

Equality Impact Assessment

Royston Masterplan Framework

Stage 1 Details of the proposal

Name of service Directorate	Place Culture and Housing
Name of officer responsible for EIA Name of senior sponsor	Stacey White
Description / purpose of proposal	<p>A Masterplan Framework has been prepared for Royston (Local Plan Allocation MU5). A public consultation exercise was undertaken in June/July 2020</p> <p>A Statement of Community Engagement report was prepared following the public consultation exercise and seeks to set out what feedback was received and how this has helped to shape the final version which is being presented to Cabinet/Full Council for approval to adopt as a policy document.</p> <p>The Masterplan Framework will help guide development proposals on the site and ensure that development comes forward in a comprehensive manner and with the correct supporting infrastructure.</p>
Date EIA started	04/10/2019
Assessment Review date	23/06/21

Stage 2 - About the proposal

What is being proposed?	As part of the development of the Masterplan Framework, a 6 week public consultation was undertaken in June/July 2020. The consultation included dedicated webpages on the council website, hosting the proposed masterplan information, online
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

questionnaire and monitoring form, consultation events with paper copy information available on request for those who were unable to use digital methods. There were online Q & A's hosted that provided stakeholders with the opportunity to ask questions of the project team. The results of the public consultation exercise was analysed and presented in a Statement of Community Engagement report that helped shape the final Masterplan Framework. In addition the equalities monitoring form allowed a breakdown of the results to support preparation of the EIA and an understanding of how the policy document could impact on referenced groups/individuals.

Why is the proposal required?

The Barnsley Local Plan was adopted in January 2019 and provides local planning policy to 2033. Some of the site allocations require the production of a Masterplan Framework. When completed, the Masterplan Framework should be robust enough to clearly influence and coordinate future planning applications, conditions and Section 106/Section 278 obligations. The public consultation exercise was important as it enabled the existing community to be included in the development of future housing plans for the area.

What will this proposal mean for customers?

The Masterplan Framework once adopted will guide future planning applications on the site and ensure that development comes forward in a comprehensive manner and with the correct supporting infrastructure.

Stage 3 - Preliminary screening process

Use the **Preliminary screening questions** to decide whether a full EIA is required

- ☒ Yes - EIA required (go to next section)
☐ No – EIA not required (provide rationale below including name of E&I Officer consulted with)

Stage 4 - Scoping exercise - What do we know?

Data: Generic demographics
What generic data do you know?
For Royston ward, almost 99% of the population is white, and 98% were born in the UK. 72.6% of residents have a religion, with christianity being the majority. Only 0.5% of households contain nobody whose main language is English.
Data: Service data / feedback
What equalities knowledge do you already know about the service/location/policy/contract?
10,728 people live in Royston, or 4.6% of Barnsley's total population. 63.9% of residents are of working age and 17.2% are of pensionable age. 32% of Royston residents have no qualifications, over 10% more than the national average but slightly fewer than the borough average.
Data: Previous / similar EIA's
Has there already been an EIA on all or part of this before, or something related? If so, what were the main issues and actions it identified?
EIA's have been undertaken during the Hoyland North Masterplan Framework and Barnsley West Masterplan Framework, which were adopted December 2019. The Hoyland West Masterplan Framework adopted during September 2020, followed by the Hoyland South Masterplan Framework adoption in November 2020. EIAs have also been started for Goldthorpe which was subject to public consultation during 2021 and Carlton which is due to public consultation during summer 2021.
Data: Formal consultation
What information has been gathered from formal consultation?
<p>We asked the following equality, diversity and inclusion questions to help us better understand the impact of the changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Do you agree with the vision of the Masterplan Framework which seeks to create a sustainable and inclusive community with high quality design and landscaping?</i> 2. <i>The Local Plan says a primary school should be provided on this site. Do you agree with the proposed location of the school?</i> 3. <i>To address future congestion during peak periods at The Wells crossroads in the centre of Royston, if there are no safe, desirable and deliverable ways of tackling this, to what extent do you agree to considering a relief road to ensure the impact on the road network resulting from the development of the Masterplan area is acceptable?</i> 4. <i>Do you agree with the location of the proposed play areas?</i> <p>To help answer these questions we did the following things (e.g. service user or staff consultation, data analysis, research etc):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present the vision within the public consultation questionnaire, quantify the number of respondents that answer 'Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree or Not sure' 2. Present the strategy and within the public consultation, quantify the number of respondents that answer 'Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree or Not sure' 3. Present the strategy and within the public consultation, quantify the number of respondents that answer 'Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree or Not sure'

4. Present the potential location of a new primary school within the public consultation, quantify the number of respondents that answer 'Yes, No, Not sure/require more information'

Stage 5 - Potential impact on different groups

Considering the evidence above, state the likely impact the proposal will have on people with different protected characteristics

(state if negative impact is substantial and highlight with **red text**)

Positive and negative impacts identified will need to form part of your action plan.

Protected characteristic	Negative ' - '	Positive ' + '	No impact	Don't know	Details
Sex			x		It is not anticipated that the proposals would impact on gender.
Age				X	Consultation responses will be monitored as a wide range of responses is hoped for.
Disabled <i>Learning disability, Physical disability, Sensory Impairment, Deaf People, invisible illness, Mental Health etc</i>				X	Consultation responses received from people with a disability will be monitored to see if the consultation has been representative of this group and if there are any common themes emerging.
Race				X	Consultation responses will be monitored against the baseline demographics to ensure that we reach all members of the community to see if the consultation has been representative of this group and if there are any common themes emerging.
Religion & Belief			X		
Sexual orientation			X		
Gender Reassignment			X		
Marriage / civil partnership			X		
Pregnancy / maternity			X		

Other groups you may want to consider					
	Negative	Positive	No impact	Don't know	Details
Ex services				x	The inclusion of affordable housing within the proposal may be welcomed.
Lower socio-economic		x			The proposals within the masterplan framework will include affordable housing. This may be welcomed by some individuals.
Other ...					
Stage 6 - BMBC Minimum access standards					

If the proposal relates to the delivery of a new service, please refer to the Customer minimum access standards self-assessment (found at)

If not, move to Stage 7.

Please use the action plan to ensure that reasonable adjustments for disabled people.

Not yet live

☐ The proposal will meet the minimum access standards.

☐ The proposal will not meet the minimum access standards. –provide rationale below.

Stage 7 – Action plan

To improve your knowledge about the equality impact . . .

Actions could include: community engagement with affected groups, analysis of performance data, service equality monitoring, stakeholder focus group etc.

Action we will take:	Lead Officer	Completion date
Community engagement with groups that are underrepresented within consultation responses – this will be established through monitoring responses weekly	Stacey White	Community engagement team were unable to offer support due to COVID-19 resourcing issues. All community groups that were known of were informed of the consultation. 03/06/2020

Consider consultation events having longer sessions to ensure that as many people as possible can attend eg outside of work hours	Stacey White	Consultation events were held online and over the telephone for those without internet access/unsure of the technology. These were held on a variety of days and times to maximise attendance. 03/06/2020-15/07/2020
Offer information in different formats on request	Stacey White	03/06/2020-15/07/2020
Requests for hard copy information	Stacey White	Due to COVID-19, as post delivery was slower, copies were handed delivered to those who requested copies. Last copies were delivered prior to the closure of the consultation. 03/06/2020 – 15/07/2020
Clarity over the masterplan framework proposals	Stacey White	A contact number was available to discuss the plans with an officer. Telephone appointments were offered when accessing the information was difficult. 03/06/2020 – 15/07/2020
Ensure all physical locations hosting information are accessible - ensure that one copy of the information is in large format	Lucie McCarthy	All physical locations accessible, contact details left with organisations to request additional copies. Contact details on publicity material to request alternative versions. These had to be takeaway options due to COVID-19 restrictions.

		03/06/2020 – 15/07/2020
--	--	----------------------------

To improve or mitigate the equality impact . . .

Actions could include: altering the policy to protect affected group, limiting scope of proposed change, reviewing actual impact in future, phasing-in changes over period of time, monitor service provider performance indicators, etc.

Action we will take:	Lead Officer	Completion date
Increase social media presence if responses from younger age categories are low	Stacey White	Social media was used extensively throughout the consultation period. Pushed social media posts were also used to increase awareness of the consultation. 03/06/2020 – 15/07/2020
Encourage households without English as a main language to contribute through targeted sessions	Stacey White	All materials provided contact details to request the information in alternative formats. 03/06/2020- 15/07/2020

To meet the minimum access standards . . .(if relevant)

Actions could include: running focus group with disability forum, amend tender specification, amend business plan to request extra 'accessibility' funding, produce separate MAS action plan, etc.

