

# **Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council**

## **Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Screening template**

### **Part 1. Information about the activity/policy/project being screened**

The COVID Recovery Small Settlements Regeneration Programme is funded collaboratively by the Department for Communities (DfC), Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and Department for Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA). The funders approached LCCC in December to request a plan which would include initiatives that may be eligible to be funded through this programme. LCCC arranged a workshop with officers and members to discuss any projects (preferably shovel ready) that could be brought forward through this programme. Once the plan was confirmed by LCCC and agreed by the funders, a letter of offer was then received in January 2022.

A report was taken to Development Committee on Thursday, 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022 in order to progress the programme and receive delegated authority in order to deliver within the set timeframe.

We are screening this programme from the outset to ensure that all section 75 Equality and Good Relations groups have been considered.

#### **Name of the activity/policy/project**

COVID Recovery Small Settlements Regeneration Programme

(Further information attached as Appendix 2)

#### **Is this activity/policy/project – an existing one, a revised one, a new one?**

New

#### **What are the intended aims/outcomes the activity/policy/project is trying to achieve?**

The Programme aims to deliver on these objectives through realising a range of benefits including:

1. Physical regeneration of small settlements in order to improve place making and aid recovery from COVID-19
2. Improvements that encourage people to live, work, visit and invest in the area by 2022/23
3. Improvements that enhance walking, cycling and other associated facilities within the scheme area by 2022/23.

**Who is the activity/policy/project targeted at and who will benefit? Are there any expected benefits for specific Section 75 categories/groups from this activity/policy/project? If so, please explain.**

The COVID Recovery Small Settlements Regeneration Programme is not directly targeting specific Section 75 Equality and Good Relations groups although there may be incidental benefits for some groups.

For example; environmental improvements such as resurfacing of footpaths, creation of a new car park to include family and disabled parking spaces and improvements to shop fronts and signage to will be of benefit the elderly, those with dependants as well as those with disabilities.

All the projects taken forward will have taken all of these benefits into consideration to ensure inclusivity.

### **Who initiated or developed the activity/policy/project?**

The funders (Department for Communities (DfC), Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and Department for Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA)) initiated this programme.

The plan was developed by officers and members of Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council.

The lead directorate in delivering this programme is Service Transformation (Economic Development – Regeneration) in collaboration with Parks & Amenities, Assets, Communities and Marketing.

### **Who owns and who implements the activity/policy/project?**

This programme is owned by Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council and will be implemented by Service Transformation (Economic Development – Regeneration) in collaboration with Parks & Amenities, Assets, Communities and Marketing.

Capital works projects will be managed by an external Employers Agent who will commission contractors to design and construct each project.

### **Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the activity/policy/project?**

Yes

#### **If yes, give brief details of any significant factors.**

Financial – Funded Programme – A the programme is funded through Department for Communities (DfC), Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and Department for Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA).

Other – Time Constraints – Council have been given a timeframe to deliver the project by which has been agreed between funders and LCCC. If there is any slippage this may run over/unable to be delivered.

### **Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the activity/policy/project will impact upon? Delete if not applicable**

## Staff

Chief Executive, Directors, Head of Service and officers of the following: Economic Development (Regeneration – Programme Lead), Parks & Amenities, Assets, Communities and Marketing.

## Service users

Residents, Visitors and Business Owners.

## Other public sector organisations

Department for Communities (DfC), Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and Department for Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA).

## Voluntary/community/trade unions [please list]

Relevant voluntary and communities who are consulted in the process of delivering each project.

## Other

Elected members – more specifically the Chair and Vice Chair of Development Committee (Lead Committee)

Consultants and Contractors appointed to carry out the design, construction and installation of the project works.

