

## Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)

### Stage 1 Scoping and Assessing for Relevance

#### Section 1 Details of the Proposal

<b>A. Title of Proposal:</b>	HEADSTONE SAFETY
<b>B. What is it?</b>	A new Policy/Strategy/Practice <input type="checkbox"/> A revised Policy/Strategy/Practice <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>C. Description of the proposal:</b> (Set out a clear understanding of the purpose of the proposal being developed or reviewed (what are the aims, objectives and intended outcomes, including the context within which it will operate))	<p>A report was submitted to Council in March 2023 on Headstone Safety which included a range of proposals aimed at improving outcomes for communities in the future management of Headstone Safety. This proposal follows on from that report to enable subsequent decision making and includes the report of findings from a Headstone Reinstatement Pilot.</p> <p>SBC has legal obligations to ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, that cemeteries are maintained in a safe condition. SBC also has a permanent responsibility for a programme of headstone safety, inspecting and making safe headstones. As part of the safety works, any headstone that fails the safety inspection and requires to be made safe is either socketed into the ground, laid flat or cordoned off.</p> <p>In response to complaints about laying headstones flat, it was agreed that a Pilot Study be undertaken at Lennel Cemetery, Coldstream, whereby any such stones were re-erected by SBC. The aim of the study was to enable further analysis of the risk, resource and cost implications involved if SBC was to carry out the</p>

works required to re-erect all headstones laid flat in order to have been made safe.

Following the pilot, the findings have been used to carry out an options appraisal process and a preferred option has been proposed for the delivery of headstone safety and reinstatement measures. Staff time, materials, fuel and one-off costs were recorded throughout the Pilot.

The preferred option is to explore a partnership approach with private contractors. The Council, as facilitator for Headstone reinstatement, supports memorial owners to undertake reinstatement themselves through developing an approach, and some certainty around fee scale(s), in partnership with the local private sector.

Upon completing this analysis of the options developed (costs, benefits and risks identified), this option appears to provide the optimal balance between facilitating improved outcomes and managing financial sustainability and risk. In recognising that (even with significant resource pressures) the Local Authority has a role as a stakeholder in this process, we can seek to work in partnership with the private sector to provide a service to memorial owners, ensuring we communicate this timeously during the Headstone Safety Programme.

This would be developed through undertaking initial engagement with suitably qualified independent monumental masons across the region. Through this engagement we would seek to develop a partnership approach, whereby a fee/fee scale is agreed for any headstone repair works. The Local Authority would then be able to signpost memorial owners to these contractors immediately at the point of making a headstone safe. This gives the memorial owners certainty over next steps and over costs for any repair works, mitigating any unnecessary distress. We will also explore financial support that may be offered where affordability remains a possible barrier (through appropriate

	revenue budget). By doing so, we would seek to work more collaboratively with communities and memorial owners, as facilitator for remedial works.
<b>D. Service Area: Department:</b>	Parks & Environment Assets & Infrastructure
<b>E. Lead Officer: (Name and job title)</b>	Carol Cooke Parks & Environment Manager
<b>F. Other Officers/Partners involved: (List names, job titles and organisations)</b>	Diane Munro, Bereavement Officer Stuart Young, Greenspace Manager
<b>G. Date(s) IIA completed:</b>	24 October 2023

## Section 2 Will there be any impacts as a result of the relationship between this proposal and other policies?

NO
If yes, - please state here:

## Section 3 Legislative Requirements

<b>3.1 Relevance to the Equality Duty:</b>
Do you believe your proposal has any relevance under the Equality Act 2010?

*(If you believe that your proposal may have some relevance – however small please indicate yes. If there is no effect, please enter “No” and go to Section 3.2.)*

<b>Equality Duty</b>	<b>Reasoning:</b>
<b>A. Elimination of discrimination (both direct &amp; indirect), victimisation and harassment.</b> <i>(Will the proposal discriminate? Or help eliminate discrimination?)</i>	No
<b>B. Promotion of equality of opportunity?</b> <i>(Will your proposal help or hinder the Council with this)</i>	No
<b>C. Foster good relations?</b> <i>(Will your proposal help to foster or encourage good relations between those who have different equality characteristics?)</i>	No

<b>3.2 Which groups of people do you think will be or potentially could be, impacted by the implementation of this proposal? (You should consider employees, clients, customers / service users, and any other relevant groups)</b>				
Please tick below as appropriate, outlining any potential impacts on the undernoted equality groups this proposal may have and how you know this.				
	Impact			Please explain the potential impacts and how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<b>Age</b> Older or younger people or a specific age grouping	√			

<b>Disability</b> e.g. Effects on people with mental, physical, sensory impairment, learning disability, visible/invisible, progressive or recurring	√			
<b>Gender Reassignment/ Gender Identity</b> anybody whose gender identity or gender expression is different to the sex assigned to them at birth	√			
<b>Marriage or Civil Partnership</b> people who are married or in a civil partnership	√			
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> (refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to <b>maternity</b> leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, <b>protection</b> against <b>maternity</b> discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth),	√			
<b>Race Groups:</b> including colour, nationality, ethnic origins, including minorities (e.g. gypsy travellers, refugees, migrants and asylum seekers)	√			
<b>Religion or Belief:</b> different beliefs, customs (including atheists and those with no aligned belief)	√			
<b>Sex</b> women and men (girls and boys)	√			
<b>Sexual Orientation</b> , e.g. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Heterosexual	√			

### 3.3 Fairer Scotland Duty

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to how we can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage when making strategic decisions.

The duty is set at a strategic level - these are the key, high level decisions that SBC will take. This would normally include strategy documents, decisions about setting priorities, allocating resources and commissioning services.

#### Is the proposal strategic?

YES

**If No go to Section 4**

**If yes, please indicate any potential impact on the undernoted groups this proposal may have and how you know this:**

	Impact			State here how you know this
	No Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	
<b>Low and/or No Wealth</b> – enough money to meet basic living costs and pay bills but have no savings to deal with any unexpected spends and no provision for the future.			√	If the proposed recommendation is agreed, there will be a cost for re-erection of headstones which memorial owners would incur and may struggle or be unable to meet.
<b>Material Deprivation</b> – being unable to access basic goods and services i.e. financial products like life insurance, repair/replace broken electrical goods, warm home, leisure and hobbies	√			

<b>Area Deprivation</b> – where you live (e.g. rural areas), where you work (e.g. accessibility of transport)	√			
<b>Socio-economic Background</b> – social class i.e. parents' education, employment and income			√	If the proposed recommendation is agreed, there will be a cost for re-erection of headstones which memorial owners would incur and may struggle or be unable to meet.
<b>Looked after and accommodated children and young people</b>	√			
<b>Carers</b> paid and unpaid including family members	√			
<b>Homelessness</b>	√			
<b>Addictions and substance use</b>	√			
<b>Those involved within the criminal justice system</b>	√			

### **3.4 Armed Forces Covenant Duty (*Education and Housing/ Homelessness proposals only*)**

This duty places a legal responsibility on Scottish Borders Council (SBC) to actively consider (give due regard) to the three matters listed below in Education and Housing/ Homelessness matters.  
This relates to current and former armed forces personnel (regular or reserve) and their families.

**Is the Armed Forces Covenant Duty applicable?**

<b>NO</b>	
If “Yes”, please complete below	
<b>Covenant Duty</b>	<b>How this has been considered and any specific provision made:</b>
<b>The unique obligations of, and sacrifices made by, the armed forces;</b>	
<b>The principle that it is desirable to remove disadvantages arising for Service people from membership, or former membership, of the armed forces;</b>	
<b>The principle that special provision for Service people may be justified by the effects on such people of membership, or former membership, of the armed forces.</b>	

#### **Section 4 Full Integrated Impact Assessment Required**

*Select No if you have answered “No” to all of Sections 3.1 – 3.3.*

#### **Yes**

If yes, please proceed to Stage 2 and complete a full Integrated Impact Assessment



**If a full impact assessment is not required briefly explain why there are no effects and provide justification for the decision.**

--

<b>Signed by Lead Officer:</b>	<b>Carol Cooke</b>
<b>Designation:</b>	<b>Parks and Environment Manager</b>
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Counter Signature Director:</b>	<b>John Curry</b>
<b>Date:</b>	