

# Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Forward Planning and Implementation</b>
<b>Lead person: Nasreen Yunis</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 2478133</b>

**1. Title:**  
Site Allocations Plan Revised Publication Consultation for Outer North East (ONE)

Is this a:

**Strategy / Policy**
                         
  **Service / Function**
                         
  **Other**

**If other, please specify**

**2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening**

This Equality Impact Assessment Screening (EIA) is for the next stage of the Site Allocations Plan (SAP), previous EIA screenings have been undertaken at key appropriate stages and this EIA is consistent with previous ones. The Site Allocations Plan is one of a series of Development Plan Documents (DPD) being prepared by the City Council, as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). The scope and purpose of the Site Allocations Plan is to set out the detailed location of new housing, retail, employment, and protected greenspace for the whole of the District to include the Aire Valley Area Action Plan and the associated site specific policies over the plan period to 2028. The Site Allocations Plan needs to be in conformity with the Core Strategy. It directly builds on the parameters for growth, including the broad distribution across the District as set out in the Core Strategy (adopted on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2014), and its key focus is to deliver on the Core Strategy’s principles of sustainable development.

The Core Strategy sets out planning policies for the District and has undertaken Equality Impact Assessment Screenings at appropriate stages, to ensure as far as is possible, any negative consequences for a particular group or sector within the community are minimised or counter balanced by other measures. Within this context, the Site Allocations Plan helps to outline in detail the broad approach of the Core Strategy. It is not appropriate to screen the overall impact of the allocations district wide or the quantum of allocations in each housing market characteristic area, however it is important to ensure that equality has been an integral part of the process. In addition, planning applications for development on specific sites will need to demonstrate how proposals meet the objectives and policies of the Core Strategy. The Site Allocations screening therefore concentrates on decisions about specific sites and also on individual site requirements. It should be noted that a Sustainability Appraisal has also been undertaken which is an integral element and justification for which sites have been chosen for allocations.

The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) is intended to help deliver the Core Strategy policies over a plan period to 2028. The SAP is at an advanced stage of preparation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination. In September to November 2015, representations were invited on the Publication Draft Plan. This stimulated engagement from nearly 10,000 interested individuals (with over 40,000 detailed representations on particular aspects of the Plan). Responses received have been considered and any implications on the SAP assessed.

The changes in SAP since the last equality screening was undertaken are in relation to housing and employment, as a result of the large strategic site Headley Hall been withdrawn by the land owners. As a result of this new sites are required to make the housing provision that Headley Hall would have provided. A portfolio of sites is provided which are based on the most sustainable approach. The sites include new settlement proposals, extensions to Wetherby and smaller scale developments.

### **3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration**

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender

reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	x	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		x
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>	x	

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

#### 4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related

information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

- **Key findings**

**(think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

At the previous SAP stage, main changes in the Plan included the following. The SAP incorporated detailed Retail and Town Centre policies which have been worked up to incorporate those within the previous Development Plan the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). These policies cover the designation of centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, detailed policy guidance for developments within protected shopping frontages within the City Centre and within other designated centres. The policy also includes detailed shop front guidance.

For housing and employment individual site requirements provided additional layers of information in relation to highways, conservation area, listed building, and other site specific requirements. An update of greenspace was provided, this designates an additional eighteen new greenspaces, and has made amendments to eighty four and minor changes to seventy nine. In addition sixty sites have been deleted. Greenspace proposals have been refined since the last stage of the SAP as a result of updating information on the quality, quantity and accessibility of greenspace, which has a positive impact on all the equality characteristics.

The previous EIA identifies due regard to equality considerations and this EIA deals in specific with issues that relate to changes to the Outer North East (ONE) Housing Market Characteristic area (HMCA). As part of the SAP public consultation in 2015, 1,407 responses were specifically received in relation to the proposals for the ONE HMCA. A large site known as Headley Hall new settlement had been withdrawn (the University of Leeds confirmed to the City Council that it no longer intended to promote the Headley Hall new settlement proposal). The public consultation ran its course and the withdrawal of the Headley Hall site was advertised to consultees. As a consequence of the Headley Hall removal, it has been necessary to consider alternative options for delivering the housing requirements within this part of the District.

