

.4 Integrated Impact Assessment

Summary Report Template

Each of the numbered sections below must be completed

Interim report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Final report	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Tick as appropriate)
----------------	--------------------------	--------------	---	--------------------------	-----------------------

1. Title of proposal

City of Edinburgh Council Sexual Entertainment Venues Licensing Policy

2. What will change as a result of this proposal?

The Air Weapons and Licensing (Scotland) Act 2015 adds new sections to the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 which enables local authorities to introduce a discretionary licensing system for sexual entertainment venues (SEVs). As a result of this policy, a licensing regime will be implemented for premises classed as SEVs. The policy and conditions allow the Council to consider local circumstances and to exercise appropriate control and regulation of these venues in setting the number of venues able to operate within Edinburgh. The Council is required to determine the appropriate number of SEV premises permitted to operate in Edinburgh and can choose to limit the number of SEVs in Edinburgh to zero or a higher number, whichever it deems appropriate. There are currently three SEV premises operating in the city. If the Council did not adopt this discretionary power then SEVs will continue to operate without any direct influence from the Council. Premises which fall under the definition of a sexual entertainment venue could close or be forced to significantly change their operation if a SEV policy is introduced with a zero limit in relation to the number of SEV premises.

3. Briefly describe public involvement in this proposal to date and planned

The Council has previously engaged in public consultation throughout the process of agreeing to adopt a scheme to licence sexual entertainment venues and setting a SEV licensing policy and conditions framework in March 2022.

On 11 March 2019 the Regulatory Committee instructed officers to carry out an initial public consultation with a view to gaining a broader understanding of community views in relation to the potential introduction of a resolution which, if implemented, would require premises classed as SEVs to be licensed in 2021. Subsequently, a consultation exercise was carried out from 8 July to 17 August with over 800 responses received.

A further report containing a comprehensive analysis of the response was considered by the Committee on 21 October 2019. The Committee agreed to adopt a scheme to licence SEVs, in principle and instructed officers to draft a proposed SEVs policy, resolution & conditions for consideration.

Following a period of extensive research, previous consultation exercises and instruction from the Regulatory Committee, a draft SEVs policy and draft licensing conditions were published with a further round of public consultation taking place on both draft proposals. This consultation took place between 9 April – 2 July 2021 and received 89 responses in total.

On 31 March 2022, Committee considered a report on the proposed licensing of SEVs within Edinburgh. Thereafter, Committee agreed to adopt a SEV licensing resolution that would require the licensing of SEVs within Edinburgh, and to adopt a scheme for the licensing of SEVs effective from 1 April 2023. The Committee thereafter determined the number of SEV premises appropriate for the City of Edinburgh to be zero; and further agreed to adopt the SEV policy statement and standard licensing conditions appended to the report, all in terms of the 1982 Act.

The SEV licensing policy which was approved on 31 March 2022, was the subject of a Judicial Review in the Court of Session. On 10 February 2023, the Court issued its decision, which found against the Council and in favour of the petitioners. The Court decided that the Council had no discretion to grant applications for SEV licences where the Council had determined the number of SEVs appropriate for Edinburgh to be zero. The Court also decided the Council had been wrong to consider that it did have discretion to grant applications for SEVs licences when a zero numbers determination was in place. Therefore, the zero limit determination agreed by the Council on this basis should be struck down.

Accordingly, on 1 May 2023 Committee instructed officers to carry out a statutory consultation process to seek community and business views on;

- What the appropriate number of Sexual Entertainment Venues (SEVs) for Edinburgh should be;
- What the appropriate number of SEVs for each relevant locality within the city should be; and
- The existing SEV policy statement and conditions framework.

As part of that consultation process, officers referred to the information gathered during the initial consultation exercises. Information was also gathered by holding a series of evidence sessions with key stakeholders such as existing SEV operators and performers. In addition, the Committee also held sessions with community councils and relevant organisations such as the Equally Safe Edinburgh Committee to provide members with a detailed and robust evidence base from which to inform any decision making. Furthermore, officers carried out a document review of existing SEV licensing policies in operation in England, including those council areas of a similar size to Edinburgh, such as Westminster. A full list of those policies that were studied is included in section 6. There has also been previous engagement with the SOLAR licensing SEV working group, which has brought together officers from a number of Scottish local authorities to discuss and consider proposed SEV licensing schemes and policies. As part of this work, officers have previously attended a SEV licensing seminar which had expert speakers on the subject from both England and Scotland.

