

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) - Bellerby Theatre and North Place Day Centre Planning Brief

All public authorities are required by the Equalities Act 2010 to specifically consider the likely impact of their policy, procedure or practice on certain groups in the society. These groups (sometimes referred to as equality stands) are defined by the 2010 Act as:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender (sex)
- Race
- Sexual Orientation
- Religion or belief
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity

It is our responsibility to ensure that our policies, procedures and service delivery do not discriminate, including indirectly, on any sector of society. Council policies, procedures and service delivery may have differential impacts on certain groups, and these will be highlighted in the EqIA screening. Likely differential impacts must be highlighted, and described, as some may be positive.

Where likely significant adverse differential impacts are identified, consideration should be given to opportunities to reduce or mitigate this through a full equalities impact assessment.

Equality Impact Assessment Screening

Section	Planning Services	Officer responsible for the screening/scoping		Tanya Mankoo-Flatt, Principal Planning Policy Officer	
Name of Policy to be assessed	Consultation Draft Bellerby Theatre and North Place Day Centre Planning Brief	Date of Assessment	14.10.2010	Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	In part. The draft brief is guidance (informal policy) based upon existing Local Plan policies as supplemented by more recent national planning policy on “sustainable economic development” (Planning Policy Statement 4, CLG, 2009)
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy/procedure/practice?		<p>To provide supplementary guidance to developers planning and designing redevelopment of the site. It also provides guidance to the Council in determining any future planning applications on the site.</p> <p>The aim is for provision of redevelopment of underused and some poor quality buildings to provide a mixed use, potentially retail-led town centre development that contributes to the vibrancy of the local economy. This will provide improved shopping facilities in the town centre, within easy access of public transport, and additional jobs in a sustainable location.</p> <p>Much of this assessment is dependent upon the mix of land uses that will be provided on the site. The brief is broad, and recognises several suitable uses for the site. The brief identifies the best use for the site to be mixed use of food retail, housing and potentially community uses (possibly in Beverley Hall).</p>			

	<p>The site includes Bellerby Theatre, Victoria Court sheltered flats, Guildford Youth and Community Centre, Beverley Hall, North Place Day Centre, the workshop at the rear of the Live and Let Live public house, and a long stay surface public car park.</p>
<p>2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To recommend suitable uses to guide the development of the site prior to its disposal. • The number of homes on the site must be maintained. • Community users currently using the site will be found or provided with suitable alternative accommodation, potentially on the site or in alternative suitable locations.
<p>3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those living in, working in or visiting the Borough of Guildford, who will benefit from increase in employment opportunities, and redevelopment of an underused, centrally-located site. • People living in and close to the town centre who will be able to do their main supermarket shopping more locally. • Some people on the Council's Housing Register, as new, energy efficient homes, both market and affordable would be provided.
<p>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy / procedures / practice?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved (food) shopping facilities in the town centre enhancing and strengthening the town centre and its contribution to Guildford's economy. • Reducing distance local residents need to travel for a full supermarket shop • Additional town centre jobs. • New homes (private and affordable) • Improvements to the appearance and safety of the area. • More energy efficient new buildings. • Making better use of an underused strategically important site and some of its dated and poor quality buildings. • Potential capital receipt to the Council.
<p>5. What factors / forces could contribute / detract from the outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic attracted by retail use. • Cost to the Council of re-providing facilities for community groups currently accommodated on the site, although the cost will need to be met by the developer, it could be on a Council-owned site. • Probably a reduced number of affordable homes on the site and a reduced number of

	homes for elderly people on this site.
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those living in, working in or visiting the Borough of Guildford, who will benefit from increase in employment opportunities, and redevelopment of an underused, centrally-located site. • People living in and close to the town centre who will be able to do their main supermarket shopping more locally. • Some people on the Council's Housing Register, as new, energy efficient homes, both market and affordable would be provided. • The few remaining elderly residents on the site (in the out-dated Victoria Court). • Providers of and users of community services currently using the buildings on the site. • Existing businesses in the town centre, in particular the food stores. • Local residents, and all those living or working close to the site.
7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	<p>Guildford Borough Council is responsible for the guidance document, and will be formally adopting it.</p> <p>The guidance will be used by developers in designing a scheme for redevelopment of the site. The Council will take it into consideration in determining any planning applications on the site.</p>
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to age?	Yes (both positive and negative)
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	<p><u>Older People:</u> Victoria Court sheltered accommodation has been decommissioned, and currently has very few remaining residents. The flats will be vacant by spring 2011. Residents are being re-housed by the Council, most in general needs housing where this is more suitable. Victoria Court flats are small and outdated, and new homes may represent a positive impact for some tenants.</p> <p>There could be some disruption in moving for some elderly people who may not be in good health.</p> <p>The brief requires that the overall number of homes on the site is not reduced, in line with adopted Council planning policy. The number of affordable homes would most be likely be reduced, as Victoria Court is 1970s-built Council-owned accommodation. This would comply with current Council planning policy. New homes on the site would not be sheltered</p>

	<p>accommodation specifically for elderly people. This accords with the reducing need of those on the Council’s Housing Register for traditional “sheltered housing”.</p> <p>The North Place Day Centre provides a meeting place and facilities for older people (almost all of whom living in the east of the borough) and its re-provision may mean that some of those currently using the centre may have to travel further to access the re-provided facilities. The brief suggests that these facilities would be best re-provided in the east of the borough, close to where the majority of its users live. This could have a positive impact for these elderly people.</p> <p>Community users such as the University of the Third Age, with an elderly membership currently use the Youth and Community Centre. These users would be provided with alternative meeting accommodation. Its location should be informed by where its users live. Depending upon the location and accommodation of its re-provision, this could have a positive or negative impact on its users. The brief is prescriptive in that these facilities must be re-provided, but is not prescriptive in where it must be re-provided.</p> <p>Elderly people living in the town centre may benefit from a town centre supermarket that can be accessed without use of a car or public transport.</p> <p><u>Younger People:</u> There are various uses of the Youth and Community Centre which must be retained on the site or re-provided nearby. These include venues for music performances, art activities, Surrey County Council Youth Service, and drop-in facilities for homeless people. The brief is prescriptive in that these facilities must be re-provided, but is not prescriptive in where they must be re-provided.</p> <p>Younger people may find employment on the redeveloped site, for example in any retail development.</p>
<p>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	<p>Yes (both positive and negative)</p>

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	<p>North Place Day Centre caters for older people, some of whom are disabled. A few current users of the North Place Day centre may have to travel further if the day centre is relocated, although the majority would be likely to travel less to a facility located closer to their homes. Overall, the relocation of this service to nearer its users would be a beneficial impact.</p> <p>Guildford Action Drop-In provides help and advice, health care and hot food for people who are homeless or in temporary hostel accommodation. The facility is located in the Youth and Community Centre.</p> <p>Many of these clients have disabilities associated with mental health and addiction/substance abuse.</p> <p>Disabled people living in the town centre may benefit from a town centre supermarket that can be accessed without use of a car or public transport.</p> <p>Some of the community groups, such as Street Level Art, using the Youth and Community Centre have members with disabilities. These groups would be provided with alternative accommodation in a suitable location. Depending upon where the alternative provision is, this may have positive or negative impacts.</p>
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?	Yes
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The Guildford Action homelessness drop-in facility at the Youth and Community Centre is mainly used by men. This need to be nearby in the town centre must be considered should it be agreed that accommodation for this community facility will be re-provided off the site.
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	There are no community users using the site that have a specific racial bias. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific racial group. However, we do not know the racial groups of the users of the community facilities.
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u>	

have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	There are no community users using the site that meet according to their sexuality. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific sexuality group. However, we do not know the sexual orientation of the users of the community facilities.
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to religion or belief?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Two Christian groups currently use the Youth and Community Centre for religious purposes. The brief requires all community users of the site to be found/provided with suitable alternative accommodation, either on the site following redevelopment, or off-site.
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender reassignment?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	There are no groups specifically for transsexual or transgender people currently using the site. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on transsexual or transgender people. However, we do not know the gender of the users of the community facilities.
15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to marriage and civil partnership?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	All community groups meeting and services provided on the site will be found suitable alternative accommodation, either on site or in a suitable alternative location.
16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to pregnancy and maternity?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	All community groups meeting and services provided on the site will be found suitable alternative accommodation, either on site or in a suitable alternative location.

<p>17. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on former offenders?</p> <p>(considering the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>If the homeless drop-in facilities are not re-provided nearby, this could have an impact on former (and current) offenders, who are one of the groups most likely to become homeless and sleep rough.</p> <p>This need to be nearby in the town centre must be considered should it be agreed that accommodation for this community facility could be re-provided off the site.</p>
<p>18. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on those with dependants/caring responsibilities?</p>	<p>Yes (potentially positive and negative)</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>North Place Day Centre would be demolished, and the service most likely re-provided in a more suitable location (given that almost all of its users live in the east of the borough). The brief is prescriptive in that this facility must be re-provided, but is not prescriptive in where it must be.</p> <p>Elderly people moving from Victoria Court may be relocated further away from their support networks, potentially a negative impact.</p>
<p>17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-18 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, some negative, some positive.</p> <p>The draft brief is prescriptive in that community users of the site must be re-provided with suitable accommodation. However, the brief is not prescriptive in where this community use must be.</p> <p>Some of the community users could be provided with suitable alternative accommodation on the site, whilst others (such as the North Place Day Centre for elderly people) could potentially be found more suitably located accommodation. A financial contribution from a developer could result in more suitable modern accommodation being found or developed.</p>

		With suitable measures put in place at the earliest stage (at the pre-planning application stage) to mitigate the adverse impact for example by re-providing the relevant facilities in a suitable location, any potentially negative impacts could be reduced.
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?	Yes	It cannot be justified on grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group. However, enhancing the town centre economy, providing jobs and making best use of centrally-located land is in the interests of all residents of the borough. The effects on particular groups can be reduced or eliminated by re-provision in suitable locations. The brief is prescriptive in that community facilities must be re-provided, but is not prescriptive in where they must be re-located.
19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?	No	Suitable facilities must be identified to replace the community uses in suitable locations, some of which will need to be in the town centre. Beverley Hall may be retained, and there is potentially for some of the uses to be accommodated in that building. Redevelopment plans for the site may include provision of new community meeting space.
20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?	Yes	Potentially. There is insufficient information in some areas to determine impacts across equality strands/groups. For example, the Council does not have access to information on the profile of all people currently using the community facilities on site, for example, ethnic groups, sexual orientation.
21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?	No	A full assessment is not considered to be required due to flexibility of the brief in relation to re-provision of community uses and potential for suitable mitigation. The decisions to close Victoria Court and North Place Day Centre have been made independently of this planning brief, and so are not considered in this assessment. Re-provision or otherwise of these facilities is the concern of this planning brief. It could be that the brief results in some users having better quality accommodation in a more suitable location. The replacement of the accommodation for community groups will need to be discussed with

		the Council's Community Care Services and Planning Services at the earliest stage of pre-planning application discussions.					
22. Is there a missed opportunity to improve your business in relation to any of the policies, procedures or practices to promote racial, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief equality?	No						
23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	No	<p>Impact on each group to score : 0 – no relevance, no adverse impact, or positive impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact</p> <p>Total Impact Score : 0-8 points low adverse impact, no need for full EIA 9-17 points medium adverse impact, full EIA required 18-24 points high adverse impact, full EIA required</p>					
		Age	Disability	Gender (sex)	Race	Sexual Orientation	Religion or Belief
		2	2	2	0	0	1

		Gender Reassignment	Marriage and Civil Partnership	Pregnancy and Maternity	Total Impact
		0	0	0	7
24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?	N	<p>No. however, if the site is redeveloped, the most appropriate replacement accommodation possible must be found for each community group or service currently using the site.</p> <p>The site is centrally located in Guildford Town Centre. However, some of the buildings are outdated. There is potential for improved more modern community space of flexible design to be provided for all users, potentially even in more suitable locations. The brief is not prescriptive in where these must be, nor in what form these should be provided (for example, existing accommodation or new buildings).</p> <p>Early discussions between the community users/groups, the Council and any potential developer of the site will be needed to ensure that the outcome is positive for each community group and for all users of services currently provided on the site.</p>			

**Signed
(completing officer)**

Tanya Mankoo-Flatt

Date

14/10/10

**Signed
(Head of Section)**

Sue Sturgeon

Date

22/10/10

**Countersigned
(member of Equality Action Group)**

Sarah-Jane Willmott

Date

21/10/10