**Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council**

**DRAFT Revised Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Screening template**

**Part 1. Information about the activity/policy/project being screened**

The Council proposes resurfacing Royal Hillsborough Off Street Car Park to provide 57 parking bays as at present. The proposal is an essential maintenance project, to simply plane off the top surface and lay new tarmac surface to the same profile and drainage layout. When resurfacing is complete then LCCC will enable 3 accessible parking spaces on the site as at present.

There will also be ducting infrastructure put in place before resurfacing to enable installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charge points at a later date.

# As Council Public Toilet improvement works are being carried out in this car park during Jan – Feb, it is proposed to complete these works in late Feb into March 2022.

# **Name of the activity/policy/project**

# Resurfacing Royal Hillsborough OSCP

# **Is this activity/policy/project – an existing one, a revised one, a new one?**

This is new project as condition of surface is poor since it was transferred to council in 2015 under Local government reorganisation.

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

To provide high quality public car parking in Royal Hillsborough that is safe for public use.

**Who is the activity/policy/project targeted at and who will benefit? Are there any expected benefits for specific Section 75 categories/groups from this activity/policy/project? If so, please explain.**

This project is not targeting any specific group within Sect 75 and all users will benefit.

The new surface will be much smoother and will assist any persons with mobility or sight problems.

**Who initiated or developed the activity/policy/project?**

Environmental Health Section with Environmental Services Directorate

**Who owns and who implements the activity/policy/project?**

LCCC through Environmental Health and overseen by Assets Team

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

Yes

* Loss of income from the carpark during the works.
* Budget is very limited to carry out both phases ie Ducting for EV infrastructure & resurfacing.
* Access to be maintained to 10 properties accessed off the carpark during the works (note there is no formal agreement to allow access to these properties from the carpark).
* Access to be provided to Cromlyn Fold accommodation through the site, although alternative access has been discussed with the Fold (note there is no formal agreement with the Fold to allow them to access their property through the carpark).
* A portion of the land is leased from the adjoining Church of Ireland. Permission has been agreed from the church to enable the project to proceed.
* There are 2 projects within this, first being the installation of ducting for EV chargers. This will not require the car park to be closed.
* The car park may be closed for approx. one week during which vehicles will be diverted to Royal Hillsborough Forest park and on street parking. Blue badge holders are entitled to park on the street outside of normal parking restrictions.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Staff – specify if particular sections of staff | Env Health OSCP management.Assets Management. |
| Service Users – specify if any particular categories of service user | All Business, leisure and residential users.  |
| Other Public Sector Organisations – please list [this could include delivery partners] | None |
| Voluntary/Community/Trade Unions – please list | None |
| Other – please list (eg, Elected Members, delivery partners, contractors, etc) | Elected members for this DEAThe nearby Cromlyn Fold and local property owners who require access Church goers who use the park to attend servicesAppointed contractor - works to be carried out under the Annual Tender Call Off contract |

**Other policies/strategies/plans with a bearing on this activity/policy/project** [Specify most relevant, eg, corporate plan, local development plan, an overarching strategy, a corporate policy or departmental protocols, Equality Scheme and associated equality plans, etc. External policies or strategies of government/other public bodies may also be relevant. Add more boxes below if necessary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name policy/strategy/plan** | **Who owns or implements?** |
| Corporate H&S policies | All & Asset Monitoring Staff |
| Planning Service Development Control Advice Note 11  | OSCP manager |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Available evidence**

**What evidence/information (qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered or considered to inform this activity/policy? Specify details for each Section 75 category.**

Routine inspections of this site have shown that the surface requires upgrade with repainting of parking bays. This is a simple resurfacing of existing car park layout. It is not possible to make any changes due to the restricted layout. We do not have specific information on who uses the car park but it is likely to be used by people from all Section 75 categories, both local residents and visitors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of evidence/information** |
| Religious Belief | The car park is used by church users for Sunday services but otherwise we have no detailed information available on religious belief etc. of users |
| Political Opinion | Not Applicable |
| Racial Group | Not Applicable |
| Age | Private domestic and Cromlyn Fold residents use the car park for access. |
| Marital Status | Not Applicable |
| Sexual Orientation | Not Applicable |
| Men & Women Generally | Not Applicable |
| Disability | The car park currently has 3 accessible spaces (greater than 4% of spaces as recommended under Planning Service Development Control Advice Note 11 (DCAN 11): Access for People with Disabilities Car Park Provision). There is no evidence of greater demand for accessible spaces. |
| Dependants | Not Applicable |

### 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**

No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of needs/experiences/priorities** |
| Religious Belief | Car park will be available for Parking for Sunday Services |
| Political Opinion | Not Applicable |
| Racial Group | Not Applicable |
| Age | Access must be made available for Cromlyn Fold residents while work is progressing especially during works on entrance roadway (approximately 80 metres long). Emergency vehicle access will have unfettered access. The car park needs to be accessible and safe to use for older people who have mobility issues. |
| Marital Status | Not Applicable |
| Sexual Orientation | Not Applicable |
| Men & Women Generally | Not Applicable |
| Disability | Council needs to provide appropriate provision for disabled users. Accessible Parking Bay provision was reviewed in October 2017 under Planning Service Development Control Advice Note 11 (DCAN 11): Access for People with Disabilities Car Park Provision. The current number of spaces is deemed adequate. |
| Dependants | Not Applicable |

**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?**

No impact identified for any one category other than car park will not be available to users during this work. Alternative parking will be available in Royal Hillsborough Forest Park but this will be a considerable distance from Village centre.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **Details of likely impact – will it be positive or negative? If none anticipated, say none** | **Level of impact -** **major or minor\*** - see guidance below |
| Religious Belief | None |  |
| Political Opinion | None |  |
| Racial Group | None |  |
| Age | Residents of Cromlyn Fold may be limited in access and discussions with Cromlyn Fold management have indicated alternative parking may be available with alternative pedestrian access to their site. |  |
| Marital Status | None |  |
| Sexual Orientation | None |  |
| Men & Women Generally | None |  |
| Disability | Minor impact due to lack of available accessible parking spaces while work is ongoing. This will be mitigated by early communication of the project through notices, through community association and council social media communication |  |
| Dependants | None |  |

\* See Appendix 1 for details.

**2(a) Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equality categories?**

This project is a simple resurfacing of the car park and installation of ducting infrastructure for future EV charge points

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 75 Category** | **IF Yes, provide details** | **If No, provide details** |
| Religious Belief |  | No opportunities identified in relation to this project for these groups. Accessible spaces were considered in survey during 2017 and Royal Hillsborough car park had best ratio in Council Car parks and no evidence has been received to review this.  |
| Political Opinion |  |
| Racial Group |  |
| Age |  |
| Marital Status |  |
| Sexual Orientation |  |
| Men & Women Generally |  |
| Disability |  |
| Dependants |  |

**2(b) DDA Disability Duties (see Disability Action Plan 2021-2025)**

Does this policy/activity present opportunities to contribute to the actions in our Disability Action Plan: to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?

No

**3 To what extent is the activity/policy/project likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Good Relations Category** | **Details of likely impact. Will it be positive or negative?** [if no specific impact identified, say none] | **Level of impact –** **minor/major\*** |
| Religious Belief | None |  |
| Political Opinion | None |  |
| Racial Group | None |  |

\*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 |  | No opportunity identified |
| Political Opinion |  | No opportunity identified |
| Racial Group |  | No opportunity identified |

**Multiple identity**

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

A resurfaced car park is likely to be safer to use for some disabled people and in particular older people with mobility or sight impairment.

**Part 3. Screening decision/outcome**

Equality and good relations screening is used to identify whether there is a need to carry out a full equality impact assessment on a proposed policy or project. There are 3 possible outcomes:

1. **Screen out** - no need for a full equality impact assessment and no mitigations required because no negative impacts identified (or only entirely positive impacts for all groups). This may be the case for a purely technical policy for example.
2. **Screen out with mitigation** - no need for a full equality impact assessment but some minor impacts identified which can easily be mitigated. Most activity will probably fall into this category.
3. **Screen in for full equality impact assessment** – potential for significant (and potentially negative) impact identified for one or more groups so proposal requires a more detailed impact assessment.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Screening Decision/Outcome**  | **Reasons/Evidence** |
| Option 1**Screen out** – no equality impact assessment and no mitigation required  | Equality screening has concluded that this project does not require detailed equality impact assessment. Ultimately, the resurfaced car park will be beneficial to all users. We have already taken steps to mitigate the impact on those who will be inconvenienced by the essential works through conversation with Cromlyn Fold and residents. Users will be directed to alternative parking in Royal Hillsborough forest park but this will be considerable distance from Village centre. |
| Option 2**Screen out with mitigation** – some potential impacts identified but they can be addressed with appropriate mitigation [complete mitigation section below] |  |
| Option 3**Screen in** for a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) [If option 3, complete timetabling and prioritising section below] |  |

**Mitigation (Only relevant to Option 2)**

**Can the activity/policy/project plan be amended or an alternative activity/policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?** [Can you take specific mitigating steps that will address the potential issues/needs identified through screening?]

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative activity/policy and ensure the mitigations are included in a revised/updated policy or plan.]

**Timetabling and prioritising for EQIA (only relevant to Option 3)**

Not applicable

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?** Yes

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? What will be monitored and how? What specific equality monitoring will be done?

Please give details below:

As this is required maintenance project the site will be monitored by assets team during the works phase to ensure restricted access is available to Cromlyn Fold especially access for emergency vehicles.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Will be undertaken by:Name & Position/Job Title: | Frequency (eg. Annually): |
| Gerwyn Young, Assets Team | Only during works phase |
| Will be signed-off by: Gerwyn Young |  |
| Name & HoS Title: Albert Reynolds |  |
|  |  |

**Part 5 - Approval and authorisation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Screened by:** | **Position/Job Title**  | **Date** |
| Donal McLaughlin | EH Manager | 7/1/2022 |
|  |  |  |
| Reviewed by Mary McSorley | Equality Officer | 27/1/2022 |
| **Approved by:** |  |  |
| Richard Harvey | Head of Service,Env Health | 24/2/2022 |
|  |  |  |

Appendix 1 – Equality Commission guidance on equality impact

\*Major impact:

1. The policy/project 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 impact (none)

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.