

ROCHDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF THE
DRAFT EAST CENTRAL ROCHDALE AREA FRAMEWORK**

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

26 February 2008

ROCHDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

This document is an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for the draft East Central Rochdale Area Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and has been prepared by the Council. The attached Pro-forma sets out how equality impacts have been assessed.

Context

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (RRAA) requires the council to carry out race equality impact assessments on new and proposed policies. The council's race equality scheme, as adopted 21 March 2005 lays down the council's commitment to undertake race equality impact assessments.

The Equality Standard for Local Government also requires equalities impact assessments to be evidenced in order to achieve progress against the levels contained in the Standard. The council has committed itself to implementation of the Standard across 5 areas of equality: gender, religion, disability, race, age and sexuality. This means that the council will ultimately be required to undertake equalities impact assessments that address all of these equalities areas.

Appendix 1 Equality Impact Proforma

Department	Strategic Planning	Section Planning and Regulation	Person responsible for the assessment	Sohida Banu	
Name of the Policy to be assessed	East Central Rochdale Area Framework SPD	Date of Assessment	26 February 2008	Is this a new or existing policy	Existing UDP policy which has been supplemented
1. Describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy	<p>The purpose of this supplementary planning document (SPD) is to provide a clear planning strategy for the area to establish a planning and regeneration framework and provide guidance for future development in east Central Rochdale.</p> <p>The primary aim of the East Central Rochdale Framework SPD is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To create a sustainable, high quality, mixed use neighbourhood that offers choice in terms of property type and tenure and provides an attractive, vibrant and diverse community where people want to live <p>The principal objectives underlying this are as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote the development of a cohesive, successful and vibrant community • To promote a viable housing market • To promote a modern local economy and enterprise culture • To promote an attractive physical and natural environment, making the most of the areas natural resources <p>The aim of the Consultation draft is to engage with the residents and the local community, businesses, landowners, development interests and others to ensure that their views are considered before the document is finalised.</p>				
2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain	<p>The principal objectives will be achieved through the following associated objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving high quality design and sustainability both in terms of new development and the public realm; • Delivering high quality and sustainable housing which meets the needs of existing and emerging households whilst also having broad appeal to people who may wish to move into the area; • Making more efficient and sustainable use of employment land and ensuring that new 				

		<p>development meets the needs of modern employment uses and satisfies local employment needs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the appearance and function of key gateways, corridors and landmarks within the area; • Improving existing areas of open space and ensuring that new areas are well located, attractive and accessible for a range of recreational needs; • Making better use of the areas environmental assets, especially the River Roch corridor. • Making the area safer and more attractive to pedestrians and cyclists and improving accessibility to services and the town centre; and • Ensuring appropriate levels of services and infrastructure to support the new development and serve the area as a whole. <p>In helping the Council to achieve this it will require better quality information to be submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of the UDP policy.</p>	
3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way		<p>Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers, Councillors, RMBC Officers.</p> <p>Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of UDP policy.</p>	
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?		<p>An efficient and effective land use policy to implement the redevelopment and regeneration of East Central Rochdale to ensure a comprehensive approach.</p> <p>Better quality information submitted with planning applications to assist the development control processes and the implementation of UDP policy.</p>	
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?		<p>Unforeseen/unavoidable circumstances.</p> <p>Complexity of topic.</p>	
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy	<p>Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers,</p>	7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?	<p>Strategic Planning.</p> <p>Development Control.</p>

	Councillors, RMBC Officers.			
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups.	Y		N	The SPD objectives generally responds well with all racial groups in the defined area in respect of access to public open spaces, new and improved housing, employment, transport etc. All groups in East Central Rochdale will benefit from this approach to achieving high quality development.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?				
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender	Y		N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?				
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due disability	Y		N	This SPD seeks better design and integration of all developments to ensure a high quality environment for all users, in particularly disabled people. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?				
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to sexual orientation	Y		N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?				
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their age	Y		N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?				
13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief	Y		N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
14. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities	Y	N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
15. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to their offending past	Y	N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
16. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual	Y	N	It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
17. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due issues surrounding poverty	Y	N	This SPD seeks to tackle neighbourhoods with the greatest concentration of poor and outmoded housing together with some of the highest indices of broader local deprivation issues. The regeneration of the SPD area will look to create more opportunities for better choice in housing, jobs, open space and local facilities. It is not anticipated that this SPD is likely to have any differential impact upon this group.		
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?					
18. Could the differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy	YES	NO		The creation of more opportunities, jobs and investment in the area looks to support the local economy and employment.	
19. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason	YES	NO		Please explain for each equality heading (question 8-16) on a separate piece of paper	
20. Should the policy proceed to a partial impact assessment	YES	NO	21. If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA	YES	NO
22. Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by 05 March 2008					

Signed (completing officer) Wayne Poole

Signed (Lead Officer) Paul Simpson