


Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
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.			
Directorate	Local Engagement		
Service area	Strategy and Performance		
Proposal being screened	Boundary Review		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Will Boardman		
What are you proposing to do?	The recommendation is to submit a proposal of 89 members as the council's size from May 2027. This is a reduction of one member of the council. The Boundary Commission will consider this and consult on options for boundaries.		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	A Boundary Review is required to improve electoral equality and was agreed as part of LGR. The desired outcome is an efficient democratic structure for the council, with each member representing a broadly equal number of electors. This specific decision is to submit a proposal for 89 councillors, a reduction of one councillor.		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No		
Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC's additional agreed characteristics			
As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? 			
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 directorate representative for advice if you are in any doubt.			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age		X	
Disability		X	
Sex		X	
Race		X	
Sexual orientation		X	
Gender reassignment		X	
Religion or belief		X	
Pregnancy or maternity		X	
Marriage or civil partnership		X	
People in rural areas		X	
People on a low income		X	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		X	
Are from the Armed Forces Community		X	
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (for example, disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No. During the development of the proposal, it was recognised that a significant decrease in the number of councillors could impact on the workload and therefore the ability of people to be a councillor whilst also undertaking caring responsibilities. This could have		

	impacted on carers. Women are disproportionately more likely to be carers. However, a reduction of 1 councillor will not alter the workload of members in any meaningful way.			
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (for example, partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	The proposal of 89 members will not significantly change the way the council operates.			
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	✓	Continue to full EIA:	
Reason for decision	There is no identified impact of the proposals on any of the protected characteristics.			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)				
Date	25/06/24			