

**ROCHDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH  
COUNCIL**

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT  
FRAMEWORK**

**EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**DRAFT TRAVEL PLANNING AND NEW  
DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING  
DOCUMENT**

**SEPTEMBER 2008**

## **ROCHDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

This document is an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) for the draft Travel Planning and New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) prepared by Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council. The attached pro-forma describes 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, adopted 21st March 2005 sets out 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 is committed to implementation of the Standard across 5 areas of equality: gender, religion, disability, race, age and sexuality. This means that the council will undertake Equalities Impact Assessments that address all of these areas.

**Appendix 1 Equality Impact Proforma**

<b>Department</b>	Strategic Planning	<b>Section</b> Planning and Regulation	<b>Person responsible for the assessment</b>	Richard Chapman	
<b>Name of the Policy to be assessed</b>	Travel Planning and New Development SPD	<b>Date of Assessment</b>	4th September 2008	<b>Is this a new or existing policy</b>	Elaborates on an existing UDP Policy
<b>1. Describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy</b>	<p>The purpose of this supplementary planning document (SPD) is to expand The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policy A12 providing more detailed practical guidance to deliver school, workplace and residential travel plans. This policy is likely to be brought forward into the Local Development Framework (LDF). The SPD sets out the :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ developments that are required to submit a travel plan,</li> <li>▪ type of travel plan required with advice on preparation and submission,</li> <li>▪ range of measures that can be included in a travel plan,</li> <li>▪ preparation, implementation and monitoring of travel plans,</li> <li>▪ method to secure the delivery of travel plan measures.</li> </ul> <p>The SPD aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimise additional trips generated by new development on the transport (rail, bus, road, cycling and walking, and in the future Metrolink) network;</li> <li>• Reduce dependency and single occupancy car journeys maintaining or enhancing the efficiency of the existing transport network at peak times;</li> <li>• To provide guidance on initiatives to restrain emissions from trips generated from new development on air quality and climate change;</li> <li>• To promote sustainable (public transport, cycling and walking) travel and car sharing;</li> <li>• To encourage efficient business practice through streamlining business fleet travel operations and logistics costs;</li> <li>• Enhance accessibility and connectivity of developments for their workforce and potential employees, widen their choice of feasible travel mode;</li> <li>• Enhance opportunities for people with impaired mobility to take up employment opportunities;</li> <li>• Promote restraint in residential car travel contributing to accident reduction enhancing safety for vulnerable road users in local communities.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation draft seeks to engage developers, agents, consultants and advisors, residents and the local community, businesses and landowners to ensure that their views are heard and considered before the document is finalised.</p>				

<b>2. Are there any associated objectives of the policy, please explain</b>		<p>Contribute to reducing congestion and the need to travel;          Address local congestion around development sites;          Reduce burning of fossil fuels;          Widen travel choice, recruitment catchments and therefore site accessibility;          Tackle social exclusion by enhancing connectivity between areas of deprivation and employment opportunities;          Enhance the viability of public transport routes to site through increased use;          Residential and school travel plans can contribute to accident reduction, enhancing community safety, creating healthier environments for the socially excluded and vulnerable people.</p>	
<b>3. Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way</b>		<p>Individuals, Local Communities and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Development End Users, Schools and Colleges, Councillors, RMBC Officers.          Clear and substantive information will be submitted with planning applications assisting the development control process and implementation of UDP/LDF policy.</p>	
<b>4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy?</b>		<p>Minimise the impact of future development trips on peak time congestion and maximise use of the existing transport network;          Constrained or reduced traffic emissions and impact on CO<sub>2</sub> levels;          Enhanced access and connectivity to employment opportunities for all, offering a feasible choice of travel that is affordable;          Encourage improved business practice and environmental responsibility;          Accident reduction and improved Road Safety,          Better quality control and information submitted with planning applications to assist and inform the development control processes and implementation of UDP policy.</p>	
<b>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</b>		<p>Unforeseen/unavoidable circumstances. Stubborn refusal from the businesses.          Complexity of topic and lack of enforcement.</p>	
<b>6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy</b>	<p>Private Individuals, Community and Interest Groups, Stakeholders, Land Owners, Developers and their agents / consultants, End Users, School pupils, staff and students, Councillors, RMBC Officers.</p>	<b>7. Who implements the policy and who is responsible for the policy?</b>	<p>Development Control, Highway Development (Impact Partnership), Strategic Planning</p>
<b>8. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on racial groups.</b>		Y	<p>N</p> <p>The SPD provides guidance on UDP policies Policy G/SP/3 (Part One Policy) Meeting the needs of local</p>

			communities, Policy A/12 New Development – Travel Plans and School Travel Plans, Policy A/2 – Accessibility Hierarchy, Policy A/3 – Access for Pedestrians and Disabled People, Policy A/4 New Development Access for Cyclists, Policy A5 New Development - Access for buses, Policy A/6 – New Development - Access by Taxi, Policy A7 Access for service vehicles, Policy A/9 New Development – Access for General Traffic, Policy A/10 New Development – Provision of Parking. It does not have any differential impact upon this equalities group.
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The SPD aims to provide a wider choice of travel options for all to the development irrespective of race.

