

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

You should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

Information about the policy

Name of the policy or policy area:

**Lisburn City Centre Public Realm Scheme:
From Design to Delivery 2009 - 2014**

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
X		

Brief Description

In February 2009, Lisburn City Council (as a legacy council of Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council), in partnership with Lisburn City Centre Management and the Department for Social Development (DSD) commissioned the production of a 15-year Masterplan for Lisburn City Centre. This Masterplan included proposals for the 'innovative regeneration' of the public spaces in the city centre (Lisburn Design Compendium, GVA Grimley and EDAW / AECOM).

The Council subsequently put out to tender two projects attached to a public realm scheme for Lisburn City Centre. The first project (referred to as Project A) placed a particular focus on the refurbishment of Market Square and Bow Street but also with consideration of Haslem's Lane, Market Street and Graham Gardens.

The plans included street paving and kerbing, the incorporation of street lighting, street furniture, hard and soft landscaping, and public art (including water features). The capital funding for the project was estimated to total £3,960,347, with £2,750,000 provided by DSD (now operating as the Department for Communities, DfC) and £1,210,347 contributed by Lisburn City Council.

The Paul Hogarth Company ('TPHC') was subsequently appointed to design and prepare plans for the scheme, and began a period of public consultations on the proposals in January 2010, according to an agreed Stakeholder Management Plan. These

consultations involved various meetings and exchanges with the following organisations during 2010:

- DRD Roads Services [now operating as Transport NI],
- DSD,
- DOE Planning Service
- PSNI
- DSD
- Disability Action
- GVA Grimley
- RNIB
- The Orange Order
- First Lisburn Presbyterian Church
- Island Arts Centre
- UDR Memorial Trust

Further to these initial engagements, a stakeholders' event was held in March 2012, together with a public display of the plans for six weeks prior to full application for planning permission in July 2012.

Following consultation with all relevant statutory and non-statutory bodies, Northern Ireland Planning Service granted full permission for the scheme in January 2013, a building contractor was appointed in March 2013, and works duly commenced in October 2013.

During construction, a weekly email was sent to 'Lisburn In Focus' outlining where works would be taking place in the following week, on the understanding that this would be distributed more widely to those with sight loss in the district.

Lisburn In Focus was a five-year project which ended in 2015, funded by the Big Lottery Fund's Safe and Well programme, designed to make the Lisburn City Council area as accessible and inclusive as possible for people with sight loss. It brought RNIB Northern Ireland together with Guide Dogs, Lisburn City Council and Lisburn City Centre Management to improve all aspects of safety, well-being and social inclusion in the city of Lisburn and surrounding villages. For example, the project sent out a free monthly newsletter that included information that might be of interest to blind and partially sighted people. The newsletter was available in different formats.

In November 2013, TPHC received comments from Guide Dogs NI regarding particular concerns with one aspect of the design, namely the adoption of a '30mm kerb show' at the interface between motorised and pedestrianised areas of the scheme.

In brief, a dispute then developed as to when the Council had been first made aware of these concerns, and, further to various representations, whether a new kerb height of 60mm should be adopted in revised plans. A number of meetings were held during 2014 with MLAs and representatives from bodies including Guide Dogs NI and Lisburn In Focus, during which time work on the scheme was largely completed.

At the time that the scheme was initially designed in 2010, guidance from Roads Service NI on kerb heights in public domains was based on a minimum height of 30mm, and this was agreed upon at various meetings through to the lodging of the planning application in 2012. Subsequently, in May 2015 revised guidance on kerb heights was made available by Transport NI, in which it was suggested that, 'where a shared surface street is envisaged, it is recommended that kerb heights should not be less than 60mm'. However, this guidance was not current during the planning phase of the project.

One outcome of the dispute was an application for Judicial Review made by Joanna Toner in 2014, a member of the blind community in Lisburn who uses a guide dog for assistance. The application centred on an allegation that the Council had acted unlawfully by establishing kerb heights of 30mm. The matter was heard over five days in 2016 and the judgment was issued on May 12th 2017.

In the judgment, all but one of the challenges brought by the applicant were dismissed, the exception being that the Council 'did not perform its public sector equality duty in accordance with section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998' with regard to the design and delivery of the scheme. The judgment states that, 'at no stage in the Public Realm Scheme's development, was the issue of the public sector duty subjected to a s75 compliant process', and goes on to reflect on the 'potential benefits which might have been obtained had the Public Realm Scheme been subjected by the Council to a careful section 75 orientated examination'. The judgment does not specify the nature of this examination but earlier (p.31, para 137) outlines the two-stage process involving first screening and next EQIA in circumstances where the impact is seen as major and negative.

This screening represents the first stage in this process and applies to the design and delivery of the scheme from 2009 through to its completion in 2014. Although the scheme was carried out under the auspices of the legacy Lisburn City Council, responsibility for the screening now rests with Lisburn and Castlereagh Council. Furthermore, primary responsibility for design and delivery of the project was contracted to a private sector company, TPHC, but as a designated public authority then the Council is content to continue to meet its statutory duties under section 75.

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)

Operating within available resources, and in line with Lisburn Council's City Masterplan 2009 – 2024, to realise the full economic potential of the City through the design and delivery of an innovative high quality design concept for the core areas of Lisburn City Centre, including options for materials, street lighting, street paving, street furniture, hard and soft landscaping and public art, that accommodates:

- Pedestrian movements and safety
- Traffic circulation
- The ongoing maintenance of the public realm

The strategy also fits within key relevant public policy and strategy documents having regard to:

- Renewal of disadvantaged areas;

- Improving the physical, economic, community and social environment of Lisburn City Centre;
- Creating and sustaining an attractive, vibrant city centre that performs a multi-functional role including for leisure and cultural facilities;
- Stimulating investment to create a vibrant, competitive city; and
- Environmentally improving the city centre and enhancement of open spaces.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
X		

If YES, explain how.

The Scheme has the potential to enhance the City Centre for a range of users across all s75 grounds by improving accessibility and remedying:

- A fragmented city centre space;
- Excessive signposting;
- Cluttered streetscape;
- Poorly maintained buildings;
- Areas of low quality architecture.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

A partnership involving Lisburn City Council, DSD and Lisburn City Centre Management commissioned consultants to produce a Masterplan for Lisburn City Centre. The Public Realm Scheme was an integral part of the Masterplan, and consultants (TPHC) then drew up designs for implementing the scheme

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

While the Council, in partnership with DSD, initiated and funded the scheme, design and delivery of the project was undertaken by TPHC and other private sector companies.

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
X		

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)

The scheme was funded jointly by Lisburn City Council and DSD (£3.9m). Costs for any future alterations to the scheme are likely to be borne by Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council.

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

The scheme was developed in line with all relevant planning statutes in operation at that time, and informed by relevant guidance including that made available by NI Roads Service (DOE). Many of the processes attaching to the development of the scheme have been subject to judicial review. One deficit was identified in relation to the failure to apply section 75 at successive stages of project development.

Other, please specify:

The scheme was developed in line with all relevant planning statutes in operation at that time, and informed by relevant guidance including that made available by NI Roads Service (DOE).

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff: Those members of Lisburn City Council staff who were involved in the design and management of the project

Service users: All residents of Lisburn and visitors to the City who access this area of the city. Traders and service providers within the designated area will also be affected.

Other public sector organisations: DSD (now DfC), Lisburn City Centre Management, Transport NI, NI Planning Service.

Voluntary/community/trade unions: Staff trade unions and associations. Representative groups engaged during consultation and beyond.

Other, please specify: Private sector companies engaged during the design and delivery of the scheme including TPHC and building contractors.

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

The Masterplan and associated schemes were linked to a raft of government policies and strategies during that period and including the following:

- NI Programme for Government 2008-11
- NI Regional Economic Strategy
- Lisburn City Council Corporate Strategies, Annual Reports and Business Plans 2010 –14
- DSD Corporate Plan 2008 – 11
- Regional Development Strategy for NI

DISABILITY

In contrast, considerable data are available from the consultation in relation to one aspect of disability, sight loss. Before considering this information in more detail, it may be worthwhile setting the data within a broader disability context.

On Census Day 2011, 21% of all Northern Ireland residents declared a long-term health problem or disability which limited their day to day activities a little or a lot while 79% of the population stated that their general health was either good or very good.

Residents living in the new Belfast and Derry and Strabane LGDs were most likely to have a long-term health problem which limited their activities a little or a lot (23%). By contrast, those living in Lisburn and Castlereagh (18%) and Antrim and Newtownabbey (19%) were less likely to have such an illness or disability.

Indeed, regarding general health status, Lisburn and Castlereagh had the highest proportion of residents who self-reported their health to be either good or very good (82%), followed by Antrim and Newtownabbey (81%). Of the long-term conditions associated with disability, the following table gives a breakdown for the Lisburn City Council district in 2011 (source: NISRA).

