City of York Council

Equalities Impact Assessment

Who is submitting the proposal?

Directorate:		Customer & Communities			
Service Area:		Customer & Communitie	Customer & Communities		
Name of the proposal:		Community Hubs Scrutiny Review Final Recommendations			
Lead officer:		Charlie Croft (in support rather than leading as Scrutiny members authored the report & recommendations)			
Date assessment completed:		9/5/2022			
Names of those w	ho contributed to the asse	ssment:			
Name	Job title	Organisation	Area of expertise		
Charlie Croft	Assistant Director (Customer & Communities)	CYC	Communities		
Mora Scaife	Communities Team Manager	CYC	Community Hubs		

Step 1 – Aims and intended outcomes

1.1	What	What is the purpose of the proposal? Please explain your proposal in Plain English avoiding acronyms and jargon.		
	Pleas			
	The recommendations made by scrutiny are as follows:			
	a.	The ability to support on a range of issues and not just one. Residents who make use of community hubs for a particular issue often have multiple complex needs.		
	b.	A clear desire to help people but also tackle the source of problems, not just the symptoms.		
	C.	An opportunity to bring communities together whilst providing safe spaces for residents with sensitive issues.		
	d.	A volunteer base to help with capacity and provision.		
	e.	Almost all the community hubs spoken to had at least some paid staff. This seemed to be a key element to a lot of provision.		
	f.	A clear means of income generation; whether that be through council grant, national lottery funding or in some cases it was found that a building lent to a community hub on a long-term lease gave that organisation the ability to rent out space to generate income. It was clear that without a suitable funding model these community hubs would fail.		
	g.	A clear method of community consultation to generate community buy-in and identify community need.		

1.2	Are there any external considerations? (Legislation/government directive/codes of practice etc.)		
	This is discretionary activity in that the government do not provide funding for hubs.		
	All recommendations support our local equalities protected characteristic in a range of ways.		

1.3	Who are the stakeholders and what are their interests?		
	The key stake holders are local communities and citizens. Their interests are self-defined in that the ethos of hubs is to support community led initiatives.		

1.4	What results/outcomes do we want to achieve and for whom? This section should explain what outcomes you want to achieve for service users, staff and/or the wider community. Demonstrate how the proposal links to the Council Plan (2019- 2023) and other corporate strategies and plans.		
	Hubs aim to connect community resources in new and productive ways: relationships, time, skills, gifts and people and to encourage growth in social connections and relationships. In this way they seek to develop community resilience.		

Step 2 – Gathering the information and feedback

2.1	What sources of data, evidence and consultation feedback do we have to help us understand the impart of the proposal on equality rights and human rights? Please consider a range of sources, including: consultation exercises, surveys, feedback from staff, stakeholders, participants, research reports, the views of equality groups, as well your own experience of working in this area etc.		
Source of data/supporting evidence		Reason for using	
		The development of hubs will take account of the widest range of information, data, and relationships available to ward teams including ward data sheets, resident engagement, and engagement with the agencies and community groups working in the ward.	

Step 3 – Gaps in data and knowledge

3.1	What are the main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your proposal? Please indicate how any gaps will be dealt with.		
Gaps in	n data or knowledge	Action to deal with this	
The expressed priorities of groups and residents living in each ward and the initiatives that they wish to move forward.		Ward teams will work in a co-production approach to develop citizens' ideas and initiatives.	

Step 4 – Analysing the impacts or effects.

4.1 Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments? Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations. **Equality Groups Key Findings/Impacts** Positive (+) Medium (M) and Negative (-) Low (L) **Human Rights.** Neutral (0) The recommendations in this report have the potential to Positive (+) High (H) Age generate positive impacts across all protected characteristics. **Disability** Positive (+) As above High (H) Gender As above Positive (+) High (H) Gender As above Positive (+) High (H) Reassignment Marriage and civil As above Positive (+) High (H) partnership **Pregnancy** As above Positive (+) High (H) and maternity Positive (+) High (H) Race As above Religion High (H) As above Positive (+) and belief Sexual As above Positive (+) High (H)

orientation

Other Socio- economic groups including:	Could other socio-economic groups be affected e.g. carers, ex-offenders, low incomes?		
Carer	As above	Positive (+)	High
Low income groups	As above	Positive (+)	High
Veterans, Armed Forces Community	As above	Positive (+)	High
Other			
Impact on human rights:			
List any human rights impacted.	As above		

Use the following guidance to inform your responses:

Indicate:

- Where you think that the proposal could have a POSITIVE impact on any of the equality groups like promoting equality and equal opportunities or improving relations within equality groups
- Where you think that the proposal could have a NEGATIVE impact on any of the equality groups, i.e. it could disadvantage them
- Where you think that this proposal has a NEUTRAL effect on any of the equality groups listed below i.e. it has no effect currently on equality groups.

It is important to remember that a proposal may be highly relevant to one aspect of equality and not relevant to another.

High impact (The proposal or process is very equality relevant)	There is significant potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or public facing The proposal has consequences for or affects significant numbers of people The proposal has the potential to make a significant contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights.
Medium impact (The proposal or process is somewhat equality relevant)	There is some evidence to suggest potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or across services, but mainly internal The proposal has consequences for or affects some people The proposal has the potential to make a contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights
Low impact (The proposal or process might be equality relevant)	There is little evidence to suggest that the proposal could result in adverse impact The proposal operates in a limited way The proposal has consequences for or affects few people The proposal may have the potential to contribute to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights

Step 5 - Mitigating adverse impacts and maximising positive impacts

Based on your findings, explain ways you plan to mitigate any unlawful prohibited conduct or unwanted adverse impact. Where positive impacts have been identified, what is been done to optimise opportunities to advance equality or foster good relations?

There are no negative implications.

Too maximise opportunities it will important to consider where particular protected characteristics are underrepresented with hubs work and to consider specialist hubs as appropriate to meet particular needs. Examples of this are the Armed Forces Community Hubs and the Migrant (Our City) hub.

Step 6 – Recommendations and conclusions of the assessment

- Having considered the potential or actual impacts you should be in a position to make an informed judgement on what should be done. In all cases, document your reasoning that justifies your decision. There are four main options you can take:
 - **No major change to the proposal** the EIA demonstrates the proposal is robust. There is no potential for unlawful discrimination or adverse impact and you have taken all opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitor and review.
 - **Adjust the proposal** the EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. This involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance quality or to foster good relations.
 - Continue with the proposal (despite the potential for adverse impact) you should clearly set out the
 justifications for doing this and how you believe the decision is compatible with our obligations under the
 duty
 - **Stop and remove the proposal** if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you should consider stopping the proposal altogether. If a proposal leads to unlawful discrimination it should be removed or changed.

Important: If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason in the justification column.

Option selected	Conclusions/justification
No major change to the proposal.	The proposals contained in this report will drive forward the development of hubs using a coproduction approach that serves all protected characteristics. The recommendation around a robust methodology will ensure that all protected characteristics are properly

identified, taken into consideration and appropriately engaged in hubs and that tailored provision is created where appropriate.

Step 7 – Summary of agreed actions resulting from the assessment

7.1 What action, b	What action, by whom, will be undertaken as a result of the impact assessment.				
Impact/issue	Action to be taken	Person responsible	Timescale		
Development of community engagement approaches	Development of approaches	Mora Scaife	During 2022/23		

Step 8 - Monitor, review and improve

8. 1	How will the impact of your proposal be monitored and improved upon going forward? Consider how will you identify the impact of activities on protected characteristics and other marginalised groups going forward? How will any learning and enhancements be capitalised on and embedded?
	All related activity will be reported through the Community Hubs Working Group to the Creating Resilient Communities Strategy Group