A draft SEVs policy and draft licensing conditions framework was published, and consultation took place between 10 July – 2 October 2023 with 1993 responses received in total.

4. Is the proposal considered strategic under the Fairer Scotland Duty?

No

5. Date of final IIA

4 January 2024 – the group also met on 28 November 2023 to discuss this IIA. Some members of the group had also formed part of the group which considered an IIA on the licensing of SEVs as part of the previous consultation process.

6. Who was present at the IIA? Identify facilitator, lead officer, report writer and any employee representative present and main stakeholder (e.g. Council, NHS)

Name	Job Title	Date of IIA training
Chris McKee (co-facilitator, lead officer, report writer)	Regulatory Team Leader	6 December 2023
Jackie McInnes (Co-facilitator)	Senior Planning Officer	09 March 2022
Catherine Scanlin	Licensing Manager	
Gordon Hunter	Regulatory Team Leader	24 October 2023
Gerry Mays	Principal Solicitor – Licensing	
Mark Upward	Advice Services Manager	November 2018
Anna Darocha (Note taker)	Licensing Officer	

7. Evidence available at the time of the IIA

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
Data on populations in need	Yes – Consultation responses	The consultation responses gave data on respondents ethnic group or background, sexual orientation, age, national identity, gender, religion, religious denomination or body.
Data on service uptake/access	Yes – Consultation responses	<p>Information on the service uptake/access to SEV premises could be considered commercially sensitive and therefore the Council has not been able to access this information.</p> <p>However, the consultation process has resulted in information being received from the following groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customers SEV Performers & Union Reps SEV Operators & Legal Agents Neighbours / Residents / Community Councils
Data on socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income, low wealth, material deprivation, area deprivation.	Yes – Consultation responses	<p>Information received during the consultation process from SEV operators, SEV performers and SEV performer union representatives stated that by introducing a licensing scheme which bans SEVs from operating would result in a loss of income for a wide range of people, including operators, performers and premises employees such and bar and door staff, which would create a socio-economic disadvantage for them and any dependents. It was further stated that any loss of income would be exacerbated due to the current cost of living crisis. The same respondents also stated that a zero limit would likely cause the sexual entertainment to operate ‘underground’ in unregulated locations which would create a greater chance of performers being a victim of crime and harm.</p> <p>SEV performers and SEV performer union representatives stated that a monopoly would be created in Edinburgh if the Committee agreed a limit of three SEV premises being permitted to operate, given</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>the fact there are currently three SEV premises currently open in the city. A limit of three would negatively impact the opportunity for them or any other party to open another SEV premises and would stifle competition and future opportunities.</p> <p>Information received from organisations such as violence against women’s groups stated that by introducing a licensing scheme which bans SEVs, it would allow performers to find alternative, safer and more stable means of employment.</p>
Data on equality outcomes	Yes – Consultation responses	<p>Information from trade organisations such as performers union groups have stated that by introducing a licensing scheme which bans SEVs from operating or which prevents new premises opening, the equality outcomes of performers, employees and operators of SEVs would be adversely affected.</p> <p>Information from organisations such as violence against women’s groups have stated that by licensing SEVs and allowing them to operate that women’s equality outcomes could be adversely affected.</p> <p>Some responses to the consultation referred specifically to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the rights given to individuals under the convention. Some responses also referred to the Council’s obligation to have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in terms of s.149 of the Equality Act 2010 which is summarised below as:</p> <p><i>“(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to—</i></p> <p><i>(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;</i></p> <p><i>(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</i></p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p><i>(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—</i></p> <p><i>(a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;</i></p> <p><i>(b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;</i></p> <p><i>(c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.</i></p> <p><i>(5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—</i></p> <p><i>(a) tackle prejudice, and</i></p> <p><i>(b) promote understanding.</i></p> <p><i>(7) The relevant protected characteristics are—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• ...</i> <i>• sex.</i> <p><i>(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—</i></p> <p><i>(a) a breach of an equality clause or rule;</i></p> <p><i>(b) a breach of a non-discrimination rule.</i></p> <p>The Committee must also have regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 when determining what would be the appropriate</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>number of SEVs and must take into account all responses received. The most relevant protected characteristic in relation to the licensing of SEVs is sex, particularly as the majority of affected individuals are women. Other protected characteristics may also be relevant.</p> <p>It is important to understand that the duty in section 149 is a prominent and should be at the forefront of decision making. There requires to be a rigorous consideration of the PSED based on a proper and conscientious focus on the statutory criteria set out in section 149 which clearly sets out the broad reach of the duty to have due regard in relation issues of the elimination of discrimination, harassment or other conduct prohibited under the Act; the advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not and the fostering of good relations between such persons . The Act sets out what in particular due regard to includes at section 149(3) and (5)."</p>
Research/literature evidence	Yes – Consultation responses which included links to various academic research papers and studies.	<p>Some consultation responses have referred the Committee to existing research and literature on a range of issues including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEV performer perspectives of working in the industry • If any links exist between SEVs and violent crimes; sexual offences; violence against women and girls • Examples of the regulation of the sexual entertainment industry in other countries.

