

DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

SECTION 75 EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY SCREENING ANALYSIS FORM

The purpose of this form is to help you to consider whether a new policy (either internal or external) or legislation will require a full equality impact assessment (EQIA). Those policies identified as having significant implications for equality of opportunity must be subject to full EQIA.

The form will provide a record of the factors taken into account if a policy is screened out, or excluded for EQIA. It will provide a basis for quarterly consultation on the outcome of the screening exercise, and will be referenced in the biannual review of progress made to the Minister and in the Annual Report to the Equality Commission.

Further advice on completion of this form and the screening process including relevant contact information can be accessed via the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) Intranet site ([Equality Intranet page](#)).

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#)

When considering the impact of this policy you should also consider if there would be any Human Rights implications. Guidance is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/articles/human-rights-and-public-authorities>

Should this be appropriate you will need to complete a Human Rights Impact Assessment. A template is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/publications/human-rights-impact-assessment-proforma>

Don't forget to RURAL PROOF - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#).

Part 1. Policy scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy, being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

Information about the policy

Name of the policy

Section 54 Planning Application – Belfast Transport Hub

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

This is a decision to approve a planning application which the Department for Infrastructure's (DfI) Planning Business Area is responsible for processing; it is not a policy. (Planning Application Ref: SPD/2023/0991/F)

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

Full permission is sought for removal of planning condition 5. This will remove any restriction on the number of trains operating out of Belfast Grand Central Station (BGCS) to Dublin for a scheduled hourly service.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

If so, explain how.

Opportunities to benefit from the more frequent Enterprise Belfast Grand Central Station to Dublin service should be experienced uniformly across the general population and all section 75 (s75) categories should therefore experience the opportunities to the same extent as the general population.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Northern Ireland Transport Holding Company (Translink).

Who owns and who implements the policy?

Translink

Background

Planning permission was granted in March 2019 for a “New integrated public transport interchange comprising; station concourse, 26 bus stands, 8 railway platforms, bus maintenance and parking, track and signalling enhancements, bus access bridge, cycle and taxi provision, car parking, new public square, public realm improvements, highway improvements, infrastructure improvements, temporary structures for bus operations during construction and temporary site construction compounds”. Construction work began in 2021 and Belfast Grand Central Station opened in September 2024.

The planning permission was granted subject to a number of planning conditions which must be complied with. Planning Condition 5 reads: *“There shall be no more than 8 daily Belfast to Dublin train services each way into the approved development (16 in total). Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.”*

The planning application under Section 54 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 is for permission to develop land without compliance with condition 5 on planning permission LA04/2017/1388/F for the Belfast Transport Hub (BTH) proposal.

The planning application does not involve any physical development on the ground or any alteration to the station building or surrounding area. The infrastructure to support the hourly service was approved as part of the original planning permission and has been constructed.

The application was advertised in the local press as per The Planning Act (NI) 2011, the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (NI) 2015 and the Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (NI) 2017. There have been 19 letters of objection and 3 letters of support to the proposal.

The principal concerns raised by objectors were:

- Concern whether Translink are building all of the roof building and whether assessments from the initial planning permission need updated before this condition is removed;
- Calls for a public inquiry into this development;
- There has been no public consultation re Blythfield Park which will be severely impacted by noise and fumes. Childrens' park and allotments should never have been sacrificed;
- Health and wellbeing and rights of children been ignored;
- Already congestion in the area;
- Planning process is flawed;
- There has been no consultation with the Education Authority / local schools / Children's Commissioner;
- There has been no estimate done for the impact of the number of extra trains;
- Increase in air and noise pollution will make it impossible for those with health problems to use the allotments/playing fields;
- Impact on interface area;
- Condition should be retained for at least 3 years then applicant could produce a community impact report;
- Considerable impact on local community regarding noise, damage to property and pollution;
- Safety - trackbed of the new station is not of sufficient strength to carry the weight of Enterprise trains and platforms are not of sufficient width to safely accommodate passenger volumes, with additional concerns relating to disabled passengers;
- considerable impact on working class residents living near the railway;
- original condition in place to protect neighbours from excessive noise and vibration;
- impact on residential amenity - increased disruption, particularly during early mornings and late evenings, additional noise from passing trains, horns, and vibrations will be intrusive and diminish the enjoyment of homes, affect overall quality of life;
- proposal will attract more commuters to the station, worsening traffic problems and congestion. Parking is limited, and extra demand will place more strain on the infrastructure, leading to even more delays and difficulties for residents; and
- increase in train services will drastically increase noise levels and vibration, causing severe disruption for residents along these routes. Impact on working class residents that have to live with the increased disruption.

