

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.9]



Title: Investing in parks to support delivery of the Parks and Green Spaces Strategy in the city's growth areas	
<input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service <input type="checkbox"/> Other [please state]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Growth and Regeneration	Lead Officer name: Richard Fletcher
Service Area: Parks and Green Spaces	Lead Officer role: Parks Services Manager

Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](http://sharepoint.com).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) early for advice and feedback.

1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use plain English, avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

To provide new facilities and visitor experiences in a number of parks across the city that can serve communities where there has been or is intended to be an increase in residential accommodation.

Investment will take the form of access improvements across a priority group of parks that will be identified through a process of engagement and consultation with stakeholder groups that represent Disabled people and local communities. Other investment will include improving existing children's play areas, investing in sports facilities and a derelict heritage area at Oldbury Court, and increasing food growing capacity.

Current proposals:

Creating more food growing opportunities in Central Bristol	We will invest in green space infrastructure in this area of the city to ensure more high quality collective and allotment food growing opportunities are available.
Improve sports facilities in parks.	We will add to our existing capital investment of £500K designed to improve the provision of nine local sports facilities, increase participation in sport and physical activity and supporting communities to operate local facilities themselves. Investment will ensure facilities will be fit for purpose and able to be operated sustainably.
Improving access for disabled people in priority parks and green spaces	We will work with Disabled people, local communities and other stakeholders to identify and design improvements to a small number of parks where we can make a meaningful difference to the park visitor experience for Disabled visitors. As well as improving parks we will improve the way we provide and present information about our parks so that Disabled people can make informed choices about where to visit and why.
Investing in Oldbury Court's heritage and communities	By adding to a project in progress to significantly enhance the children's play experiences areas, the project will bring our investment in this important heritage estate to £1M. This further investment will bring the former kitchen garden of the estate back to life. We will work with

	the community to design a new space that will deliver on our strategic ambitions for culture, heritage, food growing, nature, community ownership and support our service be more financially sustainable. We will look for ways to generate more income through heritage grants led by local people.
Providing new play experiences to include delivering accessible play at Hengrove Play Park	Investment should be transformational – making a meaningful difference to the play experience for children and young people, ensuring that young women and girls and Disabled children’s experiences are enhanced and they are involved in the design of new facilities. We will add to our £300K investment to renovate part of Hengrove Play Park, carrying out further work to provide accessible play opportunities and help parents/carers have an exciting and safe play-day out.

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If ‘No’ explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If ‘Yes’ complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[please select]
------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------

We can be confident that adverse impacts are possible but can be avoided. At this stage in the process adverse impacts cannot be identified or measured.

Step 2: What information do we have?

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

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/measuring-equalities-success>.

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](#). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](#); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](#); [Ward Statistical Profiles](#).

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](#) which shows the diversity profile of

council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment Form](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us:
Ward profile data (bristol.gov.uk)	<p>In Bristol 15% of residents (72,300 people) live in the 10% most deprived areas in England, including 17,900 children and 7,600 older people. Bristol has 41 areas in the most deprived 10% in England, with the greatest levels of deprivation in Hartcliffe & Withywood, Filwood and Lawrence Hill.</p>
<p>Census 2021</p> <p>2011 Census Key Statistics About Equalities Communities</p>	<p>In 2021, there were just over 81,000 people living in Bristol with long-term physical or mental health conditions or illnesses whose day-to-day activities were limited.</p> <p>A further 33,000 of the population had a long-term physical or mental health condition but their day-to-day activities were not limited.</p> <p>The proportion of the population that had long-term physical or mental health conditions or illnesses which limited their day-to-day activities broken down by age includes 6.1% of all children under 16 and 38.5% of older people aged 65 and over.</p> <p>The population of Bristol is increasingly diverse with the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic population increasing from 5.1% in 1991 to 18.9% in 2021. The largest minority ethnic groups in 2021 were Somali (1.9%), Pakistani (1.9% and Indian (1.8%).</p> <p>Bristol has a relatively young age profile with ore children aged 0-15 than people aged 65 and over. The median age of people living in Bristol is 32.4 compared to England and Wales at 40.3 years. There are 91,900 children under 18 living in Bristol.</p> <p>In 2021 14.5% of people aged 16+ indicated they had no qualifications. There are two wards in Bristol where more than a quarter of people aged 16+ have no qualifications – Hartcliffe and Withywood (30.4%) and Filwood (28.2%).</p> <p>Accommodation for 18.7% of the population was the social rented sector in 2021 (either council or housing association)</p>
<p>Quality of Life Survey 2022-23</p>	<p>The Quality of Life (QoL) survey is an annual randomised sample survey of the Bristol population, mailed to 33,000 households (with online & paper options), and some additional targeting to boost numbers from low responding groups. In brief, the most recent QoL survey indicated that inequality and deprivation continue to affect people’s experience in almost every element measured by the survey.</p> <p>The service measures performance through the Quality of Life Survey through two indicators:</p> <p>1) Increase the percentage of residents visiting a park or open space at least once a week (QoL)</p>

Table 1: QoL 2023 survey result - % who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week by characteristic

Quality of Life Indicator	% who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week
Characteristic	% Percentage
Bristol Average	56
Black/Black British	20.3
No qualifications	27.5
Rented from the council	27.9
Disabled	33.8
Full-time carer	36.9
65 years and older	39.8
Most Deprived 10%	40
50 years and older	43.6
Non degree qualifications	43.8
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	44.1
Rented from housing association	44.4
Single parent	44.9
Christian	47.5
Carer (All)	48.3
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	48.3
Asian/Asian British	49.6
Other religion	52.8
Part-time carer	52.8
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	53.1
Female	55.2
16 to 24 years	55.4
White British	56.2
Rented from private landlord	56.4
Male	56.7
White	57.1
Owner Occupier	59
No religion or faith	60.8
White Minority Ethnic	62.9
Degree qualifications	64.1
Parents (All)	67.4
Two parent	70.6

Table 2: QoL 2023 survey results - % who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week by ward

Quality of Life Indicator	% who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week
Ward	% Percentage
Bristol Average	56.0

Hartcliffe & Withywood	29.6
Hengrove & Whitchurch Park	35.0
Stockwood	40.2
Filwood	41.4
Hillfields	44.6
Bishopsworth	47.4
St George Troopers Hill	48.0
St George Central	48.1
Lockleaze	48.5
Eastville	49.8
Henbury & Brentry	50.4
Lawrence Hill	51.3
Frome Vale	51.3
Central	53.3
Avonmouth & Lawrence Weston	54.0
Southmead	54.0
Southville	54.0
Horfield	54.9
Brislington West	54.9
Brislington East	55.4
Bedminster	55.5
Ashley	59.3
Westbury-on-Trym & Henleaze	62.6
Easton	64.9
Clifton Down	65.9
Stoke Bishop	67.1
Cotham	67.5
Redland	68.2
Bishopston & Ashley Down	69.4
Hotwells & Harbourside	69.9
Knowle	71.6
Clifton	73.3
St George West	74.9
Windmill Hill	80.6

2) **Improve the percentage of residents satisfied with parks and open spaces (QoL)**

Table 3: QoL 2023 survey result - % satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces by characteristic

Quality of Life Indicator	% satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces
Characteristic	% Percentage
Bristol Average	73.1
Most Deprived 10%	45.6
Full-time carer	58.8
Single parent	58.8
Rented from the council	58.9

Disabled	59.6
No qualifications	63.4
Rented from housing association	64.8
Non degree qualifications	65.1
White Minority Ethnic	66
Other religion	67.5
Carer (All)	68.5
16 to 24 years	68.6
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	68.6
Asian/Asian British	69.4
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	69.5
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	70.2
Rented from private landlord	71
Black/Black British	71.8
Male	71.9
Christian	72
50 years and older	72.2
Part-time carer	72.4
White	73.6
65 years and older	73.9
Female	74.2
White British	74.7
No religion or faith	75.3
Owner Occupier	75.7
Parents (All)	76.7
Degree qualifications	77.3
Two parent	79.2

Table 4: QoL 2023 survey result - % satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces by ward

Quality of Life Indicator	% satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces
Ward	% Percentage
Bristol Average	73.1
Hartcliffe & Withywood	24.6
Filwood	41.2
Lawrence Hill	41.4
Hengrove & Whitchurch Park	51.0
Stockwood	62.6
Central	62.8
Bishopsworth	63.8
Avonmouth & Lawrence Weston	66.7
Southmead	67.7
Ashley	70.5
Lockleaze	71.6
Horfield	73.5

Brislington West	73.6
Henbury & Brentry	73.8
Hillfields	75.2
Bedminster	75.3
Southville	76.0
St George Central	76.7
Brislington East	76.9
Easton	79.5
Frome Vale	81.2
Cotham	83.2
Hotwells & Harbourside	83.7
Redland	84.3
Eastville	86.0
Stoke Bishop	87.6
St George Troopers Hill	88.4
Westbury-on-Trym & Henleaze	89.9
Knowle	90.2
St George West	91.0
Windmill Hill	91.2
Bishopston & Ashley Down	91.6
Clifton	93.2
Clifton Down	93.8

A further relevant QoL measure to the proposal being taken forward relates to the benefit more food growing opportunities may have on feelings of food insecurity.

Table 5: QoL 2023 survey result -% households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity by characteristic.

Quality of Life Indicator	% households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity
Characteristic	% Percentage
Bristol Average	8.1
Rented from housing association	29
Single parent	26.6
Rented from the council	26.4
Other religion	23.6
Disabled	22
Full-time carer	20.4
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	19.9
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	17.2
Most Deprived 10%	16
Asian/Asian British	15.2
16 to 24 years	15.1
Rented from private landlord	15

Non degree qualifications	14.7
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	14.4
No qualifications	13.9
Black/Black British	13.8
Carer (All)	11.9
Part-time carer	9
Male	8.4
Parents (All)	8
Female	7.6
No religion or faith	7.1
White British	7
White	6.9
Christian	6.3
50 years and older	6.3
White Minority Ethnic	6.1
Two parent	5.4
Degree qualifications	5
65 years and older	4
Owner Occupier	3.6

Table 6: QoL 2023 survey result - % households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity by ward where the proposal may be expected to have an impact.

Quality of Life Indicator	% households which have experienced moderate to severe food insecurity
Ward	% Percentage
Bristol Average	8.1
Horfield	10.6
Ashley	10.3
Central	10.3
Eastville	9.0
Easton	8.4
Bishopston & Ashley Down	7.4
Redland	7.4
Lockleaze	4.1
Cotham	3.0

Additional comments:

There is evidence that citizens experience park and green spaces differently and benefit from them to a greater or lesser degree depending on what ward they live in. The is the same when considering communities with a protected characteristic – with deprivation, ethnicity, Disability and education important factors.

There is evidence that citizens experience food insecurity to a greater or lesser degree depending on what ward they live in and whether they are part of a community with a protected characteristic – with housing status, Disability and whether a single parent or carer important factors.

2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Age | <input type="checkbox"/> Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity | <input type="checkbox"/> Race |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief | <input type="checkbox"/> Sex | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation |

2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

The Parks Service does not currently collect demographic data from park users due to the open access and citywide nature of the service.

2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities. See <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/equalities-groups>.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing change or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

All of the investment themes involve the need for further engagement by the delivery team with users, potential users and other stakeholders – to develop the design of the offer. We have set out that we will target investment that supports access to parks and park facilities for children and young people, women and girls and Disabled people. Hengrove Play Park has been subject to a separate consultation process. This process revealed a strong desire for more sensory play. An access audit prioritised improvements such as a changing places facility, a level access path within the play garden taking to all areas, sensory play and raised sand tables and water play to create more opportunity for accessible play.

2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?

Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.

The Service routinely engages local residents and communities in the design element of park investment projects. We ask local members to help this process. However this won't in the case in all instances. If we were to include investment in toilets for example we will be more guided by modern standards of design and access.

--

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Consider sub-categories (different kinds of disability, ethnic background etc.) and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.

Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

GENERAL COMMENTS (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)	
There is the potential for an adverse impact if in some way the design and installation of an improved or new facility interrupts the use and enjoyment of a space by other park visitors and people with protected characteristics. This could be temporarily or permanently. However this is easily avoided through the design process and management of construction process and by ensuring that equalities communities relevant to the space and the asset being improved are consulted.	
We can be confident that adverse impacts can be avoided but of course the potential exists at this stage in the process.	
The distribution of the investment also has the potential to have an adverse impact on people according to where they live – if concentrated for example in one part of the city. The impact would depend on the quality and availability of similar assets within a geographical area already. The investment funding is largely from Strategic CIL and in line with the criteria set for that funding stream investment will be in the city's 'growth areas' – where residential development has recently increased the local population or is predicted to do so. Although there is not enough funding to have a positive citywide effect, efforts have been made to ensure a number of neighbourhoods are able to benefit.	
PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	

Mitigations:	
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Marriage & civil partnership	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	
Socio-Economic (deprivation)	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. Asylums and Refugees; Looked after Children / Care Leavers; Homelessness]	
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our Public Sector Equality Duty to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't

Yes, the design of individual projects within the programme has the potential to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't – indeed much of the investment is targeted at making a positive impact.

A key theme of the investment is to improve access for Disabled people in priority parks and green spaces and to improve play facilities for Disabled children and young people. We will work with Disabled people, local communities and other stakeholders to identify and design improvements to a small number of parks where we can make a meaningful difference to the park visitor experience for disabled visitors. As well as improving parks we will improve the way we provide and present information about our parks so that disabled people can make informed choices about where to visit and why.

We will improve play facility and experiences for young women and girls, making use of guidance and resources from the Make Space for Girls charity.

Investment in new food growing opportunities at Boiling Wells is expected to create new collective and allotment growing opportunities that will offer opportunities for supported growing; particularly helpful to people on low incomes. A number of wards that experience higher than average levels of food insecurity may benefit including Ashley, Central, Eastville, Easton, Bishopston & Ashley Down and Horfield.

There is the potential for the investment to foster good relations between people who shared a protected characteristic and those who don't if wider visitor numbers increase from a larger section of the population due to a visible uplift in site quality and better facilities.

Step 4: Impact

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

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:

There is the potential for negative impact although none have been identified. To avoid this potential the delivery of the investment programme will need to:

- Ensure that equalities communities are consulted on the design and delivery of individual projects. The investment will particularly target Disabled visitors, children and young people and young women and girls and these communities will be targeted for engagement.
- Ensure that access, design and safety standards are adhered to, particularly for Disabled users and children and young people.

Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:

A key theme of the investment is to improve access for disabled people in priority parks and green spaces and to improve play facilities for Disabled children and young people. The themed approach allows for further consultation and engagement work with disabled people, young people, women and girls and other local stakeholders to identify and design improvements. We anticipate that as well as improving parks we will improve the way we provide and present information about our parks so that Disabled people particularly can make informed choices about where to visit and why.

Investment in new food growing opportunities will generate new collective and allotment growing opportunities that will offer opportunities for supported growing; particularly helpful to people on low incomes. A number of wards that experience higher than average levels of food insecurity may benefit including Ashley, Central, Eastville, Easton, Bishopston & Ashley Down and Horfield.

There is the potential for the investment to foster good relations between people who shared a protected characteristic and those who don't if wider visitor numbers increase from a larger section of the population due to a visible uplift in site quality and better facilities.

4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
Consider and record the potential for adverse impact and positive impact from each investment project. To consult and consider product design and installation project aspects accordingly and to ensure positive impacts are generated.	Susy Feltham, Landscape Works and Play Manager	25/26 – 28/29
Target consultation and engagement on young women and girls for the play investment theme.	Susy Feltham, Landscape Works and Play Manager	25/26 – 27/28

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
Target consultation and engagement with Disabled visitors and representative groups of Disabled people in order to inform the Access investment theme.	Susy Feltham, Landscape Works and Play Manager	25/26


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

How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.

The initial assessment of positive and adverse impacts in the action of 4.2 will be reviewed post-programme delivery.

Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the Equality and Inclusion Team before requesting sign off from your Director¹.

Equality and Inclusion Team Review: <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	Director Sign-Off: 
Date: 12/2/2024	Date: 13.02.24

¹ Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.