Table KS302NI – Type of Long-Term Condition (Lisburn City Council) 2011 Census Data

Lisburn City Council population (all usual residents): 120,165

Condition	Number	%
<i>No Condition</i>	83597	69.57
Mobility/Dexterity	12562	10.45
Long-Term Pain or Discomfort	11462	9.54
Shortness of Breath/Difficulty Breathing	10182	8.47
Chronic Illness	7534	6.27
Other Condition	6316	5.26
Emotional, Psychological, Mental Health	6304	5.25
Deaf/Partial Hearing Loss	5844	4.86
Learning, Intellectual, Social, Behaviour	2745	2.28
Confusion/Memory Loss	2153	1.79
Communication Difficulties	1897	1.58
Blind/Partial Sight Loss ¹	1737	1.45

While 70% of the Lisburn population had no long-term condition

¹ In the affidavit provided by Mr Mann re Joanna Toner's application for judicial review, it is stated that there are 2,940 people with sight loss living in the Lisburn area, of whom 340 have severe sight loss.

linked to ill-health, by way of example 10.5% had a disability associated with mobility and/or dexterity, 8.5% had breathing difficulties, 4.9% experienced hearing loss, 2.3% were characterised by learning difficulties and 1.5% were either blind or had partial sight loss.

During January 2010, TPHC engaged with Disability Action (an organisation that represents all types of disability) and also the RNIB (representing those affected by sight loss), with particular regard to an earlier scheme in Woodbrook village, and a proposal to adopt of 30mm kerbing, as opposed to flush surfaces. Both representatives endorsed the approach outlined by TPHC for Woodbrook, but the representative of Disability Action subsequently forwarded a copy of a research report entitled 'Effective Kerb Heights for Blind and Partially Sighted People' (2009) to TPHC for information.

This paper was based on a laboratory study carried out by the Accessibility Research Group at University College London and commissioned by the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association. Using a controlled internal environment, the study tested the ability of 36 blind and partially sighted people (17 long cane users, 11 guide dog owners and eight with no aid) to detect kerbs of varying heights from 20mm to 120mm when approaching either directly or at an oblique angle. In summary, all participants detected kerbs of 60mm or higher both stepping up and down. However, when stepping down, in 110 trials there were two failures to detect the kerb at 50mm (1.8%), three failures at 40mm (2.7%), and six failures at 30mm (5.4%). When stepping up the kerb there were four failures at 40mm (3.6%) and five failures at 30mm (4.5%). Those who failed to detect kerbs included a participant with cone dystrophy, a long cane user, and two guide dog owners.

In conclusion, the authors suggest that kerb heights which are lower than 40mm, 'appear to be less consistent in detection rates and thus consideration should be given to avoiding them if possible.' The authors also suggested that, 'Issues relating to other groups, such as people with learning difficulties, would need to be considered in future research.'

At subsequent consultation events up to the lodging of the planning application in July 2012, and including with Transport NI, no further reference was made to the research study by any consultee.

More recently, in 2015 the RNIB carried out a survey with 500 blind and partially sighted people. Almost all (95%) said they had collided with at least one obstacle over the past three months, with one third injured as a result. According to the report, 'the main issues facing people with sight loss when using the streetscape include: accessible crossing points; shared space schemes which remove kerbing and tactile paving; advertising boards left on the pavement; as well as street and café furniture.'

	<p>With regard to the latter issue, in a recent response to Causeway Coast and Glens District Council regarding the screening of Pavement Café Guidance Notes, RNIB stated, 'Since February 2015, Guide Dogs, RNIB, Disability Action and IMTAC have been providing advice and guidance at both a Departmental and local government level. Despite this engagement, we have major concerns that the guidelines will not provide adequate protection for pedestrians, particularly with regard to precise requirements on the location of cafés, screening of cafés and the maintenance of a safe and accessible width of pavement.'</p>
--	---

DRAFT

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 policy/decision? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

Section 75 Category	Details of Needs/Experiences/Priorities
Religious belief Political opinion	<p>In the design of public spaces, the inclusion of art works and displays should ensure that no 'chill factors' are introduced that adversely impact on one or more communities, and that it is regarded as a shared space for those from different identities and communities. Access to existing places of worship should be afforded due regard in the design of public realm areas.</p>
Age Dependancy	<p>Both older people and younger people, in different ways are likely to face greater difficulties with regard to mobility and access through public spaces. This could extend to distances, obstacles and <u>manoeuvrability</u>.</p>
Race Disability	<p>Signage used within the public realm should accommodate the needs of those who may not have access to written English, whether as residents or visitors. Universal signage is commonly regarded as the default choice to avoid problems or confusions arising, for example with regard to those with learning difficulties or low levels of literacy.</p>
Disability	<p>Various forms of disability may require due consideration during the design and development of public spaces in order to ensure safety and freedom of access. This should extend to a consideration of different examples of disability, both sensory and physical, and including those occasions where there may be competing needs and priorities associated with different forms of disability. Those with sensory impairment (both hearing and sight), mobility constraints (e.g. wheelchair users, walking aids) and learning difficulties should be afforded due regard in the design of public spaces in particular where safety is a concern.</p>

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy **out**. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

In favour of a 'major' impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
- c) 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;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns among affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

In favour of 'minor' impact

- a) The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
- b) 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;
- c) 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;
- d) By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In favour of none

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.
- b) 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.

Taking into account the earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none.

Screening questions

1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 grounds? Minor/Major/None		
Section 75 Category	Details of Policy Impact	Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	The PRS consultation during 2010 to 2012 did not reveal any impact on equality of opportunity attaching to this ground. Where churches or places of worship were potentially impacted by the scheme then full consultation ensured minimal impact.	None
Political opinion	The PRS consultation during 2010 to 2012 did not reveal any impact on equality of opportunity attaching to this ground. Where the scheme involved artefacts or memorials more closely associated with one community then full consultation ensured minimal impact.	None
Racial / ethnic group	The PRS incorporated best practice in the design of signage throughout the space, minimising the use of the written word wherever possible.	None
Age	Consultation with various groups and individuals between 2010 and 2012 did not reveal particular concerns attaching to age <i>per se</i> , other than potential disruption to the City centre during the building stage of the project.	Minor (-)
Marital status	No issues attaching to marital status were revealed during the consultation phase of the project, nor since.	None
Sexual orientation	No issues attaching to sex or gender were revealed during the consultation phase of the project, nor since.	None
Men and women generally	No issues attaching to sex or gender were revealed during the consultation phase of the project, nor since.	None
Disability	Early consultations prior to the lodgement of the planning application identified a number of concerns by representatives of those with visual impairment. These were then addressed through appropriate mitigations to the satisfaction of those representatives. For example, further to engagement with RNIB, additional guidance (warning) paving was introduced in the Market Square along	Major (-)

	<p>with additional 'drop' kerb doorways. At a subsequent consultation event in March 2012, concerns were raised with regard to contrasting kerbs, changes in levels and detailing of steps with contrasting colours. The reduced kerb show was received as being acceptable, along with assurances that 'spill out' areas outside coffee shops etc. would be constrained so as to avoid encroaching into the walkway. The removal of existing signage, bollards etc. was also welcomed at this time.</p> <p>Following planning approval and subsequent to completion of the project, major concerns were raised regarding the height of kerbs, and this matter remains in dispute.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that the focus to date has fallen on only one aspect of disability, sight loss, and opportunities to consider other dimensions should be given due consideration. For example, at the consultation event in March 2012 the issue of level changes within the scheme and the need to minimise such changes was raised and seemingly addressed satisfactorily, although there is no evidence of specific engagement with those with limited mobility or dependency/caring needs.</p>	
Dependants	<p>For those with caring responsibilities, either for children or older people, the design of a public realm should accommodate the needs of those accompanying buggies, wheelchairs, prams etc., to ensure ease of movement through the space. In particular this should extend to a consideration of any changes of level, and minimising these changes wherever possible. At the consultation event in March 2012 these matters were raised and addressed satisfactorily, although there is no evidence of specific engagement with those with limited mobility or dependency/caring needs.</p>	Minor (-)

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
Age Dependency Disability	Although the project is now completed, further engagement with younger and older people, those with mobility limitations and those with caring responsibilities, may be useful to consider if the completed works present any practical difficulties for users with regard to access, movement and safety	

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/Major/None		
Good Relations Category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	The project was designed to enhance the city centre for the benefit of all residents and visitors. The public arts and displays have been designed to enhance a shared space for all, irrespective of community background.	Minor (+)
Political opinion	The project was designed to enhance the city centre for the benefit of all residents and visitors. The public arts and displays have been designed to enhance a shared space for all, irrespective of community background.	Minor (+)
Racial group	The removal of signs and the introduction of universal signage may have served to increase the accessibility of the city centre for those whose first language is not English.	Minor (+)

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 reasons
Religious belief Political opinion Race		The scheme has been developed mindful of the need to create a shared space that can be used and enjoyed by those of all identities and communities.

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

The UCL research report dealing with kerb height (referenced earlier) cited the need to consider where two or more disabilities may coincide (e.g. sight loss and learning difficulties). Furthermore, where two or more grounds of difference coincide (e.g. age and mobility loss) then access to public spaces may be more severely disrupted.

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

Not available at this time.

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should:
(please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)
2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)
3. Not be subject to an EQIA at this time
4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If YES, when & why?

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Prior to the lodgement of the planning application in 2012, public consultation had shown widespread agreement, and indeed endorsement, of the design proposals for the public realm scheme as developed by TPHC. At that time the proposals were in keeping with recommendations for public realm kerb height as made available by Transport NI (i.e. a minimum of 30mm), and no objections were raised during the planning process.

In May 2015, Transport NI recommended that kerb heights for public realm schemes should be raised to a minimum of 60mm, in line with the height earlier recommended in a laboratory study of kerb height recognition by UCL (2009). Unfortunately, the public realm scheme for Lisburn City Centre had been completed by then, at a cost to the ratepayers of Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council, and the citizens of Northern Ireland, of around £3.9 million.

To address the concerns raised with regard to the existing kerb height by adjusting the kerbing is likely to cost in the region of £300,000, and will also lead to further disruption to the city centre during building work, which it is estimated could last a minimum of 4 months.

At this time, and mindful of competing financial demands on the Council along with the outcome of the current screening exercise, it is argued that the matter can best be resolved by way of an equality impact assessment (EQIA). In light of the findings of this initial section 75 screening, it is intended that the EQIA should not encompass the entire scheme but should focus on the issue of kerbage within the bounds of the scheme.

The screening has identified a limitation in the earlier consultation for the scheme between 2010 and 2012, insofar as attention was afforded almost exclusively to only one aspect of disability, sight loss.

While the significance of this aspect of disability should not and cannot be ignored or underestimated, as the earlier data indicates clearly, those with sight loss make up a relatively small proportion (4.8%) of the total number of people with a longstanding disability in Lisburn. The interests and well-being of those with other disabilities (95.2%) cannot and should not be ignored in future deliberations, including engagement with those with mobility/dexterity conditions (34.4%).

To remedy this deficit, and prior to carrying out the EQIA, it is proposed that an independent disability audit is undertaken of the public realm covered by the scheme with a particular focus on kerbage, but extending to all grounds of disability including mobility/dexterity.

The Council is aware that the judgment in the judicial review highlighted shortcomings in the way in which section 75 had been applied during the design and delivery of the scheme. The Council has already initiated an internal review to ensure that lessons are learned from the way in which the scheme was managed, and this will extend to a consideration of contractual obligations falling on third parties operating on behalf of the Council in future enterprises where section 75 is relevant.

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? NO

If YES, please provide details:

As the scheme is already in place, the EQIA should proceed in a timely manner to remedy outstanding concerns as quickly as possible.

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for EQIA.

Priority criterion	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	2
Social need	2
Effect on people's daily lives	2
Relevance to a public authority's functions	3

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: October 2017

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

In many respects this screening exercise is exceptional as it relates to a programme of work that is already completed. Nevertheless Lisburn and Castlereagh Council commits to reflecting on the completed scheme and making any reasonable adjustments to the design profile as may be required, subsequent to the completion of all section 75 activities.

Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You should consider the guidance contained in the Commission's Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007). The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

The EQIA will pay due regard to all monitoring data available from the time the project was initiated through to completion, and since that time with regard to, for example, surveys of users and complaints received. This information will form an integral part of the equality impact assessment process. In the future, the Council will continue to monitor the impact of the scheme on a bi-annual basis and will use this information to inform any revisions to the scheme.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Approved by:		

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

APPENDIX 1: Lisburn City Council: Section 75 Statistics (2011)²

1: Age

Population Estimates June 2009 (NISRA)

Area	Numbers				Percentages		
	All Ages	Children ¹	Working Age ²	Pensioners ³	Children ¹	Working Age ²	Pensioners ³
N Ireland	1,788,900	382,100	1,104,900	301,900	21.4	61.8	16.9
Lisburn	116,500	26,300	71,600	18,500	22.6	61.5	15.9

¹ Children are defined as those in the population aged under 16.

² Working age population is defined as the male population aged 16-64 and the female population aged 16-59

³ Pensioners are defined as the male population aged 65 and over and the female population aged 60 and over.

