**Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council**

**Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Screening**

**Part 1. Activity/Policy Scoping**

**Information about the activity/policy**

|  |
| --- |
| **Pilot Community Investment Fund Pilot Scheme (2021)**  Following extensive community consultation through the community planning process, LCCC has earmarked circa £2 million for developing community infrastructure by funding capital projects in each of its seven DEAs.  To inform the delivery of this major investment, it has been decided to run a pilot project in one DEA with between £200K - £250K available for one successful application. Applicants will be required to provide a minimum of 50% match funding.  This new pilot fund will be used to inform the roll out of the wider community investment funding programme to support the delivery of key regeneration projects across the Lisburn and Castlereagh council area. It is also a way for the council to connect with local communities and engage at a local level.  The council is currently seeking to fund one pilot project as part of an open call for project proposals. This is a capital funding stream which will only fund capital projects which are not owned by the Council. Projects must be located within the LCCC area. Council is looking for exciting schemes which will address either community and/or sports benefits for a community led regeneration project. |

Please attach copy of the activity/policy to this document.

# Insert Links:

LCCC 10 Year Investment Plan

[LCCC\_Investment\_Programme\_2019\_.pdf (lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk)](https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/LCCC_Investment_Programme_2019_.pdf)

CIF Report to Full Council 27th April 2021



LCCC Community Plan

<https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/Community_Plan_2017-2032_EMAIL.pdf>

# Is this activity/policy

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| An existing policy? |  | A revised policy? |  | A new policy? | **X** |

What are the intended aims/outcomes the activity/policy is trying to achieve?

The proposed pilot programme aims to trial a new approach to funding community capital projects in one council DEA. If successful, the model will be rolled out to all DEAs. A total of £2million has been allocated to community investment as part of the full programme, with £200K - £250K available for the initial pilot project at this stage.

The aim of the pilot is to test a co-design approach to community funding, and to ensure that lessons learned can be incorporated into the plan for a wider funding scheme so that the funding allocated will have maximum benefit to citizens and will make a significant contribution to council objectives.

The aim of the funding overall is to enable community organisations to deliver projects which will benefit citizens and contribute to LCCC corporate objectives as set out in our key strategic documents which include the community plan, 10 Year Investment Plan and corporate plan.

Are there any expected benefits to the Section 75 categories/groups from this activity/policy? If so, please explain

|  |
| --- |
| The pilot funding scheme is open to all eligible organisations within the LCCC area. The ultimate beneficiaries of the funding will depend on who the successful pilot organisation is and on the detail of their proposal.  This funding opportunity is not being targeted at any particular Section 75 group but in scoring applications, cognisance will be taken of who the beneficiaries of any capital investment are likely to be. |

Who initiated or wrote the activity/policy?

|  |
| --- |
| Director of Leisure and Community Wellbeing |

Who owns and who implements the activity/policy?

|  |
| --- |
| Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council owns the project. It will be delivered by a cross departmental team comprising Leisure & Community Wellbeing and Service Transformation directorates. |

**Implementation factors**

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the activity/policy/decision?

If yes, are they

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Financial? |  | Legislative? |  | Other? | **X** |

If other, please detail below

|  |
| --- |
| The success of the pilot project is dependent on expressions of interest being received for relevant quality proposals. It is anticipated that there is a limited number of potentially eligible community organisations that will apply as there is a specific timeframe on the opening and closing of the application call. |

**Main stakeholders affected**

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the activity/policy will impact upon?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Staff | X |
| Service Users | Potentially as beneficiaries of the successful applicant |
| Other Public Sector Organisations – please list |  |
| Voluntary/Community/Trade Unions – please list | X |
| Other, eg, Elected Members – please list | Elected members in the selected area will be involved |

**Other documents/activities/polices with a bearing on this activity/policy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of document/activity/policy** | **Who owns or implements document/activity/policy?** |
| 1 LCCC Community Plan | LCCC |
| 2 LCCC DEA Investment Programme | LCCC |
| 3 LCCC Corporate Plan | LCCC |
| 4 LCCC 10 Year Investment Plan | LCCC |

The above would include both internal and external documents/activities/policies.

If there is a web-link/link to any of the above please provide details.

