



**Design, Planning and  
Economics**

Submitted to  
Mansfield District Council

Submitted by  
AECOM  
4th Floor  
Bridgewater House  
Whitworth Street  
Manchester  
M1 6LT

# Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

## Mansfield District Local Plan

(Publication Draft Version)

August 2018

## Revision schedule

Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1	July 2015	Draft Report	Catriona Macdonald Socio-economist	Nicky Hodges Associate Director	Nicky Hodges Associate Director
2	October 2015	Draft Report	Catriona Macdonald Socio-economist	Nicky Hodges Associate Director	Nicky Hodges Associate Director
3	February 2016	Second Draft	Ian McCluskey Senior Consultant	Ian McCluskey Senior Consultant	Nicky Hodges Associate Director
4	June 2018	EqIA for Reg19 Publication Plan	Abi Rhodes Consultant  Ishaq Khan Consultant	Ian McCluskey Senior Consultant	Frank Hayes Associate Director

# Table of Contents

<b>Revision schedule</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>1 Background</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 EQIA Explained.....	1
1.2 The EQIA report.....	2
<b>2 Methodology</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Baseline evidence collection.....	3
2.3 Policy screening.....	3
2.4 Appraisal of potential equality impacts.....	4
<b>3 Baseline Position</b> .....	<b>5</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	5
3.2 Profile of protected characteristic groups.....	5
3.3 Issues affecting protected characteristic groups.....	10
<b>4 Policy screening</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>5 Assessment findings</b> .....	<b>23</b>
5.1 Sustainable development.....	23
5.2 Housing and employment strategy.....	23
5.3 Town and district centre uses, regeneration and improvements.....	24
5.4 Infrastructure provision.....	24
5.5 Highways and sustainable transport.....	25
5.6 Open space and environmental resources and design.....	25
5.7 Conclusions.....	26
5.8 Mitigation and enhancement.....	27
<b>Appendices: Individual policy assessments</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Appendix I: Policy S3: Supporting economic and housing growth through urban regeneration &.....	29
Appendix II: Policy P1: Achieving high quality design.....	31
Appendix III: Policy P2: Safe, healthy and attractive development.....	33
Appendix IV: Policy P3: Connected development.....	34
Appendix V: Policy P5: Climate Change in New Development.....	35
Appendix VI: Policy P7: Amenity.....	37
Appendix VII: Policy H3: Housing density and mix.....	39
Appendix VIII: Policy H4: Affordable housing.....	41
Appendix IX: Policy H6: Specialist housing.....	42
Appendix X: Policy H7: Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation.....	44
Appendix XI: Policy H8: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People.....	45
Appendix XII: Policy E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas.....	47
Appendix XIII: Policy E6: Improving skills and economic inclusion.....	49
Appendix XIV: Policy RT8: District and local centres.....	50
Appendix XV: Policy SUE1 & Policy SUE2.....	51
Appendix XVI: Policy IN3, IN4, IN5 and IN6: Protection and creation of community open space, local green space, outdoor sports provision and allotments.....	53
Appendix XVII: Policy IN7: Local shops, community and cultural facilities.....	55
Appendix XVIII: Policy IN8: Protecting and improving sustainable transport network.....	57
Appendix XIX: Policy IN9: Impact of development on the transport network.....	59

Appendix XX: Policy IN10: Car and cycle parking .....60  
Appendix XXI: Policy NE3: Pollution and land instability ..... 61  
Appendix XXII: Policy CC1: Renewable and low carbon energy generation ..... 63

# 1 Background

AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) in support of the emerging Mansfield District Local Plan (2013-2033). EQIA is a process for considering and communicating the likely effects of a draft plan in terms of equality issues, with a view to avoiding and mitigating adverse effects and maximising the positives.

Public bodies are required to consider and document how they have taken into consideration equality issues in their decision-making.

## 1.1 EQIA Explained

Equality impact assessment is intended to help make decisions by predicting the equality consequences of the implementation of a proposed plan. In addition to assessing the equality consequences, it also produces recommendations as to how favourable consequences for equality could be enhanced and how any harmful consequences could be avoided or minimised. It addresses equality in relation to protected characteristics, as defined in the Equality Act 2010. These are race, age, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy or maternity.

EQIA considers whether the implementation of proposed policies could:

- Help to address existing discrimination or disadvantage experienced by particular groups in the population;
- Increase equal opportunities for protected characteristic groups, so that they are able to access opportunities on an equivalent basis to others, particularly for people from backgrounds who have experienced historic disadvantage or inequality;
- Improve relations between groups who have different protected characteristic identities (e.g. between people from different racial backgrounds); and
- Identify if there is any risk that the policies could give rise to any intended or unintended illegal discrimination.

In summary, the process of EQIA involves:

- Deciding if a local plan requires assessment;
- Deciding the overarching questions to be answered by the EQIA;
- Deciding what the potential equality impacts will be by considering how the proposal could impact differently on different groups in the population who share protected characteristics.; and

- Making recommendations as to how positive equality outcomes could be enhanced and how potential worsened inequality outcomes or discrimination, harassment, or worsened relations between groups could be avoided or minimised.

## **1.2 The EQIA report**

This EQIA Report is produced with the intention of informing consultation on the latest version of the Mansfield District Council Local Plan. It therefore presents an assessment of the pre-publication version of the local plan.

The structure of the report is as follows:

- Chapter 1, Background
- Chapter 2, Methodology
- Chapter 3, Baseline situation
- Chapter 4, Policy screening
- Chapter 5, Assessment findings
- Appendices: Individual policy assessments

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Introduction

This section sets out the approach to the appraisal of potential equality effects arising from the Mansfield District Council Local Plan (2013 - 2033), and the identification of recommendations to remove or mitigate potential adverse equality effects and promote potential positive equality effects.

### 2.2 Baseline evidence collection

The first stage of the EQIA was to collect baseline evidence concerning people sharing protected characteristics living within Mansfield district who may be affected by the policies contained within the draft local plan. The baseline draws on Office for National Statistics (ONS) Census data from 2011, as well as other key national data sets including the recently published Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2017 and the ONS Integrated Household Survey.

The baseline information was originally gathered at the Consultation Draft Stage of the Plan, and was presented in the EQIA Report prepared at that stage (2015). Updates have been made where possible at the current stage to ensure that the assessment is based upon the most relevant information.

Chapter 3, 'Baseline situation' sets out data about people sharing protected characteristics, and about key issues that may affect people with protected characteristics living in Mansfield district, including: Poverty and Deprivation, Employment and Skills, and Housing.

### 2.3 Policy screening

The next stage was to conduct a screening of policies planned for inclusion within the emerging local plan to decide which policies would be included in the detailed appraisal process.

Policies were screened in where it was considered likely that they would have either a positive or negative impact on people with protected characteristics living in the district.

Where no differential impact was envisaged, policies were screened out. Chapter 4, Policy screening includes the screening table with the screening decision for every policy contained in the local plan. It should be noted that this exercise was carried out at the local plan consultation draft stage (2015) in order to inform policy development.

In progressing the local plan to the next stages (i.e. publication draft), policy revisions were made based on consultation comments received and updates to the evidence base.

Where the policies remained relatively unchanged, the screening decision in this EqIA (and any subsequent impact assessment) remains the same or very similar. Where there have been more significant changes to policies or new policies since the plan's consultation stage, these have been screened afresh.

## 2.4 Appraisal of potential equality impacts

The final stage of the EQIA at this point was to appraise the potential equality impacts arising from each of the policies that had been screened in, by asking the following questions:

- 1) Will the local plan potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristic identity?
- 2) Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics? This reflects Mansfield District Council's equality objective to ensure its plans and policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups.
- 3) Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?
- 4) If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?

These questions were established by drawing upon the key principles of the Equalities Act, established EqIA methods and the Council's existing EqIA process.

In answering these questions, the EqIA drew on the baseline data set out in Chapter 3, as well as key literature relating to protected characteristic groups and equality impacts.

A full appraisal for each screened in policy is included in **Appendices: Individual policy assessments**.

A summary of appraisal findings, conclusions and recommendations is set out in Chapter 5, Assessment findings.



## 3 Baseline Position

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out baseline data regarding the existing resident population in Mansfield district, and key issues that are considered likely to affect protected characteristic groups.

### 3.2 Profile of protected characteristic groups

#### 3.2.1 Age

Table 3.1 below sets out the age structure of Mansfield district in 2011, 2018 and 2033, in comparison to the East Midlands and England.

Table 3.1: Age structure of Mansfield, the East Midlands and England in 2011, 2018 and 2033

	Mansfield district (2011 census)	Mansfield district 2018	Mansfield district 2033	East Midlands (2011 census)	East Midlands 2018	Mansfield district 2033	England (2011 census)	England 2018	England 2033
<b>0-15</b>	18.2%	17.6%	16.7%	18.5%	17.5%	16.7%	18.9%	18.1%	17.2%
<b>16-24</b>	11.3%	10.3%	10.8%	12.1%	12.2%	12.4%	11.9%	11.8%	12%
<b>25-44</b>	26.1%	25%	23.8%	25.9%	24.3%	23.2%	27.5%	26.4%	24.7%
<b>45-64</b>	27.2%	27.5%	23.6%	26.5%	26.5%	23.1%	25.4%	25.5%	23.3%
<b>65-84</b>	15.0%	17%	20.9%	14.8%	17%	20.1%	14.1%	15.8%	18.6%
<b>85 and over</b>	2.1%	2.4%	4.4%	2.2%	2.5%	4.5%	2.2%	2.5%	4.2%

Source: ONS/AECOM Calculations

The 2011 census shows that each age group is generally in line with the average figures across the East Midlands and the rest of England. Slight differences can be seen in those people in the 0-15 and 16-24 age groups which are slightly lower for the district when compared to the rest of East Midlands and England, along with the 45-64 and 65-84 age groups being slightly higher than the rest of East Midlands and England. The proportion of residents aged 85 and over is in line with the regional and national averages.

Looking at the ONS<sup>1</sup> (2018) population data, it is noted that the younger age groups (0-15 and 16-24) are predicted to decrease, with proportions within Mansfield district remaining lower than averages in East Midlands and the rest of England.

<sup>1</sup> Office of National Statistics (2018)

The 25-44 age group is also lower than the 2011 census across all three localities, with the proportion in Mansfield district being higher than East Midlands but lower than the averages for England.

The proportion of those aged 45-64 in 2018 is similar to the percentage reported in the 2011 census, whereby the proportion in Mansfield district is greater than East Midlands and the rest of England. The 65-84 and over 85 age groups both see a rise in figures when compared to the 2011 census proportions, with greater proportions seen in Mansfield district than the rest of East Midlands and England.

Looking further ahead at the projections to the end of the local plan period (2033), it is evident from census data for Mansfield district that overall the younger age groups will decline, whilst the older age groups will grow over the next 15 years. This can be seen in the 0-15 age group (-1.5%), which shows a decrease during the period from 2011 to 2033; this change is less significant when considering national figures during this time period (England -0.8%). The other significant decline over the plan period is noted in the 45-64 age group (-3.6%) compared to England (-2.1%).

The largest change is experienced within the 65-84 age group which is predicted to increase by 5.9% by 2033 in Mansfield district and 4.3% in England. The over 85 age group is also expected to increase by more than double by 2033 when compared to 2011, reinforcing that the population will continue to age over the plan period.

As can be seen from **Table 3.1**, as with many areas of the country, the district has an ageing population. This change will need to be considered within the policies of the local plan to ensure it can meet the needs of the changing population. For example, the elderly age group can be at a disadvantage with regards to mobility.

### 3.2.2 Sex and sexual orientation

The Local Authority population estimates (2005)<sup>2</sup> state that 49% of residents of the district are male and 50% are female. The 2011 Census shows that the gender split in Mansfield district is very similar to the Local Authority population estimates from 2005, of 49.1% of residents being male and 50.9% being female. This follows similar trends in line with the regional and national averages for these periods.

88.8% of lone parent households in Mansfield are headed by a female, compared with 89.2% across the region and 90.3% nationally, taken from the 2011 census data.

The ONS Integrated Household Survey (IHS) introduced questions on sexual orientation. Data from the 2013 survey indicates that across England, 92.5% of adults identify themselves as heterosexual, 1.7% per cent as gay, lesbian or bisexual, and 0.3% as other.

---

<sup>2</sup> MDC (2007) Mansfield Neighbourhood Profile. Available at:  
[http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/5/Mansfield\\_District.pdf](http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/5/Mansfield_District.pdf)

Across the East Midlands region, 93.3% of adults identify as heterosexual, 1.4% as gay or lesbian or bisexual, and 0.2% as other. Estimates are not available at district level or below due to small sample size.<sup>3</sup>


According to the ONS (2012), the proportion of all usual residents registered in a same-sex civil partnership is lower in the Mansfield district (0.17%) compared to the East Midlands (0.19%) and England (0.23%) averages.

Average weekly earnings in 2017 for full-time workers in Mansfield district (£447.50) are significantly lower than the regional (£515.50) and the UK (£552.70) averages<sup>4</sup>. There is a further disparity between the pay for males and females, with females in Mansfield district averagely earning £41 less per week.

**Figure 3.1** below, breaks down the gender profile of Mansfield District Council (MDC) workforce, Nottinghamshire Labour Market (LLM) and Mansfield district (ONS) from 2012-2015.

The graph shows that over this period in Mansfield district, there has seen a slight increase in the number of Males (0.05%) and the same decrease can be seen for females based on ONS figures for the district. When comparing Nottinghamshire data (2012-2015), there is a greater change in the gender population profile within the county.

Figure 3.1 – Gender Profile of MDC Workforce (MDC), Nottinghamshire Local Labour Market (LLM) & Mansfield District (ONS) 2012-15



Source: MDC (2016) Workforce Report

<sup>3</sup> ONS (2014) Integrated Household Survey, January to December 2013: Experimental Statistics, available online at: [http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778\\_379565.pdf](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_379565.pdf) (accessed September 2015)

<sup>4</sup> ONS (2017) Earning by place of residence. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157166/printable.aspx>

In conclusion, the Mansfield district has a fairly equal gender split but a lower proportion of people who identify themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual compared to the England average. The district further has a lower proportion of residents registered in a same-sex civil partnership compared to the regional and national averages.

With regards to pay, people in Mansfield generally earn considerably less than those regionally and nationally and females further earn less than their male counterparts. Though employment practices are mostly outside the remit of the local plan, it may be able to influence the type of employment opportunities that arise within the district. There may be implications in terms of the number of higher paid jobs available to all and to women in particular.

### 3.2.3 Ethnicity

**Table 3.2** sets out the population by broad ethnic groups, taken from the 2011 census. The table shows that 97.2% of residents of Mansfield district are from White ethnic backgrounds, significantly above both the regional (89.3%) and national averages (85.4%).

The district has lower than average proportions of residents from all Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, which makes up 0.4% of the population when compared to East Midlands (1.8%) and the rest of England (3.5%). This is also evident within the Asian and Multiple mixed ethnic groups which are also seen to make up a smaller proportion of the district when compared to the East Midlands and England.

It is apparent that there has been an increase of people from Eastern Europe residing in Mansfield district since the last census. However, there is no formal survey or census either locally or nationally to provide an accurate estimate.

*Table 3.2: Population by broad ethnic group in Mansfield district, East Midlands and England (2011)*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
White	97.2%	89.3%	85.4%
Multiple/mixed ethnic group	1.1%	1.9%	2.3%
Asian/Asian British	1.2%	6.5%	7.8%
Black/Black British	0.4%	1.8%	3.5%
Other	0.1%	0.6%	1.0%

Overall, the district is less ethnically diverse when compared to regional and national census figures. Even so, there is a need to ensure that the policies in the plan do not unfairly discriminate against those from minority ethnic backgrounds.

### 3.2.4 Religion and belief

**Table 3.3** sets out the religion of the resident population, based on 2011 census data. A higher than average proportion of residents describe their religion as Christian (61.6%), when compared to East Midlands (58.8) and the rest of England (59.4%).

There is also a higher than average proportion that states they have no religion (30.1%), compared to East Midlands (27.5%) and the rest of England (24.7%). All religions other than Christianity are underrepresented in Mansfield district.

*Table 3.3: Percentage of religious beliefs in Mansfield compared to the East Midlands and England (2011)*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Christian	61.6%	58.8%	59.4%
Buddhist	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Hindu	0.3%	2.0%	1.5%
Jewish	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%
Muslim	0.5%	3.1%	5.0%
Sikh	0.2%	1.0%	0.8%
Other religion	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
No religion	30.1%	27.5%	24.7%
Religion not stated	6.7%	6.8%	7.2%

### 3.2.5 Disability

The proportion of the resident population that states their day-to-day activities are limited as a result of a long-term health problem or disability is used as a proxy indicator for disability.

Table 3.4 sets out this data for Mansfield district, East Midlands and England taken from the 2011 census. The table shows that the district has a higher than average rate of disability overall. There is a greater proportion of people whose day-to-day activities are limited 'a lot' (12.2%) when compared to East Midlands (8.7%) and England (8.3%).

There is also a higher proportion of the population whose day-to-day activities are limited 'a little' (11.6%) compared to East Midlands (9.9%) and England (9.3%).

Overall, 23.8% of residents state that they experience a long-term health problem or disability in Mansfield (2011 Census).

The Local Plan can help to provide for the needs of people who have a disability. In particular, this could include the delivery of suitable housing to meet the needs of this community group; and ensuring that services and facilities are accessible.

*Table 3.2: Long-term health problem or disability (2011)*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Day-to-day activities limited a lot	12.2%	8.7%	8.3%
Day-to-day activities limited a little	11.6%	9.9%	9.3%
Day-to-day activities not limited	76.3%	81.4%	82.4%

### 3.2.6 Maternity and pregnancy

Pregnant women can be more susceptible to experience negative effects associated with development and the built environment. For example, pregnant women can be more susceptible to poor air quality<sup>5</sup>, which can have a negative impact on birth weight.

Pregnant women will also need good access to health care facilities, particularly towards the latter stages of pregnancy. Accessibility is therefore an important issue for this group.

With regards to income, housing and wellbeing, young mothers (and fathers) may be more likely to suffer from deprivation and struggle to find affordable housing.

There have been reductions in the numbers of teenage conceptions from 1998 to 2013 in all districts within Nottinghamshire. However, it is clear that Mansfield continues to have the highest rates of teenage conception. This is in line with levels of child poverty and the Index of Multiple Deprivation. In fact, there are twelve areas that are persistent 'hotspots' for teenage pregnancy; these correlate with areas of multiple deprivation<sup>6</sup>.

### 3.3 Issues affecting protected characteristic groups

This section sets out an understanding of the key issues that are influenced by plan-making and can affect protected characteristic groups within the district. Those issues that are beyond the remit of a local plan are therefore not considered in this EqIA, such as: *employment practices, public service standards, discrimination, social housing provision processes, and health service practices.*

Factors that can be influenced by the Mansfield District Council Local Plan include:

- the provision of housing to meet specific needs
- regeneration activity
- management of development quality and building design
- accessibility to services and
- protection and provision of community facilities.

#### 3.3.1 Poverty and deprivation

A person is considered to be suffering from poverty / deprivation if they do not have or are prevented from having something considered necessary in society. Although poverty is not a protected characteristic, people possessing certain protected characteristics (e.g. disabled people, Black and Minority Ethnic [BME] people, and children) are at greater risk than other people of experiencing deprivation or of living in areas of high deprivation. An understanding of

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.nhs.uk/news/pregnancy-and-child/air-pollution-associated-with-low-birthweight/>

<sup>6</sup> Nottinghamshire Teenage Pregnancy Update for the Children's Trust Board (Nottinghamshire County Council, 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016)

where deprivation is focused can, therefore, help to identify where people who possess protected characteristics may be at greater risk of inequality.

According to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2015), Mansfield district is the 56<sup>th</sup> most deprived out of the total of 326 local authority areas in England. 6 out of 67 (9%) of its Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)<sup>7</sup> within the district fall within the top 10% most deprived nationally<sup>8</sup> and a further 24 out of 67 (10%) fall within the top 20% most deprived. Figure 3.2 shows IMD (2015) scores in relation to district wards.

The district also experiences above average levels of child poverty, with 22.9% of children living in low-income families compared with 20.1% across England.<sup>9</sup>

People with low income, those living with deprivation and those within areas of higher deprivation can experience poor health and unemployment. Thus, improving access to jobs and health services, and designing new development that promotes health and well-being and social cohesion are likely to be essential for addressing the consequences of deprivation. The location and types of housing and employment development can influence the extent to which communities in deprived areas could benefit (or become more excluded) from such opportunities.


---

<sup>7</sup> Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) are geographical areas of similar population size designed to support the reporting of small area statistics.

<sup>8</sup> DCLG (2015) English Indices of Deprivation 2015, available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015> [accessed October 2015]

<sup>9</sup> HMRC (2014) Personal tax credits: Children in low-income families local measure, available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/personal-tax-credits-children-in-low-income-families-local-measure> [accessed October 2015]

Figure 3.2 – Mansfield District: 2015 Indices of Multiple Deprivation<sup>10</sup>



Source: Nottingham Insight

<sup>10</sup> Nottingham Insight (2016) Deprivation, available at: <http://www.nottinghaminsight.org.uk/d/184487> (last accessed 16/04/18)



### 3.3.2 Employment and skills

**Table 3.5** sets out economic activity in Mansfield district, the East Midlands and England, taken from the 2011 Census.

Mansfield district had a slightly lower rate of economic activity (67.9%) compared to East Midlands (69.3%) and England (69.9%), and unemployment rates were slightly above average in Mansfield (32.1%) compared to East Midlands (30.7%) and England (30.1%). The proportion of residents who were self-employed (7.1%) or full-time students (2.4%) was below regional and national averages.

According to the Centre for Cities Outlook Report for Mansfield<sup>11</sup> (2017), the employment rate has increased by 3.65% since the 2011 census. There is a slightly higher than average proportion of residents who are retired, and a considerably higher than average proportion who are long-term sick or disabled (6.5%) compared to East Midlands (4.2%) and England (4.0%). This reflects the data in **Table 3.4** which shows that the district has a higher than average proportion of residents who have a limiting long-term health problem or disability (23.75% in total, with 12.2% being limited 'a lot') compared to England (17.6% in total)<sup>12</sup>.

In August 2015, the rate of Jobseekers' Allowance (JSA) claimants in Mansfield district was 2.3%, which is considerably higher than the 1.6% across the East Midlands and England. In February 2018 the claimant count in the district had slightly decreased to 2.18%. Although the rate of JSA claimants has declined, economic deprivation remains an issue and thus improving access to jobs for affected groups is important.

*Table 3.3: Economic activity in Mansfield district compared to the East Midlands and England (2011)*

		Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Economically active	Total	67.9%	69.3%	69.9%
	Employed	53.8%	53.2%	52.3%
	Self-employed	7.1%	8.7%	9.8%
	Unemployed	4.6%	4.2%	4.4%
	Student	2.4%	3.3%	3.4%
Economically inactive	Total	32.1%	30.7%	30.1%
	Retired	15.7%	15.0%	13.7%
	Student	3.4%	5.8%	5.8%
	Looking after home or family	4.5%	4.0%	4.4%
	Long-term sick or disabled	6.5%	4.1%	4.0%
	Other	2.0%	1.9%	2.2%

<sup>11</sup> Centre of Cities Outlook Report for Mansfield (2017) Available at: <http://www.centreforcities.org/city/mansfield/>

<sup>12</sup> Nottingham Insight (2017) Available at: <https://www.nottinghaminsight.org.uk/Document-Library/Document-Library/176710> (accessed 12.04.18)

**Table 3.6** shows the percentage of people by the highest level of qualifications achieved in Mansfield, East Midlands and England, taken from the 2011 Census.

The 2011 Census data also shows that Mansfield district has a significantly lower than average proportion of residents who are educated to degree level (Level 4) and above (16.4%) when compared to the East Midlands (23.6%) and England (27.4%).

Mansfield district also has a significantly higher than average proportion of people with no qualifications (30.4%) compared to the East Midlands (24.7%) and England (22.5%). Although, the proportions that are educated to Level 1 (GCSE grade D-G) and Level 2 (GCSE grade C-A\*) are also slightly higher than average.

*Table 3.4: Highest level of qualification held*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Level 4 and above	16.4%	23.6%	27.4%
Level 3	12.1%	12.9%	12.4%
Level 2	16.5%	15.6%	15.2%
Level 1	15.7%	13.9%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.7%	4.0%	3.6%
Other qualifications	5.3%	5.3%	5.7%
No qualifications	30.4%	24.7%	22.5%

**Figure 3.3** below is taken from the ONS 2015 Annual Population Survey (APS).


This table highlights that the percentage of the working population with level/NVQ 4 or above (i.e. degree level) remains considerably lower in Mansfield (26.4%) than in England (36.8%), however this data cannot be compared to the census data from 2011, as the table below (Figure 3.4) only shows those between the ages of 16-64.

This data should be viewed with caution, as it could be skewed by the respondents, as those who are more likely to respond have to be proficient in reading and writing, therefore more likely to have a qualification at entry level.

Overall, it is evident that skills levels in the district are lower than average. With regards to protected groups, this could have implications for younger people in particular, as they may be at a disadvantage when entering working age.

Figure 3.3: Qualifications across Mansfield district in 2015 compared to Nottinghamshire and England<sup>13</sup>

Table: Annual Population Survey 2015				
	Mansfield	Nottinghamshire	Nottingham and Nottinghamshire	England
Percentage with NVQ4+ - aged 16-64	26.4	33.1	33.5	36.8
Percentage with NVQ3 only - aged 16-64	19.6	17.8	18.3	17.3
Percentage with Trade Apprenticeships - aged 16-64	N/A	2.1	2.2	3.1
Percentage with NVQ2 only - aged 16-64	17.2	19.4	17.9	16.3
Percentage with NVQ1 only - aged 16-64	16.3	13.7	12.8	11.6
Percentage with other qualifications (NVQ) - aged 16-64	14.5	5.8	6.0	6.6
Percentage with no qualifications (NVQ) - aged 16-64	4.6	8.1	9.4	8.4



Source: [2015 APS](#)

<sup>13</sup> ONS (2015) Annual Population Survey.

### 3.3.3 Housing provision

**Table 3.5** shows that home ownership in Mansfield district was above the national average in 2011, but slightly below that of the East Midlands (Census, 2011). The proportion of households that lived in social rented accommodation was above the national and regional averages, but the proportion of private rented households was below the national and regional averages.

*Table 3.5: Household tenure in Mansfield district, the East Midlands and England (2011)*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Owner occupied	66.6%	67.2%	63.3%
Shared ownership	0.4%	0.7%	0.8%
Social rented	18.2%	15.8%	17.7%
Private rented	13.6%	14.9%	16.8%
Other	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%

Although rates of overcrowding in 2011 were low both in Mansfield district and across the East Midlands (Census 2011), in Mansfield district, 4.3% of households had an occupancy rating of at least -1 or less in 2011 (with 1% with a rating of -2 or less), meaning that they have at least one room fewer than they require to meet their needs. Across the region, the figure was 5.5%, while nationally it was 8.7%.

This suggests that there is a need for bigger homes or a wider range of affordable housing so that people living in these homes (e.g. 'concealed households') can access suitable alternative accommodation. Ethnic groups in particular may be likely to be affected by a lack of access to a suitably sized home, as they tend to have larger families living in the same home.

*Table 3.6: Occupancy rating (rooms)*

	Mansfield district	East Midlands	England
Occupancy rating of +2 or more	55.3%	56.7%	49.7%
Occupancy rating of +1	24.8%	22.8%	22.9%
Occupancy rating of 0	15.6%	15.0%	18.6%
Occupancy rating of -1	3.3%	4.2%	6.4%
Occupancy rating of -2 or less	1.0%	1.3%	2.3%

The Centre for Cities Outlook report (2017)<sup>14</sup> states that the affordability ratio in Mansfield district was 6.08, ranking Mansfield 48<sup>th</sup> out of 62 UK cities. Affordability ratios are calculated by dividing house prices by gross annual workplace-based earnings; thus, a lower ratio figure equates to higher affordability. The mean house price was recorded to be £138,578, ranking Mansfield 51<sup>st</sup> out of 62 cities in the UK. Therefore, housing in the district is broadly affordable when compared to affordability nationwide. People from low income backgrounds and younger first time buyers are more likely to experience difficulty in accessing housing.

<sup>14</sup> Centre for Cities (2017) Outlook report – Mansfield, available at: <http://www.centreforcities.org/city/mansfield/> (accessed 18/04/18)

## 4 Policy screening

Table 4.1 'screens' each of the Mansfield District Council Local Plan (2013-2033) policies, with a view to screening-in those policies that should be a focus of the EqIA.

Table 4.1: Screening the Local Plan policies

Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Out	This is a generic policy that may deliver beneficial effects across a range of factors for all social groups. No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
S2: Spatial Strategy	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged, as this is a high-level policy. Housing provision is distributed more-or-less evenly across the district and should be accessible to a range of community groups. Lower level policies are more appropriate for addressing specific housing needs.
S3: Supporting economic and housing growth through urban regeneration	In	Potential beneficial effects across a range of factors, particularly upon low-income groups.
S4: Delivering key regeneration sites	In	
S5: Development in the Countryside	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
P1: Achieving high quality design	In	Potential beneficial effects for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
P2: Safe, Healthy and attractive Development	In	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. However, the place making principles could help to encourage better integration.
P3: Connected Developments	In	The policy should help to promote safer and more attractive travel routes, potentially benefiting protected characteristic groups.
P4: Comprehensive development	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
P5: Climate Change in New Development	In	Policy has scope to have an impact on fuel poverty, which can affect certain groups more prominently.

Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
P6: Home extensions and alterations	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Any group has the ability to seek home improvements.
P7: Amenity	In	Some groups can be disproportionately affected by noise and other nuisances. The policy could therefore have benefits.
P8 Shop front design and signage	Out	Policy focuses on the appearance of shops, which is unlikely to have impacts on equality.
H1: Housing allocations	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. A range of housing sites are proposed in the urban area and at the urban periphery. This ought to be available to wide range of communities. No important community facilities are likely to be lost that are important to groups with protected characteristics.
H2: Housing Committed Sites	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
H3: Housing density and mix	In	Potential beneficial effect on the provision of housing suitable for protected characteristic group such as the elderly.
H4: Affordable housing	In	Potential beneficial effect on the provision of housing suitable for protected characteristic groups, particularly low-income.
H5: Custom and Self-Build Dwellings	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. The policy will only have benefits for a small amount of people that have an interest in self-build and custom developments.
H6: Specialist housing	In	Concerns specific groups such as the elderly and disabled. Likely to have an impact.
H7: Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation	In	Potential beneficial effect on the provision of housing suitable for protected characteristic groups.
H8: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People	In	Sets a framework for accommodating a specific minority group.

Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
E1: Enabling economic development	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Economic development should generally help to tackle inequalities rather than widen the gap (depending on the types of employment that is secured and whether they are accessible to groups with protected characteristics).
E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas	In	Sites that are allocated are at locations that are accessible to residents by a range of transport modes. They are also within close proximity to a number of deprived communities and therefore could have enhanced benefits for this protected group.
E3. Committed employment sites	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
E4: Retaining Land for Employment use	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
E5: Other industrial and business development	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
E6: Improving skills and economic inclusion	In	Access to jobs varies for different groups. The policy could have benefits with regards to low-income groups.
RT1: Mansfield town centre strategy	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Improvements ought to benefit all community groups in an equal manner.
RT2: Main town centre uses	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT3: Mansfield town centre primary shopping area	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT4: Mansfield town centre improvements	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT5: Accessing Mansfield town centre	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT6: Retail and leisure allocations	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.



Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
RT7: Retail and leisure commitments	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT8: District and local centres	In	Seeks to promote accessibility to community services which could benefit certain protected groups.
RT9: Neighbourhood parades	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT10: Retail parks	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
RT11: Hot food takeaways	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Though this could help to address impacts on health, it is not considered likely to have a disproportionate impact on different community groups.
RT12: Visitor economy	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
SUE 1: Pleasley Hill Farm	In	Potential for positive effects due to the opportunity to deliver affordable housing and infrastructure improvements.
SUE2: Land off Jubilee Way	In	
SUE3: Committed strategic urban extensions	Out	The sites involved already have planning permission and are likely to come forward anyway. The impact is therefore minor.
IN1: Infrastructure Delivery	Out	Though improvement to infrastructure could help improve health and education, there is no specific focus on particular locations or community groups. As an over-arching policy, improvements could be beneficial to a wide range of groups. Therefore, no differential impacts are envisaged for protected characteristic groups.
IN2: Green infrastructure	Out	Though access to green space is beneficial to communities, it is likely to be an integral part of all developments given that this policy provides a framework for the delivery of GI across the district. No differential impact for protected characteristic groups is envisaged. Facilities that can help to foster community engagement are dealt with under policies IN3, IN4, IN5, IN6.



Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
IN3: Protection of community open space and outdoor sports provision	In	Access to community facilities and open space is positive for community engagement and wellbeing. These community assets are most at risk in deprived areas where they may be least viable.
IN4: Creation of open space and outdoor sports provision in new development	In	Access to community facilities and open space is positive for community engagement and wellbeing. Their protection and creation is considered unlikely to have a differential impact on different community groups, however, the policy is screened in along with IN3 and IN5 as this group of policies all seek to protect and deliver community facilities and services.
IN5: protection and creation of allotments	In	Access to allotments can be positive for community engagement and wellbeing. Their protection and creation is considered unlikely to have a differential impact on different community groups, however, the policy is screened in along with IN3 and IN4 as this group of policies all seek to protect and deliver community facilities and services.
IN6: Local green spaces	In	Access to community facilities and open space is positive for community engagement and wellbeing. These community assets are most at risk in deprived areas where they may be least viable.
IN7: Local shops, community and cultural facilities	In	Seeks to protect and extend community and cultural facilities.
IN8: Protecting and improving sustainable transport network	In	Potential beneficial effects on groups with accessibility issues.
IN9: Impact of development on the transport network	In	Potential beneficial effects on groups with accessibility issues.
IN10: Car and Cycle parking	In	Potential beneficial effects on groups with accessibility issues.
IN11: Telecommunications and broadband	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Broadband provision is comprehensive across the district and infrastructure improvements should not affect groups differently.
NE1: Protection and enhancement of landscape character	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.

Draft policy	Screened in?	Justification
NE2: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
NE3: Pollution and land instability	In	Some groups can be disproportionately affected by poor air quality and various forms of pollution.
NE4: Mineral Safeguarding Areas	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Safeguarding minerals is beneficial for all groups in relation to resource protection for future economic activity.
HE1: Historic Environment	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
HE2: Pleasley Vale area regeneration	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
CC1: Renewable and low carbon energy generation	In	Potential effects on fuel poverty, which can be more prominent in certain groups such as the elderly.
CC2: Flood risk	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged. Groups with protected characteristics are not at a disproportionate risk of flooding.
CC3: Sustainable Drainage Systems	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
CC4: Protection, conservation and enhancement of river and waterbody corridors	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.
IM1: Monitoring and Review of the Local Plan	Out	No differential impact for protected characteristic groups envisaged.

## 5 Assessment findings

This section presents a summary of the assessment findings, setting out how the Mansfield District Council Local Plan (2013-2033) performs as a whole. Detailed individual assessments of each screened-in policy are presented within the appendices to this report.

### 5.1 Sustainable development

The local plan as a whole supports sustainable development across the district, which includes the principle of promoting equality of opportunity for all groups and contributing to community cohesiveness and inclusive place-making.

### 5.2 Housing and employment strategy

The spatial strategy involves growth at a range of locations spread across the district, including a focus on urban regeneration as much as possible, followed by the selective release of greenfield sites both within and on the edge of the urban area. The spread of housing growth should help ensure that there is a broad spread of housing choice, and so, as a result, there is likely to be housing provision for a wide range of community groups (including those with protected characteristics). Strategic urban extensions may provide enhanced opportunities to secure development that benefits new and existing communities by delivering a mixture of housing types and infrastructure improvements such as improved access to primary education, green infrastructure, highway improvements, sustainable transport, etc.

With regards to employment growth, there is a focus on existing employment areas, which are relatively already accessible by car and public transport. Therefore, inequalities are unlikely to arise as a result of this continued focus. New allocations are made at Ratcher Hill Employment Area, which could have particular benefits for nearby deprived communities, including young people and women, provided that they are able to access the jobs that are created. There is a possibility that policy E6 could be implemented to help secure benefits for these communities.

Housing affordability is a significant barrier to equality. The local plan requires the new housing supply to include affordable housing provision which may benefit people with protected characteristics, including those on low-income, disabled people, lone parents, and young people who may be less able to afford the costs of housing.

Housing site allocations within Mansfield urban area and Market Warsop will support the delivery of new housing in suitable, sustainable locations. As a result, related Section 106 (S106) planning contributions provide opportunities to improve access to community facilities and services where current availability is lacking or require appropriate enhancements to meet needs.

Specialist housing is addressed in policy H6 (Specialist Housing) and ought to ensure that the elderly, people with disabilities or other vulnerable groups are equally able to live in a home that meets their specific needs within the general community, rather than restricting accommodation with separate specialist social housing or care homes.

A framework has also been established to address the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show-people (policy H8). This policy should therefore promote equality of opportunity to housing and will support Gypsy and Traveller households in gaining more equal access to education, health, welfare and employment services.

Overall, the local plan is likely to have positive impacts on equality, by seeking to improve provision of housing and employment opportunities, particularly for groups that are struggling to afford homes or find a job.

Though increased development in an area can lead to amenity and traffic concerns, it is considered unlikely that there would be differential impacts on groups with protected characteristics. Furthermore, the sustainability appraisal of the Mansfield District Council Local Plan demonstrates that potential impacts on air quality, amenity and wellbeing are unlikely to be significant.

### **5.3 Town and district centre uses, regeneration and improvements**

The local plan sets out a number of policies which aim to protect and maintain the role of Mansfield centre, district centres, local centres, neighbourhood shopping parades and local shops across the district (RT2, RT8, RT9, IN7). This should promote equality of opportunity, particularly for older people, disabled and other groups that may be less able to travel or less likely to have access to a car, by supporting local access to shopping facilities and non-retail services. This is also likely to support community cohesion and positive relations between groups, though it is uncertain the extent to which this would be achieved.

The local plan also sets out policies for the regeneration and renaissance of Mansfield town centre (RT1, RT4, S3, S4). Together, these policies should improve accessibility, which will likely benefit older people and disabled people who may be more likely to be affected by mobility or visual impairments. They will also support wider improvements to the public realm which will have benefits for all groups, and promote community cohesiveness and positive relations between groups.

### **5.4 Infrastructure provision**

The provision of appropriate infrastructure, including health and education services, is key to social inclusion and cohesiveness. The local plan will resist the loss of local shops and community facilities, including community/village halls, post offices, schools, nurseries, places of worship, health services, care homes, libraries, public houses and local convenience shops. This will help to maintain and support equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups who may be more likely to use these facilities. Such facilities also help to promote community cohesiveness.

The local plan also includes policies to ensure that new development will be supported by appropriate physical, social and green infrastructure, including schools and hospitals as well as highways provision and infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. Where on-site provision is not appropriate, the delivery of agreed infrastructure requirements will be secured through Section 106 (S106) Planning Obligations, and through a Community Infrastructure Levy if adopted by the council in the future. These policies ought to help to ensure that a range of

community groups can benefit from development, rather than be impacted negatively or excluded.

## 5.5 Highways and sustainable transport

Walking and cycling can have benefits for health and wellbeing, and can contribute to reducing social exclusion. The local plan includes several policies (RT5, IN8, IN10) that support the modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport, and sets out measures to protect and enhance the sustainable transport network. This could promote equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups, including children, young people, the elderly and those with disabilities.

Improvements to the public transport network, including enhanced railway connectivity to the Warsop settlements (Policy IN8), are also likely to reduce social exclusion and promote benefits for protected characteristic groups who may be more likely than the general population to rely on public transport, including young people, older people, disabled people, and carers travelling with young children.

The local plan also includes policies (e.g. policies IN8, IN10) to ensure that new developments are accessible by public transport, that adequate car parking is provided, and that walking and cycle routes are safe. These measures should all promote equality of opportunity for both groups that rely on public transport, and those with limited mobility who may be more likely to rely on private car transport.

## 5.6 Open space and environmental resources and design

Networks of green infrastructure, community open spaces, including provision for sports facilities, and allotments can play an important role in the community, promoting health and wellbeing, social inclusion and community participation.

The local plan makes clear that developments that will result in the loss of these facilities will be resisted, and that any loss will need to be mitigated (Policy IN3, IN4 and IN5). There is also a focus on ensuring access to new open space within developments and/or improved access to existing open space and enhancement are provided (IN4).

There is also an emphasis on encouraging improved connections to strategic green infrastructure in the form of recreational green corridors, natural green space and the wider countryside (policies IN2).

The local plan also protects against the development of green areas that are of particular importance to local communities (Policies IN3 and IN6). This supports equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups, including children and young people – who may benefit particularly from the health benefits of exercise and outdoor recreation – and older and disabled people who may also benefit from access to open space for recreation and relaxation.

There is evidence to suggest that children and older people are among vulnerable groups who can be particularly badly affected by pollution and poor air quality.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See for example: <http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/air-pollution/effects?view=short-term> [accessed July 2015].

The local plan aims to ensure that all new development contributes positively to the quality of the environment, and avoids any potential negative impacts from noise, dust, vibration and pollution (Policies P7 and NE3).

Development proposals which could potentially adversely affect human health will be required to be accompanied by an assessment of its potential impact, setting out measures by which any potential impacts can be mitigated. This will promote equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups.

It is unclear what mitigation measures would be secured where developments could have an effect on sensitive sites such as schools or hospitals. However, appropriate measures would depend upon the type of development and impact; therefore specific measures have not been identified in the policy and would be sought on a case-by-case basis.

Climate change policy CC1 that supports community renewable and low carbon energy generation has potential to have a dual impact through the efficient use of environmental resources and from the generation of low-priced energy that can reduce the likelihood of fuel poverty, particularly amongst lower-income groups which include the elderly, lone-parents, and ethnic minorities. Policy P5 (Climate change and new development) also sets out criteria for ensuring that new development contributes to reducing greenhouse gases and adapting to the impacts from climate change.

High quality buildings and neighbourhoods are important to social inclusion and cohesiveness. The local plan sets out design criteria which all new buildings and developments should consider and address, including features to improve safety, reduce crime, and create inclusive environments; and the provision of public space and permeable layouts allowing good connections for pedestrians and other modes of transport. This is likely to have benefits for all groups, and will promote community cohesion and health and wellbeing.

Well-designed developments will also help people to live in a home that meets their needs, rather than in primary or secondary care environments. This ought to have positive effects with regards to building community identity.

## **5.7 Conclusions**

Overall, the local plan is unlikely to have significant negative impacts with regards to equality. The strategy seeks to be inclusive, and is unlikely to widen any gaps in equality.

In particular, the local plan is likely to support the delivery of housing that meets the needs of a wide range of community groups, and to provide employment opportunities that ought to benefit certain vulnerable communities.

A range of policies in the local plan promote equality of opportunity for all and in some cases specifically for persons sharing protected characteristics. For example, policy H6 seeks to provide specialist housing, and policy H8 provides a framework for meeting the needs of Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.

A focus on the protection and enhancement of community infrastructure, green infrastructure networks, open space and accessibility to the district centre, jobs and local centres through an

improved sustainable transport network should also help to improve relations between groups and contribute to the growth in social capital and community cohesiveness.

## 5.8 Mitigation and enhancement

Given that the local plan performs positively, there are not many measures identified for mitigation or enhancement at this stage (Publication draft). A contributing factor to this is previous appraisal work on draft policies (both in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (October 2016) and the EqIA (October 2016) which helped to refine the local plan approach and detailed policies.

Nevertheless, the following measures have been identified to strengthen the approach further.

**Policy P1: Achieving high quality design:** There are positive impacts, but it may be possible to secure enhancements by explicitly mentioning the need for design to consider the religious needs of different community groups. For example, the need to provide spaces for prayer in work environments, and considerations relating to washrooms.

**Policy P7: Amenity:** The policy could state the mitigation that would be required for any development likely to have an impact close to a sensitive site, such as a school or hospital. However, it is recognised that this may be overly prescriptive, and therefore such detail could be provided as supporting text.

**SUE Policy 1 / Policy SUE 2:** It may be beneficial to make it explicit that developments on these strategic sites ought to provide a proportion of homes for specific community groups including those with specialist needs such as the elderly and disabled in particular. However, this will depend on evidence of need.

**Policy NE3: Pollution and land stability:** The policy could state the mitigation that would be required for any development likely to cause unacceptable levels of pollution close to a sensitive site, such as a school or hospital. However, it is recognised that this may be overly prescriptive, and therefore such detail could be provided as supporting text.

## **Appendices: Individual policy assessments**



## Appendix I: Policy S3: Supporting economic and housing growth through urban regeneration & Policy S4: Delivering key regeneration sites

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy S3: Supporting economic and housing growth through urban regeneration.</b>								
<b>Policy S4: Delivering key regeneration sites</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	<p>Policy S5 outlines development proposal features that will be given substantial support and are considered to achieve the council's aims to deliver economic and housing growth through urban regeneration. Policy S6 identifies specific sites in areas that could benefit those in low income groups (access to housing and improved social infrastructure for example)</p> <p>Provision of new high quality housing is likely to promote equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups experiencing higher levels of housing need and suitable accommodation, including children, older people and Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups.</p> <p>Requirements for stronger walking and cycle routes and enhancements to the townscape is likely to promote better</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a

	<p>equality of opportunity for groups who experience mobility or visual impairments, including older people and disabled people, for whom cluttered streetscapes, poorly legible environments and poor accessibility can create barriers to movement. Improved walking and cycling infrastructure could also promote equality of opportunity for protected characteristic groups, including children and young people, who may benefit from improved health and wellbeing, and reduced social exclusion.</p> <p>Regeneration activities are not considered likely to have a differential impact on groups that are protected due to their sexual orientation or maternity. Jobs and homes would be available to people regardless of sexual orientation.</p>								
<p>Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p>	<p>High quality buildings, public spaces and neighbourhoods are key to fostering social cohesiveness through increasing opportunities for social interactions and activity. This policy could therefore have a benefit to all groups including protected characteristic groups. Groups in the urban areas, which are often of low income may potentially benefit more due to the focus on regeneration, but this is positive.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<p>If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?</p>	<p>N/A</p>								
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy IN3 promotes equality of opportunities for groups by supporting the provision of housing and public infrastructures that are required and are of benefit for all people. Improvements to accessibility and the built environment should have particular benefits for groups experiencing mobility or visual impairment. The focus on regeneration may have particular benefits for groups that also suffer from low-income, as it could provide affordable housing and new jobs that such communities could benefit from.</p>									

## Appendix II: Policy P1: Achieving high quality design

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy P1: Achieving high quality design.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>This policy sets out criteria for achieving good design and high quality places and requires all new development proposals to deliver these principles. These include a holistic approach to design, collaborative working with communities and key stakeholders to develop design solutions and utilising opportunities for achieving the regeneration aspirations of the local plan.</p> <p>The policy is likely to promote equality of opportunity for groups through requirements for their inclusion in the design process. This will particularly be beneficial for groups with mobility issues such as older people and disabled people who may benefit from suitable pedestrian access. This will also benefit ethnic minority groups that may have specific design requirements that differ from mainstream practices.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

<p>Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p>	<p>High quality buildings and neighbourhoods are important factors in supporting social inclusion and cohesiveness.</p> <p>This policy is therefore likely to have benefits for all groups, contributing to improved community relations.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<p>If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?</p>	<p>There are positive impacts, but it may be possible to secure enhancements by explicitly mentioning the need for design to consider the religious needs of different community groups. For example, the need to provide spaces for prayer in work environments.</p>							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> This policy is likely to promote equality of opportunity for all groups through requirements for their inclusion in the design process of new developments.</p> <p>There are likely to be particular positive effects for groups that have specific design requirements, such as requirements as a result of mobility issues or religious practices. This policy should help to empower groups to have their specific requirements and concerns addressed within new development proposals. However, its success will depend upon proactive consultation with community groups to understand their needs.</p>								

## Appendix III: Policy P2: Safe, healthy and attractive development

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy P2: Safe, healthy and attractive development</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy is not considered likely to have a significant effect upon equality of opportunity.	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Yes. The creation of attractive and safe public spaces ought to have positive effects with regards to social interaction.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	n/a							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy is likely to have positive impacts with regards to improved public spaces which can support greater social interaction.								

## Appendix IV: Policy P3: Connected development

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy P3: Connected development</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy promotes active modes of travel and seeks to ensure that such routes are safe and attractive. This could help to improve feelings of safety for all groups, particularly those that may otherwise be uncertain of using these routes (for example women, the young, elderly and ethnic minorities).  Seeking to ensure that routes are safe and well connected ought to also have benefits with regards to accessibility, which is likely to be most positive for those with mobility issues.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy seeks to promote the use of streets as social spaces, which ought to promote good relations. The extent of impacts is not likely to be significant though.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy is likely to have positive impacts with regards to improved public spaces which can encourage groups that may feel unsafe to use walking and cycling routes, and to support social interaction.								

## Appendix V: Policy P5: Climate Change in New Development

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy P5: Climate Change in New Development.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>The policy should help to improve energy efficiency for new development including homes, which would benefit occupants by reducing the costs of energy (and thus lowering the possibility of fuel poverty).</p> <p>Those groups that would benefit are those that are able to afford a new home (the policy does not address fuel poverty in existing developments or homes).</p> <p>Given that other local plan policies seek to provide affordable homes across the district, it is possible that a number of groups could benefit, including young people wishing to get onto the property ladder and lower income groups. The elderly are also vulnerable to being in fuel poverty. Other groups such as lone parents, and women with lower comparative earnings could also benefit.</p> <p>Requirements for sustainable transport and travel facilities should also help to benefit groups with mobility issues, such as the</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A

	elderly or the disabled.							
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Not relevant.							
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	The government makes it clear that improvements to the energy performance of buildings should be driven through Building Regulations and not planning policy. In this respect, the Local Plan is restricted in its scope of influence. However, the policy encourages more efficient design and layout as well as the use of low carbon technologies, which should all help to lower fuel bills should such measures be secured.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy will help to improve energy efficiency for new homes, which would benefit occupants by reducing the costs of energy (and thus lowering the possibility of fuel poverty). Requirements for sustainable transport will further ensure new developments are accessible by all and reduce the risk of social exclusion.</p>								



## Appendix VI: Policy P7: Amenity

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy P7: Amenity.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>The policy aims to ensure that all new development contributes positively to the quality of life of existing and future residents by avoiding any potential negative impacts on residential amenity. This includes adverse effects on living conditions through the loss of privacy, excessive overshadowing or overbearing impacts. This also includes nuisance arising from odour, light, noise or vibration.</p> <p>This is likely to promote equality of opportunity for children and older people, who are among vulnerable groups who can be particularly badly affected by noise, dust and vibration in particular. It could also promote equality of opportunity for disabled people including disabled children at schools affected by noise. Children affected by autism including Asperger's syndrome can be more sensitive to noise.<sup>16</sup></p>	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>16</sup> Autism Education Trust (2008) Educational provision for children and young people on the autism spectrum living in England: a review of current practice, issues and challenges

<p>Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p>	<p>The policy is likely to have wider benefits for all groups, and could contribute to improved community relations.</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?</p>	<p>The policy could state the mitigation that would be required for any development likely to have an impact close to a sensitive site, such as a school or hospital. However, it is recognised that this may be overly prescriptive, and therefore such detail could be provided as supporting text.</p>							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> This policy will promote equality of opportunity for vulnerable groups who may be affected by noise or vibration in particular, including children, older people and disabled people.</p>								

## Appendix VII: Policy H3: Housing density and mix

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy H3: Housing density and mix.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>The policy requires new housing developments of 10 dwellings or more to provide a range of dwelling sizes and types reflective of housing need. This is likely to promote equality of opportunity for younger people and the elderly that are likely to benefit from smaller housing compared to the common three bedroom housing within the Mansfield district. This may also support the delivery of larger housing of 4 or 5 bedrooms, suited for families, which is also undersupplied in the Mansfield area.</p> <p>Encouraging a range of housing types should further support the delivery of housing suited for groups with mobility and disability issues. Access to suitable housing within a mixed community environment can ensure equal opportunity for participation in the social realm to persons not sharing protected characteristics.</p> <p>The implications for certain ethnic groups are uncertain. Whilst the promotion of a mix of uses could help to supply housing</p>	?	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A

	that is suitable and attractive to such groups, there may be specific requirements (such as larger homes and homes in multiple occupation), that need to be considered.							
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	A range of dwelling sizes and types are likely to encourage mixed communities which are key to social cohesion. This will benefit a range of community groups. It is uncertain whether the mix of uses would help to better integrate community groups from different ethnic, religious and sexual identities though.	?	✓	✓	✓	?	n/a	?
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy will promote equality of opportunities for younger people, the elderly and the disabled by supporting the supply of a range of housing sizes and types that meet the requirements and needs of these groups. The policy could also help to promote mixing of groups from different ethnic backgrounds / race, but this is more uncertain.</p>								

## Appendix VIII: Policy H4: Affordable housing

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy H4: Affordable housing.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	Housing affordability is a significant barrier to greater equality. This policy will promote equality of opportunity across all groups by supporting the increased availability of affordable housing across the district. Affordable housing provision is likely to have the greatest benefit to groups who experience income-related barriers to housing (for example young people, single parents, ethnic minorities).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Provision of affordable housing can help communities to develop a sense of identity if it allows people to stay in a home for an extended period of time. Tenure blind mixing of affordable homes would also be beneficial with regards to the development of social capital and good relations between different community groups.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of effects:</b> The policy will increase the supply of affordable housing in the district, improve access to housing for groups who experience income-related barriers and contribute towards improved relations between groups. It is recommended that a blind mixing approach towards the tenure of affordable homes is								

undertaken, as this will be beneficial to the development of social capital.

## Appendix IX: Policy H6: Specialist housing

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy H6: Specialist housing.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy supports an increase in the provision of suitable housing for elderly and other vulnerable groups (such as the disabled). This ought to lead to greater equality between these groups and persons not sharing these characteristics (by allowing these groups to live in suitable housing and within the community).  Accommodation that is designed to support vulnerable groups and the elderly ought to make interactions with Council services more efficient.	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy should help to support groups such as the elderly and disabled to live within communities and interact socially.	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							

**Summary of impacts:** The policy should have positive effects upon elderly and other vulnerable groups by ensuring they too have access to suitable housing that meets their needs. This could have knock-on benefits with regards to community relations by supporting elderly and disable groups to live in communities rather than in separate isolated accommodation.

## Appendix X: Policy H7: Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy H7: Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy supports the delivery of houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation where it will contribute to the achievement of mixed and balanced communities and would not adversely affect the amenity of adjacent properties.  Such housing types are suited to young people and lower income groups and thus this ought to promote equalities of opportunity between such groups and persons not sharing protected characteristics. This could also be beneficial to single parents, who tend to be female.	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The provision of suitable accommodation ought to help reduce the potential for amenity concerns that are associated with houses in multiple occupation. This could help to improve relations between different social groups regardless of their characteristics.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy should promote equality of opportunities for young people and those on low incomes by supporting the delivery of housing suited to								



their needs. This could have knock-on impacts on community relations by helping to provide suitable accommodation that does not generate amenity concerns.

## Appendix XI: Policy H8: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy H8: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy sets out provision to meet the housing needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People and outlines requirements for new developments.	✓	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a
Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	<p>This policy will promote equality of opportunity to housing for the group and support Gypsy and Traveller households in gaining more equal access to education, health, welfare and employment services.</p> <p>A criteria-based approach will be applied to any proposals for new sites, and any new sites will be required to be located as such to have good access to schools, medical facilities, shops and public transport, with particular benefits for young people, pregnant women or new mothers, disabled people and older people.</p>							

Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is likely to lead to reduced tensions between Gypsies and Travellers and neighbouring settled communities to the extent that it reduces roadside dwelling and non-tolerated sites or encampments without planning permission. Permanent planning permission for new sites is likely to lead to improved services at sites and can provide the basis for fostering more neighbourly relations between communities.	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> Gypsies and Travellers include recognised racial minority groups, including English Gypsies and Irish Travellers. Site provision is important to enable equal rights to housing, strengthen equal access to services, and improve relations between Gypsies and Travellers and settled communities. The provision set out in the policy should promote equality of opportunities for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People.</p>								

## Appendix XII: Policy E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	Development of employment areas could potentially have negative implications for communities that live nearby and may be affected by increased traffic, noise, vibration and other amenity concerns. The site locations could lead to such issues close to areas that suffer from deprivation (which may impact on certain people with protected characteristics more strongly). However, modelling shows that air quality is unlikely to deteriorate over the plan period. It is expected that mitigation measures would be in place to manage issues such as noise and amenity concerns. The sites are also within existing employment areas, and so such issues ought to be minimal.	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	n/a	✓	n/a
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The allocated sites / area will help to provide employment opportunities in close proximity to communities that fall within the top 10% most deprived areas in the country. Access to jobs in these areas should be good for nearby residents, which could help to support such communities. It is unclear what groups with protected characteristics reside in these areas. However, those within these areas (as well as groups not sharing such characteristics) should benefit from improved access to jobs.	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a

	This might be more likely to benefit groups such as the young (who are entering the age of economic activity), and ethnic minorities (who may be more likely to be living in deprivation). It is considered unlikely that new jobs would be more or less accessible to people on the grounds of sexual orientation (jobs ought to be accessible to all people regardless).							
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is unlikely to have a direct impact on community relations. However, reduced unemployment in deprived areas could help to reduce incidents of anti-social behaviour and crime.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy should have benefits for very deprived communities by providing jobs in close proximity to the Ratcher Hill Employment Area in particular.. This could benefit groups with protected characteristics, but it is uncertain exactly which groups would benefit and whether the impacts would be differential. Other communities across the District may be less likely to benefit from opportunities at these sites.</p>								

## Appendix XIII: Policy E6: Improving skills and economic inclusion

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy E6: Improving skills and economic inclusion.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No.							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy ought to have a positive effect on young people that may not have the skills or experience to gain employment in construction. This could also have positive effects on deprived communities, ethnic minorities and females who may have poorer access to jobs.	✓	✓	✓	?	n/a	n/a	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Not relevant.							
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy will ensure that major development proposals contribute towards improving skills of the local labour force. This should promote equality of opportunities for young people, ethnic minorities and women that may have poorer access to jobs due to a lack of skills and experience or circumstance.								

## Appendix XIV: Policy RT8: District and local centres

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy RT8: District and local centres.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy seeks to sustain and enhance the offering and environment of existing district and local centres. It includes measures for the reduction of street clutter which should have a positive effect for groups with mobility issues (including the disabled and the elderly) or with visual impairment. Improvements to car parking provision should further promote equality of opportunity for those groups who struggle to use public transport. Pregnant women may benefit from good access temporarily should mobility become more difficult,	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	By improving accessibility to district and local centres, the policy will support social cohesiveness through creating new opportunities for social interactions and activity. This could benefit all groups, and is unlikely to lead to any inequalities.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy is likely to promote equality of opportunity for people with mobility issues or visual impairment by improving their access within and to								

district and local centres.

## Appendix XV: Policy SUE1 & Policy SUE2

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy SUE1: Pleasley Hill Farm</b> <b>Policy SUE2: Land off Jubilee Way</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No. Though large scale new development could possibly bring increased traffic, the effects on air quality are not likely to be substantial and infrastructure improvements are anticipated.							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	Both SUEs will involve the creation of new community facilities such as schools, health and open space. These could benefit communities regardless of their characteristics should they be able to afford housing on these sites and / or benefit from new facilities. Both are within close proximity to areas with a high level of deprivation and could therefore have benefits for groups in these areas. It is not known exactly which groups with protected characteristics might be able to benefit as the opportunity for housing ought to be open to all (provided that there is a suitable mix, which caters for groups such as the elderly, disabled, young people, families and those with large families).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected	Uncertain. New development will include new community facilities, and high quality open space. This should encourage social	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

<p>characteristics?</p>	<p>interaction, but it cannot be stated with certainty that relations between groups would be improved as a result.</p>								
<p>If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?</p>	<p>It may be beneficial to make it explicit that developments on these sites ought to provide a proportion of homes specific community groups including those with specialist needs such as the elderly and disabled in particular. However, this will depend on evidence of need.</p>								
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> Development at these strategic sites ought to create sustainable communities that have better opportunities to improve health and wellbeing through greater access to open space and green infrastructure and improved use of social spaces. There is opportunity to provide improved access to housing market through affordable housing schemes, which could benefit a wide range of groups provided that there is a suitable mix of housing types. It may be beneficial to make it explicit that developments on these sites ought to provide a proportion of homes specific community groups including those with specialist needs such as the elderly and disabled in particular.</p>									



## Appendix XVI: Policy IN3, IN4, IN5 and IN6: Protection and creation of community open space, local green space, outdoor sports provision and allotments

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<p><b>Policy IN3: Protection of community open space and outdoor sports provision.</b></p> <p><b>Policy IN4: Creation of open space and outdoor sports provision in new development.</b></p> <p><b>IN5: Protection and creation of allotments.</b></p> <p><b>IN6: Designated local green space.</b></p>								
<p>Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?</p>	<p>No</p>							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>These policies together set out measures to protect existing and create new community open space, sports facilities and allotments, which can play an important role in the community, promoting health and wellbeing, social inclusion and community participation.</p> <p>The policies set out restrictions on developments that will result in the loss of any of these facilities, and ensures that any loss will be mitigated. This supports equality of opportunity for all people – including protected characteristic groups such as children and young people - who may benefit particularly from the health benefits of exercise and outdoor recreation - and older and disabled people who may also benefit more from access to open</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>

	space for recreation <sup>17</sup> .  Requirements for contributions towards or the delivery of new open spaces, green infrastructure networks and sports provision as part of new residential developments should further promote the equality of opportunity mentioned above.							
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Access to open space, sports facilities and allotments can play an important role in the community, promoting health and wellbeing, social inclusion and community participation. In particular, sport and recreation (including managing an allotment patch) can have a positive impact on social inclusion, and can engage young people and older people in their communities. These policies are therefore likely to have wider benefits for all groups, and could contribute to improved community relations.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> These policies protect community open space, sports facilities and allotments, with potential benefits for protected characteristic groups including children, young people, older people and disabled people, who may gain particular benefits from access to green infrastructure networks, open space and sports facilities for recreation.</p>								

<sup>17</sup> <sup>17</sup> Public Health England (PHE), 2014, Local Action on Health Inequalities: Improving access to green spaces, available online at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/355792/Briefing8\\_Green\\_spaces\\_health\\_inequalities.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/355792/Briefing8_Green_spaces_health_inequalities.pdf) [accessed July 2015]

## Appendix XVII: Policy IN7: Local shops, community and cultural facilities

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy IN7: Local shops, community and cultural facilities.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>This policy will resist the loss of and supports new community facilities including community/village halls, post offices, schools, nurseries, places of worship, health services, care homes, libraries, public houses and local convenience shops serving the daily needs of the local community.</p> <p>This should support equality of opportunity for persons sharing protected characteristics, including children and young people, older people, people with disabilities, faith groups, and other groups such as LGBT or ethnic community groups that may make use of community halls and meeting spaces.</p>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is likely to support community cohesion and relations between persons sharing and not sharing protected characteristics.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities	N/A							

to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?									
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> This policy will protect existing and supports the delivery of new community facilities, including facilities that are used by and important to protected characteristic groups. This will support equality of opportunity and community cohesiveness.									

## Appendix XVIII: Policy IN8: Protecting and improving sustainable transport network

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy IN8: Protecting and improving sustainable transport network.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>This policy includes measures to protect and enhance the transport network, including improved access to multi-use trails, new sustainable transport measures such as pedestrian and cycle routes, assisting the reopening of the Dukeries railway line and safeguarding land for local transport schemes.</p> <p>Walking and cycling can have benefits for health and wellbeing, and can contribute to reducing social exclusion<sup>18</sup>. Improved walking, cycling infrastructure and public transport could therefore promote equality of opportunity for certain protected characteristic groups, including children and young people and the elderly.</p> <p>The policy also supports the future development of additional railway infrastructure for the Warsop settlements. Improved public transport accessibility in this area will promote equality of opportunity for groups that are more likely</p>	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a

<sup>18</sup> RA, 2010

	to rely on public transport, including young people, older people, disabled people, and carers travelling with young children, and may help to reduce social exclusion <sup>19</sup> .							
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is likely to have benefits for all groups, and could therefore contribute to improved community relations.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> This policy supports a modal shift away from private car transport towards increased walking, cycling, and use of public transport. This is likely to have health benefits, particularly for children and young people, and to increase equality of opportunity for groups that are more likely to depend on public transport. For those that rely more upon car travel (such as those who have impaired mobility), accessibility is likely to be improved too, as a move towards sustainable modes of travel should help to relieve pressures on roads and parking.</p>								

<sup>19</sup> Department for Transport, 2012

## Appendix XIX: Policy IN9: Impact of development on the transport network

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy IN9: Impact of development on the transport network.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the local plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy will ensure that new developments are accessible by a range of transport modes, including public transport. This is likely to benefit protected characteristic groups who are more likely to rely on public transport, including young people, older people, disabled people, and carers travelling with young children <sup>20</sup> .	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is unlikely to have a direct impact on community relations, but could help to improve travel, which may encourage more social interaction	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> This policy ensures new developments are adequately accessible by private and public transport. This will benefit protected characteristic groups that are likely to rely on public transport such as young people.								

<sup>20</sup> Department for Transport (DfT), 2012

## Appendix XX: Policy IN10: Car and Cycle parking

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy IN10: Car and Cycle parking.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	This policy will require new developments to ensure appropriate provision for vehicle and cycle parking, including meeting the needs of disabled people. This will promote equality of opportunity particularly for disabled people and older people with reduced mobility, potentially improving accessibility to shops and services.	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	The policy is not likely to affect community relations.							
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy will improve the accessibility of new developments, with potential benefits for protected characteristic groups including older people and disabled people in particular.								



## Appendix XXI: Policy NE3: Pollution and land instability

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy NE3: Pollution and land instability.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
<p>Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?</p> <p>Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?</p>	<p>The policy seeks to restrict development proposals that would potentially have adverse effects on human health and wellbeing through contributing to unacceptable levels of pollution or land instability. Where this is considered inevitable, appropriate mitigation and remedial measures are required to minimise the adverse effects.</p> <p>There is evidence to suggest that children and older people (and pregnant women) are among vulnerable groups who can be particularly badly affected by pollution and poor air quality,<sup>21</sup> and housing, schools, hospitals, allotments and children's play areas are particularly sensitive. The policy will therefore help to better promote equality of opportunity for these groups by mitigating any negative effects that may arise as a result of development.</p>	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	n/a	✓	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not	The policy is likely to have wider benefits for all groups, but is unlikely to lead to a							

<sup>21</sup> See for example: <http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/air-pollution/effects?view=short-term> [accessed July 2015].

sharing protected characteristics?	change in community relations.								
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	The policy could state the mitigation that would be required for any development likely to cause unacceptable levels of pollution close to a sensitive site, such as a school or hospital.								
<p><b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy will promote equality of opportunity for children, pregnant women and older people and those with existing long-term health problems or disabilities, who can be more vulnerable to the effects of pollution than other groups.</p>									

## Appendix XXII: Policy CC1: Renewable and low carbon energy generation

EQIA Questions	Discussion of significant effects	Race	Sex	Age	Disability	Religion	Pregnancy maternity	Sexual Orientation Gender reassignment
<b>Policy CC1: Renewable and low carbon energy generation.</b>								
Will the policy potentially impact negatively on persons according to their protected characteristics identity?	No							
Will it promote equality of opportunity between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?  Does the Plan and its policies support improved access and experience of Council services for those users and residents who are from one or more of the protected groups?	The policy supports proposals for community-led renewable and low carbon energy schemes. Such schemes often also provide energy at a more competitive rate than the rate offered from mainstream energy companies. This should promote equality of opportunity for groups on low incomes that may be at risk of or are experiencing fuel poverty. Young people with children, disabled groups and ethnic minorities are more likely to be on low incomes (and or benefits) for example.	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
Will it promote good relations between persons sharing/not sharing protected characteristics?	Supporting community-led proposals could encourage groups to work together to bring forward energy efficiency and renewable energy schemes. This ought to have a positive effect on community relations regardless of characteristics.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
If there is no impact, is there a gap or are there opportunities to develop the policy to promote a positive impact?	None identified.							
<b>Summary of impacts:</b> The policy has potential to reduce the risk of fuel poverty for low incomes groups through supporting community-led renewable energy schemes. Support for such schemes could also improve community relations regardless of group characteristics.								





AECOM (NYSE: ACM) is a global provider of professional technical and management support services to a broad range of markets, including transportation, facilities, environmental, energy, water and government. With approximately 45,000 employees around the world, AECOM is a leader in all of the key markets that it serves. AECOM provides a blend of global reach, local knowledge, innovation, and collaborative technical excellence in delivering solutions that enhance and sustain the world's built, natural, and social environments. A Fortune 500 company, AECOM serves clients in more than 100 countries and has annual revenue in excess of \$6 billion.

More information on AECOM and its services can be found at [www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com).

Address: 4th Floor, Bridgewater House, Whitworth  
Street, Manchester M1 6LT  
Phone number +44 (00)161 907 3500