

## 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)

<b>Name of Policy/Project/Decision</b>	Holcroft Moss Planning Obligations Consultation Draft Joint Supplementary Planning Document
<b>Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)</b>	Cris Logue
<b>Department/Team</b>	Business, Growth and Infrastructure
<b>Proposed Implementation Date</b>	25 September 2024
<b>Author of the EqIA</b>	David Wiggins
<b>Date of the EqIA</b>	13 August 2024

<b>1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?</b>
The aim of this jointly produced Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is to provide guidance on, and to facilitate, the timely provision of required mitigation at Holcroft Moss, within the Manchester Mosses Special Area of Conservation.
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)

<b>2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?</b>
Employees: <b>No</b> Community/Residents: <b>Yes</b>

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
<b>Age</b>	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 <a href="https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning-and-housing/places-for-everyone/pfe-adoption/">https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning-and-housing/places-for-everyone/pfe-adoption/</a>		
<b>Disability</b>	Positive	See above		
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Religion and Belief</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Sex</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Neutral	See above		

<b>Carers</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Looked After Children and Care Leavers</b>	Neutral	See above		
<b>Socio-economically vulnerable</b>	Positive	See above		
<b>Veterans</b>	Neutral	See above		

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

<b>2.5 Characteristics</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>

**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

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

<b>3.2 Level of risk identified</b>	0
<b>3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation</b>	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)

<b>4.1 Analysis Decision</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Reasons for This Decision</b>
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)

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

**EqIA Revision Log**

<b>5.2 Revision Date</b>	<b>Revision By</b>	<b>Revision Details</b>