## Other policies/strategies/plans with a bearing on this activity/policy/project

Name of policy/strategy/plan	Who owns or implements?
Equality and Disability Action Plans	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/council/publications/equality-section-75">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/council/publications/equality-section-75</a>
Corporate Plan 2021-24	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/ICP_2021_Final.pdf">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/ICP_2021_Final.pdf</a>
Local Development Plan	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/resident/planning/local-development-plan">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/resident/planning/local-development-plan</a>
Community Plan 2017 – 2032	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/Community_Plan_2017-2032_EMAIL.pdf">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/Community_Plan_2017-2032_EMAIL.pdf</a>
Economic Development Action Plan 2015 – 2017	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/3_Employment_and_Economic_Development_-_Final.pdf">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/3_Employment_and_Economic_Development_-_Final.pdf</a>

Regeneration and Investment Action Plan	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/LCCC_Investment_Programme_2019_.pdf">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/general/LCCC_Investment_Programme_2019_.pdf</a>
Tourism Strategy	Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council <a href="https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/planning/SUBDOC-073%20LCCC%20Tourism%20Strategy%202018.pdf">https://www.lisburncastlereagh.gov.uk/uploads/planning/SUBDOC-073%20LCCC%20Tourism%20Strategy%202018.pdf</a>

## Available evidence

### What evidence/information (qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered or considered to inform this activity/policy? Specify details for each Section 75 category.

This programme considers a Small Settlement as having a population of between 1,000 and 4,999. The Small Settlements include: Moneyreagh (resident population of Moneyreagh Settlement was 1,384 accounting for 0.08% of the NI total), Annahilt (resident population of Annahilt Settlement was 1,051 accounting for 0.06% of the NI total), Dromara (resident population of Dromara Settlement was 1,006 accounting for 0.06% of the NI total), Drumbeg (resident population of Drumbeg Settlement was 817 accounting for 0.05% of the NI total), Blaris (resident population of Blaris was 3,375 accounting for 0.19% of the NI total), Hillsborough (resident population of Hillsborough Ward was 3,758 accounting for 0.21% of the NI total), Moira (resident population of Moira Settlement was 4,591 accounting for 0.25% of the NI total), Aghalee (resident population of Aghalee Settlement was 873 accounting for 0.05% of the NI total), Ballinderry (resident population of Ballinderry was 5,128 accounting for 0.28% of the NI total), Glenavy (resident population of Glenavy Settlement was 1,784 accounting for 0.10% of the NI total), Maghaberry (resident population of Maghaberry Settlement was 2,450 accounting for 0.14% of the NI total), and Milltown (resident population of Milltown Settlement was 1,499 accounting for 0.08% of the NI total).

Key information has been considered using the following:

- Strategies/Plans/Policies outlined in the section above
- Rural Village Renewal Plans
- Community Action Plans
- Consultations carried out Community Groups and Residents of the areas
- Issues raised by Councillors, Community Groups and Residents of the areas
- Census 2011 data found on NINIS

Section 75 Category	Details of evidence/information
Religious Belief	Moneyreagh - 2.24% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 90.39% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 83.31% indicated that they had a

	<p>British national identity, 2.53% had an Irish national identity and 29.77% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Annahilt – 7.14% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 85.54% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 77.16% indicated that they had a British national identity, 8.37% had an Irish national identity and 34.06% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Dromara – 21.77% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 68.89% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 67.50% indicated that they had a British national identity, 12.13% had an Irish national identity and 29.22% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Drumbeg – 67.07% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 62.42% indicated that they had a British national identity, 21.66% had an Irish national identity and 35.01% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Blaris – 16.30% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 74.34% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 71.91% indicated that they had a British national identity, 9.72% had an Irish national identity and 28.30% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Hillsborough – 10.72% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 83.40% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 71.93% indicated that they had a British national identity, 10.75% had an Irish national identity and 29.99% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Moira – 19.45% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 71.55% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 66.30% indicated that they had a British national identity, 12.85% had an Irish national identity and 32.04% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Aghalee – 15.23% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 74.68% belong to or were brought up</p>
--	--

	<p>in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 73.65% indicated that they had a British national identity, 10.88% had an Irish national identity and 29.21% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Ballinderry – 21.70% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 70.75% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 66.85% indicated that they had a British national identity, 13.46% had an Irish national identity and 31.71% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Glenavy – 84.19% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 11.94% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 19.79% indicated that they had a British national identity, 57.51% had an Irish national identity and 28.36% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Maghaberry – 7.55% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 82.49% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 77.96% indicated that they had a British national identity, 5.02% had an Irish national identity and 32.61% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Milltown – 37.69% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 53.30% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 53.97% indicated that they had a British national identity, 22.75% had an Irish national identity and 27.62% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p>
<p>Political Opinion</p>	<p>Moneyreagh - 2.24% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 90.39% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 83.31% indicated that they had a British national identity, 2.53% had an Irish national identity and 29.77% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Annahilt – 7.14% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 85.54% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 77.16% indicated that they had a British national identity, 8.37% had an Irish national identity and 34.06% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p>

	<p>Dromara – 21.77% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 68.89% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 67.50% indicated that they had a British national identity, 12.13% had an Irish national identity and 29.22% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Drumbeg – 67.07% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 62.42% indicated that they had a British national identity, 21.66% had an Irish national identity and 35.01% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Blaris – 16.30% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 74.34% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 71.91% indicated that they had a British national identity, 9.72% had an Irish national identity and 28.30% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Hillsborough – 10.72% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 83.40% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 71.93% indicated that they had a British national identity, 10.75% had an Irish national identity and 29.99% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Moira – 19.45% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 71.55% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 66.30% indicated that they had a British national identity, 12.85% had an Irish national identity and 32.04% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Aghalee – 15.23% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 74.68% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 73.65% indicated that they had a British national identity, 10.88% had an Irish national identity and 29.21% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Ballinderry – 21.70% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 70.75% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 66.85% indicated that they had a</p>
--	--

	<p>British national identity, 13.46% had an Irish national identity and 31.71% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Glenavy – 84.19% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 11.94% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 19.79% indicated that they had a British national identity, 57.51% had an Irish national identity and 28.36% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Maghaberry – 7.55% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 82.49% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 77.96% indicated that they had a British national identity, 5.02% had an Irish national identity and 32.61% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p> <p>Milltown – 37.69% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion and 53.30% belong to or were brought up in a 'Protestant and Other Christian (including Christian related)' religion; and 53.97% indicated that they had a British national identity, 22.75% had an Irish national identity and 27.62% had a Northern Irish national identity.</p>
Racial Group	<p>Moneyreagh - 99.71% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; and 1.04% had some knowledge of Irish; 9.07% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 0.30% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Annahilt – 99.90% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 2.61% had some knowledge of Irish; 10.05% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 0.97% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Dromara – 98.81% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; and 4.85% had some knowledge of Irish; 6.65% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.48% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Drumbeg – 97.80% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 26.81% belong to or were brought up in the Catholic religion; and 6.85% had some knowledge of Irish; 8.09% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.62% did not have English as their first language.</p>



	<p>Blaris – 98.04% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 3.50% had some knowledge of Irish; 7.99% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 2.69% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Hillsborough – 99.39% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 2.60% had some knowledge of Irish; 10.27% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 0.83% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Moira – 97.78% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 4.04% had some knowledge of Irish; 6.66% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 2.71% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Aghalee – 99.89% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 2.73% had some knowledge of Irish; 5.93% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.07% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Ballinderry – 99.45% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 5.19% had some knowledge of Irish; 7.73% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.12% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Glenavy – 99.22% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 22.43% had some knowledge of Irish; 2.77% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.74% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Maghaberry – 99.88% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 1.68% had some knowledge of Irish; 6.63% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 0.47% did not have English as their first language.</p> <p>Milltown – 98.33% were from the white (including Irish Traveller) ethnic group; 9.14% had some knowledge of Irish; 4.96% had some knowledge of Ulster-Scots; and 1.98% did not have English as their first language.</p>
Age	<p>Moneyreagh - 17.92% were aged under 16 years and 13.37% were aged 65 and over; and 44 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Annahilt – 17.70% were aged under 16 years and 15.79% were aged 65 and over; and 45 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p>

