



**Causeway  
Coast & Glens**  
Borough Council

2018

# Local Development Plan 2030 Equality Screening: Interim Report Preferred Options Paper

---

**Getting in touch:**

You are invited to comment on our Local Development Plan 2030: Preferred Options Paper public consultation, including this Equality Screening: Interim Report. You may respond in any of the following ways:

By e-mail: [developmentplan@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk](mailto:developmentplan@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk)

By post: Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council  
Development Plan Team  
Cloonavin  
66 Portstewart Road  
Coleraine  
BT52 1EY

By Tel: 028 7034 7100

By Text Phone: 028 7034 7056

This document can also be downloaded from the Council website at: [www.causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk](http://www.causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk) and is available to view at the Council office listed above.

If you require a copy of this document in an alternative format, please contact the Development Plan Team, who will consider your request.

The consultation period will last for 12 weeks. The closing date for receipt of comments is 5.00pm on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2018.

June 2018

**Contents:**

Section	Topic	Page number
1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Background	4
3.0	The Local Development Plan Process	4
4.0	Equality Screening	5
	Table 1: Preliminary identification of possible negative impact of LDP policy approach on Section 75 Groups.	6
	Table 2: Preliminary equality screening of preferred options on Groups detailed in Table 1.	7
	Appendix 1: Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Screening Form.	13

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Section 75 of the Northern Ireland (NI) Act 1998 requires a public authority, in carrying out its functions relating to NI, to have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity:
- between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation;
  - between men and women generally;
  - between persons with a disability and persons without; and
  - between persons with dependents and persons without.
- 1.2 In addition, and without prejudice to the above obligations, public authorities are required to have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or race.
- 1.3 The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (as amended by Article 5 of the Disability Discrimination (NI) Order 2006) requires all public authorities, in carrying out their functions relating to NI, to have due regard to the need to:
- promote positive attitudes towards disabled people; and
  - encourage participation by disabled people in public life.
- 1.4 In advance of the publication of the Preferred Options Paper (POP) the Council wrote to its Section 75 consultee list, offering them the opportunity to identify particular issues likely to affect the groups they represent. We will write to these groups again during the POP Public Consultation and at key stages of the LDP process, as outlined in our Statement of Community Involvement in Planning (SCI).

## 2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Planning Act (NI) 2011 Act (the '2011 Act') transferred planning powers, including responsibility for the preparation of Local Development Plans (LDP's), from the former Department of Environment (DOE) to councils on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.
- 2.2 Also on this date four legacy councils (Ballymoney, Coleraine, Limavady and Moyle) merged to form the new Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council, now responsible for the preparation of a Local Development Plan for the whole Borough.
- 2.3 The policy underpinning the 2011 Act was subject to equality, regulatory and human rights impact assessment, and to extensive public consultation from July to October 2009 by the former DOE. It was agreed by the NI Executive in February 2010. The 2011 Act was subject to scrutiny in the NI Assembly from December 2010 to March 2011.

## 3.0 The Local Development Plan Process

- 3.1 The Local Development Plan (LDP) will apply regional policies at the appropriate local level and inform the general public, statutory authorities, developers and other interested bodies of the planning policy framework and land use proposals that will guide development decisions within the Borough up to 2030.

- 3.2 The publication of the Council's Preferred Options Paper (POP) is the first formal public consultation stage in the preparation of the Council's LDP. It provides the basis for consulting with the public and stakeholders and it aims to stimulate public comment and provide interested parties with an opportunity to put forward their views and become involved from the beginning of the LDP process.
- 3.3 The POP details the Council's Vision, Strategic Objectives and Overarching Principles for the development of the Borough up to 2030. These are interconnected with the aspirations of the Council's Strategy (Corporate Plan) and the outcomes identified in the Community Plan 'A Better Future Together'.
- 3.4 The POP identifies the main planning issues affecting the Borough and outlines a range of possible options to address them, including an indication of the Council's preferred option. The options presented are not policies, but rather suggestive policy approaches covering a range of strategic topics.
- 3.5 The Council prepared a series of 14 topic-related discussion papers to inform the POP. These include Paper One: Population and Growth, which provides the evidential context for the Borough's population in respect of religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender, disability and dependents. The topic papers, alongside the POP Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) Scoping Report and Interim Report, are available to view in the local planning office, or online at:  
<https://www.causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk/live/planning/development-plan> .

#### **4.0 Equality Screening**

- 4.1 An Equality Screening will be carried out at each of the three main stages of the LDP process:
  - The Preferred Options Paper (POP);
  - The Draft Plan Strategy (PS); and
  - The Draft Local Policies Plan (LPP).
- 4.2 At this early stage of the LDP process we have carried out an initial equality screening of the POP to identify if any of our strategic policy approaches are likely to have a negative impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations.
- 4.3 Table 1 details those Section 75 groups likely to be impacted by suggested policy approaches. Table 2 sets out an initial assessment of the Council's preferred options in relation to the highlighted Section 75 groups identified in Table 1.
- 4.4 It should be noted that the Equality Screening will become more detailed as we progress through the LDP preparation.

Table 1:- Preliminary identification of possible negative impact of LDP policy approach on Section 75 Groups.

Policy Topic Area	Religious Belief	Political Opinion	Racial Group	Age	Marital Status	Sexual Orientation	Gender	Disability	Dependency
Spatial Growth	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
Settlements	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
Sustainable Growth	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
Health, Education, Community & Cultural	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	X
Open Space, Sport & Outdoor Recreation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Housing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓
Economic Development, Industry & Commerce	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
Retailing & Town Centres	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
Tourism	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	X
Minerals	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Archaeology & Built Heritage	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Natural Heritage	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
Development in the Countryside	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
World Heritage Site	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	✓	X
General Principles	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transportation	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
Public Utilities, Services and Renewables	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Developer Contributions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

\* ✓ = May have a negative impact

X = Considered unlikely to have a negative impact

**Table 2:- Preliminary equality screening of preferred options on Groups detailed in Table 1.**

Key Issue	Policy Area	Preferred Option	Comments and likely Impacts
SG1	Spatial Growth Strategy	The POP recommends that we focus our housing and economic growth in the four hubs and sustain our rural communities.	The Regional Development Strategy (RDS) states that we should focus our housing and economic growth in our hubs while sustaining our rural communities. This should improve transportation options and access to health, education, employment and other services and facilities. This may impact on religious/political beliefs, age, disability and dependency due to the spatial distribution of such groups.
SG2	Settlement Hierarchy	The POP recommends that we review the existing Settlement Hierarchy as set out in the Northern Area Plan 2016.	This review may result in the reclassification or removal of some existing settlements and/or the inclusion of new settlements. Designation and status of settlements and identification of development opportunities and limits may impact on religious/political beliefs, age, disability and dependency due to the spatial distribution of such groups. As these will be brought forward at the Plan Strategy stage of the Plan preparation, it is not possible to fully assess the impact at this stage.
SG3	Sustainable Growth	The POP recommends that we only zone land for development where adequate infrastructure exists or is planned.	The amount and distribution of zoned land may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, age, racial group, gender, disability and dependency due to the spatial distribution of such groups. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the impact.
CO1	Health, Education, Community & Cultural Uses	The POP recommends that we review the existing policy framework.	Spatial and physical accessibility to these uses may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, racial group, age and disability. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the impact.
OS1 OS2 OS3	Open Space & Recreation	The POP recommends that we review the existing threshold by which new residential developments should make provision for public open space.  The POP recommends that we review the existing maintenance arrangements for public open space	Given that the policy approach is to improve the provision of public open space, it is likely that all groups may benefit from it.  Given that the policy approach is to improve upon the existing maintenance arrangements it is likely that all groups may benefit from it.

		<p>associated with residential development, so as to identify alternative, improved arrangements.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we provide policy to facilitate green and blue infrastructure in the Borough.</p>	<p>Given that the policy approach is to facilitate the provision of green and blue infrastructure, it is likely that all groups may benefit from it.</p>
<p>HS1 HS2 HS3 HS4</p>	<p>Housing</p>	<p>The POP recommends that we distribute social housing as per the focus of development in the hubs and based on the basis of settlement’s population.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we amend existing policies with regard to thresholds for the provision of social housing and develop policy relating to affordable housing.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we review the principle of the existing policy framework relating to the approach to the split between urban and rural housing.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we revise existing standards to provide minimum space per unit in both urban and rural residential development.</p>	<p>The amount and distribution/location of housing may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, racial group, age, marital status, disability and dependency, due to the spatial distribution of such groups. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p> <p>Given the policy approach is to increase the provision of social and affordable housing it is likely that all groups may benefit.</p> <p>Given the policy approach is to provide minimum private amenity space standards it is likely that all groups may benefit.</p>
<p>ED1 ED2</p>	<p>Economic Development</p>	<p>The POP recommends that we review existing zonings and provide policy to facilitate new economic development uses outside of zoned land.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we zone land and provide policy to facilitate the expansion of the Atlantic Link Enterprise Campus (Enterprise Zone).</p>	<p>The amount and distribution/location of economic development land may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, racial group, age, gender, disability and dependency, due to the spatial distribution of such groups. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p>
<p>RT1 RT2 RT3 RT4 RT5 RT6 RT7</p>	<p>Retailing &amp; Town Centres</p>	<p>The POP recommends that we review existing retail hierarchy and identify new centres.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we review existing town, village and local centre boundaries and include new boundaries.</p>	<p>In line with the SPPS the POP recognises the importance of a ‘town centre first’ policy approach. The hierarchy of town and village centres, development opportunities and associated planning policies may result in differing levels of accessibility to retailing and other town centre uses. Spatial and physical accessibility to these uses may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, racial group, age, disability and</p>



		<p>The POP recommends that we retain dominance of A1 uses by setting a minimum threshold on their presence in primary retail cores.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we provide policy to facilitate a range of uses that encourage an evening economy in town centres.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the following Retail Impact Assessment thresholds: 1000sq.m gross for Coleraine, Limavady and Ballymoney and reduce to 500 sq.m gross in all other town centres.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework in relation to Riverside (SPPS).</p> <p>The POP recommends that we provide policy on acceptable location, size and function of filling stations in the countryside.</p>	<p>dependency. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p>
TO1	Tourism	<p>The POP recommends that we identify Tourism Conservation Zones (TCZs) and Tourism Opportunity Zones (TOZs) and develop policy for development within these areas. This is in response to increasing visitor numbers and the impact of this on our sensitive landscapes.</p>	<p>Location of areas protected for and constraining tourism proposals may have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs, racial group, age and disability. However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p>
MN1 MN2 MN3 MN4	Minerals	<p>The POP recommends that we promote sustainable minerals development and define buffer zones around quarries to exclude inappropriate development.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we designate areas to be protected from minerals development (Areas of Constraint on Minerals Development) and define other areas elsewhere where minerals development will be acceptable in principle.</p>	<p>The location of areas, either protected for, or constrained from minerals development and land instability or Lignite, and associated planning policies could have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs.</p> <p>However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p>

		<p>The POP recommends that we provide policy to restrict development on land known to be at risk of instability, e.g in the vicinity of abandoned mines, adits and shafts.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the existing Lignite Resource designation and amend the existing policy framework to provide some flexibility for development.</p>	
AB1	Archaeology & Built Heritage	The POP recommends that we provide policy to facilitate identification of our non-designated heritage assets on case by case basis.	Given that the policy approach is to deal with these on a case by case basis, i.e. through individual planning applications, at this stage it is difficult to assess the likely impact on any of the identified groups.
NH1 NH2	Natural Heritage	<p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework and designate our most sensitive areas as Special Countryside Areas (SCAs) and provide policy to protect these areas.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we provide policy based on the identified landscape quality of each AONB.</p>	<p>The location of areas protected for their natural heritage could have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs, age, disability and dependency due to the spatial distribution of such groups.</p> <p>However, as no land is identified for this purpose at this stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact.</p>
CY1 CY2 CY3 CY4	Development in the Countryside	<p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework relating to dwellings on farms.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework for economic development in the countryside and provide policy to facilitate new small scale rural economic development schemes but restrict in environmentally sensitive or designated areas.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework for the provision of social housing in the countryside and provide policy relating to affordable housing, and define small settlements in line with our Settlement Hierarchy.</p>	<p>Designations and planning policy could have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs, age, disability and dependency due to the spatial distribution of such groups.</p> <p>However, as these will be brought forward at the Plan Strategy Stage, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact at this stage.</p>

		The POP recommends that we provide policy to allow greater flexibility in the reuse of farm buildings for non-farm related activities (non-residential)	
WH1	World Heritage Site	The POP recommends that we review the existing policy framework relating to development within the World Heritage Site's Distinctive Landscape Setting and retain the existing designation.	The location of policy areas and associated planning policies may have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs, age and disability.
GP1	General Principles	The POP recommends that we provide policy applicable to all types of development with additional criteria applicable in our designated areas, e.g AONB's, Conservation Areas, ATCs/AVCs, ASSIs etc.	Design, both in terms of appearance and physical access, affects everyone but has a particular impact on people with mobility difficulties such as the disabled, elderly and people with young children. Given that the policy approach is to improve design and access for all, it is unlikely to have a differential impact on any group.
TP1 TP2	Transportation	<p>The POP recommends that we identify potential transport hubs and provide policy to ensure active and sustainable modes of transport are accommodated in new development.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we identify areas of parking restraint around key tourism assets and provide policy to facilitate the provision of sustainable and sympathetic provision of off-site parking.</p>	<p>Designations and associated planning policy may have a differential impact on religious/political beliefs, age, gender, disability and dependency.</p> <p>Further assessment will be undertaken at a later stage of the Plan preparation. Therefore it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact at this stage.</p>
PU1 FR1 FR2 FR3 FR4 RN1 RN2	Public Utilities, Services and Renewables	<p>The POP recommends that we identify specific areas within our most sensitive landscapes as Areas of Constraint on High Structures development.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we allow no further development in floodplains or areas where development is likely to exacerbate flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we identify buffer strips (based on the Rivers Agency's 2030 predictions) around existing</p>	The location and accessibility of public utilities, inc. telecommunications, renewables, flood management measures, etc and associated planning policies may have differential impacts on religious/political beliefs. However, as further assessment will be undertaken at a later stage of the Plan preparation, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact on particular groups at this stage.

		<p>identified floodplains and provide policy for the protection of these areas.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we provide policy on the use of SuDS for all development.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we identify the flood inundation areas of controlled reservoirs and retain the principle of the existing policy framework.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we retain the principle of the existing policy framework and designate areas of constraint within our most sensitive landscapes and provide policy for these areas.</p> <p>The POP recommends that we identify a buffer around our towns and villages where wind turbines will not be permitted.</p>	
DC1	Developer Contributions	The POP recommends that we seek developer contributions on appropriate types and scale of development.	As the details of the policy approach are unknown at this strategic stage of the Plan preparation, it is difficult to assess the likely impact on any of the identified groups. However, given that developer contributions may assist in the delivery of community facilities and infrastructure, all groups may benefit from this policy approach.

## APPENDIX 1

## Causeway Coast &amp; Glens Borough Council

## Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Screening Form

General Information					
Service/Function <input type="checkbox"/>	Policy/ Procedure <input type="checkbox"/>	Project <input type="checkbox"/>	Strategy <input type="checkbox"/>	Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guidance <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is this an existing, revised or a new function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance?</b> Existing <input type="checkbox"/> Revised <input type="checkbox"/> New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
<b>Operational Area</b>	CC&GBC Planning Department				
<b>Title</b>	Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council Local Development Plan 2030; Preferred Options Paper (POP).				
<b>Brief Summary</b> <p>The vision of the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) is <i>"A vibrant and innovative economy, sustainably delivering health and well-being and high quality built and natural environments, for all citizens and visitors to the Borough."</i></p> <p>The Council's Preferred Options Paper (POP) is the first of three documents to be published as part of the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) programme. The POP highlights the key strategic issues identified as affecting the Borough and outlines a number of options for addressing these issues, including the Council's 'preferred option'.</p> <p>The strategic issues have emerged from our evidence gathering, or through prior consultations with a range of statutory consultees and key stakeholders, other Council officials and Elected Members. Some may also have been identified in the day to day processing of planning casework (planning applications).</p> <p>The Council has also written to its Section 75 consultee list, seeking their initial views on issues likely to affect the groups they represent. We will consult with these groups again during the 12 week POP public consultation period.</p> <p>The POP provides the basis for consulting with the public and stakeholders and aims to stimulate debate and aid the involvement of interested parties at this early stage of the Plan preparation.</p> <p>The options set out in the POP and any feedback from the public consultation will be used to shape the next stages of the Local Development Plan i.e. the Plan Strategy and Local Polices Plan, both of which will be accompanied by an Equality Screening.</p>					

**What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims and outcomes)**

The LDP is a spatial land use plan that will guide the future development and use of land in the towns, villages and rural areas in the Borough. It will include policies and proposals in relation to key areas such as housing, economic development, transport, retailing, open space, town centres, minerals development, renewable energy, and countryside and coast.

It is intended that the Plan will provide a policy framework to support the economic and social needs of the Borough, taking into account regional strategies and policies, whilst providing for the delivery of sustainable growth and development.

It will also help deliver the spatial aspects of the Council's Community Plan and provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to have a say about where and how future development within the Borough should take place.

**Who owns and who implements each element of the function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance?**

Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council.

**Other policies etc. which have a bearing on this function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance?**

NI Draft Programme for Government (NI Executive);

NI Sustainable Development Strategy 2010: 'Everyone's Involved' Government (NI Executive);

NI Regional Development Strategy 2035: 'Building a Better Future' (DfI);

NI Regional Transportation Strategy 2011: 'Ensuring a Sustainable Transport Future' (DfI);

UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS);

NI Marine Plan (when adopted);

NI Regional Water Strategy 2016: 'Sustainable Water – a Long Term Water Strategy for NI (2015-2040)' (DfI);

NI Waste Management Strategy: 'Delivering Resource Efficiency' (2015) (DAERA);

NI Strategic Planning Policy Statement 2015: 'Planning for Sustainable Development' (DfI);

NI Industrial Strategy 2017: 'Economy 2030' (emerging) (DfE);

NI Planning Policy Statements (DfI);

A 'Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland' (PSRNI) 1993 (DfI);

CC&GBC Council Strategy (Corporate Plan) 2015-2019;

CC&GBC Community Plan 2017: 'A Better Future Together (2017-2030)' (Council);

CC&GBC - All related Council Strategies;

The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016; and

Neighbouring Council plans and policies (Derry City & Strabane District; Mid & East Antrim: Mid Ulster; Donegal County Council).

**Figure 1: Details of evidence/information.**

**Available Evidence**

The Council has undertaken the following to inform the POP and its associated documents:

- Evidence/data gathering (desk top and on-site);
- Elected Member Workshops (topic-based);
- Topic-based papers presented to Planning Committee (14 in total);
- Planning Policy Review (regional and local);
- Evidence of appeals for single dwellings in the countryside (since 01/04/2015);
- Published a Statement of Community Involvement in Planning (SCI);
- Published a Local Development Plan Timetable;
- Presented 6 month indicative Work Programmes to Planning Committee;
- Consultations with key government departments;
- Retail & Leisure Capacity Study (Nexus);
- Business and Customer Surveys (Sproule Consulting);
- Stakeholder meetings;
- Adjoining Council meetings & joined-up working (cross-boundary and cross-border);
- Local planning agents workshop;
- Written to all the groups listed on the Section 75 consultee list;
- Employed Consultants to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping & Interim Reports & lead on the SA Appraisal Days;
- LDP Steering Group;
- LDP Project Management Team;
- Community Plan link: Head of Planning and Local Development Plan Manager sit on the Strategic Partnership Board. Planning officials participated in the Delivery Design Group stage. The Planning Department will assist in the implementation of some of the actions identified; and
- Council's Citizen Newsletter - issued to all households in the Borough (early 2017 & 2018) contained Local Development Plan updates.

The Council will continue to review the screening document at each stage of the Plan preparation.

**Sources:**

2011 NI Census to identify religious beliefs; racial group; age; marital status; men and women generally; dependents and disability.

The 2014 Local Government Election Results were analysed to reflect first preference votes cast.

NISRA 2015/16 Continuous Household Survey to identify sexual orientation.

The Council's Community Plan data has also been analysed.

Retail & Leisure Capacity Study (Nexus).

Business and Customer Surveys (Sproule Consulting).

The Council's Planning Department has also carried out on-site surveys.

Consultation with other related sections within the Council have also taken place.

<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>Details of Evidence/Information and Details of needs, experiences and priorities.</b>
<b>Religious Beliefs</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information:</b></p> <p>In 2011, the population within the Borough was predominantly from a Protestant/other Christian background, at 54.79%. 40.21% were from a Roman Catholic background. The proportion of people who were brought up in a different religion was 0.65%, while those with no religion (or none stated) was 4.35%.</p>
<b>Political Opinion</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information:</b></p> <p>In the 2014 local government elections, the votes per party within the Borough were as follows:</p> <p>DUP 26.9%</p> <p>Sinn Fein 19.9%</p> <p>UUP 17.3%</p> <p>SDLP 12.5%</p> <p>TUV 10.4%</p> <p>Alliance 3.9%</p> <p>PUP 1.7%</p> <p>UKIP 1.1%</p> <p>NI21 0.8%</p> <p>Conservative 0.3%</p> <p>Independent 5.2%</p>
<b>Racial Group</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information:</b></p> <p>The 2011 census figures indicated:</p> <p>White: 98.97%</p> <p>Chinese: 0.24%</p> <p>Irish Traveller: 0.03%</p> <p>Indian: 0.16%</p> <p>Pakistani: 0.03%</p> <p>Bangladeshi: 0.01%</p> <p>Other Asian: 0.15%</p> <p>Black Caribbean: 0.01%</p>



	<p>Black African: 0.05%</p> <p>Black Other: 0.01%</p> <p>Mixed: 0.25%</p> <p>Other: 0.09%</p>
<b>Age</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information:</b></p> <p>The majority of the population within the Borough fall within the Working Age Category (16-64 Years). This category makes up 64.2% of its total population. 20.4 % of the population within the Borough fall into the 'Children Category' (0-15 Years). The age structure of the population within the Borough has changed over the past 10 years. The proportion of the population aged 65 and over has increased from 13% in 2001 to 15.4% in 2011, mainly due to better life expectancy.</p>
<b>Marital Status</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information:</b></p> <p>The 2011 census revealed that, since 2001, there has been an increase in the number of divorced people, a decrease in the number of people married and an increase in the proportion of single people in Northern Ireland. 34.77% of the Borough's population are single, 53.09% are married, 5.54% divorced and 6.60% are widowed.</p>
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information</b></p> <p>There is limited local data for this category. In 2015/16, the Continuous Household Survey undertaken by NISRA (Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency) found that 97.9% of adult respondents identified themselves as heterosexual/straight; with the remaining adults identifying as gay/lesbian, bisexual, 'don't know' or not providing an answer.</p>
<b>Men and Women Generally</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information</b></p> <p>The 2011 Census indicated that the gender balance within the Borough is quite evenly split at 49.46% male and 50.54% female.</p>
<b>Dependents</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information</b></p> <p>The 2011 Census indicated that the proportion of households in the Borough with dependent children is 33.37%.</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>Details of Evidence/Information</b></p> <p>According to 2011 census data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19.77% of people had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities;</li> <li>• 80.41% of people stated their general health was either good or very good; and</li> <li>• 11.56% of people stated that they provided unpaid care to family, friends, neighbours or others.</li> </ul>

<b>1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? minor/major/none</b>		
<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>Details of policy impact</b>	<b>Level of impact? minor/major/none</b>
Religious Belief	See main document “Equality Screening: Interim Report on Preferred Options Paper”	Minor/No impact anticipated
Political opinion	As above	As above
Racial Group	As above	As above
Age	As above	As above
Marital Status	As above	As above
Sexual orientation	As above	As above
Men and women generally	As above	As above
Disability	As above	As above
Dependents	As above	As above

<b>2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equality categories?</b>		
<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>If YES, provide details</b>	<b>If NO, provide reasons</b>
Religious Belief		<p>None identified prior to the POP public consultation exercise.</p> <p>The POP should engage more people in the LDP process, due to enhanced community engagement and involvement at an early stage of the Plan preparation. This is likely to result in a positive impact on, and therefore promote, equality of opportunity for all groups.</p>

		Any Section 75 issues raised during the 12 week public consultation period will be fully considered.
Political opinion		As above
Racial Group		As above
Age		As above
Marital Status		As above
Sexual orientation		As above
Men and women generally		As above
Disability		As above
Dependents		As above

<b>3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? minor/major/none?</b>		
<b>Section 75 category</b>	<b>Details of policy impact</b>	<b>Level of impact? minor/major/none</b>
Religious Belief		The POP sets out a policy approach for a range of issues rather than defining policies in advance of the 12 week public consultation exercise. As such, it is quite difficult to assess this at such an early stage.  Any Section 75 issues raised during the 12 week public consultation period will be fully considered.
Political opinion		As above
Racial Group		As above

<b>Screening Questions</b>		
<b>4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?</b>		
<b>Section 75 Category</b>	<b>If Yes, provide details</b>	<b>If No, provide details</b>
Religious Belief		No specific opportunities to better promote good relations within and between the various Section 75 groupings have been identified at this stage.  However, any Section 75 issues raised during the 12 week public consultation period will be fully considered.
Political Opinion		As above
Racial Group		As above

<b>Additional Considerations</b>
<b>Generally speaking people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance on people with multiple identities? (For example: disabled minority ethnic people, disabled women, young Protestant men, and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people.)</b>
<p>Whilst the POP recognises that people may fall into more than one Section 75 category, no differential impact has been identified at this POP stage.</p> <p>As the Vision of the LDP is to improve the health &amp; well-being of everyone, the outworking of the Plan is likely to promote equality of opportunity for people with multiple identities.</p> <p>Any Section 75 issues raised during the 12 week public consultation period will be fully considered.</p>
<b>Provide details of data on the impact of the function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance on people with multiple identities. Specify the relevant Section 75 categories concerned.</b>
None at this stage of the Plan preparation, however, this will be kept under review.

<p><b>Disability Considerations</b></p> <p><b>Is there an opportunity to better promote positive attitudes towards disabled people by altering this function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance?</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b></p>
<p><b>If yes, please give further information and examples:</b></p> <p>Yes: It is anticipated that the LDP will contain planning policies requiring ‘access for all’. This should contribute to the promotion of positive attitudes towards disabled people.</p>
<p><b>Is there an opportunity to encourage participation by disabled people in public life by altering this function, service, policy, procedure, project, strategy, plan or guidance?</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b>                      <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Please give further information and examples:</b></p> <p>Yes: It is anticipated that the LDP will contain planning policies requiring ‘access for all’. This should contribute to participation by disabled people in public life.</p>
<p><b>Screening Decision</b></p> <p><b>Likely Impact:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Major</b>                                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Minor</b>                                      <input type="checkbox"/> <b>None</b></p> <p><b>If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment (i.e. likely impact – Major), please provide details of the reasons for this:</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. likely impact = Minor) the Council should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced:</b></p> <p>In the absence of policy detail or specific spatial proposals at this early stage of the LDP, there is no evidence that the Council’s ‘preferred options’ will cause differential adverse impact, either within or between any of the Section 75 groups.</p> <p>This will be subject to continuous review as the Plan progresses. It will also be informed by any Section 75 issues raised during the 12 week public consultation period.</p>
<p><b>If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. likely impact = None), please provide details of the reasons for this:</b> N/A</p>

<p><b>Mitigation</b></p>
<p>When the Council concludes that the likely impact is ‘<b>Minor</b>’ and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the Council may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.</p>

<p><b>Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <span style="margin-left: 150px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> - Not at this early, strategic stage.</span> </p>
<p>If <b>YES</b>, give the reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy:</p>

<b>Timetabling And Prioritising</b>	
<p>If the policy/decision has been 'screened in' for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.</p> <p>On a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.</p> <p>N/A – Not screened in.</p>	
<b>Priority Criterion</b>	<b>Rating (1 to 3)</b>
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	-
Social Need	-
Effect on people's daily lives	-
Relevance to the Council's functions	-

<b>Monitoring</b>
<p><b>Please outline proposals for future monitoring of the policy/decision:</b></p> <p>The LDP process will be subject to further Equality Screening during the preparation of the Draft Plan Strategy and Draft Local Policies Plan documents.</p>

<b>Approval And Authorisation</b>		
<b>Screened By</b>	<b>Position/Job Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Sharon Mulhern	Local Development Plan Manager	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
Cathy Watson	Equality Officer	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
<b>Approved By</b>	<b>Position/Job Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Denise Dickson	Head of Planning	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2018



