Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00673 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSE	NTIAL INFORMATION	V					
Service & Division:				Lead Officer Name	Gary McGregor		
	Environment & Ope	erations		Team	Engineering Design		
				Te	: 07763378910		
				Email	: gary.mcgregor@falkirk.go	v.uk	
Proposal:	Parking Attendants Cabin at Meeks Road Car Park - SPR			Reference No	:		
	Due to be closed an elsewhere	nd the staff moved to similar of	fice space				
What is the Proposal?		Budget & Other Financial Decision	(Nev	Policy v or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design	
		Yes	No		No	Yes	
Who does the Proposal affect?		Service Users	Members of the Public		Employees	Job Applicants	
		No	No		Yes	No	
Other, please specif	fy:						

17/01/2024 The main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update): 17/01/2024 The main aim of this proposal is to relocate Falkirk Council's Parking Attendants from their current location within a cabin in Meeks Road car park, Falkirk Town Centre to another suitable location with the required welfare and IT facilities. This has been brought about by the Strategic Property Review of all Council properties which will provide savings.

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 1 of 10

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION							
For budget changes ONLY please include infor	mation below:		Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average				
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	£26,330					
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:						
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:						
If this is a change to a charge or	Current Annual Income Total:						
concession please complete.	Expected Annual Income Total:						
If this is a budget decision, when will the	Start Date:	01/04/2024					
saving be achieved?	End Date (if any):						

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 2 of 10

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
N/A	

B - Qualitative Evidence

This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.

Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other

The parking attendants will be moved to another suitable location within the Falkirk Town Centre which will allow them to carry out their duties as current, so it is therefore recommended that there will be no impact on the service or the employees.

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Gary McGregor, Engineering Design Manager. This judgement was based on the relocation premises being just as suitable as the current location
What gaps in data / information were identified?	None
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	No further research is required. Parking attendants are aware.

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 3 of 10

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT Engagemen	t with individua	s or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place		
Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes			
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Engagement with the parking attendants who are aware that their cabin is due to be included within the SPR has taken place. This was to provide an opportunity for the PA's to raise any potential issues. Main questions based around welfare, IT, storage and location which are all mitigated.			
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.				
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list		
Focus Group	Yes	Discussed with parking attendants		
Survey	No			
Display / Exhibitions	No			
User Panels	No			
Public Event	No			
Other: please specify				
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed a result of the engagement?	I / changed as	No		
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?		No		
Is further engagement recommended?		No		

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 4 of 10

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics:

What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			No impact. Some members of the team are above 50 years old.
Disability	✓			No impact.
Sex	✓			No impact.
Ethnicity	✓			No impact.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			No impact.
Sexual Orientation	✓			No impact.
Transgender	✓			No impact.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			No impact.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			No impact.
Poverty	✓			No impact.
Care Experienced	✓			No impact.
Other, health, community justice,	✓			No impact.
carers etc.				
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change) No risks identified, aware of protected with this change)		e of protected	d characteristic groups and they are not affected	

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 5 of 10

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	Suitable facilities will continue to be available to the employees affected.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	As above, suitable facilities will continue to be available to the employees affected.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	Appropriate engagement was undertaken with the employees affected.

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 6 of 10

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS					
Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.			
Business	No				
Councils	No				
Education Sector	No				
Fire	No				
NHS	No				
Integration Joint Board	No				
Police	No				
Third Sector	No				
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of					
the relationship / impact.					

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 7 of 10

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions:

If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	and Review	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Relocation already being established. No impacts identified.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how?	Full Council on 31st January 2024

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 8 of 10

SECTION EIGHT: A	SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME						
Only one of follow	wing statements best matches your assessment of this	s proposal / pol	icy / project. Please	e select one and provide your reasons.			
No major change required		Yes	·	sly within the EPIA. The Parking Attendants will be ner suitable location with the required welfare & IT			
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups		No					
Continue with the to protected char	e proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk acteristic groups	No					
Stop the proposal	as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No					
SECTION NINE: LE	SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF						
Lead Officer:	Lead Officer:						
Signature:	Gary McGregor		Date:	17/01/2024			

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 9 of 10

SECTION TEN	SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY							
OVERALL ASS	SESSMENT OF	F EPIA:	Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?					
ASSESSMENT	FINDINGS			Engagement	was undertaken with the employees affected and no impacts were identifi	ied.		
If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve								
the EPIA	is box to mign	iligiit actic	ons needed to improve					
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing without making changes been made?			inue with the proposal /	Yes / No	If YES, please describe: N/A			
LEVEL OF IM	PACT: The EF	PIA Task G	roup has agreed the follow	ving level of im	pact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA			
LEVEL		COMME	NTS					
HIGH	Yes / No							
MEDIUM	Yes / No							
LOW Yes No impacts identified.								
SECTION ELE	SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF							
Director / He	Director / Head of Service:							

Printed: 22/01/2024 13:06 Page: 10 of 10

22/01/2024

Date:

Signature:

Malcolm Bennie