Age and Gender – Population Estimates June 2009 (NISRA)

Lisburn	PERSONS	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES
				%	%
ALL AGES	116,471	56,775	59,696	48.75	51.25
Under 1	1,794	923	871	51.45	48.55
Age 1-4	6,698	3,476	3,222	51.90	48.10
Age 5-9	7,671	3,940	3,731	51.36	48.64
Age 10-14	8,508	4,445	4,063	52.24	47.76
15-19	8,140	4,170	3,970	51.23	48.77
20-24	8,165	4,160	4,005	50.95	49.05
25-29	8,142	4,066	4,076	49.94	50.06
30-34	7,207	3,483	3,724	48.33	51.67
35-39	7,969	3,714	4,255	46.61	53.39
40-44	8,894	4,218	4,676	47.43	52.57
45-49	8,506	4,026	4,480	47.33	52.67
50-54	7,221	3,588	3,633	49.69	50.31
55-59	6,178	3,056	3,122	49.47	50.53
60-64	5,884	2,834	3,050	48.16	51.84
65-69	4,961	2,344	2,617	47.25	52.75
70-74	3,820	1,759	2,061	46.05	53.95
75-79	3,053	1,320	1,733	43.24	56.76
80-84	2,115	794	1,321	37.54	62.46
85+	1,545	459	1,086	29.71	70.29

² The enclosed statistics were prepared in January 2011 as part of the research work into the development of 'Revised Equality Schemes' for the local government sector in Northern Ireland. Official statistic sources are used in the main apart from those relating to Political Opinion. In this report Lisburn City Council statistics are compared against the Northern Ireland average where possible. Some statistics may seem dated but this is due to the fact that these are the most up to date available. Lisburn City Council should also compare these statistics against any data they may have commissioned so as to develop as full an understanding of the key statistics impacting upon the Section 75 Categories.

2: Gender

Population Estimates June 2009 (Source: NISRA)

Area	Number			Percentages	
	All	Males	Females	Males	Females
NI	1,788,896	878,609	910,287	49.11	50.88
Lisburn	116,471	56,775	59,696	48.75	51.25

N Ireland Age and Gender –Population Estimates June 2009 (Source: NISRA)

Age and Gender Group Summaries	Numbers			Percentages		
	All	Males	Females	All	Males	Females
ALL AGES	1,788,896	878,609	910,287	100.0	100.0	100.0
All aged under 16	382,127	196,090	186,037	21.4	22.3	20.4
All aged under 18	432,814	221,956	210,858	24.2	25.3	23.2
All aged 16 & over	1,406,769	682,519	724,250	78.6	77.7	79.6
All aged 18 & over	1,356,082	656,653	699,429	75.8	74.7	76.8
All aged 16-29	358,011	182,045	175,966	20.0	20.7	19.3
All aged 30-44	368,862	182,130	186,732	20.6	20.7	20.5
All aged 45-59F / 64M	378,029	209,130	168,899	21.1	23.8	18.6
All aged 60F/65M +	301,867	109,214	192,653	16.9	12.4	21.2
All aged 16 to 59F/64M	1,104,902	573,305	531,597	61.8	65.3	58.4
All aged 75-89	106,335	41,460	64,875	5.9	4.7	7.1
All aged 90 & over	8,644	2,145	6,499	0.5	0.2	0.7

3: Religious Belief

Religion of household members (Source: Continuous Household Survey)

Religion ¹	%	%	%	%	%
	2005 – 06	2006 – 07	2007 – 08	2008 – 09	2009 - 10
Catholic	41	42	45	43	43
Protestant	54	52	49	51	50
Other or none	3	5	5	5	6
No answer	2	1	1	1	1
Base = 100%	6,466	6,658	6,312	6,101	6,919

Notes:

1 Religion supplemented from others in household : If missing, unwilling or undefined religion taken from the first person in the household to state Catholic, Protestant, None or Other

Source – 2001 Census NISRA - Table UV018: RELIGION

Persons with community background	All Persons Northern Ireland	%	All Persons Lisburn	%
		1,685,267	100	108,694
Catholic ¹	678,462	40.25	32,681	30.06
Presbyterian	348,742	20.69	22,183	20.40
Church of Ireland	257,788	15.29	22,959	21.12
Methodist	59,173	3.51	4,498	4.13
Other Christian	102,221	6.06	8,567	7.88
Other Religions	5028	0.29	292	0.26
No religion / not stated	233,853	13.87	17,514	16.11

¹ The term Catholic includes those respondents who gave their religion as Catholic or Roman Catholic.

Source 2001 Census –Community Background: Religion or religion brought up in (Numbers)

Persons with community background	All Persons NI	%	All Persons Lisburn	%
		1,685,267	100	108,694
Catholic ¹	737,412	43.75	36,251	33.35
Protestant	895,377	53.12	68,233	62.77
Other Religions	6,569	0.38	387	0.35
None	45,909	2.72	3,823	3.51

¹ The term Catholic includes those respondents who gave their religion as Catholic or Roman Catholic.