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		The titles and links to the research and literature are included in the responses to the consultation
Public/patient/client experience information	Yes – Consultation responses	<p>There are a range of views on this subject. At a high level it is possible to identify two very different points of view that are diametrically opposed to each other, as to whether SEVs should be permitted to operate.</p> <p>As noted below and in the information put before the Committee, there are those who feel SEVs are safe and that those who work in SEVs have the right to work and it is their right to choose how they earn an income. On the other hand, there are some respondents who feel that SEVs negatively contribute towards equality outcomes and act as a form of violence against women. Given that the 3 SEV premises currently open have operated for a minimum of 20 years, this indicates there is a demand for this service.</p>
Evidence of inclusive engagement of people who use the service and involvement findings	Yes	<p>During the public consultation exercises, information has been provided from those who work in the SEV trade and those who have identified themselves as customers of SEV premises.</p> <p>A public consultation was published on the Council’s consultation hub webpage which allowed responses to be submitted online. The consultation was highlighted directly to key stakeholders such as SEV operators, performers and unions, in addition to relevant organisations such as the Equally Safe Edinburgh Committee and others. The consultation was also highlighted using social media.</p> <p>A series of evidence sessions were held with key stakeholders such as existing operators and performers, and community councils. In addition, the Committee also heard from the Equally Safe Edinburgh Committee. This provided members with a</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>detailed and robust evidence base from which to inform any decision making.</p> <p>Based on feedback from prospective participants, the evidence sessions were conducted in private to protect identities, commercially sensitive information and to encourage participation.</p> <p>Given the sensitive and emotive nature of this subject, the Council have taken a range of measures to encourage participation in the consultation process.</p>
Evidence of demand	Yes – Consultation responses	At present, there are 3 premises which would fall under the definition of a SEV which have operated continuously for a number of years.
Good practice guidelines	Yes – Scottish Government information and guidance, various local authority websites within the UK and existing legislation.	<p>In forming a SEVs policy and conditions framework, the Council has taken into account the information available from existing SEV licensing schemes in England. These include those from the following local authority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birmingham • Camden • Leeds • Manchester • Sheffield • Westminster <p>The Council has also referred to the Scottish Government’s Guidance on the Provisions for Licensing of Sexual Entertainment Venues.</p> <p>In drafting the SEV Licensing Policy, the Council has also had regard to the Scottish Government’s Equally Safe Strategy, the Public Sector Equality Duty set out in s.149 of the Equality Act 2010 and the European Convention on Human Rights.</p>
Carbon emissions generated/reduced data	N/A	N/A
Environmental data	N/A	N/A

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
Risk from cumulative impacts	N/A	N/A
Other (please specify)	Yes – Scottish local authorities and consultation stakeholders	<p>The decisions of other Scottish local authorities, which had resolved to licence SEVs at the time of writing, and the associated SEV licensing policies of those local authorities were considered.</p> <p>Correspondence to the Council from the Equally Safe Edinburgh Committee and the Sex Workers Union branch of the Bakers, Food and Allied Workers Union were also considered.</p>
Additional evidence required	No	No

8. In summary, what impacts were identified and which groups will they affect?

Equality, Health and Wellbeing and Human Rights	Affected populations
<p>Positive</p> <p>From the information gathered through the consultation processes and evidence sessions, it is evident that the majority of SEV workers identify as female.</p> <p>If a policy was introduced to licence SEVs, it could have a positive impact on women as it would mean there is more regulation in the industry. The SEV operator would have to comply with licence conditions, imposed by the Committee. A licensing regime would also provide a mechanism for SEV workers and also members of the public, to report any problems they have with the running of the premises to the Committee, who could investigate and possibly take appropriate action against the licence holder to ensure the SEV workers safety is not being compromised or any nuisance being caused to the public by the operation of the premises.</p> <p>If licensed, it could allow an opportunity through the licensing policy statement to provide a more secure and safe environment for SEV workers and also members of the public.</p>	<p>Men (including trans men), Women (including trans women) and Non-binary people; Children & young persons; SEV performers; SEV premises operators; SEV employees (bar staff, door staff); Neighbours/Residents; Customers</p>

If SEVs were to be licensed and an appropriate number set to enable SEVs that the Committee is currently aware of, to remain open, it would ensure that the SEVs workers continue to be employed and receive an income to support themselves and any dependents.

A number of respondents to the consultation identified themselves as SEVs performers and/or employees of SEVs. The Committee also held evidence sessions with SEV performers. The evidence put forward by those working in SEVs stated that they enjoyed working in SEVs, felt safe working in SEVs and many stated that they had worked in the industry for several years.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at three (the number of SEVs currently operating in Edinburgh) or higher this would allow individuals to continue their employment, Protocol 1 Article 1 and Article 10 of the ECHR would not be interfered with.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at higher than three (the number of SEVs currently operating in Edinburgh) this could have a positive impact on the majority of SEVs workers and any prospective operators, as it would not create a monopoly for the existing SEV operators in Edinburgh. This would mean that there would be more of an onus on the operators to maintain or improve standards for workers within the premises as there could be more competition from other SEV premises. It would also mean any prospective SEV operators have the opportunity to apply for a licence and earn income for themselves and any dependents.

If a SEV licensing scheme was introduced with limits placed on the number of SEVs in a certain locality, it would allow the Council to control the number of SEVs operating in certain vicinities. For example, near schools, places of worship, women's refuges, residential areas etc.

If SEVs were to be licensed and the number set to zero SEVs in Edinburgh, this could have a positive impact on SEV workers as some responses stated that workers in SEVs are sexually exploited, suffer sexual assault and are abused.

If SEVs were to be licensed and the number set to zero SEVs in Edinburgh, this could have a positive impact on

women (including trans women) in Edinburgh as some responses have stated that the existence of SEVs can lead to them feeling unsafe in areas of the city where SEVs currently operate.

The responses highlighted that some workers in SEVs may be transgender. The positives and negatives for transgender people would be similar to those listed above for men and women.

Although the majority of responses received from SEVs workers were from women, there are men who also work in the SEVs that the Committee has knowledge of. The positives and negatives for men would be similar to those listed for women above.

Consultation highlighted that the owners of SEVs in Edinburgh, that the Committee are aware of, were men and that those involved in the day-to-day management of those premises were both men and women. The owners and managers were in favour of a licensing regime and the number set to allow current SEVs that the Committee is aware of in Edinburgh, to continue operating. The owners and managers stated that if licensed, it would provide direct regulation for the dancers and premises.

The information gathered in developing a draft SEV licensing policy and conditions framework has allowed the Council to gain a better understanding of the issues related to SEVs in general and more specifically in Edinburgh.

Negative

If SEVs were to be licensed and an appropriate number set to enable SEVs that the Committee is currently aware of, to remain open, this could have a negative impact (or could exacerbate perceived on-going negative impacts) on SEV workers as some responses stated that workers in SEVs are sexually exploited, suffer sexual assault and are abused and that the existence of SEVs contributes towards violence against women and girls, the objectification of women and gender inequality.

Some responses to consultation stated that allowing SEVs to remain open could represent a failure to protect individuals from violence which may breach Article 2 (right to life), Article 3 (right to be free of inhumane and degrading treatment) and Article 4 (right to be free of slavery and servitude) of the ECHR.

The external appearance of sex establishments has the potential to impact those persons under 18 negatively as it could expose them to sexually explicit imagery.

Persons under 18 accessing the SEVs premises has the potential to impact those persons negatively. This risk exists as with any age restricted licensed premises.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at zero this could have a negative impact on the majority of SEVs workers who are women, as the venues they currently work in may close. This could lead to unemployment which would not only impact on the worker but also any family members who are dependent upon their income.