**Available evidence**

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this activity/policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

In developing this pilot funding project, we have looked at a wide range of publications and plans and models for community infrastructure funding. There has been widespread previous consultation on how the community sector would like to be funded and this has been taken into account in developing this project as a pilot. We have also looked at what other councils are doing in terms of the roll out of similar investment plans. Learning and experience from the pilot, if successful, will inform the roll-out of a larger funding scheme to all DEAs in the council area.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of evidence/information** |
| Religious Belief | Census 2011/2014 LGD boundary data indicates that 23.95% of the LCCC population were brought up in the Catholic religion; 66.9% were brought up in the Protestant & Other Christian religion; 9.14% identified as no religion or ‘other non-Christian’. |
| Political Opinion | Census data 2011 - There tends to be a generally accepted link between religious community background and political opinion in Northern Ireland. In this instance, the majority political opinion of LCCC residents is Unionist.  In terms of elected representatives, members of LCCC (May 2019 local government elections) belong to a range of parties across the political spectrum:  DUP – 15  UUP – 11  Alliance – 9  SDLP – 2  Sinn Fein - 2  Green Party NI - 1 |
| Racial Group | Census/LGD data suggests just over 2% of the LCCC population are from a minority ethnic group. LCCC has a small minority of different nationalities which includes Eastern European migrants and a small group of Syrian refugees. |
| Age | The mid-year population estimate 2019 for LCCC indicates that there are 29,558 children and young people aged 0-15, this represents 20.3% of the total population.  Mid-year population estimates 2019 at DEA for the 0-15 age group indicate the following figures (persons):  Castlereagh East 3920  Castlereagh South 4720  Downshire East 3430  Downshire West 3210  Killultagh 4910  Lisburn North 4370  Lisburn South 5160 |
| Marital Status | For the 16+ population in relation to marital and civil partnerships:  30.65% single  53.78% married  0.10% same sex partnership  3.27% separated  5.52% divorced  6.68% widowed |
| Sexual Orientation | There is a lack of monitoring data on sexual orientation with the question asked in the 2021 census for the first time. The ONS published data in 2017 indicating that 1.2% of the household population in NI identified as Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual (LGB). However, LGB support groups both in GB and NI suggest this is a significant under-representation.UK research published by the Government Equalities Office in 2017 suggested at least 4% of the UK population (inc NI) identified as LGB, with significantly more younger people disclosing. |
| Men & Women Generally | The LCCC population (2017) was 51% female and 49% male. This reflects the overall NI position. |
| Disability | Using the same boundary/census data as above indicates that 18.29% of the population had a long-term health problem or disability. Disability support groups estimate that the figure is likely to be higher due to some people not wishing to declare or define themselves as having a disability.  The Family Resources Survey 2018-19 suggests that 8% of children in the UK have a disability |
| Dependants | Dependants would generally include three main categories:  - care of a child or children  - care of an elderly relative/person  - care of someone with a disability |

### Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular activity/policy/decision? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

The Council’s Community Plan 2017-2032 has been given due consideration when developing the Community Investment Programme along with engagement by the council’s Senior Management Team with Heads of Service and Elected Members during March & April 2021.This consisted of a review of the needs within the DEAs listed below.

The focus of the above consultative approach was to ensure local concerns were taken into consideration, to address any emerging Covid 19 issues and to pro-actively support communities going forward.

Mid-Year Population Estimates 2019 – District Electoral Areas

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DEA | Population | % |
|  |  |  |
| Killultagh | 21450 | 14.6 |
| Downshire West | 17110 | 11.6 |
| Lisburn North | 23050 | 15.7 |
| Lisburn South | 23610 | 16.0 |
| Downshire East | 16720 | 11.3 |
| Castlereagh South | 24010 | 16.3 |
| Castlereagh East | 20860 | 14.2 |
|  |  |  |

Source: NISRA/NINIS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious Belief | At this stage, funding is not being targeted at specific needs but consideration will be given to proposals that aim to develop/provide facilities that will benefit a wide range of groups, particularly groups that experience disadvantage or inequality, for example, lack of access or inclusion because of disability, older age, or racial background. |
| Political Opinion |
| Racial Group |
| Age |
| Marital Status |
| Sexual Orientation |
| Men & Women Generally |
| Disability |
| Dependants |

**Part 2. Screening questions**

1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this activity/policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? (minor/major/none\*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of activity/policy impact** | **Level of impact (minor/major/none\*)** |
| Religious Belief | This pilot funding programme is not targeting any particular Section 75 group directly. Depending on funding applications received, many different groups may potentially benefit from the funding of a capital project that they will use.  LCCC will require applicants to demonstrate commitment to promotion of equality and good relations. | |
| Political Opinion |
| Racial Group |
| Age |
| Marital Status |
| Sexual Orientation |
| Men & Women Generally |
| Disability |
| Dependants |

\*See Appendix 1 for details.

