

**Appendix 3 - Equality Impact Assessment Summary - 2016/17 Budget Report and MTFP**

Author Anne James - Equality and Community Cohesion Team leader

Date 11 February 2016

Before making a decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

- i) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
- ii) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --
  - remove or minimise disadvantage
  - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it
  - encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- iii) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice; and promote understanding.

Bristol City Council’s vision is to support every citizen to reach their potential and create successful places in which to live, work and play. However, this vision need to be achieved in the context of reduced Government funding and increasing demand for Council services.

The MTFP 2014-17 made a number of proposals to enable the council to meet our £90 million savings gap and a cumulative equality impact assessment was published along with the final report in 2015. The budget report 2016-17 does not review the three year plan agreed in 2017, and the scope of this equality impact assessment is to consider what are the equalities implications of the Mayors proposals for £1.1m capital expenditure detailed in paragraph 3.70 of the report? The Mayor proposes to fund five projects

Allocation of the £1.1m as a result of the consultation	£'000	Equality Impact Assessment
Bristol Aerospace Centre	500	<p>This proposal has relevance for younger people (who can be encouraged to study STEM<sup>11</sup> subjects) and for older people (recognising the contributions of the original engineers' vision and design skills who would now be older people). This funding would not have a positive impact on equalities communities unless additional conditions are applied to the funding. For example to celebrate the specific contributions made by women and BME engineers, positive action to encourage girls and young women to study STEM subjects, ensuring good access for disabled people to all exhibits and interactive activities.</p>
Employment Engagement Hub	250	<p>Engagement Hub aims to help to connect businesses with educators and young people – a single site to develop employability and enterprise skills to help connect people to jobs. Its aim is to facilitate social mobility and 'level the playing field' for young people who come from families and communities that do not have a background in, or contact with, job markets such as creative and digital industries by modelling good practise and stimulating programmes in a broader range of employer groups. Target groups will be BME young people, girls and young women, Disabled young people and young people who are at risk of or are currently not in employment, education or training (NEET), including young people in or leaving care. Detail is not given but measures to maximise engagement with the target groups could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links with Access to Work so that Disabled people can access grants for adaptations, technology and/in work support which can help in accessing and retaining jobs,</li> <li>• proactive work with schools and businesses to dispel myths around stereotyped occupations, raise awareness about growth industries and sectors in BTQEZ and to</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths

		<p>broaden aspirations and careers choices of young people under-represented in the sector, before they choose their GCSE subjects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• showcasing role models to young people so they can see that BME and Disabled people and women can be successful in creative, digital and high tech industries</li> <li>• equality and diversity training for businesses so that young people have a positive experience during work placements or as employees and to communicate the businesses benefits or diversity.</li> </ul>
Small Grants for Early Years Children's Centres	250	Having a fund that allows Children's Centres to bid for up to £5k to improve their facilities will allow Centres to carry out essential repairs and maintenance to buildings and has the potential to advance equality of opportunity for example carrying out access works to improve access for Disabled parents and children and to improve the range of services on offer. The application process would need to ensure additional recognition is given to projects which have a positive impact on equalities communities.
Campus Skate Park at Bishopsworth	50	There is no data as to who uses the skate park but the assumption is that like most skate parks the majority of users are boys and sometimes men. Girl skaters are growing in number but still a minority. Bishopsworth have 20% children under the age of 16 ( compared with 18% in Bristol) and has 50% more lone parents than in Bristol as a whole, of whom 90% are women. The area is not ethnically diverse, with 93% of people being White British. The community rooms will enhance this youth project and could encourage participation by girls, disabled young people and BME young people, if it is managed well and encourages the current users of the park to be welcoming to young people who are new to using the park. Additional conditions could be applied to the funding about increasing access to girls, disabled children and economically disadvantaged children this would increase its relevance to the wider community.
Ashton Gate Rail Station –	50	The bus stop is in the Southville Ward. The Southville ward has a lower % of women, BME

Business Case		households and young people than other wards in the city. There is no particular equalities group which would be affected by this improvement. Funding a business case to look into providing a rail link in the area does not have any equalities relevance. The Metrobus Rapid Transport Link is improving overall public transport links for the area and there is no equalities relevance (positive or negative ) in investigating introducing a rail link.
Total	1,100	

The Mayor is not recommending bringing forward funding from the transport capital programme to install a high quality stop at Paxton Drive in Southville, including shelter, seating, real-time information and ticketing. There is no equalities relevance for this decision - the Southville ward has a lower % of women, BME households and young people than other wards in the city. The bus stop is close to a park but not near a school or near the football ground. The modernised bus stops are safer and do provide improved information but there is no particular equalities group which would be affected by approving or rejecting bringing forward the implementation of a high quality bus shelter at this location.

In addition to the capital programme recommendations, elected members have proposed amendments to the budget proposals. The equalities relevance of the proposals are detailed below

<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Description of amendment</b>	<b>Implications of Service Delivery</b>	<b>Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000</b>	<b>Comments on equalities impact</b>
Green	Raise council tax by the 2% adult social care precept.	Additional funding from council tax	(3,432,500)	There would be no impact on people who are in receipt of full council tax benefit or rebate. 36% of people receiving council tax reduction are in receipt of a state pension (older people) also people on certain disability benefits, carers, some ex-service personnel and lone parents with children

Political Party	Description of amendment	Implications of Service Delivery	Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000	Comments on equalities impact																								
				<p>under 5 are protected.  Those who are not treated as 'vulnerable' and who would be affected by the decision to increase council tax by 2% detailed below, using information from a 2012 equality impact assessment. The key group affected are lone parents, of whom 90% women. Only 12% of people in Bristol are lone parents but 24% of people paying council tax are lone parents  <i>Profile of people who pay council tax and do not qualify for council tax reductions 2012</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Definition</th> <th>Numbers/ Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>9,230 (46%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>10,644 (53%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unknown</td> <td>226 (1%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lone parents</td> <td>4,899 (24%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disability</td> <td>351 (2%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Households without any children</td> <td>11,875 (59%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Households with 3+ children</td> <td>2,036 (10%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White (ethnicity)</td> <td>8,081 (40%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BME</td> <td>2,170 (11%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (ethnicity)</td> <td>3,212 (16%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unknown (ethnicity)</td> <td>6,637 (33%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Definition	Numbers/ Percentage	Male	9,230 (46%)	Female	10,644 (53%)	Unknown	226 (1%)	Lone parents	4,899 (24%)	Disability	351 (2%)	Households without any children	11,875 (59%)	Households with 3+ children	2,036 (10%)	White (ethnicity)	8,081 (40%)	BME	2,170 (11%)	Other (ethnicity)	3,212 (16%)	Unknown (ethnicity)	6,637 (33%)
Definition	Numbers/ Percentage																											
Male	9,230 (46%)																											
Female	10,644 (53%)																											
Unknown	226 (1%)																											
Lone parents	4,899 (24%)																											
Disability	351 (2%)																											
Households without any children	11,875 (59%)																											
Households with 3+ children	2,036 (10%)																											
White (ethnicity)	8,081 (40%)																											
BME	2,170 (11%)																											
Other (ethnicity)	3,212 (16%)																											
Unknown (ethnicity)	6,637 (33%)																											
Green	Money to be spent on covering the shortfall in the adult social	Funding will be allocated to a specific	3,432,500	The proposal suggests consultation would advise on what specific projects would be funded therefore the equalities relevance can only be anticipated in a very general way. Using data from 2014/15 32% of people																								

Political Party	Description of amendment	Implications of Service Delivery	Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000	Comments on equalities impact
	care budget and to mitigate future government cuts.	ringfenced contingency budget		receiving an Adult Care service are under 65, 11% are BME and 60% are women. These monitoring figures are similar to what would be expected when a majority of service users are older. 60% of service users have physical impairments, 11% have mental health needs, in addition 15% have dementia related mental health needs, and 15% have learning difficulties. Therefore if additional funding is allocated to Adult Care Services older people, women and disabled people would particularly benefit.
Labour & Lib Dem	Move the East Bristol Pool into Tier 1 in the capital programme	Lib Dem proposal includes additional income generation proposals	(4,500)	Leisure centres have equalities monitoring of usage of people who have Leisure Cards. In the most recent published monitoring (2011) 16% of leisure centre service users are BME, 34% are aged under 25, 20% are over 50 and 50% had a health need or disability. It is anticipated the East Bristol pool has a higher than average usage by people from BME groups in line with local demographics and the leisure centres offer a number of concessions for low income groups and also women only swimming. This decision would have a positive impact on equalities communities
Labour & LibDem	Restore the Hartcliffe Way Recycling Centre into Tier 1 of the capital programme and using unspent revenue funding for running costs	Increased provision of recycling facilities	2000	This has no particular impact on equalities communities

Political Party	Description of amendment	Implications of Service Delivery	Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000	Comments on equalities impact
Labour	Defer 79% of the Mayor's cut to children's centres funding as a one off.	Children's centres will retain much of their funding for one year more.	£250	Allocating funding from Aerospace and the new rail link would not have a significant equality impact, but moving funding from the employment hub or skate park would have an impact as services which could be provided of benefit to equalities communities would not be funded. However the proposal to put additional funding into children's centres is likely to also have a positive impact so there is no particular equalities cost or benefit to the decision to defer 79% of the Mayors funding to children's centres. Engagement and customer data will vary for different Children's centres according to the location of each Children's Centre and the diversity of the surrounding population, as well as the services on offer at each individual Centre. For example some Centres provide services targeted at Disabled children and their parents and carers, others use targeted outreach to reach communities such as Gypsies and Travellers.
Labour	Reductions in the cost of running bus services in the City (subsidised buses and Park & Ride Services) through reduced subsidy payments as a result of the provision of more commercial bus services – (£250k)	Savings in subsidy budgets will be redirected to continue the use of Diamond Card by Community Transport Groups	0	The decision to remove the subsidy for some services could adversely impact people commuting into Bristol and people on underused bus routes. But there is no specific relevance to equalities groups. The proposal will allocate an additional £250k into continuing free community transport for some disabled people will benefit disabled people who are applicable for a diamond card and who use community transport services. This will have a positive impact on individuals at risk of isolation or exclusion who use community transport

<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Description of amendment</b>	<b>Implications of Service Delivery</b>	<b>Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000</b>	<b>Comments on equalities impact</b>
LibDem	Income generate from provision of additional paid parking (£150k)	Fund diamond card for community transport .	0	Additional parking spaces has no equalities impact. See above for benefits of Diamond Card.
Green	Reallocate £.5m funding from Filton Aerospace Museum to create a £.5m fund for additional infrastructure which improves road safety for children on routes to schools across Bristol.	The infrastructure projects to be identified in conjunction with Neighbourhood Partnerships, local schools and parents.	500	The decision to not fund the Aerospace museum does not have a significant equalities impact. Road safety schemes could benefit parents with children but have no particular relevance for people with protected characteristics. Each scheme would need to be evaluated for impact.
Labour	Reduction to the grants budget within Bristol Futures – unallocated spend (£40k)	To fund a number of small scale early intervention mental health projects targeting primary school age children		The impact of removing the underspend is unclear. The proposal to fund mental health projects could benefit disabled parents and children with emotional and behavioural issues.



<b>Political Party</b>	<b>Description of amendment</b>	<b>Implications of Service Delivery</b>	<b>Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000</b>	<b>Comments on equalities impact</b>
Labour	To remove the Park and Ride subsidy (£50k)	To fund wages for the youth mayors and a £25k discretionary spend budget		The decision to remove Park and Ride subsidies could affect commuters and some visitors into the city. The proposal to offer the youth mayors a wage would benefit the two youth Mayors. The proposal to fund the Youth Mayors manifesto priorities ( which include health and wellbeing and equalities), some of which would have a positive equalities impact but more detail would be needed to evaluate the full impact
Green	Additional parking fee income target (£50k)	Additional funding allocated to Clean Air Zone/Low Emission Zone research plan	0	No particular equalities impact.
Conservative	Capital receipt arising from disposal of the Bristol Port Freehold (£9000k)	Use to promote regeneration and Private Housing Delivery Vehicle	0	There is no equalities impact of the decision to use the port capital receipt. More information would be needed on the options for investment and priorities for investment to identify the equalities impact of investments decisions. It is likely that decisions to improve the supply of affordable housing will benefit low income women, BME people & disabled people who are disproportionately reliant on affordable housing.
Labour	Fines received from enforcement action - increased income target ( £52k) &	Additional enforcement officer, dog wardens and	0	This has no particular equalities relevance. Less flytipping will benefit disadvantage areas where this is a particular problem which could have an indirect positive impact on equalities communities living in these areas – but actual impact would depend on areas identified for additional

Political Party	Description of amendment	Implications of Service Delivery	Estimated costs or (Savings) £'000	Comments on equalities impact
	Saving against 2016/17 Pensions Contributions Costs (£50k)	vehicles		enforcement.
Labour	Identify £10k from directorate budgets	Allocate funding to Bristol Pride	10	The removal of £10k from directorate budgets is likely to have minimal equalities impact. Pride raises the majority of its own funding through sponsorship but secure funding would enable basic infrastructure to be in place for fund raising. The Pride week includes work in schools, talking to children about LGBT equality. Pride week fosters good relations between the LGBT and wider community and creates a positive identify for people who are LGBT, their friends and families.
Labour	Using £150k of the £250,000 Mayor's hardship fund.	To maintain the Welfare Rights and Money Advice core service	0	The Mayor's hardship fund is allocated to low income families through discretionary housing payments and some other payments to mitigate the impact of welfare reform. Reduction of this fund could have a negative equalities impact. The Welfare Rights and Money advice service benefits older and disabled people, this funding would increase capacity to support service users which would also have a positive impact on some disabled and older people who are assisted by the service.

## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	Bristol Aerospace Centre – One off Capital proposal – £0.5m
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

There are long-standing proposals to build an aerospace museum and learning centre which would provide a home for the world famous Concorde near the site where it was built in Filton, South Gloucestershire. It would also house a wealth of information about the aerospace industry.

The museum has already received planning permission and this one off contribution of £0.5million would help to get the proposal off the ground.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

The people who will be affected are the people who will potentially use the museum including the population of both Bristol and South Gloucestershire and tourists to the area.

#### 2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

No data available.

Ethnicity data from the 2011 census tells us that:

Group	Scheme Area	City of	South	England
White *	81.8%	84.0%	95.0%	85.4%
Mixed *	3.5%	3.6%	1.4%	2.3%
Asian or Asian	6.6%	5.5%	2.5%	2.3%
Black or Black	7.1%	6.0%	0.8%	3.5%
Other ethnic	1.0%	0.9%	0.3%	1.0%

Ethnically the museum will be of more relevance to the whole population of Bristol if there is a focus on ensuring relevance for non-white British people including children and learning.

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

There has been a long standing plan to celebrate Concorde but we are unaware of any specific consultation relating to women, BME communities, disabled people or LGBT communities. There are assumptions that can be made about age. There will be a slightly higher relevance for age because a museum could inspire young people to choose careers related to the aerospace industry. Also the people who worked on the original design would be older people, so the museum would be a celebration of some older Bristolian's work.

### Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

The museum would need good access for disabled people including those with sensory impairments. The new museum would also need to have a gender perspective to fairly reflect the contribution of women. The same principle could apply to any other equalities communities that have made a contribution.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

The relevance of the museum to the whole community will be improved by considering and reflecting the contribution of equality communities and by

ensuring access to the widest number of people.
3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?
We anticipate that this short term funding could enable the release other funds that could speed up the museum becoming a reality however such a museum would not have a particular positive benefit for equalities communities.
3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?
The museum could be a positive action initiative to encourage girls, BME people & LGB people to study STEM subjects but we are not aware of any plans in place at this time.

#### Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?
This funding would not have a positive impact on equalities communities unless additional conditions are applied to the funding. This is a large amount of money to spend on a project so its relevance to the equality communities of Bristol should be considered.
4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?
Not applicable
4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?
N/A

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Wanda Knight.
Date:	Date:



## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	Employment Engagement Hub - £250k
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

Bristol Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone (BTQEZ) is comprised of 70 hectares of land surrounding Bristol Temple Meads Railway Station, including Bristol Arena.

Enterprise Zones have been set up by the government to drive local growth and create jobs. They offer a range of incentives to businesses including business rates relief, low rent incubator units and simplified planning procedures. As they have been developed with businesses in mind, this means that investors can benefit from superfast broadband and good transport links to the major road, rail and air networks. The government is also allocating funding for infrastructure improvements in and around the Zones.

Many jobs have already been created in the area and more are forecast, both in constructing and developing the Zone and in the businesses moving there. Many of these will be opportunities in the high tech, low carbon and creative sectors, which are the focus of BTQEZ. The Zone aims to attract 4,000 jobs by 2017 and around 17,000 in the 25 year lifespan of the project..

This EqIA concerns the proposal to contribute £250k as a one-off capital spend to contribute towards the creation of a physical presence to complement a virtual Engagement Hub. This would be located in the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone helping to connect businesses with educators and young people – a single site to develop employability and enterprise skills to help connect people to jobs.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

We know that women, Disabled people and BME people are under-represented in the creative and digital industries. A workshop was held during Digital Bristol Week

2015, to restart the conversation around diversity, equality and fair access and why we do still not have diverse representation in the Creative & Digital Industries in Bristol & across the West of England.

The report from the workshop during concluded that diversity is a key challenge for the sector both locally and nationally. In 2012 Creative Skillset reported that women represented only 36%, BAME 5.4% and people with a disability 2.1% of the UK creative workforce. Locally, the lack of diversity in the regions creative sector is amplified when compared with figures for the South West from Creative Skillset; where BAME only represented 5.3% of the workforce in TV & Film, 3.5% in Animation and 4.7% in Games – when Bristol alone has a BAME population of 16% these figures are not at all representative of the population.

To ensure the continued growth and world-class excellence, both locally and nationally, of the creative industries the workforce must better represent our diverse population; ensuring that content and products reflect consumers and audiences.

2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

This proposal forms part of the capital spend programme for 2016/17 which has been subject to consultation for a 12 week period. Feedback on the capital spend proposals have been sought from the public through the council's web site and the Citizens Panel. Equality Voice and Influence Groups were also invited to comment and feedback was received from Bristol Women's Voice and Bristol Older People's Forum.

Feedback on this proposal have been generally very positive, with 64% of respondents agreeing with the proposal to establish an Employment Hub at BTQEZ and 14% disagreeing.

Bristol Women's Voice commented, 'We welcome the development of a physical Employment Engagement Hub in the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone, helping to connect businesses with educators and people, to help connect people to jobs. It is vital however, that you take into account additional issues for young and older women who are furthest away from the labour market'.

As the plans for the Employment Hub take shape we will work with the voluntary and community sector and Equality Voice and Influence organisations to ensure the needs of Bristol's diverse communities are understood and that opportunities are accessible to all.

### **Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?**

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.



3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

The initial focus of the Employment Hub during its pilot phase will be on young people aged 14-19. There is the potential that older people could be disadvantaged in getting jobs in BTQEZ if there is a big focus on creating opportunities for young people. Women, Disabled people and Black and Minority ethnic people are very under-represented in the creative, high tech and digital industries so it is likely that these are the people who may lack the skills required to access the opportunities presented by new businesses.

There is the potential that Disabled young people may not be able to access the full range of opportunities on offer unless the Hub is able to offer sufficient support – for example some Disabled young people may need assistive technology or in work support in order to access work placements or apprenticeships. Grants are available through the Government’s Access to Work scheme for Disabled people entering permanent jobs but not for short term placements.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

After the initial pilot phase of the Employment Hub the target age range will be extended. The Employment and Skills Strategy for the City complements the work of the Employment Hub and has a greater focus on the older age range so this work should ensure that older people and especially women, Disabled people and Black and Minority ethnic people can access BTQEZ jobs.

The Employment Hub will need to work closely with schools and colleges as well as agencies offering in-work support to ensure that Disabled young people have access to the technology and support they need to access all the opportunities available through the Hub.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

The proposal should create a number of benefits for young people within Bristol, including:

- Opportunities to sample careers in industries they would typically not be able to access
- Worthwhile work experience opportunities
- Information, advice and guidance that is current and relevant
- Information for them to be able to decide whether they have the talent and desire to choose a career in the targeted industries

The establishment of an Engagement Hub is intended to directly improve the employment prospects of Bristol’s disadvantaged communities by providing pathways to employment in high quality, secure jobs in modern, growth industries. It’s aim is to facilitate social mobility and ‘level the playing field’ for young people who come from families and communities that do not have a background in, or contact with, these job markets by modelling good practise and stimulating programmes in a broader range of employer groups. Target groups will be BME young people, girls and young women, Disabled young people and young people who are at risk of or are currently not in employment, education or training (NEET), including young people in or leaving care.

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

The Employment Hub building and surrounding street scene should be accessible to facilitate engagement with Disabled young people. The Hub should develop links with Access to Work so that Disabled people can access grants for adaptations, technology and/in work support which can help in accessing and retaining jobs.

The work of the Hub could be maximised by wider work including:

Proactive work with schools and businesses to dispel myths around stereotyped occupations, raise awareness about growth industries and sectors in BTQEZ and to broaden aspirations and careers choices of young people under-represented in the sector, before they choose their GCSE subjects.

Showcasing role models to young people so they can see that BME and Disabled people and women can be successful in creative, digital and high tech industries.

Equality and diversity training for businesses so that young people have a positive experience during work placements or as employees and to communicate the businesses benefits or diversity.

**Step 4: So what?**

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

Until agreement on funding is given and more detail on the hub is shared, we are unable to identify what specific recommendations will be taken on board

4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Anneke Van Eijkern Equality and Community Cohesion Officer
Date:	Date:5/2/2016

## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	Small grants for Early Years Children's Centres
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

This proposal is to contribute £250k as a one-off capital spend as a small grants fund for Bristol's 27 Early Years Children's Centres, enabling them to bid for small grants of up to £5k to improve their facilities.

The core purpose of Children's Centres is to improve outcomes for young children and their families, with a particular focus on those in greatest need. They work to make sure all children are properly prepared for school, regardless of background or family circumstances. They also offer support to parents. The centres are open to all parents, carers and children, and many of the services are free.

Different children's centres have different facilities - many have a pre-school or nurseries, some also have toddler groups, classes, and activities. Some also run support groups, and have special advisers at particular times, like health visitors or speech and language therapists.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

The engagement and service user data for all 27 Children’s Centres in Bristol was not available at the time of writing this EqIA, however, Children’s Centres mainly serve parents, carers and children up to school age. The main users of the Centres are women and their children, although centres do provide Dads only sessions, sessions for grandparents and childminders.

Engagement and customer data will vary for different Children’s centres according to the location of each Children’s Centre and the diversity of the surrounding population, as well as the services on offer at each individual Centre. For example some Centres provide services targeted at Disabled children and their carers, others use targeted outreach to reach communities such as Gypsies and Travellers.

## 2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

Childrens Centres are required to report on their engagement activity – this is not replicated here.

## 2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

This proposal forms part of the capital spend programme for 2016/17 which has been subject to consultation for a 12 week period. Feedback on the capital spend proposals have been sought from the public through the council’s web site and the Citizens Panel. Equality Voice and Influence Groups were also invited to comment and feedback was received from Bristol Women’s Voice and Bristol Older People’s Forum. Feedback on this proposal have been generally very positive, with 76% of respondents agreeing with the proposal to offer small grants to Childrens Centres and only 8% disagreeing.

Bristol Women’s Voice commented,

‘We strongly welcome the grants fund for Early Years Children’s Centres, enabling them to improve their facilities. We consider this a vital resource – Children’s Centres provide a safe place for women to raise concerns about domestic abuse and other such help such as debt advice. The Fairness Commission highlighted this issue as their number one priority and we feel strongly that some of the additional funding taken from the Bristol Aerospace Centre should be utilised to support Children’s Centres across Bristol’.

## Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?
No adverse impacts are anticipated.
3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?
3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?
It is anticipated that a number of positive impacts will be created as a result of this proposal. Having a fund that allows Children’s Centres to bid for up to £5k to improve their facilities will allow Centres to carry out essential repairs and maintenance to buildings, carry out access works to improve access for Disabled parents and children and to improve the range of services on offer.
3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?
Benefits for people with protected characteristics could be maximised if Children’s Centres use the small grants fund to improve access to services for under-represented groups or to target outreach services at children and families who find services difficult to engage with.

#### **Step 4: So what?**

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?
Comments received as part of the consultation have been supportive of this proposal, so no changes to the proposal are anticipated.
4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?
The Equality and Community Cohesion Team would assist with designing the grant giving process to ensure recognition is given to projects which have a positive impact on equalities communities.
4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

The complete list of applications and successful applications will be available on request, including summaries of main beneficiaries

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Anneke van Eijkern
Date:	Date: 27 <sup>th</sup> January 2016

## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	Campus Skate park at Bishopsworth - £50k
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

This is a one off capital grant of £50k to Campus skate park in Bishopsworth which would help attract match-funding for phase 3 of this project to provide community rooms. This will help provide a valuable community asset.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Campus Skate Parks are using the BCC owned Bishopsworth baths for free in return that it is run for the benefit of the community. Campus Skateparks is a not for profit organisation that uses the positive energy and influence of skateboarding to engage with children and young people. Therefore the main group affected would be young people and children.

#### 2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

There is no data as to who uses the skate park but the assumption is that like most skate parks the majority of users are boys and sometimes men. Girl skaters are growing in number but still a minority.

The area of Bishopworth has a high number of lone parents but is not ethnically diverse

Bishopsworth demographics Census 2011	Bristol	Bishopsworth
Aged 15 and under	18.40%	20.40%
16-24	15.60%	12%
65 - 74	6.50%	8.30%
75 and over	6.60%	9.80%
Men	49.80%	47.50%
Women	50.20%	52.50%
People with a disability or long term limiting illness total	16.70%	22%
White British	77.90%	92.80%
White – non-British	6.10%	2.40%
Black and minority ethnic	16%	4.90%
Civil partnership	0.30%	0.20%
People whose main language is not English	8.50%	2.70%
% Born in the UK	85.30%	95.20%
% resident in UK for less than 5 years	5.10%	0.90%
Lone Parent Household	12%	18%

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

It is not known if any consultation with the community has been conducted about the best use of any extra money that could be spent on the Bishopsworth community or young people specifically.

### Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

There is no reason why community rooms would have a negative effect on equalities communities.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?



N/A
3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?
The community rooms, if managed well to encourage safety and integration, will make the skate park more inviting by providing shelter and warmth for people who may be lacking in confidence, for example girls and disabled young people.
3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?
The benefit could be maximised by requiring that the skate park and community rooms are relevant for all young people and children including, those with disabilities and girls. There is a charge for the skatepark so another requirement could be vouchers/free sessions that social workers, youth workers etc. could use to benefit economically disadvantaged young people or those at risk of offending.

#### Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?
The community rooms will enhance this youth project and therefore benefit the young people who currently use the facility. If conditions are applied to the funding about increasing access to girls, disabled children and economically disadvantaged children this would increase its relevance to the wider community.
4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?
N/A
4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?
N/A

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Wanda Knight
Date:	Date:



## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form



(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)

Name of proposal	Ashton Gate rail station business case - £50k
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

To contribute £50k to fund further exploratory work on the viability of restoring local rail services at Ashton Gate as part of the £200m MetroWest local rail programme planned over the next few years.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

The bus stop is in the Southville Ward. The Southville ward has a lower % of women, BME households and young people than other wards in the city. There is no particular equalities group which would be affected by this improvement.

	Demographics in Bristol are %	Southville Number & %	
Aged 15 and under	18.40%	1,715	13.70%
16-24	15.60%	1,618	12.90%
65 - 74	6.50%	669	5.30%
75 and over	6.60%	800	6.40%
Men	49.80%	6,459	51.50%
Women	50.20%	6,084	48.50%
People with a disability or long term limiting illness total	16.70%	2,061	16.40%
White British	77.90%	10,324	82.30%
White – non-British	6.10%	1,029	8.20%
Black and minority ethnic	16%	1,190	9.50%
Civil partnership	0.30%	54	0.50%
People whose main language is not English	8.50%	902	7.50%
% Born in the UK	85.30%	10,875	86.70%
% resident in UK for less than 5 years	5.10%	376	3%
Lone Parent Household	12%	476	8%
2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?			
2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?			

### Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?
The research would identify if there are any adverse impacts
3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?
3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected

characteristics?
The research would identify if there are nay positive impacts
3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

**Step 4: So what?**

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?
Providing a rail link in the area does not have any equalities relevance. The Metrobus Rapid Transport Link is improving overall public transport links for the area and there is no equalities relevance (positive or negative ) in investigating introducing a rail link.
4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?
4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Anne James Equality and Community Cohesion Team Leader
Date:	Date:8/1/2016



## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form



(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)

Name of proposal	Upgraded Metrobus stop at Ashton Gate (Paxton Drive)
Directorate and Service Area	
Name of Lead Officer	

### Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

#### 1.1 What is the proposal?

To bring forward plans for an upgraded Metrobus stop at Ashton Gate (Paxton Drive). Construction is underway on Metrobus, the £200m sub-regional scheme which will provide faster and more environmentally friendly bus links around the city. This proposal brings forward funding from the transport capital programme to install a high quality stop, including shelter, seating, real-time information and ticketing.

### Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

#### 2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

The bus stop is in the Southville Ward. The Southville ward has a lower % of women, BME households and young people than other wards in the city. The bus stop is close to a park but not near a school or near the football ground. There is no particular equalities group which would be affected by this improvement.

	Demographics in Bristol are %	Southville Number & %	
Aged 15 and under	18.40%	1,715	13.70%
16-24	15.60%	1,618	12.90%
65 - 74	6.50%	669	5.30%
75 and over	6.60%	800	6.40%
Men	49.80%	6,459	51.50%
Women	50.20%	6,084	48.50%
People with a disability or long term limiting illness total	16.70%	2,061	16.40%
White British	77.90%	10,324	82.30%
White – non-British	6.10%	1,029	8.20%
Black and minority ethnic	16%	1,190	9.50%
Civil partnership	0.30%	54	0.50%
People whose main language is not English	8.50%	902	7.50%
% Born in the UK	85.30%	10,875	86.70%
% resident in UK for less than 5 years	5.10%	376	3%
Lone Parent Household	12%	476	8%

2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

### Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

The bus stop is close to a park but not near a school or near the football ground. There is no particular equalities group which would be affected by this improvement



3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?
n/a
3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?
It will improve access and safety for pregnant women, older people and disabled people who live in the area.
3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?
The bus stop is close to a park but not near a school or near the football ground. There is no particular equalities group which would be affected by this improvement

#### Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?
Investing in a bus stop in this area would improve access and safety for women, older people and disabled people due to the improved lighting, shelter, seating and real-time information. However there is no evidence that this location is more important for investment than other bus stops which may serve a demographic where there is a higher % of people from equalities communities.
4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?
4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

Service Director Sign-Off:	Equalities Officer Sign Off: Anne James Equality and Community Cohesion Team Leader
Date:	Date: 8/1/2016