

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00467 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Corporate & Housing Services Housing & Communities	Lead Officer Name:	Jennifer Kerr
		Team:	Communities
		Tel:	07483913623
		Email:	Jennifer.kerr@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Limerigg Community Hall - SPR	Reference No:	467

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 main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
01/04/2024	Considering closure or alternative delivery model of this community building.
22/01/2024	Group considering Community Asset Transfer

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 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.

This building has been closed for approximately 2 years. After the pandemic, the Management Committee did not reform. A new group of residents have formed a community body and are working to develop a business plan for a Community Asset Transfer. Falkirk Council have engaged with this group at the public event in Slamannan and attended 2 community events in Slamannan.

Of 4 survey respondents, 1 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

I think it would leave Limerigg village even more isolated than it is already, it should be encouraged to bring the village and surrounding areas together.

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.	

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.	<p>4 SPR survey respondents for Limerigg Hall, 1 expressed they have a protected Characteristic that disadvantaged them.</p> <p>A series of public events were held in libraries and schools across Falkirk during January 2023 and one online event. While all events were open to anyone from any area, there was an event held locally to Limerigg in Slamannan Library 10 January 2023.</p> <p>In addition, CVS Falkirk has facilitated two additional community session attended by SPR Officers to consider asset transfer options, for Limerigg Hall and Slammanan Centre.</p> <p>Ongoing support to explore a CAT throughout 2023</p>	
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	4 SPR survey respondents for Limerigg Hall, 1 expressed they have a protected characteristic that disadvantaged them.
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	Yes	SPR event and two community led events attended by Falkirk Council.
Other: please specify	We understand from the events attended that a new community body of residents are working with CVS Falkirk to develop a business plan for taking the Hall on.	
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

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 impact information received from respondents.
Disability				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Sex				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Ethnicity				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Sexual Orientation				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Transgender				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Pregnancy / Maternity				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Marriage / Civil Partnership				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Poverty				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Care Experienced				
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.				Unknown, no impact information received from respondents.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	The Hall has not been in operation for two years. There are no user groups to engage with. Further engagement with wider community should be undertaken to identify if completing closure.			

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 consultation and engagement to include protected characteristics groups and individuals
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	Inclusive consultation and engagement to include protected characteristics groups and individuals
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	Inclusive consultation and engagement to consider the impact of the closure of this facility

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	Yes	The possibility for a community body to re-open the building for community use has a positive impact.
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.

Unknown as only respondent identified as having a protected characteristic did not share information on their personal impact of a decision to close this building or asset transfer it.

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.

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	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	Further research and engagement is recommended to better understand any potential impact on equalities.
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Crawford Bell</i>	Date:	22/01/2024
------------	----------------------	-------	------------

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?	No
------------------------------------	--	----

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	A user identified that they had a protected characteristic that disadvantaged them - this needs to be further explored to determine impact of closure.	
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>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: It is proposed that an asset transfer will be progressed, an EPIA will be needed for this it is hoped the impacts will be further explored and monitored.
---	-----	---

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	
LOW	Yes / No	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

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