	<p>Dromara – 25.45% were aged under 16 years and 12.03% were aged 65 and over; and 33 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Drumbeg – 19.58% were aged under 16 years and 19.34% were aged 65 and over; and 46 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Blaris – 16.15% were aged under 16 years and 18.81% were aged 65 and over; and 42 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Hillsborough – 17.43% were aged under 16 years and 21.79% were aged 65 and over; and 46 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Moira – 22.98% were aged under 16 years and 13.53% were aged 65 and over; and 39 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Aghalee – 25.43% were aged under 16 years and 9.16% were aged 65 and over; and 37 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Ballinderry – 20.57% were aged under 16 years and 11.49% were aged 65 and over; and 39 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Glenavy – 31.95% were aged under 16 years and 6.00% were aged 65 and over; and 30 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Maghaberry – 25.35% were aged under 16 years and 6.86% were aged 65 and over; and 33 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Milltown – 25.95% were aged under 16 years and 10.27% were aged 65 and over; and 35 years was the average (median) age of the population.</p> <p>Any improvements to accessibility, visibility and places to rest will benefit this group.</p>
<b>Marital Status</b>	No information/evidence readily available to inform screening of Small Settlements.
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No information/evidence readily available to inform screening of Small Settlements.

<p><b>Men &amp; Women Generally</b></p>	<p>Moneyreagh - 50.29% of the usually resident population were male and 49.71% were female</p> <p>Annahilt – 48.33% of the usually resident population were male and 51.67% were female</p> <p>Dromara – 48.01% of the usually resident population were male and 51.99% were female</p> <p>Drumbeg – 47.86% of the usually resident population were male and 52.14% were female</p> <p>Blaris – 49.57% of the usually resident population were male and 50.43% were female</p> <p>Hillsborough – 48.00% of the usually resident population were male and 52.00% were female</p> <p>Moira – 48.94% of the usually resident population were male and 51.06% were female</p> <p>Aghalee – 49.37% of the usually resident population were male and 50.63% were female</p> <p>Ballinderry – 53.98% of the usually resident population were male and 46.02% were female</p> <p>Glenavy – 48.21% of the usually resident population were male and 51.79% were female</p> <p>Maghaberry – 50.45% of the usually resident population were male and 49.55% were female</p> <p>Milltown – 49.23% of the usually resident population were male and 50.77% were female</p>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>Moneyreagh – 18.21% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 80.64% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Annahilt – 19.79% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 82.02% of people stated their general health was either good or very good.</p> <p>Dromara – 16.80% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 82.70% of people stated their general health was either good or very good.</p>

	<p>Drumbeg – 12.00% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 89.23% of people stated their general health was either good or very good.</p> <p>Blaris – 19.32% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 81.07% of people stated their general health was either good or very good.</p> <p>Hillsborough – 16.74% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 85.13% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Moira – 15.03% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 85.93% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Aghalee – 16.95% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; 83.96% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Ballinderry – 17.02% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 84.03% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Glenavy – 13.12% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 87.84% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Maghaberry – 12.65% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 86.78% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Milltown – 17.68% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities; and 82.05% of people stated their general health was either good or very good</p> <p>Any improvements to accessibility, visibility and places to rest will benefit this group.</p>
--	---

<p>People with and without Dependants</p>	<p>Moneyreagh – 17.99% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 5.01% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Annahilt – 12.27% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 5.65% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Dromara – 11.13% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 8.77% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Drumbeg – 16.16% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 3.41% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Blaris – 12.24% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 5.83% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Hillsborough – 13.94% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 2.90% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Moira – 10.52% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 5.18% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Aghalee – 10.88% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 7.24% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>Ballinderry – 13.48% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others, and 4.58% were lone parent households with dependent children.</p> <p>Glenavy – 11.21% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others, and</p>
---	--

	<p>15.32% were lone parent households with dependent children.</p> <p>Maghaberry – 11.14% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others; and 4.88% were lone parent households with dependent children.</p> <p>Milltown – 9.67% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others, and 10.86% were lone parent households with dependent children</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Cllr Gowan raised concerns over Health &amp; Safety of parents and children outside the school in Annahilt during morning drop off and afternoon pick up. There isn't enough car parking or visibility. An Environmental Improvement Scheme is being considered in order to create more car parking bays, safer access routes, resurfacing of footpaths and the addition of traffic calming measures.</p>
--	---