Action we will take:	Lead Officer	Completion date

Stage 8 – Assessment findings

Please summarise how different protected groups are likely to be affected

Summary of equality impact

By ensuring that the consultation exercise is available to as many people as possible, in a variety of formats, it is envisaged that the impact on protected groups will be minimal.

Summary of next steps

The consultation was successful in its aim of making the community aware of the masterplan framework proposals. The consultation received 110 completed surveys which is comparable with Hoyland West (113) which was also consulted on during summer 2020 and more than Hoyland South (79) which was out to consultation at the same time as this proposal.

Whilst the masterplan framework was not supported, this has arisen from the principle of developing the site not being supported, rather than the content of the masterplan framework. Therefore a section will be included in the Masterplan Framework which confirms that the sites have been allocated in the Local Plan and that this vision relates to the Masterplan Framework.

Sex – The majority of male respondents strongly agree/agree with the masterplan framework vision. They do not support the location of the primary school and may require more information to enable them to fully answer this question. There is support for the consideration of a relief road to reduce the impact of traffic congestion. The group also support the proposed locations of children's play areas.

Female respondents – the majority disagree/strongly disagree with the masterplan framework vision. Support for the location of the primary school is mixed as is the consideration of a relief road. However there is overall support for the proposed locations of play areas.

Disability – Those identifying as being limited a little by disability support the vision of the masterplan framework. There is no support for the location of the primary school as proposed within the document and mixed support over the consideration of a relief road. Respondents do support the location of the proposed play areas.

Those respondents identifying as being impacted a lot by disability support the masterplan framework vision but would prefer to see the primary school located elsewhere within the site. There is support for the consideration of a relief road and play areas.

Ethnicity - Feedback from BME people was limited. It is anticipated that this is low due to the level of ethnic diversity in this area.

Those identifying as British, English, Northern Irish, Scottish or Welsh broadly support the masterplan framework vision. There is support for the consideration of a relief road and for the location of play areas. However, the group are unsure/unsupportive of the location of the primary school.

Those identifying as White Irish, Welsh Indian do not support the masterplan framework vision, would wish to see the primary school located elsewhere within the site and do not support consideration of the relief road or location of play areas.

Age - *Lowest support from age group 35-44.* The sites are allocated in the Local Plan therefore the principle of development has been established. It is anticipated that there is perhaps a misconception that resistance to the overall vision of the Masterplan Framework will stop development.

Signature (officer responsible for EIA)	Stacey White
Date	19/05/21

Stage 9 – Assessment Review

What information did you obtain and what does that tell us about equality of outcomes for different groups?

Q1. Our Masterplan Framework for Royston is based around eight placemaking principles designed to create a sense of place and a distinctive built environment. As explained in the iPDF, these eight principles are design quality and local character; facilities and local hub; housing mix and neighbourhood; deliverability; sustainable and active travel; landscape and open space; sustainability and carbon zero; engagement and stewardship. Do you agree with the placemaking principles for the site?

The overall response (110 respondents) was split between 'Strongly agree' (12), 'Agree' (22), 'Disagree' (26), 'Strongly Disagree' (30) and 'Not sure/ no opinion' 20). We suspect that the underlying reason for the negative response relates to individuals objection to the principle of development rather than the vision of the Masterplan Framework.

Gender:

- 11 male respondents - Strongly Agree x2, Agree x5, Disagree x3, Strongly Disagree x1
- 21 female respondents – Strongly Agree x1, Agree x5, Disagree x3, Strongly Disagree x5, Not sure/no opinion x3
- 82 respondents preferred not to share their gender – Strongly Agree x9, Agree x11, Disagree x19, Strongly Disagree x24, Not sure/no opinion x 17

Age:

- Highest level of support from age group 45-54 and 65+
- Lowest level of support from age groups 35-44

Disability:

- Those identified as 'not affected by disability' by disability - Strongly Agree x1, Agree x6, Disagree x4, Strongly Disagree x5, Not sure/no opinion x2
- Respondents identified 'limited a little' by disability support the vision – Strongly Agree x2, Agree x2, Disagree x1
- Respondents 'limited a lot' support the vision – Agree x1

Ethnicity:

- The majority of people identifying as British, English, Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Irish broadly support the vision (Strongly Agree x3, Agree x10, Disagree x5, Strongly Disagree x5, Not sure/no opinion x2)
- Those identifying as White Irish Welsh Indian do not support the vision (Strongly Disagree x1)

The Local Plan says a primary school should be provided on this site. Do you agree with the proposed location of the school?

