples include looking for missing and vulnerable people and producing evidence in support of hate crime victims.

### **14 Asset Management Implications**

- 14.1 The CCTV camera assets will be managed and maintained by the SDC CCTV Control room on behalf of SWT.

### **15 Data Protection Implications**

- 15.1 Large scale, systematic monitoring of the public by CCTV cameras is considered to be high risk processing under GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. All processing must be fully justified and assessed for any risks to the privacy of those affected. Appropriate mitigation measures must be applied where necessary.
- 15.2 The Surveillance Camera Commissioner's Code of Practice, issued by the Secretary of State Under Section 30 of the 2012 Act, provides guidance on the appropriate and effective use of surveillance camera systems by Authorities who must exercise regard to the code when exercising any functions to which the code relates, and it sets out 12 guiding principles that apply to all surveillance equipment in public spaces.

[Code of Practice](#)

### **16 Consultation Implications**

- 16.1 The current proposal has been consulted with the Police and SDC as they are principally compliance changes for 1) removing cameras that no longer have a purpose and 2) enhancing the evidential quality of pictures for the most used cameras.

### **Contact Officers**

Name	Sally Parry
Direct Dial	07880179002
Email	<a href="mailto:s.parry@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk"><u>s.parry@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk</u></a>
Name	Scott Weetch
Direct Dial	07717513768
Email	<a href="mailto:s.weetch@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk"><u>s.weetch@somersetwestandtaunton.gov.uk</u></a>

**Appendix A** - Current level of CCTV coverage within the other Councils that will make up the Somerset Unitary Authority.

Camera by District Council	Quantity
Sedgemoor	113
Somerset West & Taunton	92
Mendip	48
South Somerset	29

Camera Town	Quantity
Bridgwater	90
Taunton (will be 52)	60
Yeovil	29
Minehead (will be 13)	17
Wells	13
Burnham (soon to be 12)	11
Shepton Mallet	10
Frome	10
Watchet	9
Street	8
Glastonbury	7
Wellington	6
Highbridge	2

## Appendix B: Equality and Impact Assessment

# Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Before completing this EIA please ensure you have read the EIA guidance notes – available from your Equality Officer

**Organisation prepared for**

Somerset West and Taunton Council

**Version**

2

**Date Completed**

2<sup>nd</sup> August 2022

**Description of what is being impact assessed**

**Impact of upgrade of CCTV services in central Taunton to an enhanced digital provision.**

**Evidence**

**What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups?** Sources such as the [Office of National Statistics](#), [Somerset Intelligence Partnership](#), [Somerset's Joint Strategic Needs Analysis \(JSNA\)](#), Staff and/ or [area profiles](#),, should be detailed here

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and area profiles outline the different protected characteristics and their prevalence within the wider Somerset society. It is known that there is an ageing population with large areas of rurality. Also, there are a number of health inequalities dependent on where people live. Protected groups are represented across the community through various groups but not always as a single entity. Individuals with protected characteristics are most likely to be at risk from hate crime attacks in town centres and intelligence is gathered on these through case management and reported through Police Priorities meetings and also within individual teams e.g. One Teams multi-agency meetings. CCTV operations help to detect, deter and prevent these crimes from happening, ensuring a safer environment where cameras exist.

**Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups?** If you have not consulted other people, please explain why?



Individuals and groups have not been consulted as the impact is seen as solely being beneficial. The service will be enhanced in Taunton, whilst remaining the same in others. Therefore, it should bring about improvements in monitoring, spotting incidences and bringing offences to justice.

**Analysis of impact on protected groups**

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires us to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with protected groups. Consider how this policy/service will achieve these aims. In the table below, using the evidence outlined above and your own understanding, detail what considerations and potential impacts against each of the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty. Based on this information, make an assessment of the likely outcome, before you have implemented any mitigation.

Protected group	Summary of impact	Negative outcome	Neutral outcome	Positive outcome
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral outcome but potential for positive impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral outcome but potential for positive impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender reassignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marriage and civil partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy and maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral outcome but potential for positive impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Race and ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral outcome but potential for positive impact</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Select date			<input type="checkbox"/>
	Select date			<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.</b>				
No negative impacts identified. The service should be enhanced as a result of the project.				
<b>Completed by:</b>	Scott Weetch			
<b>Date</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2022			
<b>Signed off by:</b>				
<b>Date</b>				
<b>Equality Lead/Manager sign off date:</b>				
<b>To be reviewed by: (officer name)</b>	Scott Weetch			
<b>Review date:</b>	31/3/2023			