## 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 activity/policy/decision? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories** [This section is easier to complete if you actually have gathered and analysed some information/material to help inform the planning and your screening. It is intended to draw out any particular needs and different experiences of the various equality groups that are pertinent to the policy or project being screened. Sometimes you will be saying 'No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy'. However, it may be necessary to consult with stakeholders or take advice to establish whether there are in fact some issues we need to take account of. If we don't have the information, we're supposed to try to get it and not make assumptions or just say 'no information available'.]

<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>Details of needs/experiences/priorities</b>
Religious Belief	No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy
Political Opinion	No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy
Racial Group	No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy
Age	Things to consider that would benefit this group when designing physical environment: Improved and/or additional seating areas, improved surfaces e.g. footpaths to prevent accidents, clearer signage and improved accessibility e.g. shop front schemes in order to encourage use, larger spacing e.g. new car park to include family and disabled spaces etc.
Marital Status	No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy
Sexual Orientation	No evidence of specific needs identified in relation to this project/policy
Men & Women Generally	<p>There have been no specific needs identified for men although it is anticipated that more women may benefit from improvements carried out through this project as majority of are out during the day when with their children/dependants.</p> <p>Things to consider that would benefit this group when designing physical environment: Improved and/or additional seating areas, improved surfaces e.g. footpaths to prevent accidents, clearer signage and improved accessibility for buggies e.g. shop front schemes in order to encourage use, larger spacing e.g. new car park to include family friendly spaces due to use of buggies etc.</p>
Disability	<p>People with disabilities may need suitable places to rest and some require spaces that are accessible for wheelchairs, assistance dogs, etc. Project designs need to be safe and not present hazards for people with disabilities, e.g. blind or partially sighted or those with mobility problems.</p> <p>Things to consider that would benefit this group when designing physical environment: Improved and/or additional seating areas, improved surfaces e.g. footpaths, clearer signage and improved accessibility e.g. shop front schemes in</p>

	order to encourage use, larger spacing e.g. new car park to include disabled spaces etc.
Dependants	<p>Some people with dependants may require spaces to rest and that can accommodate buggies/prams etc. Space for prams and buggies needs to be taken into account during project design.</p> <p>For example; family spaces in car parks provide space for buggies, removing children from car seats etc.</p>

## Part 2. Screening questions

**1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this activity/policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? [This is about trying to identify whether the proposed project, policy or plan will impact on particular groups or impact differently on various groups. It may be ok to say 'no impact identified' or 'no differential impact identified'. Subsequent monitoring should then be used to ensure that any unanticipated impact is identified and addressed.]**

Section 75 Category	Details of likely impact – will it be positive or negative? If none anticipated, say none	Level of impact - major or minor* - see guidance below
Religious Belief	No direct impact identified	None
Political Opinion	No direct impact identified	None
Racial Group	No direct impact identified	None
Age	<p>The Small Settlement Regeneration Programme is expected to have some positive benefits for this group. For example; improved surfaces, accessibility and signage.</p> <p>The needs of those who are elderly will be taken into account in the designs.</p>	Minor Positive
Marital Status	No direct impact identified	None
Sexual Orientation	No direct impact identified	None



Men & Women Generally	The Small Settlement Regeneration Programme is expected to have some positive benefits for this group.	Minor Positive
Disability	The Small Settlement Regeneration Programme is expected to have some positive benefits for this group. For example; improved surfaces, accessibility and signage.  The needs of those with disabilities will be taken into account in the designs.	Minor Positive
People with and without Dependants	The Small Settlement Regeneration Programme is expected to have some positive benefits for this group. For example; family car parking spaces that can accommodate buggies/prams.  The needs of those with dependants will be taken into account in the designs.	Minor Positive

\* See Appendix 1 for details.

