

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00471 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Transformation, Communities & Corporate Services Housing & Communities	Lead Officer Name:	Crawford Bell
		Team:	Communities
		Tel:	+447483919745
		Email:	crawford.bell@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Thornhill 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 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	Building being considered for Community Asset Transfer (CAT)

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:	01/04/2024	
	End Date (if any):	31/03/2025	

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.	

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.	6 respondents in relation to Thornhill Community Hall identifying as users and local affected residents. A series of public events were held in libraries and schools across Falkirk during January 2023 and one online event. Ongoing support to explore a CAT throughout 2023 and 2024.	
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	

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)				

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.

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.		

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.

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. Further report in January 2025.

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	No impact information provided by users that reported having a disability.
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?	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	There is some evidence of use by protected characteristic groups - usage survey indicates that building used by older persons and also ethnic minority groups - proposed changes will have an impact although difficult to say if negative positive or neutral.
--	---

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 hoped to progress to an alternate model of delivery or Community Asset Transfer as a mitigation to closure. The impact of closure or any mitigations on groups with protected characteristics who use the building should be further explored and monitored as they are developed.
---	-----	--

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 protected characteristics groups.
LOW	Yes / No	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	<i>Karen Algie</i>	Date:	09/01/2025