4: Political Opinion

Summary Election Results 2005 – 1993 (Source: www.arc.ac.uk/elections)

2005 Results	2001 Results	1997 Results	1993 Results
Votes by Party: DUP: 17,238 (40.7%), 13 councillors UUP: 9,625 (22.7%), 7 councillors SF: 7,092 (9.2%), 4 councillors Alliance: 3,907 (9.2%), 3 councillors SDLP: 3,894 (8.5%), 3 councillors Cons: 333 (0.8%) Green: 284 (0.7%)	Votes by Party: UUP: 16,449 (35.2%), 13 councillors DUP: 9,444 (20.2%), 5 councillors SF: 7,508 (16.0%), 4 councillors SDLP: 3,987 (8.5%), 3 councillors Alliance: 5,169 (11.0%), 3 councillors NIUP: 64 (0.2%) Cons: 636 (1.4%) Ind*: 3,502 (7.5%), 2 councillors	Votes by Party: UUP: 11,799 (36.6%), 13 councillors DUP: 4,239 (13.2%), 2 councillors SF: 4,427 (13.7%), 4 councillors SDLP: 1,859 (5.8%), 2 councillors Alliance: 4,188 (13.0%), 3 councillors UDP: 1,615 (5.0%), 2 councillors U: 1,739 (5.4%), 2 councillors WC: 209 (0.6%) WP: 192 (0.6%) Cons: 935 (2.9%), 1 councillor Ind*: 1,003 (3.1%), 1 councillor	Votes by Party: UUP: 13,216 (39.1%), 16 councillors DUP: 5,350 (15.8%), 3 councillors SF: 3,138 (9.3%), 3 councillors SDLP: 2,661 (7.9%), 3 councillors Alliance: 4,169 (12.3%), 2 councillors ULDP: 1,617 (4.8%), 1 councillor U: 1,394 (4.1%), 1 councillor WP: 598 (1.8%) Cons: 1,402 (4.1%), 1 councillor Env: 281 (0.8%)
Electorate: 71,696; votes cast: 43,661; spoilt votes: 888 (2.0%); valid votes: 42,773 (98.0%)	Electorate: 75,619; votes cast: 47,844; spoilt votes: 1,085 (2.3%); valid votes: 46,759 (97.7%)	Electorate: 74,777; votes cast: 32,780; spoilt votes: 575 (1.7%); valid votes: 32,205 (98.3%)	Electorate: 70,012; votes cast: 34,648; spoilt votes: 822 (2.4%); valid votes: 33,826 (97.6%)
2001 Census: 36,251 "Catholic" (33.35%); 68,233 "Protestant" (62.78%); 387 Other (0.36%); 3,823 None (3.52%)			

Electoral Area	2005 Result	2001 Result	1997 Result
Downshire	2 DUP, 2 UUP, 1 Alliance	3 UUP, 1 DUP, 1 Alliance	2 UUP, 1 DUP, 1 Alliance, 1 Conservative
Lisburn Town North	3 DUP, 3 UUP, 1 Alliance	4 UUP, 1 Alliance, 1 DUP, 1 Ind	3 UUP, 1 Ind U, 1 Alliance, 1 UDP, 1 Prot U
Lisburn Town South	4 DUP, 1 Alliance, 1 UUP	3 UUP, 1 Alliance, 1 DUP, 1 Ind	4 UUP, 1 Alliance, 1 UDP
Killultagh	3 DUP, 1 UUP, 1 SDLP	2 UUP, 2 DUP, 1 SDLP	3 UUP, 1 DUP, 1 SDLP
Dunmurry Cross	4 SF, 2 SDLP, 1 DUP	4 SF, 2 SDLP, 1 UUP	4 SF, 1 UUP, 1 SDLP, 1 Ind

5: Disability

Percentage reported limited long-standing illness by sex and age
(Source: Continuous Household Survey)

All persons aged 16 +

Sex & age	Lisburn					
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Base (2009-10) = 100%
Total						
16-44	13	13	10	12	12	2,130
45-64	29	29	30	27	26	1,529
65-74	42	41	46	41	42	564
>=75	53	51	57	53	48	378
All Persons	25	24	25	24	23	4,601
Males						
16-44	12	12	10	11	12	984
45-64	29	28	28	25	25	699
65-74	36	41	45	39	40	260
>=75	51	46	53	53	43	166
All Males	22	23	23	22	22	2,109
Females						
16-44	15	13	11	13	12	1,146
45-64	30	30	32	29	27	830
65-74	48	42	46	43	43	304
>=75	54	53	60	53	53	212
All Females	27	25	26	25	24	2,492

6: Racial Group

(Source: N I Census 2001)

Lisburn	
Ethnic Group	
White	99.26%
Irish Traveller	0.05%
Mixed	0.2%
Indian	0.09%
Pakistani	0.02%
Bangladeshi	0.01%
Other Asian	0.01%
Black Carribean	0.01%
Black African	0.03%
Other Black	0.02%
Chinese	0.23%

Estimated Net Total Migration, by Age and Gender (July 2008 - June 2009)	
Gender / Age	Estimated Net Total Migration
Male	1,040
Less than 18 years	517
18-24	-296
25-34	436
35-44	27
45-54	218
55-64	105
65 years and over	33
Female	1,080
Less than 18 years	643
18-24	-306
25-34	438
35-44	54
45-54	144
55-64	91
65 years and over	16
Total	2,120
Source: NISRA (July 2010)	
Other ethnic group	0.09%

7: Marital Status

NI: Percentage of persons aged 16 and over (Source – NISRA 2001, Census)

Marital Status	N Ireland
Single (never married)	31.24%
Married	48.45%
Re-married	2.67%
Separated (but still legally married)	4.6%
Divorced	4.12%
Widowed	7.81%

Lisburn: Percentage of persons aged 16 and over (Source – NISRA 2001, Census)

Marital Status	Lisburn
Single (never married)	30.45%
Married	50.4%
Re-married	3.39%
Seperated (but still legally married)	4.07%
Divorced	4.66%
Widowed	7.03%

Civil Partnerships: Numbers, Mean Age and Percentage by Age

Source NISRA – N Ireland 2005 to 2009^P

Year	Total civil partnerships	Male Partners			
		Number of civil partnerships	Average age of partners	Percentage of partners aged under 25	Percentage of partners aged 40 and over
2005 ¹	12	6	39.4	8	42
2006	116	65	42.7	3	52
2007	111	60	41.1	7	53
2008	86	43	40.6	3	57
2009 ^P	96	46	39.4	7	43

Year	Total civil partnerships	Female Partners			
		Number of civil partnerships	Average age of partners	Percentage of partners aged under 25	Percentage of partners aged 40 and over
2005 ¹	12	6	34.7	-	17
2006	116	51	39.5	8	49
2007	111	51	38.0	6	40
2008	86	43	37.9	6	29
2009 ^P	96	50	35.6	8	24

^P Provisional Data¹ Civil Partnerships only introduced in December 2005

8: Sexual Orientation

Sexual identity by Government Office Region in England and countries of the UK, April 2009 to March 2010

United Kingdom Percentages	Heterosexual/Straight	Gay/Lesbian / Bisexual	Other	Don't know / Refusal	Non response
North East	96.7	1.1	0.5	1.3	0.4
North West	95.5	1.5	0.3	2.2	0.4
Yorkshire and The Humber	95.4	1.5	0.5	2.1	0.4
East Midlands	96.0	1.1	0.4	2.3	0.3
West Midlands	93.3	1.2	0.7	4.3	0.5
East of England	95.0	1.1	0.4	3.2	0.3
London	92.3	2.2	0.6	4.2	0.6
South East	94.7	1.5	0.6	2.8	0.5
South West	95.4	1.8	0.4	2.0	0.4
Wales	95.6	1.3	0.4	1.9	0.8
Scotland	95.7	1.3	0.3	2.0	0.6
Northern Ireland	92.4	0.9	0.4	5.3	1.0
Total (Thousands) (=100%)	46,922	727	242	1,394	233

1 The total number of eligible responders to this question was 238,206.

Source: Integrated Household Survey, Office for National Statistics

Comparison of LGB estimates; surveys from within the UK

Survey	Coverage	Year	LGB (%)	Sample Size	Non response (%)
Integrated Household Survey	UK	2009/10	1.5	238,206	3.8
Citizenship Survey	England & Wales	2009/10	2.3	9,203	2.7
British Crime Survey	England & Wales	2009/10	2.2	22,995	2.7
General Lifestyle Survey	Great Britain	2008	1.1	3,443	5.4
Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey	Northern Ireland	2005	1.7	1,199	1.3
British Social Attitudes Survey	Great Britain	2005	1.4	1,732	1.4
Scottish Census Small Test	Scotland	2005	1.3	692	14.7
DTI Fair Treatment at Work Pilot Survey	Great Britain	2008	2.4	2,704	9.0

Source: Integrated Household Survey, Office for National Statistics

9: Dependants

Percentages of Households with Dependent Children and Households with Limiting Long- term Illness. (Source: NISRA 2001 - Census)

Area	All households	Percentage of households:				1+ with limiting long-term illness
		With no adults in employment:		With dependent children ¹ :		
		With dependent children	Without dependent children	All ages	Aged 0-4	
N Ireland	626,718	7.25	29.83	36.47	14.35	41.31
Lisburn	39,862	7.05	25.73	38.61	15.37	37.92