The Headley Hall proposal included 3,000 homes alongside 7ha of employment land, within the plan period. Given its withdrawal, there is a need to undertake a second round of (Publication stage) consultation with a revised Publication Draft Plan for the Outer North East HMCA only. From an equality perspective the impact of this change is taken into consideration as part of this screening, but for context the overall equality considerations which were considered at the last stage of the EIA screening are also set

out.

Consultation arrangements which are proposed for the ONE HMCA will accord with those adopted for the previous Publication Draft Plan, including drop in events, to be held in the area so as to discuss the proposals with local people and interested parties. Under the previous 2015 SAP consultation, ONE sites that have generated most objections are on a range of issues, including loss of Green Belt, lack of infrastructure (highways, schools, doctors), use of greenfield land before previously developed land and the reliance on a new settlement bringing forward the majority of the housing need in this HMCA. It is these main changes to the ONE HMCA as detailed in the sections below, which are the main subject of this EIA.

- **Actions**

**(think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

The section below examines in more detail equality considerations in relation to the protected characteristics. In identifying sites at this pre-publication stage key criteria included public transport accessibility and access to services. The following points are therefore key findings in relation to these broad parameter and the impact on the equality characteristics and are similar to those identified in the Core Strategy, as the Core Strategy is the overarching policy framework for the Site Allocations Plan. Transport has been given the greatest consideration as set out below as it has an overarching impact on other topic areas as accessibility as one of the key considerations for equality. However the generic equality considerations considered as part of previous EIAs apply to this screening.

The changes in SAP since the last equality screening was undertaken are in relation to housing and employment, as a result of the large strategic site Headley Hall been withdrawn by the land owners. As a result of this new sites are required to make the housing provision that Headley Hall would have provided. A portfolio of sites is provided which are based on the most sustainable approach. The sites include new settlement proposals, extensions to Wetherby and smaller scale developments.

### Transport

#### Race

Differential access to the transport system and the effect of transport policies, particularly for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BME) people are around impacts on access to employment, education and training, which are important issues for BME communities as a means of overcoming known disadvantages in the job market. One of the reasons for this is greater reliance of BME communities on public transport, and a consequent difficulty accessing more remote employment locations. People from BME groups often have increased safety concerns about using public transport, particularly at night, yet BME groups are more likely to be involved in shift work or making journeys to non-mainstream venues at unsocial hours.

#### Age

Young people rely very much on public transport, although many have personal security concerns when using public transport and this is coupled with the fact that in terms of actual risk they are the age group which are most likely to be the victims of violence

and/or assault. Many older people are not able to drive because health conditions related to their age or find the cost of running a car prohibitive. Consequently, public transport often plays a vital role in enabling participation in community life for older people. Planned improvements to strategic connectivity and the reliability of public transport will benefit people in both these younger and older age groups. Older people are disproportionately more likely to be living in poverty and suffering the associated effects of low quality and inappropriate housing. Older people require access to a range of facilities and services within their local area. Older people also have a higher incidence of long-term ill health. It is important therefore that they are able to gain access to healthcare facilities and preventive health and well being services by public transport accessible within walking distance.

#### Gender

Fewer women drive than men, and women drivers are likely to have less access to the use of a car. Consequently, women often have a greater reliance on walking on footpaths and local roads. Women more frequently have primary responsibility for the care of their children, which often exacerbates problems regarding access to travel, as they may need to combine escorting children to school or childcare with travel to work, shopping or other activities, involving trip chains to multiple destinations.

Despite men (particularly young men) being the most frequent victims of violent crime and assault, women have greater concerns regarding personal safety. Although broad measures to increase public transport use may increase informal surveillance and deter acts of violence, it is outside the scope of the Site Allocations Plan to specifically improve women's personal safety when travelling which would be considered when assessing individual planning applications for housing sites.

#### Disability Discrimination

Differential access to the transport system and the effect of transport policies, particularly (but not restricted to) those with physical and sensory impairments, mental health issues or learning disabilities. Disabled people travel more frequently by bus than others, so public transport plays a vital role in ensuring that they can participate in community life and avoid social exclusion. Overcrowding and disruption of services on public transport is a deterrent to travel for disabled people. Taxis also are used disproportionately by disabled people, so ensuring good road connectivity is vital.

