

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	Whitefield Town Centre Plan
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Sarah Porru
Department/Team	Economic Development and Projects – BGI
Proposed Implementation Date	Proposed for adoption at Cabinet on 4 th December
Author of the EqIA	Jack Livingstone
Date of the EqIA	11/11/24

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

Purpose

- The Plan's purpose is to improve Whitefield town centre for businesses, communities, and the environment over the next 10 years. It does this through proposing various projects which have been developed through multiple consultation sessions with relevant stakeholders

Outcomes

- Development at Uplands and Pinfold Lane
- Interventions on Whitefield's roads to make them easy to walk, wheel, and cycle around. Also, improvements related to infrastructure related to public transport.
- Improvements to Whitefield's townscape and heritage assets
- Creating more things to do in Whitefield
- Improve partnership relating to community space/ community assets
- Work with stakeholders to improve green spaces in Whitefield

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: **Yes/No** (state reasons for answering 'no')

Community/Residents: **Yes/No** (state reasons for answering 'no')

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **Yes/No** (state reasons for answering 'no')

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:

Baseline data/ data already in Council possession

- Nomis data on ethnicity, language, religion, age and sex:-

[Whitefield-Neighbourhood-Profile.pdf \(theburydirectory.co.uk\)](#)

Ethnicity

Ward name	Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	Other ethnic group	White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British	White: Other White
Besses	6.7%	4.4%	4.0%	2.1%	76.5%	4.6%
Pilkington Park	7.7%	0.9%	3.0%	3.9%	77.7%	4.9%
Unsworth	8.5%	1.1%	2.3%	0.7%	83.0%	2.7%

Main language

Ward name	All adults in household have English as a main language	At least one but not all adults in household have English as a main language	No adults in household, but at least one person aged 3 to 15 years, has English as a main language	No people in household have English as a main language
Besses	92.1%	3.0%	1.3%	3.7%
Pilkington Park	94.2%	3.0%	0.7%	2.2%
Unsworth	95.5%	2.4%	0.5%	1.6%

Religion

Ward name	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other religion	No religion	Not answered
Besses	0.3%	51.5%	0.5%	2.6%	5.4%	0.4%	0.2%	34.6%	4.6%
Pilkington Park	0.1%	40.4%	1.2%	22.2%	6.2%	0.8%	0.2%	23.6%	5.2%
Unsworth	0.3%	54.5%	0.7%	5.7%	7.2%	0.3%	0.2%	25.8%	5.2%

Population by age band

Ward name	Aged 4 years and under	Aged 5 to 9 years	Aged 10 to 15 years	Aged 16 to 19 years	Aged 20 to 24 years	Aged 25 to 34 years	Aged 35 to 49 years	Aged 50 to 64 years	Aged 65 to 74 years	Aged 75 to 84 years	Aged 85 years and over
Besses	6.0%	6.6%	9.0%	4.9%	5.4%	14.3%	21.0%	18.2%	7.6%	5.4%	1.8%
Pilkington Park	5.1%	5.6%	6.7%	3.6%	3.9%	11.3%	19.7%	20.0%	12.4%	8.3%	3.5%
Unsworth	4.3%	5.7%	7.7%	4.3%	4.7%	10.9%	19.3%	21.6%	11.1%	7.8%	2.6%

Population by sex

Ward name	Female	Male
Besses	52.4%	47.6%
Pilkington Park	50.4%	49.6%
Unsworth	50.9%	49.1%

- Whitefield land use classes, transportation infrastructure, community sites
- Data from Mapping GM – culture, heritage, transportation, environment and ecology and People and Communities

- Cost of living and anti-poverty analysis, Integrated neighbourhood team strategies, information on which groups have received National Lottery Funding:



Bury Community
Champions Slide De



T5866_CHWhitefiel
d_InFocus.pdf



Placemat_Besses
_v2.docx



Placemat_Pilkingto
n Park_v2.docx



Placemat_Unsworth
_v2.docx



Cost of living and
anti poverty strateg

Data:

Stakeholder information/consultation:

Consultation periods

1. Period 1 ran in June – July 2023. Questionnaire was online. Event held in a public space on a Saturday. The team worked with Whitefield Hebrew Congregation and other Jewish groups to ensure that Jewish people were not under-represented
2. Period 2 22nd January 2024 to 25th March 2024, with a final session in October 2024.
3. Efforts were made to maximise engagement with local stakeholders, including:
 - a) Dedicated Whitefield Town Centre Plan pages were created on the Council’s websites, which contained the full draft Plan, the executive summary, an abridged “about” page, which concisely outlined the information from the plan, and a link to a survey hosted on MS forms;
 - b) Pop-up consultation sessions hosted on Friday 2nd February and on Saturday 3rd February in the foyer of Morrisons, Whitefield;
 - c) Meeting with Bury Blind Society members on Wednesday 7th February;
 - d) Meeting with members of Philips High School’s pupil leadership team on Tuesday 12th March;
 - e) Leafleting of local businesses with flyers containing QR codes;
 - f) Press releases;
 - g) Social media;
 - h) Distribution of weblinks to community and business contacts/ stakeholders; and
 - i) Community Hub updates via the weekly Whitefield newsletter.

j) Meeting with the Whitefield Business Group

Impact on protected characteristics

- Proposals were amended when salient points raised from consultation were found

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	Improvements to junctions, traffic calming, improvements to paths -> Likely to make roads and town centre more friendly to children and older people		<p>Concern in consultation that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cyclops junctions could make road crossing harder for older people. Mitigation – involve older people in the design and consultation of these junctions 2. Paths may be dark and dangerous. Mitigation ensure paths are designed to be 	Neutral

			well overlooked and safe for all	
Disability	Improvements to junctions, support for more car parking spaces (when placed appropriately) -> easier for disabled people to get to Whitefield and to get around once in the town		<p>Concern in consultation that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cyclops junctions could make road crossing harder for disabled people (particularly members of blind community and those using wheelchairs). Mitigation – involve groups of above in the design and consultation of these junctions 2. Disabled people may not be able to use the new or improved paths. Mitigation - involve groups of above in the 	Neutral

			design and consultation of these & ensure that making footpaths easier to traverse does not mean that disabled people who rely on using a car are excluded	
Gender Reassignment	Proposal to better coordinate all community space in Whitefield -> easier to find space to book and more awareness of when e.g., support classes would run		n/a	Positive
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No impact expected		n/a	Neutral

Pregnancy and Maternity	Proposal to better coordinate all community space in Whitefield -> easier to find space to book and more awareness of when e.g., support classes would run		n/a	Positive
Race	No impact expected		n/a	n/a
Religion and Belief	Improvements to junctions, support for more car parking spaces (when placed appropriately) - > Places of worship should become easier to access		Access and egress to places of worship may be affected planned works. Should this happen the Council will work with contractors to ensure that a safe number of fully accessible access and egress points to	Positive

			the places of worship will remain available.	
Sex	Proposal to better coordinate all community space in Whitefield -> easier to find space to book and more awareness of when e.g., support classes would run		n/a	Positive
Sexual Orientation	Proposal to better coordinate all community space in Whitefield -> easier to find space to book and more awareness of when e.g.,		n/a	Positive

	support classes would run			
Carers	No impact expected		n/a	Neutral
Looked After Children and Care Leavers	No impact expected		n/a	Neutral
Socio-economically vulnerable	No impact expected		n/a	Neutral
Veterans	No impact expected		n/a	n/a
All characteristics	No displacement (temporary or permanent) is expected of any groups representing the above characteristics			

2.5 Does the activity present an opportunity to improve inclusion or promote council services relating to any protected characteristic

Some – the proposal to coordinate community space could aid in these ends

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

2.6 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Section 3 - Impact Risk (Pages 10 to 12 of the guidance document)

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 Level of impact x Likelihood	Unlikely (U) x 1	Possible (P) x 2	Likely (L) x 3	Very Likely (V) x 4
Very High Impact (VH) x 4	4	8	12	16
High Impact (H) x 3	3	6	9	12
Medium Impact (M) x 2	2	4	6	8
Low Impact (L) x 1	1	2	3	4
Positive or No Impact (N) x 0	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	

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	outlined in 2.4
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	Jack Livingstone	11/11/24	
Responsible Director/ Asst. Director			
EDI	Lee Cawley	11/11/24	QA complete, impacts identified with mitigations in place to neutralise negative impact or have a positive impact

EqlA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details
December 2023	Jack Livingstone	EQIA updated and added onto new form
11th November 2024	Jack Livingstone	EQIA updated in line with the new proposals – notably, the proposal for a Family Hub has been removed and the proposals to increase footpath width on Bury New Road have been altered to be conditional upon the results of various road audits to be undertaken

EqlA Action Log

5.3 Date	Action
11th November 2024	Consult with Bury Blind Society and Older People's Groups in the design phase of the forthcoming junction refurbishments. Active Travel Team would be the responsible stakeholders for arranging this.