

FORMAL CONSULTATION

Appendix 1

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	28.11.03	<p>- Michael Bennett Local Water Polo Club</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maysfield is a safe neutral venue for Children</li> <li>• Alternative neutral site has not as yet been earmarked</li> <li>• The Centre is in need of updating however had it been in a ghetto this wouldn't be a problem</li> <li>• Concerns about Council closing its only cross community leisure facility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A commitment is given in the EQIA report to siting the new leisure facility in a neutral site. Moreover consultation is currently underway to seek community views on this subject It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term, in the medium term the community of South Belfast, will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> <li>• It is planned that the new facility will enhance access to the level and choice of Leisure Service provision available to local people.</li> </ul>
	22.1.04	Marcus MacRuairi POBAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Belfast City Council is implementing the impact study, it should be remembered that the Northern Ireland Act was enacted in a wider context and that the Good Friday Agreement is a central aspect of this context. As an aspect of the context the British government signed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.</li> <li>• Therefore POBAL believes that Belfast City Council should erect signage in Irish in Leisure Centres in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belfast City Council is currently considering the points raised.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	28.1.2004	David Carr –Save Maysfield Action Committee	<p>areas, which would welcome this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the Equality Impact Study being implemented POBAL would like the current policy in respect of signage to be reconsidered.</li> <li>• Concerns raised about the consultation process conducted by the Council on the siting of the new Leisure Facilities</li> <li>• Concerns re staff from other centres inspecting the equipment in Maysfield and earmarking it for their centres</li> <li>• Concerns on lack of action taken on complaints made over two years.</li> <li>• Comments on the expenditure to implement the adaptations necessary to ensure Maysfield is compliant with DDA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These comments are noted. However this is a separate consultation exercise to the formal consultation process on the EQIA on the Strategic Review of Belfast City Council Leisure Facilities.</li> <li>• No action has been taken to pre-empt the final decision by Council.</li> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• We note your point on DDA but compliance with DDA will ensure the building is fit to serve the community for the next 26 years.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why South Belfast is being discriminated against by the closure of Maysfield when it will take five years to build a new centre</li>   <li>• Most Centre users do not believe that a new centre will be built</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term, in the medium term the community of South Belfast, will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li>   <li>• There is a commitment from the Council to provide a South Belfast Leisure Facility</li> <li>• Please see final report under Recommended Actions.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	20.1.04	Sam Wilson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking a reversal of the decision to close Maysfield</li> <li>• Asking that consideration be given to substantial investment to improve the facility</li> <li>• It seems that if you disadvantage every sector of the province you will not be affecting the EQIA</li> <li>• You can only mitigate against removing facilities that promote health, well being and cross community activity by direct replacement and there is nothing comparable with this capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision to close Maysfield was taken by Council on 01.04.03 pending the outcome of the EQIA. A major consultation exercise has been commissioned by the Council to establish the views of the community on possible sites for new Leisure Centres. Maysfield is being considered as one of the options. Your comments will be forwarded to the group consulting on site location.</li> <li>• This section of the EQIA report has been redrafted to more fully embrace the Council's duty to promote Equality of Opportunity between the Section 75 groups.</li> <li>• It is planned that the new range of facilities will enhance access to level and range of choice of Leisure provision available to local people.</li> </ul>
	04.02.04	NICVA	The Council's EQIA on Review of Indoor Leisure facilities provides good examples of pre-consultation, collection of quantitative and qualitative data from various sources and targeted consultation with certain representative groups which showed awareness that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is pleased to note NICVA's positive comments on the extensive consultation exercise that the Council has implemented in relation to the Strategic Review of Belfast City Council owned Indoor Leisure Facilities</li> </ul>

		<p>NICVA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• particular issues of sensitivity and confidentiality may arise in relation to disability and sexual orientation</li> <li>• Concerns about decision to close Maysfield before a suitable alternative site has been identified and ignores the views of the consultees including community groups, city centre employees user groups a school and range of parents.</li> </ul> <p>The statutory duty requires public authorities to assess whether different groups will be adversely affected and the fact that many groups will be adversely affected makes it more, not less necessary, to reconsider the policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has commissioned consultants to implement an independent consultation exercise into the decision of 1/4/2003, The Council has also consulted extensively on the decision of 1.4.2003 through the EQIA</li> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision</li> <li>• Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> </ul> <p>This section of the EQIA report has been redrafted to fully embrace the Council's duty to promote Equality of Opportunity between Section 75 Groups. See changes to Recommended Actions</p>
--	--	--------------	---	---

