Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00471 (Version 1)

	SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION				
	Corporate & Housing Services Housing & Communities	Lead Officer Name:	Crawford Bell		
Но		Team:	Communities		
			+447483919745		
		Email:	crawford.bell@falkirk.gov.uk		
Proposal: The	nornhill Community Hall - SPR	Reference No:	471		

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New 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
	Yes	Yes	No	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the m	Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):				
01/04/2024	704/2024 Considering closure or alternative delivery model of this community building.				
22/01/2024	22/01/2024 Building being considered for Community Asset Transfer (CAT)				

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 Page: 1 of 10

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION				
For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average	
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:			
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		Financial savings detailed in the report; Strategic Property Review Update, Falkirk Council, 31st January 2024	
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		

31/03/2025

End Date (if any):

saving be achieved?

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 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.

Jan 2023 usage survey identified 180 users in a week: A range of small businesses for fitness, preschool activities and a children's party, a few community and social activities including bingo and an 'ethnic group'.

Of the 6 survey respondents for Thornhill Hall, 3 expressed they have a protected characteristic that disadvantaged them.

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

Unknown, no comments received in relation to impact.

1 comment received 'Community centres are the heart of the local community'.

Best Judgement:		
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No	
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?		
What gaps in data / information were identified?		
Is further research necessary?	Yes / No	
If NO, please state why.		

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 Page: 3 of 10

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT Engagemen	t with individual	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?				
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	6 respondents	in relation to Thornhill Community Hall identifying as users and local affected residents.		
	A series of pul event.	lic events were held in libraries and schools across Falkirk during January 2023 and one online		
	Ongoing supp	ort to explore a CAT throughout 2023		
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	No			
Survey	Yes	6 respondents for Thornhill Hall.		
Display / Exhibitions	No			
User Panels	No			
Public Event	Yes	No specific comments on this venue raised		
Other: please specify				
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?		Yes		
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?		Yes		
Is further engagement recommended?		Yes		

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 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				Unknown, no comments received.
Disability				Unknown, no comments received.
Sex				Unknown, no comments received.
Ethnicity				Unknown, no comments received.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				Unknown, no comments received.
Sexual Orientation				Unknown, no comments received.
Transgender				Unknown, no comments received.
Pregnancy / Maternity				Unknown, no comments received.
Marriage / Civil Partnership				Unknown, no comments received.
Poverty				Unknown, no comments received.
Care Experienced				
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.				Unknown, no comments received.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)			1	,

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 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):	Inclusive survey and consultation process			
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Inclusion of protected characteristic groups in the consultation			
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	Due regard demonstrated towards older persons groups and ethnic minority groups.			

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 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	Yes	The majority of activities taking place in the venue are run by small businesses. Closure would require them to find alternative venues and alternative delivery may increase rental costs.	
Councils	No		
Education Sector	No		
Fire	No		
NHS	No		
Integration Joint Board	No		
Police	No		
Third Sector	Yes	Positive impact - alternative delivery model would create a third sector social enterprise business model for this building with the potential to grow the third sector in many ways, employment, size, income, social benefits, community leadership role.	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.			

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 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.

3 disabled persons did not report an impact of the decision on them.

The usage survey identified an 'Ethnic Group' but no comments or responses were received by anyone who identified as not from the UK or non-white background. Further engagement with this group is recommended to better assess the impact of changing the delivery model or closing this building.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how?	Strategic Property Review reported to Members in March 2023, and an updated report to Members in 2024.

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 Page: 8 of 10

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME							
Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.							
No major change	e required	No					
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups		No					
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups		Yes	No impact inform disability.	No impact information provided by users that reported having a lisability.			
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation		No					
SECTION NINE: L	EAD OFFICER SIGN OFF						
Lead Officer:							
Signature: Crawford Bell			Date:	22/01/2024			

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 Page: 9 of 10

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY							
	trated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as dappropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the actor equality duties?						
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS 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	There is no evidence from protected characteristic groups - usage survey indicates that building used by older persons and also ethnic minority groups - this will have an impact although difficult to say if negative positive or neutral.						
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been	Yes	If YES, please describe:					
identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing without		The impact on these groups should be further explored and monitored before closure.					
making changes been made?							

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA							
LEVEL		COMMENTS					
HIGH	Yes / No						
MEDIUM	Yes	More information needed to determine impact on these groups.					
LOW	Yes / No						

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:					
Signature:	Karen Algie	Date:	24/01/2024		

Printed: 24/01/2024 12:00 Page: 10 of 10