

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) – North Street Design and Development Brief SPD

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		Victoria Potts, Senior Planning Policy Officer	
Name of Policy to be assessed	Consultation Draft North Street Design and Development Brief SPD	Date of Assessment	21.06.2012	Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	<p>The proposed brief updates and replaces the existing Design and Development Brief for North Street, Commercial Road and Leapale Road. Commercial 2003.</p> <p>The draft design and development brief is guidance (informal policy) based upon existing Local Plan policies as supplemented by more recent national planning policy on “Ensuring the vitality of town centres” National Planning Policy Framework March2012.</p>
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 principal purpose of the design and development brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. The brief considers the potential impact of the development of the area on Guildford as a</p>			

	<p>whole and lays down principles for its redevelopment that seek to serve the interest of the wider town.</p> <p>The aim is for the redevelopment of the North Street area to make it a fully integrated part of Guildford town centre based on typical town centre uses, especially retail and extend the active part of the town centre beyond North Street contributing to the vibrancy of the local economy.</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 does not specify the best use for the site but recognises that a mix of uses may be appropriate but that any scheme should be retail-led.</p> <p>The site is bounded by the Friary Centre, North Street, Haydon Road and Leapale Road and includes a total of 2.5 hectares.</p>
<p>2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.</p>	<p>To provide a clear guidance to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site including design principles and land uses.</p>
<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 benefit from the improved visual appearance and safety of the area and improved shopping facilities in the town centre.
<p>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy / procedures / practice?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved shopping facilities in the town centre enhancing and strengthening the town centre and its contribution to Guildford's economy. • Extend the active part of the town centre beyond North Street. • Additional town centre jobs. • Improvements to the appearance and safety of the area. • More energy efficient new buildings. • Making better use of an underused strategically important site
<p>5. What factors / forces could contribute /</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic attracted by retail use.

<p>detract from the outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost to the council of re-providing facilities for bus users currently accommodated on the site, although the cost will need to be met by the developer.
<p>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?</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 benefit from the improved visual appearance and safety of the area and improved shopping facilities in the town centre. • Providers of and users of community services currently using the bus station on the site. • Existing businesses in the town centre. • Local residents, and all those living or working close to the site.
<p>7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?</p>	<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.</p> <p>The Council will take it into consideration in determining any planning applications on the site.</p>
<p>8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to age?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The future provision of a bus facility has not been determined by the Design and Development Brief and the impact on the equality strands will be considered fully in the future proposals for the bus station. This may show a differential impact due to age depending on the users of the bus facility.</p> <p>None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific age group</p>
<p>9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The future provision of a bus facility has not been determined by the Design and Development Brief and the impact on the equality strands will be considered fully in the future proposals for the bus station.</p> <p>The Brief promotes a high density, mixed use development with a high quality pedestrian network which would make it an attractive place for walking and cycling. The development will also remain well-connected by public transport.</p> <p>Redeveloped sites and improvements to the pedestrian environments will need to be designed to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.</p> <p>Improvements to street and public spaces will improve the environment for all, including people</p>

	with a variety of disabilities. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific age group.
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Employment opportunities and improvements to development sites and to the wider environment should benefit men and women equally. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any gender.
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?	The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific racial group.
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?	The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific sexuality group.
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?	The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on any specific religious group or belief.
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender reassignment?	No

<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on transsexual or transgender people</p>
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to marriage and civil partnership?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently due to marriage and civil partnership.</p>
<p>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to pregnancy and maternity?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently due to pregnancy and maternity.</p>
<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>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on former offenders.</p>
<p>18. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on those with dependants/caring responsibilities?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p>	<p>The brief is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above. None of the recommended uses would impact differently on those with dependants/caring responsibilities.</p>
<p>17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-18 amount to there</p>	

<p>being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?</p> <p>Or any other reason?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>	

23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	No	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 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					
		Age	Disability	Gender (sex)	Race	Sexual Orientation	Religion or Belief
		0	0	0	0	0	0
		Gender Reassignment	Marriage and Civil Partnership	Pregnancy and Maternity	Total Impact		
		0	0	0	0		
24. If No, are there any changes required to the policy to improve it around the equality agenda?	No						

Signed
(completing officer)

Victoria Potts

Date

21/06/2012

Signed
(Head of Section)

Carol Humphrey

Date

29/06/12

Countersigned
(member of Equality Action Group)

Sarah-Jane Willmott

Date

02/07/12