

Equality Relevance Assessment

| 1. Details of proposal | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| Policy title | | in the number of household community centres from six to five |
| Lead officer | Jim Jack - | - Head of Operational Services |
| Date relevance considered | 23/09/201 | 3 |
| 2. Does the council have control over how | this policy | will be implemented? |
| YES ✓ NO | | |
| 3. Do you have evidence or reason to belie | eve that thi | s policy will, or may potentially: |
| General Duties | | Impact on equality (Yes or No) |
| Reduce or increase discrimination, victimisati harassment against people covered by the exprotected characteristics? | | No |
| Reduce or increase equality of opportunity be people who share an equality protected chara and those who do not? | | Yes |
| Provide opportunity to improve good relations those who share an equality protected characteristic and those who do not? | | No |
| 4. Equality impact assessment required? (Two Yes above = full assessment necessary | /) | |
| YES ✓ NO | | |
| 5. Decision rationale | | |
| This proposal is has the potential to impact or further in order to use recycling facilities. | n disabled s | service users who may need to travel |

- No assessment required process ends
- Assessment required continue to next section

| Equality Impact Assessme | nt |
|---|--|
| 1. Details of proposal | |
| Details of others involved | Jim Jack – Head of Operational Services Elizabeth Wark – Facilities Manager Daniel Matonti – Project Team Leader Kenny Selbie – Equality Officer Hannah Gardner – Equalities Analyst |
| Date assessment conducted | 12/01/15 |
| 2. Aims of the proposed char | nge to council policy or resources |
| • | e savings where staffed services are under-utilised by the public. It is deep to be closing one of six recycling centres in the community. |
| 3. What equality data, research | ch or other evidence has been used to inform this assessment? |
| Usage figures for the recycling inform this assessment. | centres and limited knowledge of the customer profile were used to |
| 4. Details of consultation and | I involvement |
| | ject to scrutiny by representatives of the equality community forums ivering Better Outcomes projects as agreed by the council's quality. |
| 5. Issues identified and 'prote | ected characteristics' impact |
| (Covering: age; disability; ge or belief and sexual orientation | nder; gender identity; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion on equality) |
| The assessment considered when disabilities | nether this measure presented implications for customers with |

disabilities.

Usage figures provided by the service indicate the times that these services are used and there is no evidence to suggest that there are any differences between any protected groups. The assessment also identified service standards and support available to ensure customers will not be affected by the implementation of the measure and any increase in travel time to an alternative facility is minimal.

6. What measures are in place to monitor the actual impact following implementation?

The Delivering Better Outcomes projects are being monitored by the Modernisation Board during implementation and equality impact assessment is identified as a key enabler for projects.

| 7. Recommendation | |
|--|--|
| ☑ Implement proposal with no amendments ☐ Implement proposal taking account of mitigating actions (as outlined below) ☐ Reject proposal due to disproportionate impact on equality | |

| 8. Mitigating actions and additional outpu |
|--|
|--|

N/A

• Equality impact assessment completed