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moreover, the examination of mitigating and alternative measures has been misunderstood with only a vague reference to an alternative. Sometime in the future – ‘the provision of a new facility with a wider range of services in the South/East area of Belfast over the longer term will alleviate any short term loss or reduction in services.</li> <li>• NICVA would therefore argue that the closure of Maysfield will put the Council in breach of its duties under Section 75 of the NI Act and flies in the face of the Council’s Good Relations Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement facility will be constructed in South Belfast commencing in 2006. We are aware that mitigating and alternative measures are necessary and these will be implemented through a mitigation plan and monitored on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• The concerns raised in relation to the duty to promote Good Relations are noted.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	10.02.04	Tim Cunningham CAJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe that many of the issues raised in earlier letter remain unaddressed. We would therefore encourage you to revisit our earlier recommendations and if for the same reasons you are not able to take them on board we would appreciate learning why.</li> <li>• Our main concern, however at this time relates to the Belfast City Council's decision to close Maysfield Leisure Centre, pending the outcome of the final EQIA.</li> <li>• The EQIA acknowledges that Maysfield is a neutral venue used by all members of the community. Yet the document goes on to state – “Although the Maysfield element of the strategy would be unpopular it would also have a negative impact on all sections of the community (in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to letter of 7.7.03 and to minute of meeting with Tim Cunningham. We believe that all queries have been dealt with.</li> <li>• A decision was taken by the elected representatives on 1.4.03. The implementation of this decision is pending the outcome of the EQIA and an independent consultation exercise on the actual decision itself.</li> <li>• The comments are noted and this section of the EQIA report has been redrafted to more fully embrace the Council's duty to promote Equality of Opportunity between the 9 Section 75 groups.</li> <li>• It is noted that while the users maybe disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• terms of religion and political opinion) and therefore would not constitute any adverse differential impact. This approach is a total misrepresentation of the legislation which exists to promote equality on the grounds of religious belief and political opinion.</li>   <li>• The EQIA does not in any way comply with the statutory guidelines issued by the Equality Commission for the implementation of the Section75 duty</li>   <li>• Other critical steps in the EQIA have been ignored see in particular the duty of public authorities to examine mitigating and alternative measures</li> </ul>	<p>community of South Belfast will benefit from a modern leisure facility Moreover, in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield in existing facilities..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term, in the medium term, the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision.</li>   <li>• The Council has followed the guidelines and liaised with the Equality Commission on the implementation of the EQIA.</li>   <li>• We are aware that mitigating and alternative measures are necessary and these will be implemented through a mitigating plan and monitored on an ongoing basis.</li>   <li>• See response above to previous point</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than examining possible mitigating measures which might compensate for the closure of Maysfield facilities there is only a vague commitment to provide 'another facility with a wider range of services in South/East area of Belfast over the longer term.</li> <li>• Only when this happens will the consultees be able to make a determination of whether the strategy is appropriate from an Equality perspective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a commitment from the Council to provide a South Belfast Leisure provision commencing in 2006.</li> <li>• Furthermore consultation with those affected by any decision will be incorporated in the mitigation plan.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	10.02.04	Tim Cunningham CAJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAJ believes it is irrational for the Council to propose taking the policy decisions (i.e. to close Maysfield and presumably to demolish it) and only then develop mitigating measures in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> <li>• This is covered in the recommended action in the final report.</li> </ul>
	11.02.04	Francis Dowds NI Anti Poverty Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main concern re the Councils decision to close Maysfield Leisure Centre pending the outcome of the EQIA.</li> <li>• The policy is likely to have an adverse impact on good community relations given that Maysfield is a shared facility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns noted. The decision of 1.04.03 is part of an ongoing strategic review of indoor leisure.</li> <li>• The concerns raised in relation to the duty to promote Good Relations are noted and neutral site is recommended through this EQIA.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	11.02.04	Francis Dowds NI Anti Poverty Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="981 320 1453 448">• The EQIA does not in any way comply with the statutory guidelines issued by the Equality Commission.</li> <li data-bbox="981 560 1453 855">• Rather than examining possible mitigating measures which might compensate for the closure of Maysfield facilities there is only a vague commitment to 'provide another facility with a wide range of services in the South/East area of Belfast over the longer term.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1543 320 2033 520">• The Council has made considerable efforts to follow the guidelines and has liaised with the Equality Commission on the implementation of the EQIA and has amended the report.</li> <li data-bbox="1543 560 2033 687">• There is a commitment from the Council to provide a South Belfast Leisure facility, commencing by 2006.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	11.02.04	Mary Blair Park Road and District Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that there will be no Leisure Centre in South Belfast for at least 2 years and that if Maysfield is to be demolished where the new proposed facility will be.</li> <li>• The Committee believes Maysfield remains the ideal site for a Leisure Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council notes the concerns raised.</li> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision.</li> <li>• Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> <li>• This EQIA relates to a range of decisions on 1.04.03 that would ensure that a range of new leisure centres will be accessible to existing users within the community and to new users.</li> <li>• The Council notes the preferred siting is in Maysfield and this will be fed into the consultation on the siting of new leisure centre in the South of the City.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	13.02.04	UNISON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNISON does not see how the closure of Maysfield could possible proceed at this stage given. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gaps in basic data</li> <li>- The failure of the Council to seriously engage in a full EQIA across Section 75 categories</li> <li>- The failure of the Council to offer any mitigating or alternative options</li> <li>- The failure of the Council to develop a comprehensive Leisure Services strategy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Elected Representatives took a range of decisions on 01.04.03 as part of an ongoing Strategic Review of Council owned indoor leisure facilities.</li> <li>• Moreover all of the Council minutes pertaining to the Strategic Review of Belfast City Council owned indoor Leisure facilities are in the public domain.</li> <li>• Extensive consultation has been undertaken in relation to the EQIA and a separate exercise to establish the views of the community on possible sites for a new Leisure Centres. Maysfield is one of the site options. It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision. Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> </ul>