Performers who attended the evidence sessions stated that the closure of SEVs could lead them to travelling elsewhere to places like Glasgow and Newcastle to work in SEVs. This could have an adverse effect on their family as they could be away from them for longer or adversely impact those in further education for example. Furthermore, it could lead to them travelling further distances on their own and late at night which could have an adverse effect on their safety.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at zero, this could have a negative impact as it could cause the sexual entertainment to operate 'underground' in unregulated locations which would create a greater chance of performers being a victim of crime.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at zero, this could have a negative impact on the SEV operators, employees and performers rights under Article 1 Protocol 1 (right to property) and Article 10 (right to freedom of expression) of the ECHR.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at three (the number of SEVs currently operating in Edinburgh) this could have a negative impact on the majority of SEVs workers who are women, as it would create a monopoly for the existing SEV operators in Edinburgh. This would mean that there could be less of an onus on the operators to maintain or improve standards for workers within the premises as there is limited competition from other SEV premises.

--	--

<p>Environment and Sustainability including climate change emissions and impacts</p> <p>Positive If SEVs were to be licensed and the number set to zero, this could have a positive effect as it could encourage new businesses to the premises, should the existing SEV premises operators vacate.</p> <p>If SEVs were to be licensed and an appropriate number set to enable SEVs that the Committee is currently aware of, to remain open, it would result in the continued use of a business premises in the area.</p> <p>Negative If SEVs were to be licensed and the number set to zero, this could have a negative impact as those affected businesses could be forced to close and could result in empty premises. This could have a negative impact on, or contribute to the decline of, the surrounding built environment.</p>	<p>Affected populations</p> <p>SEVs premises operators/Local businesses</p> <p>Residents</p>
---	---

<p>Economic</p> <p>Positive If SEVs were to be licensed and an appropriate number set to enable SEVs that the Committee is currently aware of, to remain open, it would ensure that the SEVs workers continue working and receive an income to support themselves and any dependents. This would not result in socio-economic disadvantage for these populations.</p> <p>If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at higher than three (the number of SEVs currently operating in Edinburgh) this could have a positive impact on the majority of SEVs workers and any prospective operators, as it would not create a monopoly for the existing SEV operators in Edinburgh. This would mean that there would be more of an onus on the operators to maintain or improve standards for workers within the premises as there could be more competition from other SEV premises. It would also mean any prospective SEV operators have the opportunity to apply for a licence and earn income for themselves and any dependents.</p>	<p>Affected populations</p> <p>Men (including trans men), Women (including trans women) and Non-binary people; SEV performers SEV premises operators/Local businesses; SEV employees (bar staff, door staff, full time staff, part time staff); SEV Customers, SEV suppliers</p>
---	---

If SEVs were to be licensed and the number set to zero SEVs in Edinburgh, this would have a positive impact on SEV workers/performers as some responses stated that workers in SEVs are financially exploited by the SEV operators. There are also various ways in which performers can access support in finding alternative employment in Edinburgh. However, it is also noted that some workers will live out with Edinburgh or also work at venues in different local authority areas.

Negative

Premises which fall under the definition of a sexual entertainment venue could close or be forced to significantly change their operation if a SEV policy is introduced with a zero limit in relation to the number of SEV premises.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs but set the appropriate number of SEVs in the locality at zero this could have a negative impact on the majority of SEVs workers, who are women, as the venues they currently work in may close. This could lead to loss of income, unemployment and create a socio-economic disadvantage, which would not only impact on the worker and any other staff but also any family members who are dependent upon their income. The continuing increases to the cost of living (e.g. fuel, food & energy costs), at the time of writing, was also noted and that any loss of income would exacerbate any cost increases for those affected.

If a SEV licensing scheme was introduced with limits placed on the number of SEVs in a certain locality, it would allow the Council to control the number of SEVs operating in certain vicinities. This could restrict the ability of SEV businesses to operate in certain areas of the city.

If a SEV premises closed as a result of a licensing scheme it could have a negative impact on other businesses which supply the SEV business, such as suppliers who provide cleaning or bar supplies.

Some responses to the consultation noted that even if the Council determined that the appropriate number of SEVs in the city is zero, existing SEV premises would still hold a Premises Licence to sell alcohol under the Licensing (Scotland) Act 2005 and could re-purpose the premises to operate as a bar/restaurant or another hospitality business. However, existing SEV operators stated during evidence sessions that without a SEV licence, the

premises would likely close in the current financial climate and noted that some existing hospitality businesses in the city had been closed or experiencing difficulties due to financial hardships.

If the Committee determined to licence SEVs and set the appropriate number of SEVs in a locality at three (the number of SEVs currently operating in Edinburgh) this could have a negative impact on the majority of SEVs workers who are women, as it would create a monopoly for the existing SEV operators in Edinburgh. This would mean that any prospective operators of SEVs would be unable to open new premises which may result in socio-economic harm to them and any dependents.

9. Is any part of this policy/ service to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors and if so how will equality, human rights including children’s rights, environmental and sustainability issues be addressed?

N/A

10. Consider how you will communicate information about this policy/ service change to children and young people and those affected by sensory impairment, speech impairment, low level literacy or numeracy, learning difficulties or English as a second language? Please provide a summary of the communications plan.

The Licensing Service currently deals with customers from a range of backgrounds. This includes those affected by sensory impairment, speech impairment, low level literacy or numeracy, learning difficulties or English as a second language.

If the Regulatory Committee passes a resolution to licence SEVs, it must specify a date from when it is to take effect in their area. This must be at least one year from the date the resolution is passed. The local authority must also publish notice that they have passed a resolution not less than 28 days prior to the date the resolution is to take effect. The notice must state the general effect of the licensing procedure and provisions at Schedule 2 of the 1982 Act, as modified for SEV, and be published either electronically or in a local newspaper.

If the Regulatory Committee agree to adopt a resolution to licence SEVs, the licensing service will communicate this in a number of ways. All affected premises will be written to in order to inform them of the decision along with information on the agreed SEVs policy, conditions framework and any other appropriate information. Furthermore, the Committee’s decision will be communicated using the Council’s and Licensing Service’s social media accounts in addition to updates being placed on the Council’s website. The Licensing Service will also include information of the Committee’s decision in its regular newsletter which is sent to all licence holders. The decision will also be communicated to Community Councils.

Where customers require further support to access information in respect of SEV licensing, the licensing service will make the necessary reasonable adjustments to cater for this. For example, translators can be provided for those customers whose primary language is not English and who have difficulty understanding this information.

11. Is the plan, programme, strategy or policy likely to result in significant environmental effects, either positive or negative? If yes, it is likely that a [Strategic Environmental Assessment](#) (SEA) will be required and the impacts identified in the IIA should be included in this. See section 2.10 in the Guidance for further information.

No

12. Additional Information and Evidence Required

If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered. If appropriate, mark this report as interim and submit updated final report once further evidence has been gathered.

At this stage, it has not been established that any additional information or evidence is required. Should the Regulatory Committee request further information, this will be provided.

13. Specific to this IIA only, what recommended actions have been, or will be, undertaken and by when? (these should be drawn from 7 – 11 above) Please complete:

Specific actions (as a result of the IIA which may include financial implications, mitigating actions and risks of cumulative impacts)	Who will take them forward (name and job title)	Deadline for progressing	Review date
Include a copy of this IIA in the Regulatory Committee Report due to be considered on 5 February 2024.	Chris McKee, Regulatory Team Leader		5 February 2024
Ensure an updated IIA is completed when the SEV licensing policy is next reviewed	Chris McKee, Regulatory Team Leader		TBC

14. Are there any negative impacts in section 8 for which there are no identified mitigating actions?

At the time of writing, there were no negative impacts for which there are no identified mitigating actions. The group noted that the Committee were yet to make a decision on the appropriate number of SEVs permitted to operate in Edinburgh and that this position could change as a result of the Committee's decision.

15. How will you monitor how this proposal affects different groups, including people with protected characteristics?

It is proposed that the SEV licensing policy is reviewed annually, or more frequently, should circumstances require it. A review of the IIA and how the policy is affecting different groups, including those with protected characteristics, will form part of that work.

16. Sign off by Service Director

Name – Peter Watton

Date – 9 February 2024

17. Publication

Completed and signed IIAs should be sent to:

integratedimpactassessments@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published on the Council website www.edinburgh.gov.uk/impactassessments

Edinburgh Integration Joint Board/Health and Social Care

sarah.bryson@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published at www.edinburghhsc.scot/the-ijb/integrated-impact-assessments/