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Sec 75 equality categories?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **IF Yes, provide details** | **If No, provide details** |
| Religious Belief | The funding opportunity needs to be promoted widely to encourage take up from all eligible community groups across the district. Applicants will be required to demonstrate that they will ensure equality of opportunity in development and delivery of their proposed projects. |  |
| Political Opinion |  |
| Racial Group |  |
| Age |  |
| Marital Status |  |
| Sexual Orientation |  |
| Men & Women Generally |  |
| Disability |  |
| Dependants |  |

3 To what extent is the activity/policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (minor/major/none\* - see Appendix 1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Good Relations Category** | **Details of activity/policy impact** | **Level of impact (minor/major/none\*)** |
| Religious Belief | There is the potential for funding to be granted to projects that will benefit good relations between the main religious/political groups in the area and between racial groups | Potentially minor positive impact – depends on the nature of the successful project |
| Political Opinion |
| Racial Group |

\*See Appendix 1 for details.

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Good Relations Category** | **IF Yes, provide details** | **If No, provide details** |
| Religious Belief | As above, in scoring applications, consideration can be given to projects that are likely to promote good relations |  |
| Political Opinion |  |
| Racial Group |  |

**Additional considerations**

**Multiple identity**

Provide details of data on the impact of the activity/policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

|  |
| --- |
| LCCC recognises that most people will have multiple identities and that some will experience multiple disadvantage in terms of access and inclusion. Consideration will be given in scoring applications to those proposals that aim to deal with multiple disadvantage. |

**Part 3. Screening decision**

There are 3 screening decision outcomes, as noted below.

Choose only 1 of these and provide reasons for your decision outcome and ensure evidence is noted/referenced for any decision outcome reached.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Screening Decision Outcome - Options** | **Reasons/Evidence** |
|  |  |
| Option 1  Screen out without mitigation |  |
| Option 2  Screen out with mitigation | It is considered that it is not necessary to carry out a full equality impact assessment on this pilot programme. This is because the scheme has been developed as the result of widespread community consultation and is open to all eligible community organisations in the area. No adverse impacts have been identified as a result of this screening. However, should any issues arise at a later stage, further consideration can be given. |
| Option 3  Screen in for a full EQIA |  |

**Mitigation (Relevant to Option 2)**

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is ‘minor’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the activity/policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative activity/policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative activity/policy.

|  |
| --- |
| This is a pilot project and its main purpose is to implement a funding scheme in one area so that the learning can be used to inform a wider roll out of community funding. To ensure there is representative take up across the community, the pilot project will be promoted widely and support will be given to prospective applicants if necessary to ensure equality of opportunity in the application process. |

**Timetabling and prioritising (Relevant to Option 3) - Not applicable**

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising activities/policies for equality impact assessment.

If the activity/policy has been **‘screened in’** for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the activity/policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Priority criterion | Rating (1-3) |
|  |  |
| Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations |  |
| Social need |  |
| Effect on people’s daily lives |  |
| Relevance to a public authority’s functions |  |
|  |  |
| Total Rating Score |  |

Is the activity/policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

If yes, please provide details

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Part 4. Monitoring**

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission’s Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the activity/policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the activity/policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and activity/policy development.

Who will undertake and sign-off the monitoring of this activity/policy and on what frequency?

Please give details below:

The pilot project will be subject to ongoing evaluation to inform the proposed wider funding programme.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Will be undertaken by:  Name & Position/Job Title: | Frequency (eg. Annually): |
| Community Investment Fund, Programme Board | Monthly |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Will be signed-off by: |  |
| Louise Moore, Director Leisure & Community Wellbeing (SRO) |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Part 5 - Approval and authorisation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screened by:** | **Position/Job Title** | **Date** |
|  | Hazel King  Portfolio Manager | 28th April 2021 |
|  | Mary McSorley | 28th April 2021 |
|  | Equality Officer |  |
| **Approved by:** | Louise Moore | 28th April 2021 |
|  | Director |  |

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each activity/policy screened should be ‘signed off’ and approved by a senior manager responsible for the activity/policy, made easily accessible on the public authority’s website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

Appendix 1

Major impact:

1. The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
2. Potential equality matters are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
3. Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
4. Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
5. The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
6. The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Minor impact

1. The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
2. The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
3. Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
4. By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

No (none) impact

1. The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations;
2. The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.

Appendix 2

The following documentation (as a minimum) should be available to support the screening outcome decision:

* A written copy of the activity/policy in question;
* The screening template duly completed with the screening decision made explicit;
* All evidence utilised/referenced to support the screening decision to be available.