**2(a) Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equality categories?**

Section 75 Category	IF Yes, provide details	If No, provide details
Religious Belief		No opportunities identified in relation to this policy/project/activity for any of these groups.
Political Opinion		
Racial Group		
Age		
Marital Status		
Sexual Orientation		
Men & Women Generally		

Disability		
People with and without Dependants		

## Equality Action Plan 2021-2025

**Does the activity/policy/project being screened relate to an action in the Equality Action Plan 2021-2025? Yes - If yes, specify which action.**

Theme 2: Access to Information

Action 2.1: Some individuals/ groups may be disadvantaged by not having full access to information provided by Council. (Ensure information is accessible to all)

Theme 6: Development of all strategies

Action 6.2 – policy development

## 2(b) DDA Disability Duties (see Disability Action Plan 2021-2025) [new]

**Does this policy/activity present opportunities to contribute to the actions in our Disability Action Plan:**

- To promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?
- To encourage the participation of disabled people in public life?

**Yes - If yes, give details/specify which action.**

Yes – Both.

## 3 To what extent is the activity/policy/project likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Good Relations Category	Details of likely impact. Will it be positive or negative? [if no specific impact identified, say none]	Level of impact – minor/major*
Religious Belief	None - No direct impact on religious belief, political opinion or racial group identified although it is hoped that all	None
Political Opinion		None

Racial Group	projects will be seen as neutral shared spaces for all.	None
--------------	---	------

\*See Appendix 1 for details.

**4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?**

<b>Good Relations Category</b>	<b>IF Yes, provide details</b>	<b>If No, provide details</b>
Religious Belief		No opportunities identified at this time but if any arise e.g. through feedback from consultation, they will be addressed.
Political Opinion		
Racial Group		

**Multiple identity**

**Provide details of any data on the impact of the activity/policy/project on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.**

LCCC recognises that all individuals are not exclusive to just one designated group. Multiple identity has been given consideration within this screening exercise.

### Part 3. Screening decision/outcome

Equality and good relations screening is used to identify whether there is a need to carry out a **full equality impact assessment** on a proposed policy or project.

There are 3 possible outcomes:

- 1) **Screen out** - no need for a full equality impact assessment and no mitigations required because no relevance to equality, no negative impacts identified or only very minor positive impacts for all groups. This may be the case for a purely technical policy for example.
- 2) **Screen out with mitigation** - no need for a full equality impact assessment but some minor potential impacts or opportunities to better promote equality and/or good relations identified, so mitigations appropriate. Much of our activity will probably fall into this category.
- 3) **Screen in for full equality impact assessment** – potential for significant and/or potentially negative impact identified for one or more groups so proposal requires a more detailed impact assessment. [See Equality Commission guidance on justifying a screening decision.]

**Choose only one of these** and provide reasons for your decision and ensure evidence is noted/referenced for any decision reached.

Screening Decision/Outcome	Reasons/Evidence
<p>Option 1</p> <p><b>Screen out</b> – no equality impact assessment and no mitigation required [go to Monitoring section]</p>	<p>It has been concluded that a detailed equality impact assessment is not necessary as all the potential impacts identified are minor and positive. The appointed design team will be required to ensure that the projects are accessible for older people and disabled people, etc. and that they will not present any barriers for them.</p>
<p>Option 2</p> <p><b>Screen out with mitigation</b> – some potential impacts identified but they can be addressed with appropriate mitigation or some opportunities to better promote equality and/or</p>	

good relations identified [complete mitigation section below]	
<p>Option 3</p> <p><b>Screen in</b> for a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)</p> <p>[If option 3, complete timetabling and prioritising section below]</p>	

**Mitigation (Only relevant to Option 2)**

**Can the activity/policy/project plan be amended or an alternative activity/policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?**

If so, give the **reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative activity/policy and ensure the mitigations are included in a revised/updated policy or plan.

**N/A**

**Timetabling and prioritising for full EQIA (only relevant to Option 3)**

If the activity/policy has been ‘**screened in**’ for full equality impact assessment, give details of any factors to be considered and the next steps for progressing the EQIA, including a proposed timetable.