3 letters of support have also been received making the following points:

- a frequent, reliable and affordable train service between Belfast and Dublin will enable increased cross border collaboration, improve cross border mobility and enhance economic opportunities.
- the additional trains are all of similar noise and pollution profiles to trains operating local services. It is irrational to permit the operation of additional services within Northern Ireland from Grand Central using low noise Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) but to forbid additional services to Dundalk, Drogheda and Dublin.

One respondent to the public consultation raised issues in relation to the impact on children. The Environmental Statement assesses the impact on sensitive receptors including the two schools near Blythefield Park and concludes that there would be no significant impacts on those receptors. Environmental Health concurred with this position.

The above issues are considered as part of the Development Management Report which is available through the public register

<https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk/simple-search> using the reference number SPD/2023/0991/F.

The Environmental Statement submitted in support of the planning application states that the rail network plays an important enabling role in driving economic growth and that improved public transport is key to increasing labour mobility thus increasing connectivity and therefore the efficiency and competitiveness of business. Public transport is also seen as a catalyst for regeneration through linking urban and rural areas and is important in profiling the region to external investors. The supporting information states there will be significant potential economic development benefits through the growth of the *Enterprise* service for commuting and the growth of local urban economies through enhanced tourism, leisure and shopping opportunities. The service will create increased travel opportunities for all providing enhanced access to hospitals and medical centres.

The proposal aligns with the All-Island Rail Review 2024 which identified that service frequencies and speeds between Belfast and Dublin are relatively low compared to similar infrastructure in other capital cities.

The local Council are supportive of the proposal citing the growth in cross-border workers, the opportunity to improve cross-border trade of services with improved transport links enabling growth. In the Council's view, improved

intercity connectivity is essential to businesses and communities in Belfast, providing linkages to facilitate trade, investment, tourism, and labour mobility.

Any delay to the planning decision or restriction on the train service could result in the loss of €165m of European Union (EU) funding and the loss of revenue to Translink over 30 years of circa £157m.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

No. The funding for the project is a matter for the applicant.

If yes, are they (please delete as appropriate)

financial

legislative

other, please specify _____

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

- Public transport users
- local residents/local community

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- what are they?
 - Regional Development Strategy 2035
 - Draft Belfast Metropolitan Plan

- Belfast Local Development Plan 2035 – Plan Strategy
- Strategic Planning Policy Statement
- Ensuring a Sustainable Transport Future: A New Approach to Regional Transportation
- Regional Strategic Transport Network Transport Plan (RSTNTP) 2015
- All-Ireland Rail Review (published in July 2024)

• who owns them?

- Department for Infrastructure (DfI)
- Belfast District Council

Available evidence

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data. The Commission has produced this guide to [signpost to S75 data](#). Also refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#) for some evidence sources.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

The Belfast Transport Hub proposal lies within the Belfast district.

Religious belief evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census states 17% of the surrounding area (Botanic Super Data Zone) were recorded as Catholic and 44.3% were recorded as Protestant. 29.7% of the surrounding area said they had no religion or did not state one and 9.1% stated other religions. This compares with 42.31% Catholic and 37.36% Protestant, 18.99% said they had no religion or did not state one and 1.34% stated other religions in the whole Northern Ireland population.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the planning application would affect people of different religious beliefs. Although the composition of the surrounding local community may be dominated by one particular religious group, the analysis has concluded that there will be no significant impact on any receptors.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Political Opinion evidence / information:

The 2023 Local Election Results for the Botanic Ward are broken down as follows; Sinn Fein 24.3%, Democratic Unionist Party 19.1%, Social Democratic and Labour Party 17.8%, Alliance 17.1%, Ulster Unionist Party 3.6%, Traditional Unionist Voice 2.94%, Green Party Northern Ireland 9.4%, The Workers Party

