

Appendix F

Sheffield City Council

Equality Impact Assessment



Name of policy/project/decision: Libraries Review

Name of person(s) writing EIA; Dawn Shaw

Date: 07/02/2014

Service: Libraries

Portfolio Communities

What are the brief aims of the policy/project/decision?

The overall aim of the Libraries Review is to provide a comprehensive & efficient Library Service within the dedicated budget. The proposal for consultation is to retain 11 hub libraries – determined by a priority tool linked to the overall needs assessment; to provide limited resources for up to 5 ‘co-delivered’ libraries; to provide support for independent libraries.

This process may take until June 2014 to be completed so at this stage this EIA is a ‘live’ document focussing on proposed changes. Some impacts may subsequently be addressed in part or in whole by the determination of community-led and independent libraries.

A major consultation has been undertaken on these proposals and the outcomes are highlighted in this assessment and in the Cabinet Report. This includes an assessment of the impacts of the wider proposals in the main report including, for example, the Mobile Library service, and the Home Library Service. All individual Libraries not proposed as hubs have individual Equality Impact Assessments.

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
Age	<p>The age profile of Registered Library Users (RLUs) shows that the largest proportion comes from the 18-65 age groups with 47%. Under 18’s make up 40% of and those 65+ 13%. There is a wide variation in the age profiles of registered library users in individual community libraries. The number of under 18s and people 65+ living in the community has been included as a demographic indicator in determining need/priorities for Community Libraries</p> <p>Under 18’s - there is no discernible pattern in the proportions of children in the population registered as Library users across the city. The Community Library with the largest proportion is Park with 59% of its RLUs under 18 with the lowest proportion at 35% in Crystal Peaks and Totley. The best performing areas are dispersed around the city and may in part reflect the success of the promotion of the Bookstart programme. The numbers are generally lower in the South East of the City.</p> <p>65+ - The highest proportion of 65+ RLUs is 25% in Totley and the lowest is 4% in Burngreave.</p> <p>The needs of older people (over 65) were also taken into account in the priority tool as increasingly there are more older people in the population. Social isolation is an issue for many older people, particularly those who have lost a partner (by 2025 it is estimated that there will be a 23% increase in people aged over 75 living alone). Low</p>

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
	<p>income is an issue for many pensioners, and 28% of people aged over 60, living in Sheffield households, claiming benefits relating to low income.</p> <p>2012 Consultation The largest proportion of RLU's who responded were aged 65+ at around 3%. For those under 25 the proportion was very low at 0.2%. This indicates the consultation exercise was least successful with younger RLUs and most successful with older RLUs. Whilst all age groups wished to protect the range of services and materials most, and the Council running services least, there were some distinctive variations in between.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 16s wished to protect Opening Hours; Library staff; Number of Libraries (in that order) • Over 80s wished to protect Opening Hours; Number of Libraries; Library staff <p>2013/14 Consultation</p> <p>In general, older people did not offer statistically different opinions to people aged under 65. However, some of the free text comments received offered some insight into factors that might be important for older people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on local libraries as a source of social contact to relieve isolation. • Difficulty travelling and carrying books. • Concerned about cost of transport if bus passes are withdrawn at some stage. • The closure of the mobile library service was a particular concern. • Travelling longer distances in bad weather and negotiating the hills <p>Children – The needs of children and young people were taken into account as students who are exposed to reading from a young age are more likely to do well in their education. Sheffield has a higher number than the national average of 16-18 year olds not in education, employment or training.</p> <p>The consultation work undertaken with children 5-11 years gathered the views of 152 children. 28% of these were non-library users. In the work undertaken by Sheffield Futures with 164 11-19 year olds views, 49% were non-library users. Some of the key concerns expressed by children and young people were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library hours as they are at the moment are inconvenient for children and are a reason why some of the children don't use libraries • Central library – want it to close in mornings instead of afternoons and evenings as they can only go later in day after school • Hubs proposals – Those whose local library isn't becoming a hub had concerns about distance to travel and the cost and safety implications of travelling on their own. This mirrors concerns expressed by adults in the survey. • Community-led – concerns about volunteers with no professional librarians on site • Scepticism about whether volunteers in the number needed could be recruited for non-profit making activity. • In favour of expanding the home library service • Against the closure of mobile library service
Disability	<p>Monitoring of Library Users asks whether individuals consider themselves disabled. The current overall figure for this declaration is 1.4% in Community Libraries. The highest proportion of RLUs declaring themselves disabled is in Woodhouse at 3% and the lowest is in Broomhill at 0.6%. The estimated number of disabled people (using figures for Adults and Children in receipt of Social Care) has been included as a demographic indicator in determining need/priorities for Community Libraries.</p>

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
	<p>The needs of disabled people were taken into account in the priority tool as the location of library services may be more acute for some members of this group of people, who may be less able to travel to other libraries.</p> <p>2012 Consultation The proportion of respondents reporting a disability was 10%. This compares very favourably with the 1.5% of RLUs reporting disabilities. There was no variation from the overall priorities for protection from disabled respondents.</p> <p>2013/14 Consultation 14% of respondents identified themselves disabled. Disabled people were significantly less positive about all the proposals than non - disabled people. Some comments from free text boxes that might shed some insight into the reasons why include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value relationship with current librarians which they fear will be lost if they have to attend another library e.g. making adjustments and offering support where required e.g. with accessing appropriate materials – audio books and Braille. • Concerns about less staff being available to support disabled people. • More difficult to travel to alternative libraries in general and a greater impact on disabled people of this • Some alternative libraries reported as being particularly inaccessible for disabled people e.g. Hillsborough, Woodseats, Central and Ecclesall. Parking, distance to walk and toilet facilities were registered as factors in this. • Uppertorpe was particularly valued for its ease of access. • The cumulative impact of the proposed cuts in library services and other changes e.g. benefit changes. • The closure of the mobile library service was a particular concern. <p>Accessibility to Hubs Anecdotal comments have suggested that some disabled Library Users with access issues travel to for example to Uppertorpe Library because of the better ramped access, toilets and parking than such libraries as Broomhill, Walkley and Hillsborough. This is not evidence based but does highlight a key issue for residual hub libraries in that they really must be prioritised for removing barriers (both physical and non-physical) that disabled people might face when trying to access the service. (This would also provide an antithesis to the representations that wider library users would not travel to neighbouring libraries). Likewise individuals have identified the benefits of a person centred approach where library staff have developed and applied an understanding of the individual needs of disabled library users to better facilitate their use of specific libraries.</p> <p>Mobile Library In the consultation exercise 33% of mobile library users identified themselves as disabled - despite the obvious and severe accessibility issues of the Mobile Library buses. This suggests that the Mobile Library service has certain distinct benefits for disabled people who don't have mobility issues.</p>
Pregnancy/ maternity	<p>There are no impacts anticipated for this category and there is no monitoring of diversity of RLUs in this area. 2013/14 consultation did not identify any specific issues from this group.</p>
Race	<p>Analysis of RLUs shows that 21% are from BME backgrounds compared to an estimate 19% BME people in the wider population. The BME Community should not, however, be seen as a single homogenous group. The 3 groups that are most significantly better</p>

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
	<p>represented within RLUs are the Black African, Pakistani and Other White groups. The number of BME people has been included as a demographic indicator in determining need/priorities for Community Libraries. The proportion of RLUs from BME Communities in individual Community Libraries varies substantially from 72% in Burngreave to 2.3% in Frecheville - in part reflecting the make-up of the communities using the Community Libraries.</p> <p>The needs assessment has taken into account people from minority ethnic backgrounds. Unlike the general population (from a white British background), many people from black and minority ethnic communities live in households concentrated in specific areas of the city. This means the location of a library service could have a bigger impact on this group.</p> <p>2012 Consultation – 9% of the respondents identified themselves as BME – half of what would have been expected. The views expressed were consistent with the overall survey results in terms of priorities. Refugees and Asylum seekers highlighted their need for books which will help them learn English.</p> <p>2013/14 Consultation 12.5% of respondents identified themselves as BME. People from BME communities were significantly less positive about the proposals overall than non BME communities. This did vary from question to question though. Some factors identified in the free text boxes and in visits to BME groups which might indicate a difference in reliance or use of libraries include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidence in their local area but concerns about using libraries outside of their community e.g. personal safety. • Expressed concern about loss of language support if their local library closes. • The libraries they use now have resources in community languages e.g. Urdu and Bengali and concern that alternative libraries may not have these. • Familiarity with staff and strong relationships with staff are something people value, perhaps because of the support that’s been available. • People who’ve arrived relatively recently have less awareness of the geography of the city and therefore will find it hard to navigate to alternative libraries outside of their communities. • Some BME people use libraries as a way to engage with people in their local community and are concerned that if their local library closes it will have a more significant impact on BME people
Religion/belief	<p>There are no impacts anticipated for this category and there is no monitoring of diversity of RLUs in this area of diversity. 2013/14 consultation did not identify any specific issues from this group.</p>
Sex	<p>More women than men are registered as Library Users 57% – 43%. There is very little distinction in the gender of RLUs up to the age of 16 – but between the ages of 16 and 69 there are around 50% more women RLUs than men. A 60% - 40% split was also evident in the 2009 PLUS survey responses. This might reflect the variations in working and caring patterns between the genders.</p> <p>2012 Consultation The split between women and men respondents was exactly 2/3 – 1/3. This balance is quite disproportionate to the population where it is nearly 50/50 but more reflective of Library Users. There was very little difference in opinions on gender lines for the key question around options for cuts with the biggest variation being greater preference amongst women to retain the number of libraries.</p>

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
	<p>2013/14 Consultation 66% of respondents identified themselves as women and 34% as men but there were few differences in answers to the key questions.</p>
Sexual orientation	<p>There are no impacts anticipated for this category and there is no monitoring of diversity of RLUs in this area of diversity 2013/14 consultation did not identify any specific issues from this group. We will ensure that Hub Libraries have staff that are trained in diversity awareness issues so they can develop and apply an understanding of the individual needs of LGB library users – a person centred approach - to better facilitate their use of specific libraries.</p>
Transgender	<p>There are no impacts anticipated for this category and there is no monitoring of diversity of RLUs in this area of diversity 2013/14 consultation did not identify any specific issues from this group. We will ensure that Hub Libraries have staff that are trained in diversity awareness issues so they can develop and apply an understanding of the individual needs of Transgender library users – a person centred approach - to better facilitate their use of specific libraries.</p>
Financial inclusion, poverty, social justice, cohesion or carers	<p>Poverty – The Index of Multiple Deprivation has been included as a demographic indicator in determining need/priorities for Hub & Community Led Libraries. There are 29 neighbourhoods in the city that are within the most 20% deprived within England, in total accounting for 28% of the city’s population. The location of library services is acute for this group of people, as the cost of travelling to another library could be a barrier to accessing the service. The availability of free books and internet access is of greater importance when income levels are low. In considering how a comprehensive geographical spread of Libraries might be achieved, consideration has included the accessibility by frequent public transport routes. Carers were identified as part of the 2012 consultation but expressed views consistent with the overall survey findings.</p> <p>2013/14 Consultation Job seekers - Overall job seekers are less positive about the proposals than non- job seekers. The responses clearly show that a significantly greater proportion of Job Seekers use the library for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessing computers • Borrowing CDs/DVDs • Printing and photocopying • Job searching and /or volunteering opportunities • Reading books/newspapers in the library • Education and learning • Meeting people • Advice and guidance • Job seekers were significantly more likely than non-job seekers to use Central library or the next nearest library should their usual library close. However, they were not significantly more likely to lose access to library services altogether, nor were they significantly more concerned about travel to another library. • The closure of the mobile library service was a particular concern.
Voluntary,	VCF Sector organisations have been invited to express an interest in running libraries

Areas of possible impact	Explanation and evidence
community & faith sector	<p>and will be invited to participate in the process to facilitate the running of the 'community led' libraries. Positive impacts include the potential for enhancing community engagement, gaining access to external funding, and helping tailor activities more closely to community need.</p> <p>The proposal includes a volunteer programme with training and support.</p> <p>Some Community Groups will be affected in the context of their use of Library buildings for meetings and events in those areas where 'Hub' Libraries are not provided. Engagement with Community Groups as part of the proposed consultation will seek to establish whether there are specific impacts.</p>
Other/additional:	<p>The needs analysis referenced in the report provides insight and evidence of the need for library services in the city. From this and the consultation undertaken in 2012 we can ascertain that people use libraries for the following key reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Free access to books and other materials, particularly for people who are frequent and heavy readers, and people on low and restricted incomes. - Social spaces – for book groups, coffee mornings, children's activities, general relaxing space to meet. Particularly important for isolated older people. - Children's activities not only provide development and socialisation opportunities for Children, but also provide support to parents and guardians by enabling them to make new friendships and share the challenges of parenting. - Access to knowledge, particularly for young people, especially where there is access to school and college curriculum information, and quiet space to study. - Access to free computers and internet. It is estimated that 45,980 households in Sheffield do not have a computer at home with internet access. Many services are now only available online, such as Universal Credit; therefore free access to the internet is essential for many people. - Access to reliable information, research and reference material including local history for leisure and educational purposes <p>The needs assessment has also taken into account literacy needs, as access to books, knowledge and learning in a safe and welcoming environment, can help people with low literacy needs improve their skills.</p> <p>Consultation will seek to establish whether there are specific impacts.</p>

Overall summary of possible impact

- The Cabinet report outlines how features of the proposal will contribute to the Library Archives and Information Service Strategy and meeting the needs identified
- There is no doubt that any closures of Libraries would have a negative impact on protected groups both in local communities and the city as a whole.
- The process of the needs assessment has taken into account the demographic needs of the key protected groups and has included this in the process of prioritisation.
- A key mitigation against potential negative impacts will be the provision of packages of support for 'community co-delivered' libraries and a package of support and funding to enable independent

libraries to become viable and sustainable. The additional funding which has been identified should provide a basis to avoid closures and thereby avoid the most negative equality impacts.

- The attached Action Plan below highlights a number of specific actions to mitigate potential negative impacts. Some of these can be mitigated in part by policy developments such as Housing+ which will include providing local community-based approaches to delivering services; work to address the digital inclusion agenda as part of the Councils emerging digital strategy; ensuring the inclusiveness of services supported by staff; and greater utilisation of the Schools Library Service.
- The consultation has identified stronger resistance to the proposals from protected group but in particular from Disabled Library Users
- We have examined key indicators to determine whether we feel there are likely to be significant equality impacts should an individual 'non-hub' library face closure and we have identified the following locations/characteristics;
 - o Park Library – Young People
 - o Burngreave Library – BME People
 - o Tinsley Library – BME people
 - o Uppertorpe Library – Disabled People
 - o Totley Library – Older People.
- Individual actions have been identified and will need to be incorporated into negotiations with communities to ensure the residual services are responsive to the equality needs of local residents

Approved (Lead Manager): Dawn Shaw **Date:** 23/01/2014

Approved (EIA Lead): Michael Bowles **Date:** 07/02/2014

Action Plan	
Areas of impact	Actions
Age	<p>Development of the Home Library Service The development and promotion of the Home Library Service received the highest levels of approval in the consultation exercise and will be a critical tool to address the needs of the least mobile of Older People. We will explore the possibility of closer working alongside voluntary sector groups and lunch clubs to facilitate greater access to the Home Library Service or to develop alternative approaches.</p> <p>Housing+ This will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services and building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants</p> <p>In considering the options for more efficient and fit-for-purpose accommodation to meet the needs of the Housing+ model, co-location options are currently being considered in liaison with the Libraries Review.</p> <p>School Library Services The School Library Service is a traded service which schools choose whether to buy. The current buy in of schools at all levels across the city is 71%. This is an important element of the overall provision for school children which, given the focus on Community Libraries, may have been partly overlooked in this consultation. The School Library Service works closely with schools and may be able to provide some mitigation should any of the Libraries have to close.</p> <p>Library Opening Hours Consideration should be given to protecting/expanding the opening hours of Hub Libraries to facilitate greater use by children outside of school library hours.</p> <p>Under the proposal, there will be a continuing commitment to activities in hub and community run libraries such as baby and story-time ; children’s books and children library space; homework zones & after school clubs; and educational activities.</p> <p>Provision of reader development activities e.g. adult literacy schemes, reading groups, and community outreach will enable the improvement of literacy and skills for people of all ages.</p>
Disability	<p>Development of the Home Library Service The development and promotion of the Home Library Service received the highest levels of approval in the consultation exercise and will be a critical tool to address the needs of the least mobile of Disabled People. We will explore the possibility of closer working alongside voluntary sector groups to facilitate greater access to the Home Library Service or to develop alternative approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing+ This will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services and including building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants

Action Plan	
Areas of impact	Actions
	<p>In considering the options for more efficient and fit-for-purpose accommodation to meet the needs of the Housing+ model, co-location options are currently being considered in liaison with the Libraries Review.</p> <p>Accessibility to Hubs Hub libraries will be considered as potential priorities for improvements to facilitate removing barriers (both physical and non-physical) that disabled people might face when trying to access the service including such issues as access, parking and toilets. We will ensure that Hub Libraries have staff that are trained in diversity awareness issues so they can develop and apply an understanding of the individual needs of disabled library users – a person centred approach - to better facilitate their use of specific libraries.</p> <p>Digital Inclusion Library Users with sensory impairments may be more likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p>
Race	<p>The dispersal of the BME population means that impacts cannot all be mitigated on a city-wide basis but need to be focussed locally as detailed below however we will ensure that Hub Libraries have staff that are trained in diversity awareness issues so they can develop and apply an understanding of the individual needs of BME library users – a person centred approach - to better facilitate their use of specific libraries. We will also ensure that Hub libraries will have accessible stocks of appropriate minority language materials.</p> <p>Digital Inclusion There is some evidence to suggest that Library Users in areas with high BME populations are increasingly likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p>
Financial inclusion, poverty, social justice, cohesion or carers	<p>Job Seekers Overall job seekers are less positive about the proposals than non-job seekers. The responses clearly show that a significantly greater proportion of Job Seekers use the library for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accessing computers ● Borrowing CDs/DVDs ● Printing and photocopying ● Job searching and /or volunteering opportunities ● Reading books/newspapers in the library ● Education and learning

Action Plan	
Areas of impact	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting people • Advice and guidance <p>Job seekers were significantly more likely than non-job seekers to use the Central Library or the next nearest library should their usual library close. However, they were not significantly more likely to lose access to library services altogether, nor were they significantly more concerned about travel to another library.</p> <p>Features of the proposal includes running job search sessions, free access to computers and the internet via the People’s Network, smart meters for loan, and community outreach by Community Development Librarians.</p> <p>Housing+ This will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services including building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants</p> <p>In considering the options for more efficient and fit-for-purpose accommodation to meet the needs of the Housing+ model, co-location options are currently being considered in liaison with the Libraries Review.</p> <p>Digital Inclusion There is some evidence to suggest that Job Seekers are increasingly likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to digitally access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p> <p>The location of static libraries, hubs, community co-delivered and independent libraries will be promoted, including the services they offer. This includes activities and opportunity to meet people</p>
Voluntary, community & faith sector	The investment in Community-led libraries provides a new opportunity for building social capital in the areas affected. The proposal includes a volunteer co-ordinator and training programme to build capacity and ensure compliance with legislation and equalities duties.
	Individual Libraries
Park – Young People	<p>Issues in Park have actually increased by 7% (-22% average) and PN sessions have fallen by 8% (+18% average) – at odds with city wide trends. Visits have retained the same level whilst the city wide average shows a 12% reduction</p> <p>Mitigation Park has been identified as a Community-led library so the needs of children can be negotiated with the community as part of the new arrangements.</p> <p>Housing+ Specific parts of Park will be covered by Housing+ and this will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services and including</p>

Action Plan	
Areas of impact	Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants <p>Schools Library Service is working with schools in the area to ensure high quality provision within and alongside the schools.</p>
<p>Upperthorpe – Disabled People</p>	<p>Housing+ Specific parts of Upperthorpe will be covered by Housing+ and this will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants <p>Digital Inclusion Library Users with sensory impairments may be more likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p>
<p>Burngreave – BME People</p>	<p>Issues have fallen 35% (22% average) between 2010 and 2012 from 26K to 17K whilst for the same period PN sessions have increased 19% (18% average) from 7K to 8K. This shows the overall trend of usage. Overall visits are down by the city wide average (-12%)</p> <p>Mitigation Burngreave has been identified as a Community-led library so the needs of BME people should be a key priority in the discussions with the community about the new arrangements.</p> <p>Housing+ Specific parts of Burngreave will be covered by Housing+ and this will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants <p>Digital Inclusion There is some evidence to suggest that Library Users in areas with high BME populations are increasingly likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p>
<p>Tinsley – BME People</p>	<p>Issues are down by 32% and PN sessions up by 22%</p> <p>Mitigation Tinsley will remain open until April 2016 so this will give time for an options appraisal on what elements might be re-provided locally</p> <p>Digital Inclusion There is some evidence to suggest that Library Users in areas with high BME populations are increasingly likely to utilise digital access to the Library Service which will continue to be developed. This will include the 24 hour reservation/renewal, access to reference and information services, and e-audio books. The Council is developing a digital strategy that will include addressing digital inclusion as an important element of ensuring communities are able to access services and benefits e.g. Universal Credit.</p>

Action Plan	
Areas of impact	Actions
<p>Totley – Older People</p>	<p>Totley shows an average 23% reduction in issues but has only maintained the same level of PN usage</p> <p>Promotion of the Home Library Service The development and promotion of the Home Library Service received the highest levels of approval in the consultation exercise and will be a critical tool to address the needs of the least mobile of Older People. We will explore the possibility of closer working alongside voluntary sector groups to facilitate greater access to the Home Library Service or to develop alternative approaches.</p> <p>Housing+ Specific parts of Totley will be covered by Housing+ and this will provide local community-based approaches to delivering services including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building community resilience by encouraging more ‘grassroots’ involvement of tenants <p>South West Local Area Partnership are about to embark on some work around tackling social isolation of older people and digital inclusion</p>

Individual Library Analysis

Equality Impacts – Individual Libraries vulnerable to closure

We have examined 3 key indicators to determine whether we feel there are likely to be significant equality impacts should an individual library face closure;

- The proportion of the total library users registered at the library that is in the specific group,
- The proportion of the local population in that group that is registered with the local library,
- The demographic needs ranking for that specific group

The full table of data/evidence is attached but the key areas of significant impact we have identified are as follows;

- Park Library – Young People
- Burngreave Library – BME People
- Tinsley Library – BME people
- Uppertorpe Library – Disabled People
- Totley Library – Older People

Non 'Hub' Library	Areas of Impact	Evidence	Impact
Frecheville	Young People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 47% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 43% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Slightly higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 16% (13%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 20% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 2.3% (1.4%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 31% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 2% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 14% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Walkley	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 37% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 94% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 10% (13%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 30% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.7% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 14% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts

	BME People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 12% (20%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 38% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Jordanthorpe	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 38% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 72% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Average proportion of RLUs are older people – 16% (13%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 38% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 1.8% (1.4%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 29% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 10% (20%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 42% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Park	Young People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 59% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 63% (50%)	Some Significant Impact
	Older People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 9% (13%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 21% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.8% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 7% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 27% (20%) Average proportion of population as RLUs - 24% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Gleadless	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 43% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 94% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 20% (13%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 38% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Average proportion of RLUs are disabled	No disproportionate

	BME People	<p>people – 1.6% (1.4%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 43% (21%)</p> <p>Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 3% (20%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 38% (25%)</p>	<p>impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p>
Ecclesfield	Young People	<p>Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 41% (40%) Average proportion of population as RLUs - 48% (50%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	<p>Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 20% (13%) Slightly higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 25% (22%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	<p>Slightly higher than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 1.8% (1.4%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 20% (21%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	<p>Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 3% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 21% (25%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
Uppertorpe	Young People	<p>Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 37% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 42% (50%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	<p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 9% (13%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 29% (22%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	<p>Higher than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 2.9% (1.4%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 40% (21%)</p>	Some Significant Impact
	BME People	<p>Much higher than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 43% (20%) Average proportion of population as RLUs - 24% (25%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
Southey	Young People	<p>Higher than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 48% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 38% (50%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	<p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 8% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 11% (22%)</p>	No disproportionate impacts

	Disabled People	Average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 1.4% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 14% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 13% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 19% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Stannington	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 41% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 40% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 19% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 15% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 2.2% (1.4%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 20% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 4% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 17% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Burngreave	Young People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 43% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 35% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 4% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 9% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.7% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 7% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 72% (20%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 44% (25%)	Some Significant Impact
Greenhill	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 38% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 37% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 19% (13%)	No disproportionate impacts

	<p>Disabled People</p> <p>BME People</p>	<p>Average proportion of population as RLUs – 21% (22%)</p> <p>Average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 1.2% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 14% (21%)</p> <p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 7% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 19% (25%)</p>	<p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p>
Newfield Green	<p>Young People</p> <p>Older People</p> <p>Disabled People</p> <p>BME People</p>	<p>Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 39% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 19% (50%)</p> <p>Average proportion of RLUs are older people – 13% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 10% (22%)</p> <p>Average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 1.6% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 13% (21%)</p> <p>Average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 20% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 12% (25%)</p>	<p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p>
Tinsley	<p>Young People</p> <p>Older People</p> <p>Disabled People</p> <p>BME People</p>	<p>Higher than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 47% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 69% (50%)</p> <p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 4% (13%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 22% (22%)</p> <p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.7% (1.4%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 38% (21%)</p> <p>Higher than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 68% (20%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 51% (25%)</p>	<p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>No disproportionate impacts</p> <p>Some Significant Impact</p>
Totley	<p>Young People</p>	<p>Lower than average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 35% (40%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs - 55% (50%)</p>	<p>No disproportionate impacts</p>

	Older People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 25% (13%) Higher than average proportion of population as RLUs – 33% (22%)	Some Significant Impact
	Disabled People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.8% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 16% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 4% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 19% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Broomhill	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 37% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 25% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Average proportion of RLUs are older people – 13% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 15% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Lowest proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 0.6% (1.4%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 8% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 16% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 15% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts
Woodhouse	Young People	Average proportion of RLUs are younger people – 37% (40%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 24% (50%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Older People	Higher than average proportion of RLUs are older people – 18% (13%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs – 13% (22%)	No disproportionate impacts
	Disabled People	Highest proportion of RLUs are disabled people – 3.0% (1.4%) Average proportion of population as RLUs – 18% (21%)	No disproportionate impacts
	BME People	Much lower than average proportion of RLUs are BME people – 7% (20%) Lower than average proportion of population as RLUs - 13% (25%)	No disproportionate impacts