

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	Draft Supplementary Planning Document 18 – Development Frameworks for Places for Everyone Strategic Site Allocations
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Cris Logue
Department/Team	Business, Growth and Infrastructure
Proposed Implementation Date	25 September 2024
Author of the EqlA	David Wiggins
Date of the EqlA	13 August 2024

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?

Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 18 supports policies relating to Bury’s strategic site allocations at Elton Reservoir (Policy JPA7) and Walshaw (Policy JPA9) of the Places for Every Joint Plan (PfE) which was adopted in March 2024.

Draft SPD18 sets out more detailed guidance on what the Council will expect in terms of this specific requirement of the PfE policies for the Elton Reservoir and Walshaw strategic site allocations. In particular, SPD18 requires the masterplans and phasing strategies are supported by detailed evidence to justify the approach and that this is presented collectively as a Development Framework for each site. It is intended that these Development Frameworks be approved as SPDs in their own right so that they will be a material consideration in the decision-making process for subsequent planning applications.

It is proposed that the draft SPD is subject to a six-week period of consultation in order to establish stakeholder views on its content.

Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?

Employees: **No**
 Community/Residents: **Yes**
 Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **Yes** – site developers
 If the answer to all three questions is ‘no’ there is no need to continue with this analysis.

2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation

Documentary Evidence:

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and supporting evidence

Data:

[Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and supporting evidence](#)

Stakeholder information/consultation:

Places for Everyone has been subject to consultation at various stages and has been subject to an examination by Government-appointed Inspectors.

2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age	Positive	PfE has been subject to an Integrated Appraisal and part of this has involved an Equality Impact Assessment which has considered in its scope, the likely effects on discriminatory practices; the potential to alter the opportunities of certain groups of people; and/or effect on relationships between different groups of people. The		

		Integrated Appraisal is available at https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning-and-housing/places-for-everyone/pfe-adoption/		
Disability	Positive	See above		
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	See above		
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Neutral	See above		
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	See above		
Race	Neutral	See above		
Religion and Belief	Neutral	See above		
Sex	Neutral	See above		
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	See above		
Carers	Neutral	See above		
Looked After Children and Care Leavers	Neutral	See above		
Socio-economically vulnerable	Positive	See above		
Veterans	Neutral	See above		

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date

Section 3 - Impact Risk

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 – 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

3.2 Level of risk identified	0
-------------------------------------	---

3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	The impacts considered under section 2.4 show that the activity will have either positive or neutral impacts on the various groups identified.
-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	X	
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	David Wiggins	13/08/24	
Responsible Asst. Director/Director	Cris Logue	13/08/24	
EDI	Lee Cawley	12/09/24	QA Complete. Positive and neutral impacts identified only

EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details
