

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00940 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Place Services Invest Falkirk	Lead Officer Name:	Charlotte Paterson
		Team:	PMO (SPR)
		Tel:	07527703987
		Email:	charlotte.paterson@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	Closure of Kinneil Museum	Reference No:	

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	No
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	No	Yes	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
06/01/2025	To deliver the approved Strategic Property Review saving of £16,960 per annum.
06/01/2025	To identify if there are any mitigation to closure through Community Asset Transfer or an Alternative Delivery Model

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:	£16,960 per annum	
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:	The budget has been agreed to be removed as part of the Strategic Property Review approved savings	
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	--

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
<p>The Strategic Property Review has identified Kinneil Museum as a non-core property and therefore proposed for closure in the event of no Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model to deliver the approved financial savings. Visitor numbers for 23/24 were 3,163.</p>	

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other	
<p>The Strategic Property Review has identified Kinneil Museum as a non-core property and therefore proposed for closure in the event of no Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model to deliver the approved financial savings. The Kinneil Museum is a much valued asset to the local and wider community and it is hoped that an opportunity for Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model will come to fruition.</p> <p>There is little evidence to support the identification of any potential equality impacts. A Strategic Property Review survey was undertaken December 2022 - January 2023. There were no comments made in relation to Kinneil Museum.</p>	

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	Yes
Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	The financial performance and viability of the venue.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	N/A
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	Kinneil Museum was identified as part of the Strategic Property Review alongside all other non-core assets. The Strategic Property Review and savings were approved by Council in January 2024.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT**Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place**

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Strategic Property Review engagement took place December 2022 - January 2023. Further engagement is planned on the wider Kinneil Estate Masterplan in relation to the wider Kinneil Estate.	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?	What were the results from the engagement? Please list...	
Focus Group	No	
Survey	Yes	A Strategic Property Review survey was undertaken December 2022 - January 2023. There were no comments made in relation to Kinneil Museum.
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	No	
Public Event	Yes	Strategic Property Review public events took place January 2023. Future engagement is planned in 2025 for the Kinneil Estate Masterplan.
Other: please specify		
Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No	
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	No	
Is further engagement recommended?	Yes	

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Disability	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Sex	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Ethnicity	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Sexual Orientation	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Transgender	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Poverty	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Care Experienced	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			No negative impacts identified.
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)				

Public Sector Equality Duty: Scottish Public Authorities must have ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance quality of opportunity and foster good relations. Scottish specific duties include:

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	The closure of Kinneil Museum is in line with other closure of other non-core buildings to deliver financial savings to the Council given the budget position. Discussions with national and local groups have been undertaken to help progress opportunities for Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model as a mitigation to closure.
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	The closure of Kinneil Museum is in line with other closure of other non-core buildings to deliver financial savings to the Council given the budget position. Discussions with national and local groups have been undertaken to help progress opportunities for Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model as a mitigation to closure.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	The closure of Kinneil Museum is in line with other closure of other non-core buildings to deliver financial savings to the Council given the budget position. Discussions with national and local groups have been undertaken to help progress opportunities for Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model as a mitigation to closure.

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	Yes	There may be a future commercial interest in the property.
Councils	No	
Education Sector	No	
Fire	No	
NHS	No	
Integration Joint Board	No	
Police	Yes	A vacant building does pose a vandalism risk however robust security measures are put in place for all closed properties.
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.		

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Closure of Kinneil Museum	Visitors	<p>Explore opportunities for Community Asset Transfer or Alternative Delivery Model.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are higher visitor numbers during the Summer period and the timeframe for development of the park masterplan, the Council, Cultural Services will keep the property open to support open days until 30 September 2025. This is an extension to the closure timeframe which commences 1st April 2025 for Phase 3 properties.</p> <p>Options will be explored for some form of museum collection within other assets in the local area.</p>	Jessica Paterson, Helen Rashad	31/03/2025	Supporting stronger and healthier communities. Supporting a thriving economy and green transition.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes
Kinneil Museum sits within the wider Kinneil Estate	Visitors, the local community	Kinneil Museum was deferred from phase 2 to phase 3 of the SPR to better align with the masterplan work. It was expected that at the time of the decision to close the facility, it would be subject to an ADM or CAT and form part of a new masterplan and strategy for the wider Kinneil park. The masterplan for the wider park and facilities will be progressed as a priority over the coming months and will be reported upon late summer / early Autumn 2025.	Mike Ewart	31/08/2025	Supporting stronger and healthier communities. Supporting a thriving economy and green transition.

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Are actions being reported to Members?	Yes
If yes when and how ?	The Kinneil Estate Masterplan will be reported to Executive around August 2025.

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	The closure has been approved by Council as part of the Strategic Property Review. However actions have been identified to look at other opportunities, this has included deferring the property from phase 2 to phase 3 and meetings to discuss the opportunity for Community Asset Transfer and Alternative Delivery Model. Improved Financial Performance of the property has been explored by Council officers but given the property costs, the backlog maintenance and ongoing investment needs, this option has been discounted and therefore a community led management approach for the museum is necessary to avoid closure.
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	<i>Charlotte Paterson</i>	Date:	06/01/2025
------------	---------------------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA: Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?		Yes
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	There is limited evidence available to assess the impact. As such, the assessment has to rely on use of best judgement.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	No	If YES, please describe: N/A

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA		
LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes / No	
MEDIUM	Yes / No	
LOW	Yes	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:			
Signature:	Malcolm Bennie	Date:	09/01/2025