

Appendix - Equality Impact Assessment

Directorate: Public Health & Public Protection	
Service: Trading Standards & Licensing	
Name of Officer/s completing assessment: Russell Denney-Clarke	
Date of Assessment: 03/02/2026	
Name of service/function or policy being assessed: Non-Executive Fees and Charges	
1.	<p>What are the aims, objectives, outcomes, purpose of the policy, service change, function that you are assessing?</p> <p>The purpose of the revised fees and charges is to ensure that all licensing regimes falling under the remit of the Licensing Committee are set in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Slough Fees and Charges Framework (full cost recovery model) • Legislative requirements, including statutory discretionary provisions and prescribed fees where applicable <p>The objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve full cost recovery where allowed • Ensure legal compliance and consistency with national legislation • Maintain financially sustainable delivery of licensing services • Adjust fees where workload, enforcement demand or application processing costs require it
2.	<p>Who implements or delivers the policy, service or function? State if this is undertaken by more than one team, service, and department including any external partners.</p> <p>Licensing</p>
3.	<p>Who will be affected by this proposal? For example who are the external/internal customers, communities, partners, stakeholders, the workforce etc. Please consider all of the Protected Characteristics listed (more information is available in the background information). Bear in mind that people affected by the proposals may well have more than one protected characteristic.</p> <p>Age: N/A Disability: N/A Gender Reassignment: N/A</p>

	<p>Marriage and Civil Partnership: N/A Pregnancy and maternity: N/A Race: N/A Religion and Belief: N/A Sex: N/A Sexual orientation: N/A Other: N/A</p>
4.	<p>What are any likely positive impacts for the group/s identified in (3) above? You may wish to refer to the Equalities Duties detailed in the background information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures transparent, fair and legally compliant fee setting • Reduces reliance on general taxation by ensuring services are not subsidised by the wider public • Encourages consistent treatment of applicants • Supports lawful regulation and public protection (e.g., through fees set partly for enforcement as required in Hemming v Westminster)
5.	<p>What are the likely negative impacts for the group/s identified in (3) above? If so then are any particular groups affected more than others and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No negative equalities impacts on protected groups have been identified. • There may be financial impacts on businesses and individuals, but these apply <i>equally to all applicants</i> and reflect actual processing and enforcement costs, not characteristics of applicants. • Some specific fees experience significant increases (e.g., street trading deposits, private hire operator fees), but these increases relate solely to full cost recovery and legislative compliance, not protected characteristics.
6.	<p>Have the impacts identified in (4) and (5) above been assessed using up to date and reliable evidence and data? Please state evidence sources and conclusions drawn (e.g. survey results, customer complaints, monitoring data etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fees and Charges Report 2026/27 and its underlying costing methodology • The Slough Fees and Charges Framework • Legislative references and statutory fee-setting constraints

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case law, including <i>Hemming v Westminster</i> (processing cost vs enforcement cost) • Historic licensing data showing general uniformity of impact across applicant types <p>Conclusion: No disproportionate impact on protected groups.</p>
7.	<p>Have you engaged or consulted with any identified groups or individuals if necessary and what were the results, e.g. have the staff forums/unions/ community groups been involved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing policies and associated fees require public consultation as set out in relevant legislation (e.g., Local Government (Misc Provisions) Act 1976; Licensing Act 2003; Gambling Act 2005). Statutory consultees and stakeholders are engaged as required. • Ultimately decisions rest with the Licensing Committee. • Some of the fees in the report are required to be advertised after the decision of the committee and if there are any objections / negative comments from the public and trade, the community thoughts will be brought back to a future committee.
8.	<p>Have you considered the impact the policy might have on local community relations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No negative impacts identified. Fees support good community relations by enabling effective enforcement and protection of residents through properly funded licensing controls.
9.	<p>What plans do you have in place, or are developing, that will mitigate any likely identified negative impacts? For example what plans, if any, will be put in place to reduce the impact?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No equalities-related negative impacts identified. General mitigations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparent communication of fee changes • Continuing to ensure fees are only based on cost recovery • Reviewing fees annually to avoid sudden disproportionate increases • Providing clear guidance to applicants in advance

10. What plans do you have in place to monitor the impact of the proposals once they have been implemented? (The full impact of the decision may only be known after the proposals have been implemented). Please see action plan below.

- Fees and charges reviewed annually as part of the corporate process
- Specific licensing regimes monitored through performance and budget monitoring
- Any equalities concerns raised through complaints, feedback or consultation will be reviewed
- Legal requirement for periodic policy reviews, e.g., 3-yearly for some regimes (Gambling Act)

What course of action does this EIA suggest you take? More than one of the following may apply	✓
Outcome 1: No major change required. The EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or adverse impact and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken	✓
Outcome 2: Adjust the policy to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better promote equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers identified? (Complete action plan).	
Outcome 3: Continue the policy despite potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality identified. You will need to ensure that the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You should consider whether there are sufficient plans to reduce the negative impact and/or plans to monitor the actual impact (see questions below). (Complete action plan).	
Outcome 4: Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. (Complete action plan).	

Action Plan and Timetable for Implementation

At this stage a timetabled Action Plan should be developed to address any concerns/issues related to equality in the existing or proposed policy/service or function. This plan will need to be integrated into the appropriate Service/Business Plan.

Action	Target Groups	Lead Responsibility	Outcomes/Success Criteria	Monitoring & Evaluation	Target Date	Progress to Date

Name: Russell Denney-Clarke

Signed:



(Person completing the EIA)

Date: 03/02/2026