

1. Title of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service:

Cambridge City Council Review of Community Provision and development of a Community Centres Strategy.

2. What is the objective or purpose of your strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

An EqlA for the Strategic Review of Community Provision was completed during Phase 1 (the Auditing phase), and Phase 2 (the analysis, planning and draft recommendations/strategy stage).

The EqlA has been updated to incorporate the Phase 3 work completed; the consultation and final recommendations/strategy stage.

Background

The purpose of the review is to develop a Vision that will ensure:-

- Council supported community centres are located in the right areas of the city to address the greatest needs
 - They are sustainable and provide accessible, joined up services to residents
 - They effectively contribute to the delivery of the Council's corporate priorities in a cost efficient way
 - The Council has successful partnership arrangements in place with the voluntary sector and other agencies, that meet the needs of local communities
- Council community development resource and activities are flexible to meet changing needs of the city

The datasets used to undertake the review include:

1. Community facility audit data;
2. Output data for low income households and benefit claimants;
3. Population density;
4. GIS 15 minute walk time¹ catchments

These datasets have helped to build a comprehensive evidence base to complete analysis work that will provide the Council with answers to the following questions:

1. What is the range of community facility provision currently in place across the city?
2. Are the Council's existing and planned community centres located in the right places to deliver the Council's community development activity and anti-poverty priorities?
3. If there are Council community centres which are not best located to deliver this work what should the future of these centres be?
4. Are there any gaps in current provision to be able to deliver the Council's anti-poverty priorities?
5. How could the Council look to address these gaps?
6. Following the analysis work, what is the future for centres identified as less strategically important and 'Transitional'?

Decision Making to Date

1. The Outcomes for the review were agreed at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 14th January 2016 (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g2792/Public%20reports%20pack%2014th-Jan-2016%2014.30%20Community%20Services%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

2. The Development of a community centres strategy was agreed at Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 20th June 2016 (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/documents/g3076/Public%20reports%20pack%2030th-Jun-2016%2014.30%20Community%20Services%20Scrutiny%20Committee.pdf?T=10>

3. An EqIA was completed to inform a report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 19th January 2017, which provided details of the audit and analysis work completed and draft recommendations within a draft Community Centres Strategy. It was agreed to undertake a 12 week public consultation on the draft proposals and strategy (click here to link to the report):

<http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=176&MId=3078&Ver=4>

4. The EqIA has now been updated to inform a report to Community Services Scrutiny Committee on 29th June 2017

• Who will be affected by this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

Residents

Visitors

Staff

A specific client group or groups: Low income residents and other residents who use community centres, other statutory agencies and voluntary organisations

• What type of strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service is this?

New strategy

• Responsible directorate and service

Directorate: Community Services

Service: Community Services

• Are other departments or partners involved in delivering this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service?

Housing Development Agency, Cambridge Investment Partnership, Corporate Strategy, GIS team, Planning team, Centre staff, Centre users, residents, residents associations, partner organisations e.g. County Council, voluntary organisations

• **Potential impact**

Please list and explain how this strategy, policy, plan, project, contract or major change to your service could **positively** or **negatively** affect individuals from the following equalities groups. When answering this question, please think about:

- a. The results of relevant consultation that you or others have completed (for example with residents, people that work in or visit Cambridge, service users, staff or partner organisations).
- b. Complaints information.
- c. Performance information.
- d. Information about people using your service (for example whether people from certain equalities groups use the service more or less than others).
- e. Inspection results.
- f. Comparisons with other organisations.
- g. The implementation of your piece of work (don't just assess what you think the impact will be after you have completed your work, but also think about what steps you might have to take to make sure that the implementation of your work does not negatively impact on people from a particular equality group).
- h. The relevant premises involved.
- i. Your communications.

Performance Information

Quarterly key performance data is collected from Council community centres, on three of the protected characteristics (age, ethnicity and disability) as part of routine monitoring at each of the Council operated centres. Community centres which are managed by voluntary sector organisations under a Service Level Agreement arrangement are also required to submit performance monitoring data as a condition of grant funding. User survey data was also collected.

A detailed stakeholder analysis has been completed for each of the Council's community centres to enable the impact of individual recommendations to be assessed. Further work has also been completed to assess the capacity of community centres which serve the same catchment of residents.

Consultation Methodology

A 12 week public consultation to enable feedback on the draft proposals ran from the 13th February to 5th May 2017 and consisted of:

1. Online survey (344 received)
2. Drop-ins (28.5 hours of face to face public engagement)
3. Reports to all Area Committees (4)
4. Focus group work with equality groups (voluntary sector led)
5. Partner engagement
6. Group meetings on request

The consultation has enabled the Council to more fully assess the impact of the recommendations from the review on current community centre users; local residents; the voluntary sector and partner agencies.

Consultation Findings

Detailed consultation findings and a summary document are both available, and the key issues raised in relation to positive or negative impacts of the proposals on individuals are summarised below.

1. Buchan Street

The consultation findings support Proposal A (69% of responders) to explore interest from voluntary organisations in taking on management of the centre. The Council's final recommendation is to complete a full feasibility study to assess the viability of being able to deliver community supported aspirations for both:

- a.) a new community hub to replace the Meadows Community Centre and;
- b.) leasing Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre to a voluntary sector organisation

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to Proposal B:

- The elderly and disabled users will have further to travel to access services if the Buchan Street centre is closed
- There is a lack of public transport options to get people to the alternative centre provision

2. The Meadows

The consultation supported the draft proposal (58% of responders) to build a new community hub to replace the Meadows Community Centre.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The transition from the current building to a new hub must not cause any disruption to existing users of the centre
- Accessibility for disabled persons
- Loss of the sports hall
- Loss of the youth club
- Loss of the garden area for sensory impairments
- A need for groups and residents to input into the detailed design of a new hub to ensure specific needs and requirements are addressed

3. Nun's Way Pavilion and 37 Lawrence Way

The consultation supported the draft proposal (79% of responders for Nuns Way and 83% of responders for 37 Lawrence Way) to explore options for a suitable alternative community space. Keep operational with the existing management arrangement until re-provided, and then explore voluntary organisation interest managing Nuns Way Pavilion, and convert 37 Lawrence Way back into a Council house.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The elderly and disabled users will have further to travel to access services if the location of the replacement provision is further away
- The current provision is out of date and badly designed and not a suitable venue because of accessibility issues

4. Brown's Field

The consultation supported the draft proposal (96% of responders) to retain as a Council managed community centre, ensuring community access in accordance with the community development approach and Council priorities.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- The centre is of high value to families, young people and children and provided vital, safe access to the outdoor/green space for children and young people.
- The signage was poor and that the centre can be very difficult to find
- It requires improved internal design, better wider general facilities and local publicity

5. Ross Street

The consultation supported the draft proposal (68% of responders) to pursue a voluntary organisation to lease the centre, with an agreement to safeguard community use. If a suitable organisation cannot be found, the Council will retain management of the centre.

The consultation raised the following impact issues in relation to this proposal:

- Concern that if it is managed by a faith organisation this could potentially impact on wider users
- Participants do not feel that the centre is accessible for people with Physical Disability and Sensory Impairments, and therefore do not access services from this centre

Subject to the outcome of detailed feasibility work, further detailed consultation with users and residents will be required as part of any planning application process.

National research (local information is not always available, particularly for some equalities groups, so use national research to provide evidence for your conclusions).

Prior to commencing the review, officers visited Oxford City Council who had completed a similar recent review of community centres provision. As part of this they had defined a 15 minute¹ accessibility standard for residents. The city shares a number of similarities with Cambridge so in defining the methodology for the review we adopted the same 15 minute¹ accessibility standard to complete the geographic and demographic assessment analysis work.

(a) Age (any group of people of a particular age, including younger and older people – in particular, please consider any safeguarding issues for children and vulnerable adults)

- Age profile performance data collected for each of the Council managed community centres highlights the following in terms of the age profile of community centre users:-
 1. Brownsfield – high level use for younger people and families
 2. Meadows and Buchan Street – high level use for older people and families
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city (East Chesterton, Abbey, Cherry Hinton and Queen Edith's). The recommendations propose changes which will address these gaps in access to provision, and this will have a positive impact on improving access for all age within a 15 minute walk time (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(b) Disability (including people with a physical impairment, sensory impairment, learning disability, mental health problem or other condition which has an impact on their daily life)

- The data collected about disabilities as part of the key performance data is broad and encompassing. We are also aware that there are some disabilities which some people won't be happy to disclose e.g. mental health, so the data collected is generic.
- There are known accessibility issues at two existing Council centres:
 1. 37 Lawrence Way – a community house
 2. Nun's Way Pavilion – a sports pavilion with community rooms
 3. 82 Akeman Street – a converted shop
- The recommendations in the review will have a positive impact on addressing the accessibility issues for disabled users at these facilities
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres

(c) Gender

- We currently collect individual data on gender and classify community centre users based on interest.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for both genders that currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(d) Pregnancy and maternity

- The centres currently provide activities for children, young people, families and activities.
- There is a particular focus for children and young people's activity at Brown's Field community centre, as this provides the base for the ChYpPs service (Children and young people's participation service), which runs activities all year round for children and families. The recommendations do not propose changes to Brown's Field but a review of community development activity may revise the focus of this activity across the city.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for families and children who currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time¹ (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(e) Transgender (including gender re-assignment)

- The Council does not currently collect individual data on transgender, but we do run high profile awareness events in partnership with voluntary organisations e.g. transgender awareness training, which helps to raise the profile as a safe space.
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(f) Marriage and Civil Partnership

No data and no impact as far as we can tell, but this will be kept under review.

(g) Race or Ethnicity

- The breakdown of the % proportion of all visits based on ethnicity is limited, high level and is not based on individual usage basis, but rather on activity.
- The activities on offer at all Council community centres are inclusive, but 82 Akeman Street has a greater proportion of BME users which reflects its location in the city.
- The review analysis has identified gaps in access to community centres in four wards within the city. The recommendations propose changes which will address the gaps and this will have a positive impact on improving access for BME groups who currently do not have access to a centre within a 15 minute walk time¹ (0.75 miles of their home).
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(h) Religion or Belief

- Brown's Field, Buchan Street and the Meadows all have regular bookings for faith organisations.
- We will examine on a case by case basis the impact of the recommendations and decisions relating to individual centres.

(i) Sexual Orientation

- No individual data is collected. Centres promote the 'Safer Spaces' campaign <http://encompassnetwork.org.uk/saferspaces>

- As part of developing the evidence base for the review, LGBT groups were consulted specifically and had shared the findings from their own needs assessment work. This assessment identified a need for a dedicated space for the LGBT community in the city.
- The Meadows has been used as a venue by the LGBT community. Throughout the review we have held a number of meetings with the LGBT community to consider need for a dedicated community venue and office space in the City.
- Following their needs assessment completed in summer 2016, they have now moved away from the view that they need a dedicated community space, because this often diverts resources from frontline service delivery and require specific asset management skills.
- We will look at opportunities to address the LGBT community's needs through partnership working at both Council venues and with other facility providers in the city.

(j) Other factors that may lead to inequality – please consider the impact of any changes on low income groups or those experiencing the impacts of poverty:

Low income households and benefit claimants provided geographic evidence of need across the city for the review. Generally, the areas of greatest need in the city are in the north and east.

• If you have any additional comments please add them here

This EqIA is a living document and this assessment will be updated on an on-going basis. An Action Plan has been completed in relation to the negative impacts identified.

• Conclusions and Next Steps

- j. If you have not identified any negative impacts, please sign off this form.**
- k. If you have identified potential negative actions, you must complete the action plan at the end of this document to set out how you propose to mitigate the impact. If you do not feel that the potential negative impact can be mitigated, you must complete to explain why that is the case.**
- l. If there is insufficient evidence to say whether or not there is likely to be a negative impact, please complete the action plan setting out what additional information you need to gather to complete the assessment.**

All completed Equality Impact Assessments must be emailed to Suzanne Goff, Strategy Officer, who will arrange for it to be published on the Council's website.
Email suzanne.goff@cambridge.gov.uk

• Sign off

Name and job title of assessment lead officer: Allison Conder

Names and job titles of other assessment team members and people consulted:
Jackie Hanson, Suzanne Goff, Debbie Kaye

Date of completion: 13th June 2017

- Date of next review of the assessment: In accordance with any development timetable**

Action Plan

Equality Impact Assessment - Review of Community Provision

Date of completion: 13th June 2017

Equality Group	Age
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Elderly users will have further to travel to access services
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review used 15 minute walk time¹ catchments to assess the impact on residents. Although some elderly residents will have further to travel to access services, they will still remain within a 15 minute walk time of the alternative provision i.e. the same accessibility as other elderly users within the same catchment ▪ Further assessment will be made to identify any particular individuals who cannot access the new community hub at the Meadows and if there is a valid reason they cannot, the Council will try to find a solution to enable access to continue.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable
Equality Group	Disability
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Disabled users will have further to travel to access services
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review used 15 minute walk time¹ catchments to assess the impact on residents. Although some disabled residents will have further to travel to access services, they will still remain with a 15 minute walk time¹ of the alternative provision i.e. the same accessibility as other disabled users within the same catchment. ▪ Further assessment will be made to identify any particular individuals who cannot access the new community hub at the Meadows and if there is a valid reason they cannot, the Council will try to find a solution to enable access to continue.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable

¹ Travel time of 3mph, covering 0.75 miles in 15 minutes Reference: <https://www.bhf.org.uk/get-involved/events/training-zone/walking-training-zone/walking-faqs>

Equality Group	Religion or Belief
Details of possible disadvantage or negative impact	Faith organisation management could potentially impact on wider community use
Action to be taken to address the disadvantage or negative impact	A community access agreement will safeguard community use.
Lead Officer	Jackie Hanson and Allison Conder
Date action to be completed by	In accordance with any development timetable
Equality Group	Gender
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Pregnancy and Maternity
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Transgender
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Marriage and Civil Partnership
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Race or Ethnicity
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Equality Group	Sexual Orientation
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage
Other factors that may lead to inequality	
Disadvantage or negative impact	N/A at this stage