

www.landuse.co.uk

Integrated Impact Assessment of the Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options

Equalities Impact Assessment

Prepared by LUC March 2019

Planning & EIA Design Landscape Planning Landscape Management Ecology Mapping & Visualisation

LUC BRISTOL 12th Floor Colston Tower Colston Street Bristol BS1 4XE T +44 (0)117 929 1997 bristol@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in: London Glasgow Edinburgh



Land Use Consultants Ltd Registered in England Registered number: 2549296 Registered Office: 43 Chalton Street London NW1 1JD LUC uses 100% recycled paper

FS 566056 EMS 566057

Project Title: Integrated Impact Assessment: Cannock Chase Local Plan

Client: Cannock Chase District Council

| Version | Date | Version Details | Prepared by | Checked by | Approved by |
|---------|------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 01/03/2019 | Draft Equality Impact Assessment for Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options | Kieran Moroney | Taran Livingston | Taran Livingston |
| 2 | 15/03/2019 | Final Equality Impact Assessment for Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options | Kieran Moroney | Taran Livingston | Taran Livingston |

Cannock Chase Local Plan: Equalities Impact Assessment

- 1. This report presents the findings of an assessment of the likely effects of the Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options on equality issues.
- 2. The requirement to undertake formal Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of plans was introduced in the Equality Act 2010, but was abolished in 2012 as part of a Government bid to reduce bureaucracy. Despite this, authorities are still required to have regard to the provisions of the Equality Act, namely the Public Sector Duty which requires public authorities to have due regard for equalities considerations when exercising their functions. In fulfilling this duty, many authorities still find it useful to produce a written record of equalities issues having been specifically considered. That is the purpose of this report.
- 3. The Equality Act 2010 identifies nine 'protected characteristics' and seeks to protect people from discrimination on the basis of these characteristics. They are:
 - Age
 - Disability
 - Gender reassignment
 - Marriage and civil partnership
 - Pregnancy and maternity
 - Race
 - Religion or belief
 - Sex
 - Sexual orientation
- 4. There are three main duties set out in the Equality Act 2010, which public authorities including Cannock Chase District Council must meet in exercising their functions:
 - To eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited under the Act.
 - To advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it.
 - To foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The Cannock Chase Local Plan

- 5. As described in the SA Report which has been provided within the full Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2019), the latest version of the Cannock Chase Local Plan, the Issues and Options version (May 2019), sets out 54 policy options. Specific site options have been identified for housing, employment and mixed use development, as well as Gypsy and Traveller and green space option sites.
- 6. The purpose of the Local Plan is to guide development in the District up to 2036. Strategic planning is only one of the functions of Cannock Chase District Council, so it is not expected that the Local Plan alone would address all of the duties of the Equalities Act.

Baseline Information

7. The Issues and Options version of the Cannock Chase Local Plan (May 2019) and Appendix 3 in the SA Report within the full Integrated Impact Assessment (March 2019) set out baseline information about Cannock Chase District, including some information relevant to the protected characteristics covered by the Equalities Act. The most relevant information is summarised below.

- Cannock Chase had a marginally higher proportion of people who are of working age (63.5%) when compared to the West Midlands region (62.2%) and Great Britain as a whole (63.1%) in 2016. Population projections for the District indicate that the proportion of people over the age of 65 is expected to grow from 18.6% in mid-2016 to 21.9% in mid-2026. It is expected that the over 75 age group will grow faster in Cannock Chase than the rest of the country (48% compared to 38% nationally) up to this same period. This equates to an additional 5,300 people aged 75 and over by 2026. In the 2011 census results 97.7% of the Cannock Chase population was classed as white, compared to 85.9% in England and Wales.
- The health of people in Cannock Chase is varied compared with the England average. Health deprivation is higher than the national average and 16.0% of children (2,900) live in low income families. Life expectancy between 2013 and 2015 in the District was 78.9 for men and 82.5 for women, which was slightly lower than the national averages of 79.5 and 83.1 respectively. This represents a trend towards a slight decrease in local life expectancy and a slight widening of the gap since 2016, between the life expectancy of those living in the most deprived areas in the District and those living in the least deprived areas.
- The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015 showed that Cannock Chase ranked as the second most deprived district in Staffordshire for disability.
- 8. There is little baseline information available that is directly relevant to other protected characteristics including gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, sex or sexual orientation.

Method

- 9. The Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options document has been reviewed to consider the likely impacts of the policy options and the site options on each of the nine protected characteristics from the Equality Act 2010 listed above. For each protected characteristic, consideration has been given to whether the options considered for inclusion in the Local Plan are compatible or incompatible with the three main duties set out in the Equality Act 2010.
- 10. A colour coded scoring system has been used to show the effects that the Local Plan: Issues and Options document is likely to have on each protected characteristics, as shown below.

| Score | Likely Effect |
|-------|---------------|
| + | Positive |
| 0 | Neutral |
| - | Negative |

11. Note that the criteria applied to the appraisal of site options as part of the EqIA differ from the criteria applied to the appraisal of sites as part of the Sustainability Appraisal in the main SA Report; therefore the effects identified are not the same between the two assessments.

Findings

- 12. The detailed findings of the equalities assessment for the policy options considered are presented in **Table A11.1** below. **Table A11.2** presents the findings of the equalities assessment for the site options considered as part of the Local Plan: Issues and Options document. The Local Plan: Issues and Options document does not directly affect a number of the protected characteristics. All of the options considered are expected to have either a positive, mixed or neutral relationship with all of the protected characteristics considered in this assessment. The document is therefore considered to be generally compatible with the three main duties of the Equality Act 2010.
- 13. The Local Plan: Issues and Options document does not include any direct or indirect references to gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, sex and sexual orientation and does not include policy options or site options that are considered to have a direct effect on these four protected characteristics. For the remaining five protected characteristics age, disability, religion or belief, pregnancy and maternity and race , the options considered as part of the

Local Plan: Issues and Options document are likely to have some positive and mixed effects as follows.

- 14. Policy options which seek to address the creation of healthy living opportunities in the District (Policy Options A, B and C) are all expected to have positive effects in relation to the protected characteristics of **age**, **disability** and **race**. All options considered would update the current policy of the Local Plan (Policy CP5) as to place a greater emphasis on the need to create opportunities for healthy lifestyles, healthy eating, and mental health and wellbeing in Cannock Chase. Each of the policy options would incorporate an approach which would seek to reduce the potential for isolation in the District. As such the approach of each policy option is likely to benefit potential vulnerable groups within the local population and those who may be more likely to be affected by issues of isolation. Particular consideration has been given to residents who comprise minorities within the local population.
- 15. Those policy options which relate to whether or not specific policy standards/requirements should be adopted in the Local Plan regarding housing choice (Policy Options A, B, C and D) are likely to have similar effects in relation to the protected characteristics of both **age** and **disability** in Cannock Chase.
- 16. Policy Option A (Housing Mix) would update the existing policy approach in the Local Plan (Policy CP7) in line with current local circumstances, to provide an appropriate mix of housing sizes, types and tenures for different groups. Given that this policy requires developers to demonstrate how the proposed housing mix provides housing appropriate for a range of housing needs (which is likely to include specialist housing for older people and people with disabilities), a positive effect has been identified on both characteristics.
- 17. Alternative Policy Options B and C (Housing Mix) are also expected to have a positive effect on the two protected characteristics in question, as each policy option would result in the introduction of specific percentages of housing mix for all groups. For Option B the requirement for this type of development would be tailored to reflect the ability of different schemes to deliver housing, meaning that some schemes would have no requirement to provide specialist homes. The positive effect expected for this option in relation to each protected characteristic is therefore uncertain. The positive effect expected in relation to these protected characteristics for Option C is likely to be more certain considering that the requirement for larger sites to provide specialist homes is reflective of the greater ability of such sites to accommodate this type of provision and remain viable.
- 18. The final Policy Option D (Housing Mix) has been identified as having a mixed negative and positive effect on the characteristics of **age** and **disability**. While this Option allocates specific sites to provide for the housing needs for identified groups, it is unlikely to promote the integration of these groups within the wider community and may potentially result in the risk of isolating these groups from the rest of the community.
- 19. Policy options which relate to the provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople development in the District are broadly expected to have positive and mixed effects in relation to the protected characteristic of **race** in Cannock Chase. All Policy Options seek to provide sites to meet Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs in Cannock Chase. Policy Option A, which relies on a criteria-based approach to allocating Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites, has been identified as having potential positive and negative effects, given the uncertainty over the delivery of the housing need as the policy does not allocate specific sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople development.
- 20. Policy Option B (Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople) is identified as having a positive effect on the characteristic of **race**, given that the policy allocates sites within the current 'Area of Search'. This area is likely to provide more certainty in terms of the accessibility this group has to local services.
- 21. Policy Option C (Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople) expands the area considered for the allocation of sites beyond the current 'Area of Search'. This is likely to include additional Green Belt sites within the District and may result in the allocation of sites with reduced accessibility to essential services and facilities. As such, potential mixed positive and negative effect has been identified for the characteristic of **race**.

- 22. Policy Option D (Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople) has been identified as having positive effects on the characteristic of **race**, given that the policy requires new large housing sites to provide for GTTS accommodation needs. It is likely that the incorporation of this type of development could be accommodated at such sites without adverse impacts in terms of viability of development. However the positive effect has been identified as uncertain given that the approach does not specify the location or accessibility of these new sites at this stage.
- 23. A large number of other policy options have been considered in the Local Plan Issues and Options document. The remaining policy options do not specifically refer to the protected characteristics of the Equality Act but are expected to benefit all people including those covered by the protected characteristics in question. This includes, for example, affordable housing requirements, provision of sustainable transport options, and protecting town centres.
- 24. It is expected that the residential sites options would have the most direct positive effect in relation the characteristic of **age** in the District. These site options would help to provide a mix of housing (including affordable homes) which meets the needs of older and younger people.
- 25. Sites that are located within close proximity of the more developed areas of the District may also provide a good level of access to community services and facilities. These services and facilities are likely to be of particular benefit to certain sections of the local community such use pregnant woman, as well as those who partake of religious activities. A positive effect has therefore been identified for residential site options within or at the settlement boundaries of the larger settlements in the District in relation to the protected characteristics of **pregnancy and maternity** and **religion or belief.** Residential sites which are not located at the periphery of any urban areas with existing town, district or local centres in Cannock Chase and are not in close proximity to any existing sustainable transport links are less likely to provide access to such services and facilities. Therefore the allocation of these site options may have an adverse impact in relation to these protected characteristics.
- 26. All Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites are likely to benefit this particular group of people in the District by supporting the delivery of accommodation to meet local needs. As such a positive effect is expected for these site options in relation to the protected characteristic of **race**.
- 27. As mixed use site options may provide community uses as part of any new development which comes forward, a positive effect is likely in relation to the protected characteristic of **pregnancy and maternity**. This effect is uncertain given that the precise nature of the development at each location is unknown at this stage. Where mixed use sites would provide residential use as part of the new development, the relationship between the site and existing services and facilities in the District may have an effect in relation to the protected characteristic of **religion or belief**. The proximity of sites to the more developed areas of the District and sustainable transport links has also been used to inform this part of the assessment.

Consultation on the Local Plan

28. As well as the content of the Local Plan, it is important that the protected characteristics of the Equalities Act are taken into consideration when preparing and consulting on the Plan, in particular ensuring that all groups of people have the opportunity to access and participate in consultations.

Table A11.1: Likely effects of the Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options document (policy options) on the nine protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Objective 1: P | romote pri | ide in attracti | ve, safe, local | communities | | | | | | |
| Design Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options A negligible effect | | | | | | tected character | ristics against | which they hav | e been assesse | ed. A |
| Objective 2: C | reate heal | thy living opp | ortunities acr | oss the Distri | ct | | | | | |
| Social Inclusion and Healthy Living Policy Options | Option A | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The three options considered (Option A, Option B and Option C) would update the current Local Plan policy (Policy CP5) relating to social inclusion and healthy living. All options would place increased emphasis on providing linkages and opportunities for healthy lifestyles healthy eating, and mental health and wellbeing including reducing isolation. As such it is likely that these options would help to reduce the potential for otherwise vulnerable groups within the local community to be affected by these issues. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **age**, **disability** and **race** for all three options.

Objective 3: Provide for housing choice

| Overall Housing Growth Policy | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Options | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B, C and D do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

| Strategy for Meeting Overall | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Housing Growth Policy Options | Option B1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | Option B2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options A assessed. A neg | | | | | | | rotected chara | cteristics agains | st which they h | ave been |
| Affordable Housing Percentage | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Requirements Policy Options | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options A negligible effect | | | | | | tected characte | ristics against | which they have | e been assesse | d. A |
| Housing Mix Policy Options | Option A | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | +? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|------------------------|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| | Option C | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option D | +/- | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Option A continues the current policy approach, which is laid out in Policy CP7 and requires the provision of choice in homes for the elderly, including developments meeting 'lifetime homes' and 'lifetime communities' standards, standards which help enable independent living, sheltered housing, care homes and 'extra care' developments with structured community areas/medical support on site. This Policy Option encourages the 'appropriate mix of housing, sizes, types and tenures for different groups in the community', including requiring developers to demonstrate how their proposed mix provides housing appropriate for older people – either by adopting technical standards, or by the type of dwellings to be provided (such as bungalows). It would also continue the current policy approach of providing 'housing suitable for households with specific needs'. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **age** and **disability**.

Policy Option B would place greater demands on developers by requiring specific percentages for the mix of housing types, which may include housing for older people as well as homes which are suitable for people with disabilities. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **age** and **disability**. The effect is uncertain considering that the Policy Option does not refer to the requirement to provide specific types of housing provision to meet specialist needs in the District, and there is no guarantee that the required mix could be delivered on all sites.

Policy Option C would require these specific percentages relating to mix of housing sizes, types and tenures for different groups in the community only on large site allocations. This would be based on local evidence of needs and would reflect the ability of larger sites to accommodate a greater range of housing mix. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **age** and **disability**. It is expected that this type of provision is more likely to be viable at larger sites and as such a greater degree of certainty is attached to delivery at these types of sites.

Policy Option D would allocate specific sites in their entirety for different housing needs, which may include care homes that benefit older people and would take into account their needs e.g. locating housing for older people in more accessible locations within reach of town centres. While this approach may help to meet need for certain types of dwellings in the District, specialist housing may encounter viability issues where they are not delivered alongside standard residential dwellings. Furthermore, proving specialist housing at separate sites result in issues relating to the integration of these groups with the wider community. As such a mixed positive and negative effect has been recorded in relation to **age** and **disability**.

| Gypsy, Traveller and | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|
| Travelling | | | | | | | | | | |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|--|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Show People Housing Needs Policy | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Options | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 |

All four policy options seek to provide for the housing needs of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople in the District.

Policy Option A does not allocate specific sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople, but seeks to provide for housing to meet their needs via a criteria-based approach to determining planning application, to reflect the current local context. However given that housing mix would be determined by negotiation, this option would provide less certainty in delivering land to accommodate Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Both positive and negative potential effects have therefore been recorded in relation to **race**.

Policy Option B allocates sites within the current 'Area of Search' and sets out the principle of working with neighbouring authorities to identify opportunities to meet needs. The 'Area of Search' is designed to match travel patterns of this group and is located along the A5 corridor which provides access to the town centre of Cannock and local centres of Bridgtown and Norton Canes. As such residents are likely to be provided with a reasonable level of access to shops, schools and other community facilities. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **race**.

Policy Option C allocates sites and expands the current 'Area of Search' to a District-wide area, as well as working with neighbouring authorities to accommodate Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. However by expanding outside the 'Area of Search' there is no guarantee that these locations will be with easy access of facilities and services. The consideration of additional Green Belt sites, in particular, has the potential to result in adverse impacts in terms of access to services and facilities. A mixed positive and negative potential effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **race**.

Policy Option D provides for the needs of this group by requiring new large housing sites, either as part of the planning applications process, or through Local Plan site allocations process. A positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to **race**. The effect is uncertain considering that the Policy Option does not specify the location of these new sites which may result in sites being located where access to services and facilities is variable.

Objective 4: Encourage a vibrant local economy and workforce

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|--|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Strategy for Meeting Overall Employment | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Needs Policy Options | Option B1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B1, B2, C1 and C2 do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

| Other Employment Land Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Policy Options A negligible effect | | | | | | tected character | istics against | which they hav | e been assesse | d. A |
| Economy & Skills Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A and B do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

Objective 5: Encourage sustainable transport infrastructure

| Sustainable Transport Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B and C do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|---|------------------|----------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Objective 6: C | reate attra | active town ce | entres | | | | | | | |
| Town Centres Hierarchy Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option D | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B, C and D do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

Objective 7: Provide well managed and appreciated environments

| Biodiversity & Geodiversity Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|---|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Policy Options A negligible effect | | | | | | cected character | ristics against | which they hav | e been assesse | ed. A |
| Cannock Chase SAC Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options A effect has there | | | | | y of the protecte | ed characteristic | s against whic | ch they have be | en assessed. / | A negligible |
| Landscape Character and Cannock Chase AONB | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy Options A negligible effect | | | | | | rotected charac | cteristics agair | st which they h | nave been asse | ssed. A |
| Historic Environment Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy option group | Policy Option | Age | Disability | Gender reassign- ment | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|------------------------|------------------|-----|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B and C do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

| Objective 8: Support a greener future | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greener Future Policy Options | Option A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Option C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Policy Options A, B and C do not include any direct or indirect references to any of the protected characteristics against which they have been assessed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics.

Table A11.2: Likely effects of the Cannock Chase Local Plan: Issues and Options document (site options) on the nine protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010

| Site type | Age | Disability | Gender reassignme nt | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|-------------|-----|------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Residential | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 |

It is expected that new residential development would provide for a mix of housing to meet the needs of younger and older people in line with requirement of the emerging Local Plan. A positive effect has therefore recorded in relation to **age** for all residential site options.

*It is also expected that where residential sites are provided in close proximity to community services and facilities within the District a positive effect could result in relation to the provision of services relevant to **pregnancy and maternity**. Premises such as community halls for example might be used for meetings, classes and activities, thereby providing support and reducing isolation for parents. Community facilities may also include places of worship which would be of benefit for residents in terms of support for **religion or belief**. Those residential sites which are located within or at settlement edge of the more developed areas of the District (Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley as identified in the centres' hierarchy) are more likely to provide access to these types of services and facilities. As such a positive effect has been identified for the following residential site options:

C63; C121; C152; C176; C177; C178; C220(a); C220(b); C269; C364; C422(b); C457; R16; R18; R18(a); R20; R30; R32; R33; R37; R112; R139; and R159.

Those residential sites which have been identified as being located outside of the settlements set out in the centres hierarchy and not within close proximity of public transport links are less likely to provide access to services and facilities relevant to pregnancy and maternity. Sites outside of these settlements and not within close proximity of public transport links are also less likely to provide access to services and facilities which may support religion or belief. As such a negative effect has been identified in relation to both of these protected characteristics for the following residential site options (although this is not shown in the effects row above):

C116(b); N49; N49(a); N63; N68; R39; and R129.

Note that the criteria applied to the appraisal of sites as part of the EqIA differ from the criteria applied to the appraisal of sites as part of the Sustainability Appraisal in the main SA Report, therefore the effects identified are not the same between the two assessments. Of the sites not listed above there a number of sites which provide access to sustainable transport links but are not in close proximity to the larger settlements and therefore would have no effect as part of the appraisal for the EqIA.

| GTTS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | |

New GTTS sites provided in the District would specifically help to meet the accommodation needs of this particular group. Therefore a positive effect is expected for all GTTS site options in relation to **race**.

| Site type | Age | Disability | Gender reassignme nt | Marriage and civil partnership | Pregnancy and maternity | Race | Religion or belief | Sex | Sexual orientation |
|-----------|-----|------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| Mixed use | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +?* | 0 | 0* | 0 | 0 |

New mixed use sites in the District may provide space for the provision of community services and facilities. The majority of the mixed use sites considered contain an element of residential or employment development, however, sites CE42, CE52/C119, CE56/C326, C113, C373/CE55, C373/CE58, NE8/N57, NE11, RE23, RE25/R128 and R127/RE24 would deliver an element of unspecified non-residential development or other form development which might support service provision in the District such as community uses or recreational uses. The improved provision of community services and facilities in Cannock Chase could result in a positive effect in relation to the provision of services relevant to **pregnancy and maternity**. Premises such as community halls for example might be used for meetings, classes and activities, thereby providing support and reducing isolation for parents. As it is unknown what type of development will be provided at all of the mixed use site options considered, the effect of this this type of site in the District is uncertain.

*It is also expected that where mixed use sites proposed to contain residential development are provided in close proximity to community services and facilities within the District a further positive effect could result in relation to the provision of services relevant to pregnancy and maternity. Four mixed use site options (C113, C375/CE58; C432/CE61, and R127/RE24) which are expected to contain new homes are located at or within the settlement edges of the more developed settlements in Cannock Chase. The higher number of community facilities and services which are likely to be accessible at such locations may also include places of worship. This is expected to be of benefit for residents in terms of support for **religion or belief** and as such a positive effect is expected for the four sites in relation to this.

Only one mixed use site option (NE8/N57) which would contain housing has been identified as being located outside of the settlements set out in the centres hierarchy and not within close proximity of public transport links. This site is less likely to provide access for new residents to services and facilities relevant to pregnancy and maternity or supporting religion or belief. As such a negative effect has been identified in relation to both of these protected characteristics for this one mixed use site option.

| Employment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------|--|--|
| It is not expected that the provision of employment sites in the District will have any direct or indirect effect in relation to any of the protected characteristics against which this assessment has been performed. A negligible effect has therefore been recorded for all protected characteristics. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Green Space 0 <th< th=""></th<> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| It is not expected the against which this as | • | | | | • | | • | • | aracteristics | | |