0.8%, Conservative and Unionist Party 0.5%, Socialist Party (NI) 1.4%, People Before Profit 2.9%

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect different groups with different political opinions.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Racial Group evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census provides an ethnicity breakdown of the NI population as follows: White 96.55%; Irish Traveller 0.14%; Roma 0.08%; Indian 0.52%; Chinese 0.50%; Filipino 0.23%; Pakistani 0.08%; Arab 0.10%; Other Asian 0.28%; Black African 0.42%; Black Other 0.16%; Mixed 0.76%; and Other ethnicities 0.19%. The 2021 NI Census states in the Belfast district 92.9% as white, Chinese 1.37%, Indian 1.26 %, people of mixed ethnicity 1.2%, and Black African 1.19%. No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect different Racial Groups.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Age evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census recorded the statistics in the surrounding area of the application site as 12.5% between 0-14 years, 58.3% between 15-39 years, 20.8% between 40-64 years and 65+ years were 8.4%. This compares with Northern Ireland population as 19.19% between 0-14 years old, 31.23% between 15-39 years old, 32.43% between 40-64 years old, whilst 17.15% were 65+.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect different age groups.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Marital Status evidence / information:

30.7% of the Belfast district population were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as married or in a civil partnership or separated and 50.2% were recorded as single, divorced or widowed. This compares with 39.6% married or in a civil partnership or separated and 40.2% single, divorced or widowed for Northern Ireland as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect groups of differing marital status.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

70.4% of the Belfast district population were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as heterosexual and 3.3% as gay, lesbian or other sexual orientation with 7.1% preferring not to say. This compares with 71.6% heterosexual, 1.65% as gay, lesbian or other sexual orientation and 6.2% preferring not to say of the Northern Ireland population as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect different groups of differing sexual orientation.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

The Belfast District population was recorded in the 2021 NI Census as 51.3% female and 48.7% as male. This compares with 50.8% female and 49.2% as male in the Northern Ireland population as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect men and women differently.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Disability evidence / information:

26.7% of people in Belfast district were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as having a long term health problem or disability which limits day to day activities. This compares with 24.3% of the Northern Ireland population.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect people with disabilities.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals, It is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision. However, the proposal itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

Dependants evidence / information:

43.2% people in Belfast District were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as living in a household with dependent children and 27.2% households in the district have dependent children. This compares with the NI Census 2021 data; out of a population of 1.9 million, 34% per cent of households contained dependent children and 40% contained at least one person with a long-term health problem or disability; made up of those households with dependent children (9.2%) and those with no dependent children (31%).

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect people with dependents differently.

In the absence of more robust data outside of that referenced during the consideration stages of the proposals it is difficult to determine the impact(s) on this group of this planning decision.

However, the scheme itself is to improve public transportation provision generally as well as the local economy and will therefore potentially benefit society.

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 policy/decision?

(Specify details of the needs, experiences and priorities for each of the Section 75 categories below).

Religious belief

This decision will support Translink's objective to operate an hourly rail service between Belfast and Dublin. As noted in the background there have been objections to this development in particular on the grounds on impact on residential amenity.

All groups should expect good air quality and a peaceful neighbourhood without detrimental impacts from adjoining developments as a result of pollution or

noise. The Environmental Statement submitted with this planning application concludes that the removal of Planning Condition No.5 would not result in any new likely significant effects as a result of air or noise pollution and no additional mitigation is therefore required. Belfast City Council Environmental Health concurred with this conclusion.

That said no other specific needs, experiences and priorities have been identified for people within this group. The proposal provides an enhanced rail service which potentially could benefit all society.

Political Opinion

As outlined above

Racial Group

As outlined above

Age

As outlined above.

A concern was also raised during consultation in relation to the impact on children. The Environmental Statement (ES) assessed the impact on sensitive receptors including the two schools near Blythefield Park and concluded that there would be no significant impacts on those receptors. Environmental Health concurred with this position.

Marital status

As outlined above

Sexual orientation

As outlined above

Men and Women Generally

As outlined above

Disability

As outlined above

Dependants

As outlined above

Part 2. Screening questions

Introduction

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of this Guide.

If the public authority's conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the public authority may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, a public authority should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

If the public authority's conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

If the public authority's conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories and/or good relations categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

- measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
- the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In favour of a 'major' impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts 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.

In favour of '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.

In favour of 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.

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none

Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?

(Please provide details of the likely policy impacts and determine the level of impact for each S75 categories below i.e. either minor, major or none).

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**:

As noted in the background there have been objections to this development though none from a s75 perspective.

All s75 categories could potentially benefit for a more frequent train service from Belfast to Dublin. It is concluded that there will be no significant impacts on any members of the public as a result of noise, vibration and emissions.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**: As outlined above at religious belief.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**: As outlined above at religious belief.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**: As outlined above at religious belief.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status:** [As outlined above at religious belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [Potentially minor positive.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation:** [As outlined above at religious belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [Potentially minor positive.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women:** [As outlined above at religious belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [Potentially minor positive.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability:** [As outlined at above at religious belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [Potentially minor positive.](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants:** [As outlined at religious belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [Potentially minor positive.](#)

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?

(Detail opportunities of how this policy could promote equality of opportunity for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below).

Religious Belief - No.

[The proposal provides an enhanced rail service which potentially could benefit all society. There have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for people in this s75 category.](#)

Political Opinion – No. As outlined above in religious belief.

Racial Group – No – as outlined above in religious belief.

Age – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

Marital Status – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

Sexual Orientation – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

Men and Women generally – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

Disability – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

Dependants – No - as outlined above in religious belief.

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

Please provide details of the likely policy impact and determine the level of impact for each of the categories below i.e. either minor, major or none.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**:

The proposal provides an enhanced rail service which potentially could benefit all society. It is not anticipated to impact on good relations on people in this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**:

As outlined above.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**:

As outlined above at religious belief.

What is the level of impact? Potentially minor positive

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

Detail opportunities of how this policy could better promote good relations for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below:

Religious Belief –

No. The proposal will enhance public transportation provision. There are no opportunities to promote good relations in this s75 category identified.

Political Opinion - No. As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Racial Group - No. As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?

(Every citizen belongs to more than one group - For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

Each Section 75 category combines to make society in general, all people fall into more than one category. This proposal will enhance public transportation train services from Belfast to Dublin potentially benefiting people in all s75 categories in Northern Ireland. No potential impacts are identified at this stage of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities.

Provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

As above.

Part 3. Screening decision

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

The proposal has not been found likely to impact differently on any section 75 groups. A full equality impact assessment is not considered necessary at this stage, should any changes/concerns/issues arise, this form will be reviewed and amended as required.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced - please provide details of this consideration.

These proposals have the potential to positively impact society in general and as such an EQIA is not required. The Environmental Statement submitted with this planning application concludes that the removal of Planning Condition No.5 would not result in any new likely significant effects and no additional mitigation is therefore required.

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

N/A

All public authorities' equality schemes must state the authority's arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

Mitigation

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is 'minor' and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

No - The Environmental Statement submitted with this planning application concludes that the removal of Planning Condition No.5 would not result in any new likely significant effects and no additional mitigation is therefore required at this stage.

If so, **give the reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

N/A

Timetabling and prioritising

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been ‘**screened in**’ for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

Priority criterion [choose 1 2 or 3 if a full EQIA is to take place]

Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Social need **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Effect on people’s daily lives **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Relevance to a public authority’s functions **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

No

If yes, please provide details.

Part 4. Monitoring

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

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

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

Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by: Nicole Thompson
Position/Job Title: Planning Officer
Date: 19/09/25

Approved by: Kathryn McFerran
Position/Job Title: Director – Regional Planning Policy and Casework
Date: 24/10/25

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each policy screened should be 'signed off' and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy, made easily accessible on the public authority's website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

For Equality Team Completion:

Date Received:	19/09/2025
Amendments Requested:	Yes
Date Returned to Business Area:	26/09/2025
Date Final Version Received / Agreed:	30/07/2026
Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage:	31/07/2026