#### Race Discrimination

Differential access to the transport system and the effect of transport policies, particularly for BME people are around impacts on access to employment, education and training, which are vitally important issues for BME communities as a means of overcoming disadvantages in the job market and improving whole life and economic opportunities. One of the reasons for this is greater reliance of BME communities on public transport, and a consequent difficulty accessing more remote employment locations. People from BME groups often have increased safety concerns about using public transport, particularly at night, yet BME groups are more likely to be involved in shift work or making journeys to non-mainstream venues.

Effects on cultural resources of particular significance for ethnic minority groups (e.g. places of worship, community facilities, etc.). The ways that public transport is organised and operated frequently does not meet the needs of some BME communities. Focusing on particular peak periods and winding down services on specific religious holidays may

not reflect the needs of an increasingly diverse population.

Discrimination on grounds of sexuality or gender identity; (Neutral)

Equality Effects; Members of the lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and trans-gender (LGBT) community typically have greater concerns about personal safety when using public transport due to fear of victimisation or harassment.

Proposals to improve strategic connectivity and the reliability of public transport services may increase informal surveillance and deter acts of violence. However, there is little in the Core Strategy that is likely to specifically improve personal safety of LGBT people when travelling.

Equality Effects; Young people rely very much on public transport, although many have personal security concerns when using public transport and this is coupled with the fact that in terms of actual risk they are the age group which are most likely to be the victims of violence and/or assault.

Many older people are not able to drive because health conditions related to their age or find the cost of running a car prohibitive. Consequently, public transport often plays a vital role in enabling participation in community life for older people. Planned improvements to strategic connectivity and the reliability of public transport will benefit people in both these younger and older age groups.

Religious Discrimination; (Neutral)

Equality Effects; Differential access to the transport system and the effect of transport policies, particularly (but not restricted to) Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, Jews, Sikhs and Hindus (e.g. cultural or religious requirements for travel at particular times). Effects on cultural resources of particular significance for religious groups (e.g. places of worship).

There is a lack of transport planning for major religious festivals and at Christmas especially non-Christians may be left without transport while still needing to work or make other vital journeys. There are few proposals of the Core Strategy that address existing inequalities, but also no specific measures that will exacerbate these. However, placement of employment sites may help mitigate this.

Social Deprivation/Exclusion; (Slight Benefit)

Equality Effects; The key issue here is the extent that the Site Allocations will have a positive effect on the number of jobs and the general functioning of the economy. On balance, this is likely to work towards reducing deprivation and exclusion, although the effect of this is likely to be slight. The early prioritisation of employment especially in the context of linking new employment to sustainable travel will increase employment opportunities for those currently unemployed.

The increased emphasis on walking and cycling has the potential to benefit people on low incomes and identifying new housing sites which are well located in relation to existing settlements and the main urban area will enable best access to employment and facilities.

**RETAIL**

Identifying centre boundaries and primary shopping frontages providing detailed policy guidance in order to implement Core Strategy policies and protect the centres increases accessibility for all but in particular those more reliant on local facilities such as the elderly, disabled people, and those on lower incomes. Identifying sites at the edge of the Centre as part of the site Allocations process provided opportunities for all the protected characteristics, as good accessibility benefits all groups. All people benefit from the co-location of uses, facilities and services. By grouping them together it could lead to groups/communities coming into increased contact and therefore increasing community cohesion and integration.

The retail allocations are not considered to give preference to any one group and that all people benefit from the co-location of uses, facilities and services, accessibility of local centres is important. By grouping them together it could lead to groups/communities coming into increased contact and improved accessibility for all. Use of the sites for retail would preclude them being brought forwards for housing or employment.

## HOUSING

In identifying site options for housing, it is important that sites avoid areas of flood risk which would present a concern for all the community, including but particularly the most vulnerable. Sufficiency of supply of housing will be of greater importance to the young who are more likely to form new households and generate a need for new housing and issues of affordability. Housing schemes particularly aimed at elderly people should be located within easy walking distance of town or local centres or have good access to a range of local facilities or good transport links. Increasing provision for an ageing population and for the young. Policy H4 of the Core Strategy on Housing mix in particular creates more appropriate mixes. At this publication stage of the Site Allocations Plans sites have been identified which would be particularly appropriate for sheltered or other housing aimed at elderly people. In a similar manner the accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers have been identified on an equal basis with the accommodation needs of the house occupying population and the subsequent criteria for site selection should not be over-restrictive.

People with disabilities could be disadvantaged if the required densities are too high and make it difficult to accommodate features of housing design necessary to enable accessibility to all. It is important that new housing avoids areas of flood risk which would present a greater concern to disabled people.

At this stage of SAP the outer North East HMCA proposes changes to meet housing demand for this area, which will undergo further consultation. In terms of equality considerations the impact of housing delivery on the equality characteristics is very similar, individual sites which are sustainable will have an impact on all, but in particular younger people, the elderly and those who are on lower incomes as they will be more reliant on accessible transport and affordable housing. As part of the public consultation on the new sites there will be opportunity for local people to comment on the planning merits of individual proposals.

## EMPLOYMENT

There is a change in employment sites since the last stage of the SAP, this relates again to a new settlement being identified. In identifying sites for employment, these seek to aid the growth and diversification of the Leeds' economy which should improve job



prospects, availability and increase skills/training opportunities for a range of businesses and groups/residents. Improving prospects and diversity of jobs should help to reduce unemployment which in turn should result in an increase of opportunities for all ages, including different ethnic groups. Training and skills opportunities can also be promoted locally to assist groups who are more reliant on public transport to access employment.

Site allocations within the context of the core strategy policies have positive impacts for all ages, people with disabilities, gender and BME. The overall policy promotes in and edge of centre sites with good access to facilities and public transport links. It seeks to better meet the needs of employers and potentially could increase jobs to meet local need and to improve mental well being and economic outcomes. The provision of office development in main centres provides a sustainable location for workers to access local facilities and public transport networks and may improve increase safety within the public realm as well as contributing to regeneration.

#### Safeguarding existing industrial & warehouse employment sites & premises (EC3)

The industrial and warehousing employment sectors are considered to be one of the key local economic drivers needed to support the retention of existing businesses and to drive future job creations, particularly in the low skilled job sector. The purpose of this policy is to help deliver an appropriate local balance between potentially competing uses of land for example housing and employment, for the market alone will not deliver that balance.

Provision or retention of jobs may support people from different communities to mix together at work which is beneficial to overall community cohesion. However the restriction of other development uses within existing areas that have been safeguarded for industrial and warehouse purposes only may prevent other beneficial developments for example affordable housing, health services and sports/leisure facilities being built in these areas.

#### GREEN SPACE

In some instances, disadvantaged communities have lower levels of access to green space, further away, or inaccessible by public transport. By promoting city wide green space standards, access for disadvantaged communities without private vehicle access and the disabled will be improved. The protection and enhancement of green space provides a positive amenity improvement to all groups. Low income and disadvantaged communities also tend to have lower levels of access to natural habitats which will be important in identifying specific types of green space allocations.

Disadvantaged communities tend to have lower levels of access to Green Infrastructure and green space. By promoting city wide green space standards, access for disadvantaged communities without private vehicle access and the disabled will be improved. The natural green space standards at Policy G3 are lower in the urban developed area than undeveloped areas. The implication is that there will be less natural green space in the developed areas than undeveloped areas, thereby disadvantaging those in the most densely developed parts of Leeds. To mitigate this implication the Site Allocations promotes links and improved access to existing spaces for example by improved transport links. The protection and enhancement of green space provides a positive amenity improvement to all groups.

In addition a Sustainability Appraisal of the SAP has been undertaken. The SA of the SAP assesses the effects of the site allocations against the SA objectives. An SA Report was prepared to accompany the Issues & Options document and was published as part of the consultation process in 2013. At that stage the SA Report provided an individual assessment of sites being considered for allocation for retail, employment and housing use, with an expectation that the SA at the Publication draft would consider the cumulative effects of the proposed site allocations coming forward collectively.

**5. If you are **not** already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment.****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	
--	--

Date to complete your impact assessment	
---	--

Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	
--	--

**6. Governance, ownership and approval**

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
D Feeney	Head of Strategic Planning City Development	6/9/16
<b>Date screening completed</b>		

**7. Publishing**

Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to [equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk) for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:	
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to <b>Governance Services</b>	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate <b>Directorate</b>	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to <a href="mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk">equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</a>	Date sent: