

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.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

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.

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

Proposed amendments to the Schedule of Classes of Development in the Planning (Development Management) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015.

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

Revised policy

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

Section 25 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) (the 2011 Act) introduced a hierarchy of development within the planning system, establishing development as one of two categories, major or local. The Planning (Development Management) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 (the Development Management Regulations) sets out nine classes of development and relevant thresholds or criterion for each of these categories in a Schedule. The procedures for submitting and handling planning applications for the different categories of development vary, as does the extent of supporting information required.

The purpose of this review is to explore and determine the need for revisions to the categories, classes of development and the corresponding thresholds and criterion within the Development Management Regulations. The aim is to

ensure that the current classes and thresholds remain relevant, fit for purpose and take account of future development requirements.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy? If so, explain how.

No

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The Department for Infrastructure (DfI)

Who owns and who implements the policy?

DfI own the policy. Local councils and DfI implement the policy.

Background

This is the second time the Department is consulting on the Classes and Thresholds contained in the Planning (Development Management) Regulations (NI) 2015. This is due to the diverse range of responses to the initial consultation; it was therefore considered appropriate to re-consult on a number of specific changes to the regulations.

This revised screening form also reflects the outcomes of the initial consultation undertaken with regards to this policy.

As noted above the 2011 Act introduced a hierarchy of development within the planning system, establishing development as one of two categories, major or local.

The aim of the hierarchy is to encourage a more proportionate and responsive approach to processing planning applications, with resources and decision-taking mechanisms tailored according to the scale and complexity of the proposed development.

At the outset of the planning process, applicants preparing a planning application will screen their proposed development against the nine classes of development and corresponding thresholds or criterion in the Development

Management Regulations, to identify if the proposal will be considered major or local development. This will determine the procedures to be followed during the pre-application stage, the information to be submitted with the planning application and the relevant planning authority.

There were no section 75 issues or comments raised as part of the initial consultation on this matter. However, all the points raised on the policy itself from the first consultation have been reviewed and considered by the Department.

Major Development

Major developments have important economic, social, and environmental implications for an individual council area, with potential to deliver important benefits for the local community. They are developments which have the potential to be of significance and interest to communities.

There is a mandatory requirement for prospective applicants to consult with the local community before they submit proposals for major development to the council or Department. This is known as Pre-Application Community Consultation (PACC), and it aims to inform local communities about forthcoming development proposals and allows them an opportunity to view and comment on the emerging design proposals before a formal planning application is submitted. The intention is to add value and improve the quality of the proposed development, by addressing community issues, misunderstandings, and mitigate potential negative impacts where possible. A PACC Report must be prepared which should summarise this consultation process and collate the feedback garnered, to be submitted with the planning application.

A Design and Access Statement (D&AS) is also required in support of a planning application for major development, outlining the supporting design principles and proposed access for the development. All applications for major development are submitted to local councils and determined by the councils' Planning Committee.

Examples of major development might include residential developments with more than 50 dwellings, a large industrial development with floorspace greater than 5000 square metres, or a wind farm with a capacity greater than 5 megawatts.

Major Development of regional significance

Some major developments are considered to have the potential to make a significant contribution to the economic and social success of Northern Ireland as a whole or a substantial part of the region. These are known as regionally significant developments.

The Development Management Regulations identifies five classes of development with corresponding thresholds and criteria to establish what major development might be considered regionally significant. Regional significance is confirmed following consultations between the prospective applicant and DfI. All planning applications for major development deemed to be of regional significance are submitted to and determined by DfI.

Local Development

Local development comprises all other developments which is not major or regionally significant. They are likely to comprise the vast majority of residential and minor commercial applications received and are determined by councils. They do not require consultation with the local community prior to submission of a planning application.

Implementation factors

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

Legislative:

The proposed amendments may be added to or removed after consultation and further scrutiny.

Main stakeholders affected.

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

Staff: Yes

Service users: Yes

Other public sector organisations: Yes

Voluntary/community/trade unions: Yes

Others (Please specify): Yes

- Members of the public
- Prospective applicants / developers
- Planning Consultants, Architects, and Legal profession

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

- **What are they?**
 - Council Scheme of Delegation
- **Who owns them?**
 - Councils

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](#).

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

The screening is informed by the content and scope of the existing 2015 Development Management Regulations, departmental operational experience of the classifications and thresholds, consideration of how planning processes interact with equality considerations and knowledge of existing processes.

Religious belief evidence / information:

The 2021 Census provides a religious breakdown of the NI population by Age and also by different geographic areas i.e. Electoral Area, Health Trust etc. The 2021 Census finds that of the total NI population, 42.3% are from a Catholic background, 37.3% are from a Protestant background and 20.3% were classified as Other/ No religion/ Not stated.

The consultations did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Political Opinion evidence / information:

The 2021 Census provides a national identity breakdown of the NI population. The 2021 Census finds that of the total NI population, 31.9% identified themselves as British Only, 29.1% identified as Irish Only, 19.8% identified as Northern Irish only and 19.2% identified within more than one of these categories, or as Other.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Racial Group evidence / information:

The 2021 Census provides an ethnicity breakdown of the NI population. The 2021 Census finds that of the total NI population, 96.5% are from a white ethnic group, with all other ethnic groups making up 3.5% of the NI population.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Age evidence / information:

Although the planning system does not request or hold information on age, the 2021 Census finds the NI population aged 18 years old or over to be 1,468,081 as of March 2021.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Marital Status evidence / information:

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Disability evidence / information:

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Dependants evidence / information:

Although the planning system does not request or hold information on age, the 2021 Census finds the NI population aged 18 years old or over to be 1,468,081 as of March 2021.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

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

People from different religious beliefs have a shared interest in fair and transparent planning processes that support high-quality places, community cohesion and access to services. The proposed changes do not relate to belief, worship, or community identity and do not affect access to planning processes on the basis of religious belief. Any impacts arising from development outcomes would be location based rather than linked to religious belief.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Political Opinion

Individuals across political opinions share an interest in confidence in the planning system, democratic accountability and consistent decision-making. The proposals do not differentiate on the basis of political opinion and do not influence access to participation or representation within the planning system based on political belief. The classification of development as major or local applies equally regardless of political opinion.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Racial Group

People from different racial groups may have particular priorities relating to housing availability, access to employment, and the quality of local environments, especially in urban areas where minority ethnic populations may be more concentrated. The proposals may indirectly influence the planning process applicable to some developments; however, they do not affect rights of participation or access to services on the basis of race. Any impacts are indirect and linked to development location and type rather than racial group.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Age

Children, young people and older people may have differing priorities in relation to development, such as availability of housing, access to education, healthcare, public transport and safe public spaces. The proposals do not target or disadvantage any age group. While threshold changes may indirectly influence the speed or scale of certain developments, the policy does not alter substantive planning considerations relevant to age-related needs.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Marital status

People of different marital or civil partnership status share similar needs in relation to housing quality, neighbourhood amenity and access to services. The proposed changes to development classification thresholds do not differentiate between individuals based on marital or civil partnership status and do not affect access to planning processes or outcomes on this basis.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Sexual orientation

People of all sexual orientations have equal interests in inclusive, safe and accessible local environments. The proposal is procedural in nature and does not affect individuals or communities differently on the basis of sexual orientation. There is no evidence to suggest that changes to development thresholds impact the needs or experiences of this group differently.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Men and Women Generally

Men and women may experience development impacts differently depending on caring roles, employment patterns or use of local services. However, the proposal does not distinguish between genders and does not affect opportunities for participation, access to housing or services on a gender-specific basis. Any differences in experience would arise from development outcomes rather than the regulatory classification itself.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Disability

People with disabilities may place particular priority on accessible environments, proximity to services and the ability to engage effectively with decision-making processes. Changes in development classification could, in some cases, alter the extent of formal consultation requirements. However, planning authorities continue to be subject to statutory duties relating to accessibility and equality, and the proposal does not remove consideration of disability-related needs in decision-making.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

Dependants

People with dependants, such as children or caring responsibilities, may prioritise access to suitable housing, education, healthcare and safe environments. The proposals do not directly affect this group, although development outcomes may indirectly influence service provision. The regulatory changes apply equally to those with and without dependants and do not create barriers linked to dependency status.

The initial consultation did not highlight any additional evidence with regard to section 75 needs and/or impacts, positive or negative.

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**:

The proposal is regulatory and procedural and applies equally regardless of religious belief. There is no evidence that changes to development thresholds would differentially affect persons of a particular religious belief.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

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

The proposal is regulatory and procedural and applies equally regardless of political opinion. There is no evidence that changes to development thresholds would differentially affect persons of a particular political opinion.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

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

Minority ethnic communities may be more concentrated in urban areas where certain development types are more common. Changes in thresholds could indirectly alter consultation processes for developments in some locations. Any such effects are location-based rather than group-based and are mitigated by ongoing statutory consultation and equality duties.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**:

Children, young people and older people may be indirectly affected by development outcomes (such as housing or community facilities). However, the proposed changes do not target or disadvantage any age group and primarily affect procedural classification rather than development content.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**:

The proposal does not affect individuals differently on the basis of marital or civil partnership status.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**:

There is no relationship between the proposed regulatory changes and sexual orientation.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women**:

While some forms of development (such as childcare or health facilities) may be used disproportionately by one gender, the classification of development thresholds does not in itself create gender-based disadvantage.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**:

People with disabilities may be more dependent on accessible local amenities and may face barriers to participation if procedural engagement

mechanisms differ between major and local development. However, planning authorities retain statutory duties to consider accessibility and inclusion; Section 75 duties continue to apply to decision-making; and the proposal does not remove consultation rights entirely. Any indirect impacts are limited and capable of mitigation.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact?

Potential minor indirect impact identified.

The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**:

Persons with dependants may be affected by certain development outcomes, such as education or recreational facilities. The proposal does not directly impact this group, and any effects are indirect and development specific. The initial consultation on the matter did not raise any issues with regard to equality of opportunity of this policy.

What is the level of impact? None

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:

While the policy does not in itself create new equality opportunities, the way it is implemented provides scope to continue promoting equality of opportunity through inclusive engagement, accessible information and ongoing monitoring, ensuring that the needs of Section 75 groups are appropriately considered in practice.

The consultation did not inform any better ways to promote equality of opportunity for this s75 category.

Religious Belief

No - As above

Political Opinion

No - As above.

Racial Group

No - As above.

Age

No - As above.

Marital Status

No - As above.

Sexual Orientation

No – As above.

Men and Women generally

No – As above.

Disability

No – As above.

Dependants

No – As above.

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 policy is unlikely to have any significant impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group. The proposed amendments are procedural and regulatory, relating solely to the classification of development as major or local for planning purposes. They apply consistently across Northern Ireland and do not differentiate

between individuals or communities on the basis of religious belief, political opinion or racial group. Overall, the proposal is neutral in terms of good relations and does not present a risk of exacerbating community tensions or adversely affecting relations between Section 75 groups. The consultations did not inform anything contrary to the above.

What is the level of impact? None

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

What is the level of impact? None

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

What is the level of impact? None

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:

The proposal is procedural and regulatory in nature and is not expected to have a significant impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group. However, opportunities exist at the implementation stage to support good relations through clear, transparent communication about the revised thresholds, consistent application of the regulations and the use of inclusive engagement approaches where developments may affect local communities. Ongoing monitoring of the practical effects of the changes can also help identify and address any unintended issues that could have implications for community relations. The consultation did not conclude anything additional to the above.

Religious Belief
As above.

Political Opinion
As above.

Racial Group

As above.

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?

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

The policy is unlikely to have any significant differential or adverse impacts on people with multiple Section 75 identities. The proposed changes are procedural and regulatory and as such apply uniformly across Northern Ireland, regardless of Section 75 characteristics. While individuals with multiple identities (for example, disabled people from minority ethnic backgrounds or young people with caring responsibilities) may, in general, experience greater barriers to engagement with planning processes, these are mitigated by existing equality duties, consultation requirements and good practice in planning decision-making. The policy does not alter rights of participation or access on the basis of identity. Any indirect impacts would arise from specific development proposals or local circumstances rather than the regulatory changes themselves.

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

There is no specific quantitative or qualitative data available on the impact of the proposed policy on people with multiple Section 75 identities (for example, disabled minority ethnic people, disabled women, or young people with caring responsibilities). This is because the policy is procedural and regulatory, relating to development classification thresholds rather than individuals or communities.

Part 3. Screening decision

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

Following screening, it has been concluded that a full Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

The proposed amendments to the Development Management Regulations are procedural and technical in nature, relating to the classification of development as “major” or “local” for planning purposes. The policy applies uniformly across Northern Ireland and does not differentiate between individuals or groups on the basis of any Section 75 equality category, either directly or indirectly.

The screening has identified no evidence of significant adverse impacts on equality of opportunity or good relations. Any potential impacts are indirect, minor and development-specific, arising from how individual planning applications are processed rather than from the regulatory changes themselves. These impacts are not considered significant and are capable of mitigation through existing statutory duties, planning safeguards, consultation requirements and established good practice.

There is no available data indicating that the proposed changes would have a differential impact on people within any Section 75 category, including those with multiple identities. Ongoing compliance with Section 75 duties in planning decision-making and monitoring of implementation will continue to ensure equality considerations are considered. It is also important to note that the initial consultation on this matter did not raise any section 75 issues or concerns and the policy itself is technical in nature.

On this basis, the policy is assessed as having a neutral equality impact, and a full EQIA is not considered proportionate or necessary at this stage.

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.

These impacts are not considered significant and are capable of mitigation through existing statutory duties, planning safeguards, consultation requirements and established good practice. The initial consultation on this matter did not raise any section 75 issues or concerns and the policy itself is technical in nature.

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?

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

The policy is procedural, technical and regulatory in nature, and no amendments or alternative policy options have been identified that would more effectively promote equality of opportunity or good relations without undermining the purpose of the Regulations.

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 [Author pick 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

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: R McCrory
Position/Job Title: DP
Date: 12 August 2026

Approved by: M McCricken
Position/Job Title: PPTO
Date: 12 August 2026

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: 15.04.26
Amendments Requested: Yes
Date Returned to Business Area: 24.04.26, 05.05.26 & 27.05.26
Date Final Version Confirmed: 12.08.26
Date Published on DfI's Section 75 webpage: 13.08.26