<b>9. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact due to gender</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on accommodating the impact of travel from new development, and the measures proposed have no differential impact upon this equalities group.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? The SPD in providing wider travel choices to access development will benefit both genders, particularly people who do not have access to a car.

<b>10. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact due disability</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on travel plans which alongside the Transport Assessment accompanying a planning application for a development address access requirements for all users. There are specific measures in the detailed design proposals that directly address the needs of people with a disability or impaired mobility. Planning permission and building regulations ensure that developments are accessible and link to the rest of the site. Planning conditions on any decision ensures the development links to adjoining land uses and the existing off-site transport network. There are therefore no concerns that the policy has a differential impact on users with a disability or impaired mobility.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This SPD incorporates measures that are implemented to directly meet the needs of people with a range of disabilities.

<b>11. Are there concerns that the policy <i>could</i> have a differential impact on people due to sexual orientation</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on providing travel and access choices for all irrespective of sexual orientation. The policies within it therefore do not have any differential impact on this equalities group.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? Sexual orientation has no bearing on peoples travel patterns. This SPD aims to meet the travel needs of all accessing a development so provides benefits to all.			
<b>12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their age</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on the implementation framework for travel plans for new developments in line with UDP policies. It therefore will not have any differential impact upon this equalities group. Issues of safety and access are addressed through the preparation and implementation of travel plans alongside measures that are identified through Transport Assessments.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This SPD seeks to overcome some of the safety and accessibility issues and address differential impacts on people due to their age. This is particularly addressed where accessibility to developments need to be strengthened.			
<b>13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their religious belief</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on the implementation framework for travel plans for new developments in line with UDP policies. It therefore will not have any differential impact upon this equalities group. Religious belief has little impact on people's decisions on how they travel therefore the influence of the SPD is negligible.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? As the Travel Planning and new Development SPD seeks to enhance accessibility and reduce demands on the existing transport network, there may be some benefits of access to places they visit associated with their religious beliefs.			
<b>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to them having dependants/caring responsibilities</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on the implementation framework for preparing and implementing travel plans associated with new development. The document does not have any differential impact upon people with dependants / caring responsibilities.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This SPD may result in some improvements to the transport network and accessibility improvements that may make travel for people with dependants / caring responsibilities better.			
<b>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to their offending past</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on the implementation framework for preparing and implementing travel plans associated with new development. The document does not have any differential impact upon people due to their offending past.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? In implementing the travel plans that are produced guided by this SPD their may be some benefits that have a positive impact on people with an offending past and may improve access foer them to employment opportunities.			

<b>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual</b>	Y	N	The SPD provides technical guidance on the implementation framework for preparing and implementing travel plans associated with new development. The document does not have any differential impact upon people due to them being transgender or transsexual.
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? This SPD in guiding the accessibility arrangements and travel needs to access new developments could provide modest improvements to transgender or transsexual people by widening their choice of travel mode.			
<b>17. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on people due issues surrounding poverty</b>	Y	N	This SPD through the implementing the measures identified in travel plans will increase the choice of transport modes available to many people affected by surrounding poverty issues however the cost of travel (fares) could affect their ability to access it and the developments which it serves. It may affect people who earn modest or the minimum wage as well as those without employment. For these people travel will be a high proportion of their income
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?			

5

<b>18. Could the differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy</b>	YES	NO	The improvements to the transport network and the widened choice of travel modes through the preparation and implementation of travel plans provides a positive impact to the majority of groups identified in 8-17. The SPD may also result in enhancements to the wider social, economic and environmental quality of local communities.		
<b>19. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason</b>	YES	NO			
<b>20. Should the policy proceed to a partial impact assessment</b>	YES	NO	<b>21. If Yes, is there enough evidence to proceed to a full EIA</b>	YES	NO
<b>22. Date on which Partial or Full impact assessment to be completed by 26 February 2009</b>					

Signed : Richard Chapman (Strategic Transport Policy Co-ordinator)

Signed (Lead Officer) : Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager)