

<b>Initial equality impact assessment screening form</b> This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
<b>Directorate</b>	Resources		
<b>Service area</b>	Finance / Community		
<b>Proposal being screened</b>	Consideration of various requests for Community Infrastructure Levy Funding (CIL) to a number of community schemes from the previous Ryedale District Council		
<b>Officer(s) carrying out screening</b>	Tony Law		
<b>What are you proposing to do?</b>	To use the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding to fund education capital schemes in the former Ryedale geography. As opposed to the community schemes suggested by Ryedale District Council		
<b>Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?</b>	As a unitary council, NYC now has the opportunity to take a holistic view of community infrastructure needs in line with the CIL planning and policy guidance. It is essential that any approvals from CIL are delivering strong value for money for the taxpayers of the former district of Ryedale and the County more generally.		
<b>Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources?</b> Please give details.	NO The level of CIL funding remains the same		
<b>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC's additional agreed characteristics</b> As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?</li> <li>Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?</li> <li>Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?</li> </ul> <p>If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your <a href="#">Equality rep</a> for advice if you are in any doubt.</p>			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age	Yes		
Disability		No	
Sex		No	
Race		No	
Sexual orientation		No	
Gender reassignment		No	
Religion or belief		No	
Pregnancy or maternity		No	
Marriage or civil partnership		No	
People in rural areas			yes
People on a low income		No	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		No	
<b>Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable</b>	The change in allocation from a range of community schemes to supporting the education capital budget will limit the impact of the CIL funding to those of a school		

**Appendix B**

<p><b>impacts</b> (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.</p>	<p><b>age as opposed to a more wider age range and demographic who use the community schemes. The proposed redirection of funding could create an imbalance in standards between some community schemes in Ryedale and the rest of the county, which could deter some from attending.</b></p> <p><b>However, one of the schools highlighted in the report Welburn Hall is a county wide residential resource for SEND children, including those living in Ryedale. The refurbishment of which would benefit SEND children county wide.</b></p>			
<p><b>Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.</b></p>	<p><b>One of the reports other recommendations is to work with local groups to assist in identifying other funding opportunities. So as to mitigate the possible loss of the CIL funding.</b></p>			
<p><b>Decision (Please tick one option)</b></p>	<p>EIA not relevant or proportionate:</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Continue to full EIA:</p>	
<p><b>Reason for decision</b></p>	<p><b>Insufficient detail contained in the report to reconcile the merits of opposing funding options</b></p>			
<p><b>Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)</b></p>				
<p><b>Date</b></p>				