Is the activity/policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? Yes/No. If yes, please provide details.

**N/A**

## Part 4. Monitoring

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission's Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

Effective monitoring will help a public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the activity/policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and activity/policy development.

**What will be monitored and how? What specific equality monitoring will be done? Who will undertake and sign-off the monitoring of this activity/policy and on what frequency? Please give details:**

The delivery of each individual project will be monitored accordingly.

The projects included in this programme vary from grant funding, revenue and capital works therefore the monitoring will differ for each of these.

A project board has been set up to ensure the Programme is delivered on time and on budget.

Grant funding will be advertised via the council website and social media channels. The application process will involve the completion of an 'Expression of Interest' and 'Application Form' before the eligible business receive a letter of offer which will inform them regarding the grant amount they have secured. There is a working policy called 'Grant Policy for Funding Initiatives' that ensures compliance of officers and applicants.

The following will be recorded: number of applicants who applied, relevant business details, number of applicants invited to participate, how much grant funding they will receive etc. If the grant funding was targeted at specific 75 groups then information on this would also be collected.

Revenue projects are being delivered in-house and will go through the normal monitoring procedures set out by the team delivering.

Capital works will be project managed by an external employer's agent who will then follow our procurement regulations in order to appoint contractors.

## Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

	Position/Job Title	Date
<b>Screened by:</b> Becky Gamble & Yvonne Burke	Project Support Officer & Regeneration Manager	10/05/22
<b>Reviewed by:</b> Mary McSorley	Equality Officer	01/07/22

<b>Approved by:</b> Paul McCormick	Head of Economic Development	18/10/22
------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------

Note: On completion of the screening exercise, a copy of the completed Screening Report should be:

- approved and ‘signed off’ by a senior manager responsible for the activity/policy
- included with Committee reports, as appropriate
- sent to the Equality Officer for the quarterly screening report to consultees, internal reporting and publishing on the LCCC website
- shared with relevant colleagues
- made available to the public on request.

Evidence and documents referenced in the screening report should also be available if requested.

## **Appendix 1 – Equality Commission guidance on equality impact**

\*Major impact:

- a) The policy/project is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality matters are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- 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 amongst 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.

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.

No impact (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.

Revised Template @ April 2022



## Screening Policy

### Small Settlements

#### Project Description and Background:

The COVID Recovery Small Settlements Regeneration Programme follows on from the successful collaborative approach of the COVID-19 Recovery Revitalisation Programme. That saw DfC, DAERA, and DfI contribute to the establishment of objectives, jointly fund and oversee the delivery of the programme.

Council was required to submit a draft Small Settlement Regeneration Investment Plan which sets out its proposed projects.

Initiatives may include the following:

- **Rural Investment Fund (RIF)**  
Grant aid to encourage new business into the area or support existing businesses to diversify their current offer through repurposing of vacant units (this must include unused areas of their current premises).
- **Improved Transport and Walkability Infrastructure**  
Infrastructure to support Traffic Calming Measures and increase safety across a number of villages.
- **Environmental Improvement Scheme**  
Improvements to footpaths, lighting, roads etc.
- **Greenway Enhancement Schemes**  
Increase the accessibility of Greenway links across Small Settlements to include improvements to sections of the Lagan Towpath linking the tow path to villages and creating walking loops for residents of the villages, resurfacing to allow for better navigation and the installation of benches, bins, sign posting and bicycle racks, improving usability of these linkages (Bike lock ups where possible).
- **Access to the Lagan Tow Path from Navigation House**  
Reopen access from the Navigation House to the Lagan Tow Path. Historically there were steps from the Navigation House site through a gate down to the path.
- **Implementation of an Active Travel Network Strategy (ATNMS)**  
To identify existing walking and cycling routes and to investigate where upgrades or new routes can be anticipated over the next 15 years (Future Routes). The Strategy will be publicised on the Council Website.
- **Parklets**  
Identify areas across rural settlements that can be cleared and suitably landscaped to create a community Parklet/ seating area. The implementation of a Parklet will create a central space for villagers and shoppers alike to relax and enjoy a coffee contributing to the improved mental health of the village and also provide local hospitality businesses with extended space to facilitate customers.
- **Heritage Shop Front Scheme (Moira/Hillsborough)**  
The scheme aims to support business, whose shop fronts currently sit outside of planning regulations, from a heritage perspective, and help the businesses to replace their shop front façade and signage in order to conform to the guidelines as per the Lisburn Conservation area guide. The aim of the scheme is to create a more pleasing village centre environment by improving heritage shop fronts, resulting in wider benefits for the public realm and civic pride.

