

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00194 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Corporate & Housing Services Housing & Communities	Lead Officer Name:	Steve Bentley
		Team:	Operations
		Tel:	01324590833
		Email:	steve.bentley@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Haugh Gardens Development.	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	No	Yes	No	No
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	Yes	No	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
23/01/2020	To authorise the Director of Corporate & Housing to declare two council properties as surplus to requirements and exchange these with the two remaining owners at Haugh Gardens to ensure the progression of the redevelopment project.
23/01/2020	The reason for the submission is that the remaining owners have religious beliefs that mean they are not allowed to take out a conventional mortgage. Research by the Housing Strategy Team confirms that based on the District Valuer's valuation both owners will be restricted in their options to secure an alternate property within the Falkirk district.

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:		
Increase to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

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.

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 affected persons due to strict religious observance are not able to secure funding by traditional lending agencies.

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?	The proposed actions have been extensively discussed with Governance and Head of Housing & Communities.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	We have spoken to the owners and have all the information we need.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals 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.	Property owners.	
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	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify	Personal interview	
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	Yes	
Is further engagement recommended?	No	

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, public protection etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Disability	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Sex	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Ethnicity	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief			✓	The inability to access traditional lending institutions.
Sexual Orientation	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Transgender	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Poverty	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Other, health, community justice, public protection etc.	✓			The proposals are not impacted by this characteristic.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)				

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):	Ensuring no discrimination against religious beliefs.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Ensuring no discrimination against religious beliefs.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	Recognising the religious and cultural beliefs.

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.		

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	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
The inability to access traditional lending institutions.	Property owners.	Identified other Council housing where the residents can be housed.	Steve Bentley	15/02/2020	Increasing Housing LHS Outcome 2

No Mitigating Actions

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

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	February 2020 Executive

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 required	Yes	This proposal is anticipated to be unique and doesn't set any future policy trends.
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	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Steve Bentley</i>	Date:	29/01/2020
------------	----------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF 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?	Yes
------------------------------------	--	-----

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	This EPIA has taken account the religious belief of the tenants affected by this housing project	
--	--	--

Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	No	If YES, please describe:
---	----	--------------------------

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 / No	
LOW	Yes	This was potentially a high impact but because of the mitigating action taken to support these tenants it is rated a low impact EPIA.

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:		
Signature:	<i>Stuart Ritchie</i>	Date: 30/01/2020