	19.01.04	Public Consultation Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to comment on the EQIA as no detail on the future siting of the facility in South Belfast is provided</li> <li>• Representatives from POBAL requested that the Council consider bilingualism in Leisure Centres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a commitment from the Council to provide a South Belfast Leisure facility commencing construction by 2006. Further public consultation will take place on the actual site for the Leisure Centre.</li> <li>• The results of this EQIA will be fed into consultations on location of centres</li> <li>• Comments are noted. They are however outside the strategic review of Leisure and will be dealt with as a corporate matter.</li> </ul>
	19.01.04	Public Consultation Meeting. Representative from Community Relations Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The flags and emblems surrounding some leisure centres are not welcoming to other traditions.</li> <li>• Issues were raised concerning ownership and access to Beechmount which it was stated were unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council applies a neutral and harmonious working environment policy. All properties are inspected and anything that is in breach of policy dealt with. The Council cannot however deal with areas that surround Leisure Centres. However the Council does acknowledge that future location for Centres should take account of the local environment.</li> <li>• The arrangements for public access will be set out in the agreement which will be subject to consultation with the user group.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	28.11.04	Public Consultation Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="981 355 1451 483">• North Belfast residents not consulted as part of the process on the location for the North Belfast Leisure Centre.</li>   <li data-bbox="981 762 1451 826">• Maysfield does not appear on the map on the website</li>   <li data-bbox="981 1106 1451 1201">• There was a request to extend the formal consultation process on the EQIA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1541 355 2033 515">• Normal Council practice for consultation of EQIA's is to circulate the Executive Summary to all consultees on the AA list publicised in the 3 main papers.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 531 2033 754">• The preliminary consultation was publicised through Council leisure and community centres, press launch, widespread media coverage. Further local consultation will take place before the final location is decided upon</li> <li data-bbox="1541 770 2033 1090">• This was noted. The location of Maysfield was omitted in error and corrected. The consultation process on the location of the new Centres was conducted. The preliminary consultation on the location of future Leisure Centres is outside the scope of the EQIA. Further consultation will take place before a decision is taken.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 1106 2033 1233">• The Council notified those who requested an extension that further two weeks would be granted for receipt of responses.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 1249 2033 1329">• Responses on the EQIA were received up to 27.02.04 were considered.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire badly designed.</li> <li>• Belfast is the only capital city in the UK without a 50metre pool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments relating to the Questionnaire design are noted and forwarded to the Head of Leisure Services.</li> <li>• Noted. The Council has noted that N.I. does not have a 50-metre pool This matter is under consideration by Council.</li> </ul>
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points 1.1 – 1.8 on the aim, objectives who defines policy and implements policy</li> <li>• 1.9 This is a high level decision but until other decisions are taken you cannot access full impact</li> <li>• That there are two strands to the EQIA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The physical facilities and their location</li> <li>(2) the range and diversity of activities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The points are noted and the report has been amended.</p> <p>It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision. Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts have been accessed in relation to the decision 1 April 2003</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	1.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="965 320 1464 384">• 1a.1b points relating to Grove and Loughside</li> <li data-bbox="965 459 1464 624">• 1.c The EQIA does not give full consideration to all Equality issues as the details of the decision of 1.4.03 are as yet to be agreed.</li> <li data-bbox="965 730 1464 895">• 2.The EQIA document does not give sufficient and clear information at this stage on the Strategic Review to determine particular adverse equality impact</li> <li data-bbox="965 1034 1464 1198">• 2.aThe impact assessment does not contain quantitative data of usage against activity by age/gender etc against each of the facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1532 320 2051 384">• 1.a 1.bThese matters are outside of the scope of this EQIA.</li> <li data-bbox="1532 459 2051 655">• This EQIA has identified the potential impacts of this decision. Moreover when detailed decisions are taken to implement the overall strategy these factors will be taken into account.</li> <li data-bbox="1532 730 2051 991">• 2.The Council considers that following the extensive consultation exercise on the Strategic Review of Belfast City Council Indoor Leisure Facilities, sufficient information was available to facilitate the assessment of impacts at a strategic level .</li> <li data-bbox="1532 1034 2051 1332">• 2.a .It is acknowledged in the EQIA report that while the Council does not currently hold data on the breakdown of users against the 9 Section75 categories monitoring systems are being developed. The points are noted and the report has been amended to clarify these points.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="981 491 1391 619">• 2.a The impact assessment document does not contain quantitative data on usage against each of the facilities</li> <li data-bbox="981 831 1406 890">• 2b Loss of outdoor pitches at Beechmount</li> <li data-bbox="981 938 1451 1098">• 2.c Loss of outdoor pitches if the facilities at Beechmount transfer and the apparent lack of outdoor facilities at Whiterock, Andersonstown and Falls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1541 320 2011 416">• The data available has been supplemented with an extensive consultation process.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 491 2047 788">• 2.a. The broad data captured on overall centre usage was considered. This information is available through the Council. The Council does not however currently capture information on centre users. New systems are being developed by the Council to address this shortfall</li> <li data-bbox="1541 831 2029 895">• Centre plans for Beechmount outdoor facilities will be upgraded.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 938 2024 1002">• This is a review of Council owned Indoor Leisure facilities</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1 Available data and research. The consultation document does not give clear and easily interpreted information to consultees on what the Strategic Review of Indoor Leisure sets out to do.</li> <li>• It is unclear whether subsequent policies and location of facilities arising from this review will be subject to EQIA process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1 Available data and research. This comment is not accepted given the detail provided on pages 16 – 17 of the report In an attempt to make the remit of this report explicitly clear we have amended the aims and objectives Section 3.2, 3.1.7.</li> <li>• The Council is fully aware of its obligations to screen/EQIA any new or amended policies.</li> </ul>
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4 – Comments in 3.3.41 – 3.3.35 The statement on absence of qualitative and quantitative data</li> <li>• 2.5 Information Gaps</li> <li>• 2.6 Not clear if Millward Brown Report was made available.</li> <li>• 2.8 The comment on a reliance on gathering further information as the strategy is implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4 – Comments in 3.3.41 – 3.3.35 Relates to actual consultation data provided by consultees. No further detail was provided.</li> <li>• 2.5 In order to access impacts the Council made considerable efforts to supplement quantitative data with qualitative data and a wide range of consultation/focus groups.</li> <li>• Relevant documentation is available in Council Minutes</li> <li>• 2.8 The comment is noted and Section 3.3.43 amended. To read “during the development of the</li> </ul>

			<p>(3.3.43) not as the strategy is developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2.9 See Belfast City Council response on 2.8</b></li> <li>• 3.2 Differences in conclusions reached using quantitative and qualitative methods.</li> <li>• 3.5 As above</li> </ul>	<p>operational actions ensuing from 1 April 2003 decisions pending the outcome of the EQIA. In addition an action plan is being developed to implement the strategy. Further consultation will take place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The broad strategic objective is to enhance the range and quality of provision across all groups including children. The Council will implement the mitigating plan during the time lapse between the closure of one facility and the opening of the new facility.</li> <li>• Comments noted and relevant section of reports amended.</li> <li>• <b>2.9 See above</b></li> <li>• 3.2 There is no difference reached in using qualitative and quantitative data.</li> <li>• <b>3.5 There is no difference reached in using qualitative and quantitative data</b></li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.6 –3.9 Comments on insufficient data on which to determine discrimination</li> <li>• 3.10 Insufficient data to determine potential for adverse impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3.6 – 3.9</b> This EQIA has identified the potential impacts of this decision. Moreover when detailed decisions are taken to implement the overall strategy these factors will be taken into account.</li> <li>• 3.10 See above response</li> </ul>
	1.3.02	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1 Comments on 7 step EQIA process</li> <li>• 4.3 It is impossible at this stage to determine the consequences for many of the groups concerned as the mitigating actions merely indicate further consultation with no discrete decisions being given</li> <li>• 4.5 What are the costs of implementing each option including the net social benefit</li> <li>• 4.6 Relevant international obligations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1 The 7 step process is adhered to and is quoted in the report</li> <li>• 4.3 Recommended actions in the report it is indicated that services will be enhanced in the New Strategy. See bullet point 3 Recommended Actions</li> <li>• 4.5 There is one overall decision. The options relating to location, for which budget provision has been included, are in the draft capital programme.</li> <li>• 4.6 There are no relevant international obligations.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.1 Information made available at public meetings</li>   <li>• 5.2 Have the Guiding Principles on consultation been adhered to</li>   <li>• 5.3 Comments on where consultees were consulted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.1 Background information on the decision of 1.4.2003 has been made available at the meetings.</li>   <li>• The guide has been adhered to</li>   <li>• The statement does not take cognisance of the meetings held in Grosvenor Hall, Beechmount, Maysfield and the offer to meet representative groups in their own premises</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	1.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.4 However the mitigating action at 4.2 (bullet no 1) suggests that not enough information was available as to the future range and level of leisure provision which has resulted in the awareness and need to ensure 'information...is made widely available on an ongoing basis as decisions are taken on the future range and level of provision'</li> <li>• 5.4 The format of the EQIA is somewhat confusing as it does not give a fuller and more factual account of the background and reasons submitted to the Council on which the Strategic Review is based.</li> <li>• 5.6The EQIA appears disjointed. A lack of information both quantitative and qualitative and sufficient background on decisions previously taken (prior to 1 April 2003) makes the EQIA less informative and suggests further questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.4 We note your concerns but do not consider them relevant in this instance</li> <li>• 5.4 We note your concerns and will endeavour to improve the format of the EQIA to reduce confusion</li> <li>• 5.6 This EQIA has been conducted on the April 1 2003.Council decision and will inform the Council's final decision.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.6 The lack of quantitative and qualitative information on specific leisure facilities especially those to be closed, transferred to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party or relocated etc is disappointing.</li> <li>• 6.1 Is it evident that all available information has been combined in a decision or decisions with respect to adopted or proposed policies, together with rationale for that decision?</li> <li>• 6.2 Does the decision making documentation indicate that the impact of alternative policies and mitigation was considered.</li> <li>• 6.3 No specific or clear explanation in these mitigating actions relate directly to the information contained within the EQIA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted - However facility and usage data was considered in undertaking the EQIA.</li> <li>• 6.1The EQIA explains the process of this EQIA and previous decisions in relation to the Strategic Review of Leisure. Amendments have been made to assist the reader to follow the process.</li> <li>• 6.2 This EQIA identifies the issues which would affect Section 75 groupings. A mitigating action plan will be developed.</li> <li>• 6.3 See response above at 6.2</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.3 No Reference is made to NTSN or Promoting Social Inclusion in the documents although classes for Travellers at Beechmount were identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.3 The Council does bear in mind when taking all decisions other initiatives such as NTSN and Promoting Social Inclusion These may be evidenced in this case by reference to 3.3 and 4.2 bullet point 5</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.3 No context within which the policy operates is given and existing data is scarce (other than Millward Brown)</li> <li>• 7.3 No summary of the screening document was provided</li>   <li>• 7.4 Statement on limited data on each leisure centre</li>   <li>• 7.5. The correlation of key findings</li>   <li>• 7.6(a) Not enough specific information to gauge how each option furthers or hinders equality opportunity. Further decisions on the Indoor Leisure Strategy will need to be considered as these are developed. Keeping consultees informed of the decision (p30 4.2 Bullet point 1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.3. Pages 10-17 in the EQIA report provide the context in which the decision of 1.4.2003 sits.</li> <li>• The Council Minutes are available through the Council</li> <li>• 7.3 Noted. A screening statement has been included in the appendix of the final EQIA document.</li>   <li>• 7.4 The Council is in the process of establishing a system of monitoring based on Section 75 categories.</li> <li>• <b>7.5 This EQIA is on the overall impact of the decision as a whole and no separate impact assessments on individual facilities.</b></li>   <li>• Any ensuing decisions taken by Council will be assessed through consultation techniques and mitigating plan will be implemented.</li> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision.</li>   <li>• Moreover in the short term every</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.6c There are and will be in future decision by BCC on this Strategic Review consequences for all S75 categories and the groups within these. For instance multiple identity issues (i.e. disabled children who use Maysfield's Summer Scheme) have not been dealt with.</li> </ul>	<p>effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above response (7.6(a))</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission		

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="981 352 1435 451">• 7.6 (d) How will the relevant group be advised of the new or changed policy or service?</li>   <li data-bbox="981 627 1464 991">• 7.6(e) While there is (presumably) a large body of quantitative data regarding costs-running costs, salary and wages, maintenance costs, refurbishment cost associated with each leisure facility as well as income and participation data against each facility – this information is not included in the EQIA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1541 352 2040 584">• 7.6 (d) Details of the final EQIA report will be placed in local press, circulated to interested parties, AA consultees and on the Councils website. The relevant section on publication is included in final report</li>   <li data-bbox="1541 627 2024 719">• 7.6. (e) Data in relation to operation of Leisure Centres was conducted.</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="981 320 1467 448">• 8.1 Is there an unambiguous undertaking to monitor the impact of policy and publish the results on annual basis?</li> <li data-bbox="981 560 1467 687">• 8.2 Does the monitoring information identify opportunities for greater equality of opportunity to be promoted?</li> <li data-bbox="981 735 1467 831">• 8.3 No indicators or targets other than dates for potential rebuild and transfer (see Table 3 – P18)</li> <li data-bbox="981 999 1467 1094">• 8.4 In what format will monitoring information be published? <b>Not mentioned</b></li> <li data-bbox="981 1110 1467 1262">• 8.5 What is to be monitored and who has overall responsibility for ongoing monitoring? <b>Not mentioned further to entering into ongoing consultation</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1541 320 2051 520">• 8.1 Monitoring will be developed in accordance with the guidance issued by the Equality Commission – comprehensive monitoring systems are currently being developed.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 560 1783 584">• 8.2 See above</li> <li data-bbox="1541 727 2051 959">• 8.3 Due to the nature of the 1 April 2003 decision targets and indicators will be developed through ongoing consultation with the appropriate representative group and the Equality Commission.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 999 1957 1094">• 8.4 Points noted. Monitoring statement in final report subsequently amended.</li> <li data-bbox="1541 1142 1783 1166">• 8.5 See above</li> </ul>

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
	01.03.04	Equality Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.6 Will arrangements need to be put into place for others to collect monitoring and evaluation information (for example where the public authority is not responsible for the implementation of the policy?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.6 See above.</li> </ul>
	26.02.04	Youth Focus Group Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will be the implications of the restricted use of Beechmount.</li> <li>• How much will it cost to rebuild Maysfield</li> <li>• The nearest Leisure Centre to Maysfield is Avoniel and it is not perceived to be accessible to all young people.</li> <li>• Group preferred Maysfield as a site due to transport issues (time accessibility and cost). Any other consideration of site should take public transport and neutrality into consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contractual arrangements have yet to be developed and will be consulted upon</li> <li>• Provision has been made in the draft capital programme for the 3 new replacement leisure centres</li> <li>• Comment noted. The Council acknowledges Maysfield is perceived to be a neutral site. The nature of Belfast is such that perceived accessibility is an issue in many parts of the city.</li> <li>• Maysfield is one of the options being considered and will be fed through to the consultation on sites.</li> </ul>

--	--	--	--	--

Ref	Date	Organisation/Individual	Comments	Our Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time delay in opening the new site in South Belfast will be disadvantage young people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note this issue and will endeavour to accommodate all people during the time delay between the closure of Maysfield and the re-opening of the South Belfast site.</li> <li>• It is noted that while the users may be disadvantaged in the short term in the medium term the community of South Belfast will benefit in terms of a modern leisure provision</li> <li>• Moreover in the short term every effort will be made to accommodate the users of Maysfield within existing facilities.</li> </ul>