



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: 2 Aldermanbury Square (London Wall)

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

Improvements to the public realm area in the vicinity of a new development at 2 Aldermanbury Square.

The scope is defined within the associated Section 106 agreement and includes, but is not limited to: walking and cycling improvements to London Wall, including widening and greening the footways and introduction of cycle infrastructure mirroring the cycle lane on the north side of the street; redesigning junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue; works to integrate a new pedestrian route through the development site and; other changes deemed necessary as part of the development.

The project aims to:

1. Deliver improvements to walking and cycling conditions in the vicinity of the development.
2. Integrate the new pedestrian route, between London Wall and Basinghall Street, with the surrounding public highway.
3. Ensure the new building can be adequately access and serviced.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Through the Option 1 design, older and younger people and children are likely to benefit from the proposals to renew the surfaces, widen footways and central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall. They are also likely to benefit from a new level crossing at Basinghall Street junction. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>Option 2 design will likely benefit older people, younger people and children to walk, wheel through the area.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged, that the Options 1 and 2 have a potential to impede people with this protected characteristic, as they are more likely to be reliant on using motor vehicle as a mobility aid. This is because reducing the road to one lane on London Wall could potentially increase the travel time and its cost.</p> <p>Option 3 will bring benefits to people walking and wheeling in Basinghall Street; the impact of changes in London Wall will remain unchanged.</p> |
| Disability | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>People with mobility impairment will likely benefit from wider pavements around the development, renewed surface and level pedestrian crossing at the junction of Basinghall Street and Basinghall Avenue and wider central reservation at the existing raised tables on London Wall.</p> <p>People with vision impairment are also expected to benefit from the same level surface and clear demarcation of changes between road and pavement.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged, that the Options 1 and 2 have a potential to impede people with mobility impairment, as they are more likely to be reliant on using motor vehicle as a mobility aid. This is because reducing the road to one lane on London Wall could potentially increase the travel time and its cost.</p> |
| Gender Reassignment | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Pregnancy and Maternity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Level crossing points, clearly demarcated infrastructure, widened footways, and renewed surfaces are also likely to benefit people with this protected characteristic.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged, that the Options 1 and 2 have a potential to impede people with this protected characteristic, as they are more likely to be reliant on using motor vehicle as a mobility aid. This is because reducing the road to one lane on London Wall could potentially increase the travel time and its cost.</p> |
| Race | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |
| Religion or Belief | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |
| Sex (i.e. gender) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |
| Sexual Orientation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No evidence of impact to gender reassignment was discovered during this exercise. |

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

Yes

No

Briefly explain your answer:

This project is looking to improve the quality and function of the local public realm for people walking, wheeling, and cycling. All proposed Options can bring a positive change to the public realm for people with protected characteristics, albeit to a varying extent.

5. There are no negative / adverse impact(s)

Some negative impact could be experienced by people with protected characteristics of age, disability and pregnancy and maternity, who are likely to use motor vehicles as a mobility aid.

6. Are there positive impacts of the proposal on any equality groups or Social Mobility? It is envisaged that the proposals will encourage active travel. It is expected that all people with protected characteristics will benefit from raising the carriageway to the footway level and narrowing the space motor vehicle space to improve the environment and ease of active movement in the area for people walking, wheeling and cycling.

7. As a result of this screening, is a full EA necessary?

Please check appropriate box

Yes

No

Briefly explain your answer:

The proposed changes seem to have positive or neutral impact on people with protective characteristics who use active mode of transport. However, reducing a road with to one lane for motor vehicles may impede people with protected characteristics of age, disability and pregnancy and maternity, who are more likely to use motor vehicles as a mobility aid due to potential increase in journey times and associated costs. The option recommended for implementation will be re-assessed prior to Gateway 5.

8. Name of Lead Officer: Andrea Moravicova

Job title: Project Manager

Date of completion: 12/06/2024

Signed off by Department Director:

Name:

Date: