



TEST OF RELEVANCE: EQUALITY ANALYSIS (EA)

The screening process of using the Test of Relevance template aims to assist in determining whether a full Equality Analysis (EA) is required. The EA template and guidance plus information on the Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) can be found on City of London Intranet at: [Equality and Inclusion](#)

Introduction

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) is set out in the Equality Act 2010 (s.149). This requires public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have statutory 'due regard' to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

The characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sexual orientation

It is also Corporation policy to give voluntary (non-statutory) 'due regard' to the impact upon Social Mobility

What is due regard?

- Statutorily, it involves considering the aims of the duty in a way that is proportionate to the issue at hand.
- Ensuring that real consideration is given to the aims and the impact of policies with rigour and with an open mind in such a way that it influences the final decision.
- Due regard should be given before and during policy formation and when a decision is taken including cross cutting ones as the impact can be cumulative.

The general equality duty does not specify how public authorities should analyse the effect of their business activities on different groups of people. However, case law has established that equality analysis is an important way public authorities can demonstrate that they are meeting the requirements.

Even in cases where it is considered that there are no implications of proposed policy and decision making on the PSED it is good practice to record the reasons why and to include these in reports to committees where decisions are being taken.

It is also good practice to consider the duty in relation to current policies, services and procedures, even if there is no plan to change them.

The Corporation has also adopted a voluntary (non-statutory) due regard of the impact upon social mobility issues. This should be considered generally and, more specifically, against the aims/objectives in the Social Mobility Strategy, 2018-28.

How to demonstrate compliance

Case law has established the following principles apply to the PSED:

- **Knowledge** – the need to be aware of the requirements of the Equality Duty with a conscious approach and state of mind.
- **Sufficient Information** – must be made available to the decision maker.
- **Timeliness** – the Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken not after it has been taken.
- **Real consideration** – consideration must form an integral part of the decision making process. It is not a matter of box-ticking; it must be exercised in substance, with rigour and with an open mind in such a way that it influences the final decision.
- **Sufficient Information** - The decision maker must consider what information he or she has and what further information may be needed in order to give proper consideration to the Equality Duty
- **No delegation** - public bodies are responsible for ensuring that any third parties which exercise functions on their behalf are capable of complying with the Equality Duty, are required to comply with it, and that they do so in practice. It is a duty that cannot be delegated.
- **Review** – the duty is continuing applying when a policy is developed and decided upon, but also when it is implemented and reviewed.

However, there is no requirement to:

- Produce equality analysis or an equality impact assessment
- Indiscriminately collect diversity data where equalities issues are not significant
- Publish lengthy documents to show compliance
- Treat everyone the same. Rather, it requires public bodies to think about people's different needs and how these can be met
- Make services homogeneous or to try to remove or ignore differences between people.

The key points about demonstrating compliance with the duty are to:

- Collate sufficient evidence to determine whether changes being considered will have a potential impact on different groups
- Ensure decision makers are aware of the analysis that has been undertaken and what conclusions have been reached on the possible implications
- Keep adequate records of the full decision making process

Test of Relevance screening

The Test of relevance screening is a short exercise that involves looking at the overall proposal and deciding if it is relevant to the PSED.

Note: If the proposal is of a significant nature and it is apparent from the outset that a full equality analysis will be required, then it is not necessary to complete the Test of Relevance screening template and the full equality analysis must be completed.

The questions in the Test of Relevance Screening Template to help decide if the proposal is equality relevant and whether a detailed equality analysis is required. The key question is whether the proposal is likely to be relevant to any of the protected characteristics.

Quite often, the answer may not be so obvious and service-user or provider information will need to be considered to make a preliminary judgment. For example, in considering licensing arrangements, the location of the premises in question and the demographics of the area could affect whether section 149 considerations come into play.

There is no one size fits all approach but the screening process is designed to help fully consider the circumstances.

What to do

In general, the following questions all feed into whether an equality analysis is required:

- How many people is the proposal likely to affect?
- How significant is its impact?
- Does it relate to an area where there are known inequalities?

At this initial screening stage, the point is to try to assess obvious negative or positive impact.

If a negative/adverse impact has been identified (actual or potential) during completion of the screening tool, a full equality analysis must be undertaken.

If no negative / adverse impacts arising from the proposal it is not necessary to undertake a full equality analysis.

On completion of the Test of Relevance screening, officers should:

- Ensure they have fully completed and the Director has signed off the Test of Relevance Screening Template.
- Store the screening template safely so that it can be retrieved if for example, Members request to see it, or there is a freedom of information request or there is a legal challenge.
- If the outcome of the Test of Relevance Screening identifies no or minimal impact refer to it in the Implications section of the report and include references to it in the Background Papers when reporting to the Committee or other decision making process.

**1. Proposal / Project Title:
Fann Street Enhancement**

2. Brief summary (include main aims, proposed outcomes, recommendations / decisions sought):

Removal of hardstanding and existing concrete planters for the construction of three new connected and raised planting beds with integrated permeable paving. The project aims to increase greening to trial climate resilience measures and enhance biodiversity. The project proposed seeks to develop a woodland edge style planting scheme with species-rich perennial planting, integrating a range of measures for biodiversity including invertebrate nesting habitat. The project will also review opportunities to include small standard or multi-stem trees, shrubs and hedging to create layers enhancing ecological value. There are aspirations to incorporate educational interpretation. The proposed beds will be open to the ground and raised by 300mm utilising a range of climate resilient soils, substrates and mulches. Permeable paving will be implemented with a proposed subsurface measure to attenuate and infiltrate surface water for existing and new greening. The project has been co-designed with the local community, taking into account their aspirations and concerns, and has reached a viable design. The option will be progressed to Gateway 4 for approval. This project is not a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS).

3. Considering the equality aims (eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; foster good relations), indicate for each protected group whether there may be a positive impact, negative (adverse) impact or no impact arising from the proposal:

Protected Characteristic (Equality Group)	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	No Impact	Briefly explain your answer. Consider evidence, data and any consultation.
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed scheme should increase local accessibility. Currently there is a series of 12 concrete planters though-out the public walkway which provide no clear route through. The proposed designs have been developed to create defined walkways and retain a minimum of 2000mm for accessibility. Seating has been included to replace the existing seating.
Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed scheme should increase local accessibility. Currently there is a series of 12 concrete planters though-out the public walkway which provide no clear route through. The proposed designs have been developed to create defined walkways and retain a minimum of 2000mm for accessibility. Seating has been included to replace the existing seating.
Gender Reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
Pregnancy and Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
Race	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

Religion or Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
Sex (i.e. gender)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

4. Are there any potential social mobility or wider issues? Please check appropriate box

Yes	No	Briefly explain your answer:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

5. There are no negative / adverse impact(s) Please briefly explain and provide evidence to support this decision:
A core objective of the project is to enhance to local area for public benefit. The project has been co-designed with local residents and focuses on providing an enhanced public realm, whilst retaining and improving accessibility. Once approved the detailed design and construction phase will continue to retain accessibility as a core objective.

6. Are there positive impacts of the proposal on any equality groups or Social Mobility? Please briefly explain how these are in line with the equality aims or social mobility strategy:
The project proposed will improve accessibility through defining and providing walkways of a minimum of 2000mm and will incorporate improved seating to provide pedestrian respite opportunities, in a favourable position to reduce the opportunity for antisocial behaviour. The proposed enhancements are likely to have a positive effect on wellbeing through providing improved green infrastructure and access to nature.

7. As a result of this screening, is a full EA necessary? Please check appropriate box

Yes	No	Briefly explain your answer:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The design process to date has ensured that accessibility, the primary potential impact, has been a core focus of the project development. Through the detailed design phase this will continue to be implemented and will be a key outcome of the project.

8. Name of Lead Officer: Ben Bishop **Job title:** Environmental Resilience Officer **Date of completion:** 26/09/2024

Signed off by Department Director:  **Name:** Ian Hughes – City Operations Director **Date:** 18/10/2024