- Improved Planting at Gateways and improving arterial routes  
A range of interventions have been identified through the village Renewal Plans and consultation with members that would improve the environment of the gateways and along the main arterial routes through small settlements. This would include improved planting and creating more accessible walking routes from just outside of the villages to the core of the village community. It would also create an improved central community space to support the wider community and related commercial activity.
- Small Settlements Shop Front Scheme  
This grant will be offered to small business owners with premises in hospitality/ retail units on the main street within small settlements, to enhance the appearance and condition of their shop fronts and signage, making the area a more attractive place for both occupiers and visitors.
- Improvements to dedicated open space and walking trails  
To include signage, digital signage, maps, capital infrastructure.
- Community Markets pilot  
Supporting community groups to deliver 'Farmers style' markets in the small villages. Based on the success of the markets in Hillsborough, Moira and Newtownbreda it is proposed to offer the option to local communities to take on the responsibility of delivering a monthly market in their area. This could be an option for a number of community groups from different settlements to come together to increase the offering across a larger radius.
- Destination Tourism Packages based around Royal Hillsborough and Historic Moira  
Council have been working closely with 39 rural business who have agreed to act as Local Champions for 'Royal Hillsborough and Historic Moira' creating a series of Destination packages to promote the villages as tourism and hospitality destinations. These packages are aimed at boosting the visitor economy within these areas.

It is anticipated that projects will be strategic and support outcomes that have a substantial impact on local communities.

A Small Settlement is defined as having a population of between 1,000 and 4,999.

These has been agreed with Department for Communities as:

1. Hillsborough
2. Moira
3. Glenavy
4. Maghaberry
5. Moneyreagh
6. Dromara
7. Annahilt
8. Ballinderry
9. Aghalee
10. Drumbeg
11. Milltown

Although not every initiative will be delivered in all of the Small Settlements outlined above.

Council plan for an even spread of deliverable initiatives across DEAs.

- **Aims of the Scheme:**

The Programme aims to deliver on these objectives through realising a range of benefits including:

1. Physical regeneration of small settlements in order to improve place making and aid recovery from COVID-19
2. Improvements that encourage people to live, work, visit and invest in the area by 2022/23
3. Improvements that enhance walking, cycling and other associated facilities within the scheme area by 2022/23.

**Programme Objectives**

1. To agree a costed COVID Recovery Small Settlements Regeneration Plan for each district council and enable programme spend by March 2022.
2. To support each district council to deliver the project outcomes identified in its Regeneration Plan by March 2023.
3. By March 2024, 70% of residents surveyed, in smaller settlements where projects have been delivered, agree that funded works would encourage people to live, work, visit and invest in the area.
4. By March 2024, 70% of people surveyed while using smaller settlements where projects have been delivered for work, tourism or leisure, agree that the improvements to the area would encourage people to live, work, visit and invest in the area.
5. By March 2024, attitudinal surveys completed by businesses indicate that 70% believe that schemes funded through this Programme will have positively impacted on sales figures.
6. By March 2024, attitudinal surveys indicate 40% of the public (residents and visitors) agree that projects supported would encourage people to change from car use to more environmentally friendly choices such as walking and cycling for journeys of under two miles.
7. By March 2024, each Regeneration Plan will support projects which increase the use of land for active travel (i.e. extended footways, cycle ways, and connecting pathways) which connects people with key services and ensures accessibility for all including those with disabilities.

- **Contract Duration:**

It is intended that the programme would commence in 2021/22 and run over 2 years. March 2022 – March 2024.