

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00938 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Place Services Invest Falkirk	Lead Officer Name:	Charlotte Paterson
		Team:	PMO (SPR)
		Tel:	07527703987
		Email:	charlotte.paterson@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Closure of Burnbank Store	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	No

Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	No	Yes	No

Other, please specify:

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):

06/01/2025	Closure of Burnbank Store to deliver the approved Strategic Property Review savings and reduce the number of buildings that are in poor condition.

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	£1,250 per annum on property running costs. Total backlog in maintenance is £799,410	
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:	01/04/2025	
	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.

The building has been identified as Condition D - Bad: Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure; risk of injury.

The backlog in maintenance required for the building is £799,410 and given this significant investment required and the current budget position, it was agreed to relocate the storage and close the property.

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

Burnbank Store is used to store equipment for children with disabilities. There is no disruption to service delivery or service users by the relocation of equipment. Staff will now have to access an alternative property for the equipment but this is not perceived to be a negative move. The feedback from staff who currently access Burnbank Store is that it is not a pleasant environment given the unsanitary conditions, leading to an unnecessary financial and environmental impact where equipment cannot be recycled and must be wasted. Given the building is a Condition D, regular checks are underway but it's recognised this is not a suitable operational property and working environment.

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?	No
If NO, please state why.	The property has already been assessed as a Condition D building - Bad: Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure; risk of injury. The is also significant backlog in maintenance required and therefore will close.

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.	Engagement on the Strategic Property Review was undertaken December 2022 - January 2023. 1 response was in relation to the closure of Burnbank Store. Given there is no change to service delivery, no further engagement is required.	
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	As part of the Strategic Property Review engagement, a survey was available for completion December 2022 - January 2023.
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	Yes	As part of the Strategic Property Review engagement, public events took place January 2023.
Other: please specify		
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, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Disability	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Sex	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Ethnicity	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Sexual Orientation	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Transgender	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Poverty	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Care Experienced	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			No negatives impacts identified.
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):	There is no impact to service delivery. The relocation will ensure staff are not accessing a building that has been assessed as Bad: Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure; risk of injury.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	There is no impact to service delivery. The relocation will ensure staff are not accessing a building that has been assessed as Bad: Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure; risk of injury.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	There is no impact to service delivery. The relocation will ensure staff are not accessing a building that has been assessed as Bad: Life expired and/or serious risk of imminent failure; risk of injury.

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	Yes	Children's Services has a duty of care to children affected by a disability. This includes the statutory responsibility to assess their needs, and provide advice, guidance and assistance to ensure the welfare of children. The concerns raised above fall into these areas of statutory responsibility as outlined in the Scottish Government's Guidance on the Provision of equipment and adaptations and require to be urgently addressed: Guidance on the Provision of Equipment and Adaptations Jan 2023.pdf
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

No Mitigating Actions

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

No identified negative impact following the closure of Burnbank Store and the relocation of equipment. This is due to the current condition of the property. An options appraisal was undertaken to agree a suitable relocation option with colleagues in Children's Services. There is no impact on service users.

Are actions being reported to Members?

No

If yes when and how ?

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	Burnbank Store is in bad condition with a significant backlog in maintenance. This will close and the equipment for children with disabilities will be relocated to a suitable alternative location.
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>Charlotte Paterson</i>	Date:	06/01/2025
------------	---------------------------	-------	------------

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	Assessment identified no impact on any of the protected characteristics.	
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		

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: N/A
---	----	---------------------------------

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	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	<i>Malcolm Bennie</i>	Date:	09/01/2025