Gender:

- 11 male respondents – Yes x1, No x4, Not Sure x3, locate elsewhere within site x3
- 17 female respondents – Yes x6, No x2, Not sure x3, Locate elsewhere within site x6
- 82 respondents preferred not to share their gender – Yes x19, No x22, Not sure x26, Locate elsewhere in site x15

Age:

- Highest level of support from age group 45-54 and 25-34
- Lowest level of support from age groups 65+

Disability:

- Those identified as 'not affected by disability' by disability – Yes x5, No x2, Not sure x6, Locate elsewhere within site x5
- Respondents identified 'limited a little' by disability – Yes x1, No x2, Not sure x0, Locate elsewhere within site x2
- Respondents 'limited a lot' – Located elsewhere within site x1

Ethnicity:

- The majority of people identifying as British, English, Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Irish – Yes x6, No x5, Not sure x6, Locate elsewhere within the site x8
- Those identifying as White Irish Welsh Indian – Locate elsewhere within the site x1

To address future congestion during peak periods at The Wells crossroads in the centre of Royston, if there are no safe, desirable and deliverable ways of tackling this, to what extent do you agree to considering a relief road to ensure the impact on the road network resulting from the development of the Masterplan area is acceptable?

Gender:

- 11 male respondents - Strongly Agree x3, Agree x4, Disagree x0, Strongly Disagree x3, Not sure/no opinion x1
- 17 female respondents – Strongly Agree x4, Agree x4, Disagree x2, Strongly Disagree x7, Not sure/no opinion x0

- 82 respondents preferred not to share their gender – Strongly Agree x22, Agree x18, Disagree x11, Strongly Disagree x23, Not sure/no opinion x 8

Age:

- Highest level of support from age group 65+
- Lowest level of support from age groups 45-54

Disability:

- Those identified as 'not affected by disability' by disability - Strongly Agree x5, Agree x5 , Disagree x2, Strongly Disagree x6, Not sure/no opinion x0
- Respondents identified 'limited a little' by disability-- Strongly Agree x1, Agree x1 , Disagree x0, Strongly Disagree x2, Not sure/no opinion x1
- Respondents 'limited a lot' – Agree x1

Ethnicity:

- The majority of people identifying as British, English, Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Irish - Strongly Agree x6, Agree x8, Disagree x2, Strongly Disagree x8, Not sure/no opinion x1
- Those identifying as White Irish Welsh Indian - Strongly Disagree x1

Do you agree with the location of the proposed play areas?

Gender:

- 11 male respondents - Strongly Agree x1, Agree x3, Disagree x0, Strongly Disagree x1, Not sure/no opinion x6
- 17 female respondents – Strongly Agree x2, Agree x3, Disagree x1, Strongly Disagree x3, Not sure/no opinion x8
- 82 respondents preferred not to share their gender – Strongly Agree x7, Agree x18, Disagree x5, Strongly Disagree x17, Not sure/no opinion x 35

Age:

- Highest level of support from age group 65+
- Lowest level of support from age groups 35-44

Disability:

- Those identified as 'not affected by disability' by disability - Strongly Agree x2, Agree x2 , Disagree x1, Strongly Disagree x3, Not sure/no opinion x10
- Respondents identified 'limited a little' by disability –Strongly Agree x1, Agree x2, Disagree x0, Strongly Disagree x1, Not sure/no opinion x1
- Respondents 'limited a lot' - Agree x1

Ethnicity:

- People identifying as British, English, Scottish, Welsh, or Northern Irish - Strongly Agree x3, Agree x7, Disagree x1, Strongly Disagree x3, Not sure/no opinion x12
- Those identifying as White Irish Welsh Indian - Strongly Disagree x1
