

## Equality Impact Assessment

### Purpose of assessment

The Public Sector Equality Duty which is set out in the Equality Act 2010 requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (this includes ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (this includes lack of belief), gender and sexual orientation.

The purpose of carrying out an Equality Impact Assessment is to assess the impact of a change to services or policy on people with protected characteristics and to demonstrate that the Council has considered the aims of the Equality Duty. The Equality Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a change to services or particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken. A public body cannot satisfy the Equality Duty by justifying a decision after it has been taken.

**Note:** Please write in Plain English as this document, once approved, will be published on the Council's website.

<b>Title</b>	
Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan Submission Draft Consultation Document and Proposed Modifications	
<b>Date</b>	August 2016
<b>Lead Officer for this assessment</b>	Sally Gill (Group Manager Planning – Nottinghamshire County Council)
<b>List of other officers/organisations involved in the assessment</b>	Eilidh McCallum (Planning Officer – Nottinghamshire County Council), Karen Moss (Equality Officer – Nottinghamshire County Council)

<b>1a</b>	<b>What is being considered and why? Explain rationale behind proposed changes and other options considered, if applicable.</b>
<p>This EqIA considers the Submission Draft consultation document of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan along with a schedule of proposed modifications resulting from formal representations.</p> <p>The Submission Draft was preceded by a preferred approach consultation (plus two additional consultations on sand and gravel provision) which was subject to separate EqIA.</p> <p>The Submission Draft document and proposed modifications set out the Council's intentions with regards to future planning policy for minerals development within the County. This includes proposed policies and the allocation of sites for future minerals extraction. As such, it includes changes to Council policy and so the impacts of this need to be considered.</p> <p>It must be noted that further changes may occur before the Minerals Local Plan is adopted. If such changes are significant an EqIA review will be completed. Once adopted, the document will replace the existing Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. The policies within it will set out the Council's approach towards minerals development, including detailed policies concerning development management issues and site specific allocations for future mineral extraction. In combination, these will be used to aid in the determination of planning applications.</p>	

<b>1b</b>	<b>What is the demographic profile of the community you are serving? What is the profile of your services users by protected characteristics, where information is available?</b>
-----------	---

Please see attached report – Chapter 4

<b>1c</b>	<b>What will be the effect on service users?</b>
-----------	--

Please see attached report – Chapter 5 (and Appendix A)

<b>1d</b>	<b>Even if the proposals apply to everyone equally, could they have a disproportionate/adverse or negative impact on people with the following protected characteristics, if so how?</b>
-----------	--

**Age**  
**Disability (physical, sensory or learning disabilities including effects on carers):**  
**Gender (Sex)**  
**Gender Reassignment**  
**Pregnancy and Maternity**  
**Race**  
**Religion or belief**  
**Sexual orientation**

**Vision and Strategic Objectives**  
The impact of the vision on all of the protected characteristics groups was considered to be neutral as reference to the protection of quality of life does not prejudice or promote any group above another.

For the majority of the strategic objectives no clear link was found with matters of equality. The exception was Strategic Objective 5 – Minimising Impacts on Communities where again there was a neutral impact on all groups.

**Strategic Policies**  
All but one of the strategic policies were found to have a neutral impact on all of the protected characteristic groups (with SP2 – Biodiversity-led Restoration having no clear link). The policies tended to make reference to residential amenity, or in some way were related to impacts on the population. However, in all instances these references were not considered to either significantly prejudice or promote one group above another and as such the impact was neutral.

Only one slight differential impact was identified. This was in relation to SP3 – Climate Change whereby, through the seeking of minimisation of long term negative impacts of minerals development, future generations are afforded greater protection. However, this impact was not considered great enough to be considered as a positive impact in terms of the ‘scoring’.

**Mineral Provision Policies**  
The majority of the mineral provision policies were found to have no clear link to matters of equality. Where a link was identified, the impact was considered to be neutral in all instances. This was due to policy wording that promoted the protection of residential/community amenity, but that in doing so did not either prejudice or promote any of the protected characteristic groups.

**Development Management Policies**  
Just six of the 18 development management policies were found to have any impact on the protected characteristic groups. Where impacts were identified, all of the impacts were found to be neutral across all groups.

Please see Appendix A of the attached report for the policy by policy assessment.	
<b>1e</b>	<b>Will your proposal have any positive impacts on people with the above protected characteristics to advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations?</b>
No positive impacts were identified. However, two opportunities for promoting equality (through changes to policy) were identified. Both relate to the provision of public access to open countryside and restored minerals workings. It was considered that reference to the protection and enhancement of public access in Policies DM7 and DM11 could be more explicit in their support of equal access, e.g. for those in wheelchairs or those with pushchairs. See Chapter 5 and Appendix A for more details.	

<b>2a</b>	<b>In terms of any disproportionate/negative/adverse impact that the proposal may have on a protected group, what steps (if any) could be taken to reduce that impact for each group identified. Attach a separate action plan if necessary.</b>
No disproportionate/negative/adverse impacts were identified and as such no action was needed.	
<b>2b</b>	<b>If ways of reducing the impact have been identified but are not possible, please explain why they are not possible.</b>
n/a	

<b>3</b>	<b>Evidence Sources</b> <b>(i) Give details of any data or research that has led to your reasoning above, in particular, the sources used for establishing the demographics of service users.</b> <b>(ii) Give details of how you have engaged with service users on the proposals and steps to avoid any disproportionate impact on a protected group and how you have used any feedback to influence your decision.</b>
All sources of data are cited in the attached report	

**(Complete this section where staff are directly affected:)**

<b>4a</b>	<b>What is the profile of your current staff by age group, disability, gender, race and ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation?</b>
n/a – staff not directly affected	
<b>4b</b>	<b>Give details of how the proposed service changes (if applicable) will affect staff? Will staff of any particular protected equality characteristic be affected more than any other?</b>
n/a – staff not directly affected	
<b>4c</b>	<b>In terms of any disproportionate/negative/adverse impact that the proposal may have on a protected staff group, what steps (if any) could be taken to reduce that impact for each group identified.</b>
n/a – staff not directly affected	
<b>4d</b>	<b>If ways of reducing the impact have been identified but are not possible, please explain why they are not possible.</b>
n/a – staff not directly affected	

<b>5</b>	<b>Decision Log – (detail how Elected Members and Senior Managers have been involved in the decision process (give dates of key meetings and decisions made))</b>
Environment and Sustainability Committee: 4 January 2016 Full Council: 14 January 2016 To seek approval for consultation on the proposed document.	
Environment and Sustainability Committee: 22 September 2016	

To note the progress on the Plan, the representations received and the proposed modifications  
Full Council: 24 November 2016  
To seek approval to submit the Submission Draft and proposed modifications to Secretary of State for examination

<b>6a</b>	<b>Date of Next Review:</b> A review may be necessary if any major changes to the policy are made as a result of the public examination. In the longer term, the plan may be subject to review, at which stage any changes will be subject to EqIA.
<b>6b</b>	<b>If review is not required, explain why.</b> n/a

<b>7a</b>	<b>Approved by:</b> Tim Gregory
<b>7b</b>	<b>Approval date:</b> 22.08.16
<b>Please return the approved EqIA to the Equality Officers, Policy Performance and Research Team, County Hall, Nottingham NG2 7QP. The EqIA will be published on the Equality pages of the internet.</b>	

## Appendix 1



# Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan

## Equality Impact Assessment

**Submission Draft and Proposed Modifications**

August 2016



## Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>What is an Equality Impact Assessment?.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Equality Impact Assessment process .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>EqIA in the Plan making process .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>EqIA methodology .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>A profile of Nottinghamshire .....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Age.....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Gender reassignment.....</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Marriage and civil partnerships.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>Pregnancy and maternity/paternity.....</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Disability.....</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>Race.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>Religion and belief.....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Gender .....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Sexual orientation.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Assessment of Minerals Local Plan policies .....</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Key findings .....</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Review of Submission Draft .....</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Review of Proposed Modifications .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Assessment of Minerals Local Plan public consultation.....</b>	<b>14</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Policy Impact Assessments .....</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Appendix B: Review of EqIA for Submission Draft .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Nottinghamshire County Council is currently in the process of developing a new Minerals Local Plan (the Plan). The Plan is being prepared under the terms of the 2011 Localism Act and once adopted it will provide a planning framework for the County, guiding all minerals development to 2030. It includes:
- A long term Vision for minerals development in Nottinghamshire until 2030;
  - Strategic Objectives demonstrating how the Vision will be achieved;
  - Strategic Policies covering the key issues of sustainable development, minerals provision, biodiversity led restoration, climate change, transport, the built and natural environment and the Green Belt;
  - Minerals Provision Policies setting out the minerals requirements during the plan period to 2030, including land allocations to meet this demand;
  - Development Management Policies to deliver the strategic objectives and policies, by providing the criteria against which future minerals development will be assessed;
  - A framework by which the implementation of and subsequent effect of the Plan and its policies can be monitored and reviewed;
  - A Policies Map which identifies site allocations and policies; and
  - Site specific Development Briefs.
- 1.2 Various stages of public consultation have taken place during the preparation of the Plan, most notably an Issues and Options Consultation (January – March 2012) and a Preferred Approach Consultation (October – December 2013) plus Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision (May – July 2014) and Shelford West (October – December 2014). A period for formal representations on the Submission Draft ran during February – March 2016. A timetable for the remaining stages of production is set out in Table 1.

**Table 1: Timetable for progression of the Minerals Local Plan**

Stage	Date
<b>Submission to Government</b>	December 2016
<b>Examination</b>	March 2017
<b>Adoption</b>	September 2017

- 1.3 Part of the process to prepare the Plan is to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) which assesses the implications of the planning policies contained within the Plan upon the whole community. Its aim is to eliminate discrimination and tackle inequality. An initial EqIA was carried out at the Preferred Approach stage<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.4 This report builds on this initial EqIA and considers in greater detail the impact of the policies of the Plan on the Protected Characteristics groups identified in the Equalities Act 2010:
- Age
  - Being or becoming a transsexual person
  - Being married or in a civil partnership
  - Being pregnant or having a child
  - Disability

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/equalities/eqia/>



- Race including colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin
- Religion, belief or lack of religion/belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

1.5 The purpose of this 'full' EqIA is to contribute to a transparent preparation and decision making process in producing the Plan, informing the policies within the Submission Draft to ensure that they do not discriminate against any particular people or groups. The report demonstrates how equality was taken into account during the preparation of the Submission Draft document. It also reviews the proposed modifications to the Submission Draft. It addresses issues relating to people or groups with protected characteristics and how negative impacts of the Plan would be mitigated.

1.6 This report is part of a suite of assessment reports which together contribute to a complete consideration of the potential impacts of the policy in the Minerals Local Plan. The other reports are the Sustainability Appraisal and Health Impact Assessment.

## **2.0 What is an Equality Impact Assessment?**

- 2.1 The Public Sector Equality Duty (the Duty), as set out in the Equalities Act 2010, requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and those who do not; and
  - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 2.2 Equality Impact Assessments (EqIAs) originated from the Macpherson Report and the subsequent Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 and although they are no longer required under the Equalities Act 2010, they continue to be a popular tool used by public authorities to ensure they meet the Duty.
- 2.3 In the context of the Minerals Local Plan, an EqIA is used to assess the impact of a change in policy on people with protected characteristics and to demonstrate that the Council has considered the aims of the Duty. It should identify not only negative or adverse impacts and methods for removing or mitigating such impacts, but also identify opportunities to promote equality through the policies in the Minerals Local Plan.

## **3.0 Equality Impact Assessment process**

### **EqlA in the Plan making process**

- 3.1 As Equality Impact Assessments (EqlAs) should assess the impact of policy changes, it is important that they form part of policy formulation. The first stage of Plan production was a consultation on Issues and Options. No EqlA was completed at this stage as the document did not include any proposed policy, it was simply a discussion document looking at issues and how to address them.
- 3.2 The second stage of Plan preparation, the Preferred Approach, introduced some draft policies and so was subject to an initial EqlA which sought to identify if the Preferred Approach as a whole (and the public consultation on it) had the potential to impact either positively or negatively on people with protected characteristics.
- 3.3 This report builds on the initial assessment by assessing in greater detail the potential impacts on a policy by policy basis. This process was done alongside the review and development of the policies to ensure that any mitigation the EqlA identified could be incorporated into the Submission Draft.
- 3.4 A review of the final Submission Draft was completed to check whether any changes to the Plan (resulting from the Preferred Approach consultations) were significant enough to require reassessment in terms of their impact on equality. Details of this review can be found in Appendix B. A review of the subsequent Proposed Modifications was also completed, see Section 5.
- 3.5 There is a possibility that further EqlA reviews will need to be undertaken at the Submission and Examination stages, if major changes to the Plan (specifically the policies) are made which could result in differing impacts on the protected characteristics groups.

### **EqlA methodology**

- 3.6 This 'full' EqlA involves three main stages. Firstly, a baseline of Nottinghamshire's population in relation to the protected characteristics groups has been identified using published statistics. This has been analysed to identify important local trends which could have a bearing on the impact of the policies of the Plan. See Chapter 4.
- 3.7 Secondly, each of the Plan's policies, as well as the vision and objectives, were assessed in detail by examining the policy in relation to each of the protected characteristic groups and whether the likely impact is positive, neutral/negligible, negative or not applicable. This is accompanied by a commentary to explain the outcome of the assessment. See Chapter 5 and Appendix A.
- 3.8 A final stage of assessment looks at the public consultation on the Submission Draft to identify possible negative impacts on protected characteristic groups (and mitigation) as well as opportunities for promoting equality where possible. See Chapter 6.
- 3.9 The EqlA was reviewed by a Nottinghamshire County Council Equalities Officer who has specialist knowledge to aid in identifying any differential impacts or

opportunities to promote equality, as well as providing an overview of the EqlA process.

## 4.0 A profile of Nottinghamshire

- 4.1 In order to assess any potential differential impact on any of the protected characteristic groups it is important first to establish a profile of Nottinghamshire's population in relation to these groups. Nottinghamshire's profile will be compared to both the wider (i.e. the East Midlands – hereafter referred to as regional) and national picture to identify any particular local trends that need to be accounted for. Where relevant and available, trends over time will also be examined.
- 4.2 The most comprehensive data available is from the 2011 Census and so this has been used as the main source. Where the Census does not provide suitable data, other sources have been identified (where possible), using the closest time period to the 2011 for the purpose of comparison and consistency.

### Age

- 4.3 Data on the age structure of Nottinghamshire's population is readily available, as published by the Office for National Statistics. The 2011 Census provides a recent and comprehensive breakdown of the age of the population.

Table 1: Age Structure	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Age 0 to 4	45,259	5.8	270,174	6.0	3,318,449	6.3
Age 5 to 7	25,459	3.2	151,534	3.3	1,827,610	3.4
Age 8 to 9	16,288	2.1	96,030	2.1	1,145,022	2.2
Age 10 to 14	45,750	5.8	264,538	5.8	3,080,929	5.8
Age 15	9,566	1.2	56,179	1.2	650,826	1.2
Age 16 to 17	19,981	2.5	114,815	2.5	1,314,124	2.5
Age 18 to 19	18,307	2.3	124,920	2.8	1,375,315	2.6
Age 20 to 24	44,562	5.7	307,676	6.8	3,595,321	6.8
Age 25 to 29	44,051	5.6	278,581	6.1	3,650,881	6.9
Age 30 to 44	155,113	19.7	895,538	19.8	10,944,271	20.6
Age 45 to 59	165,910	21.1	908,888	20.0	10,276,902	19.4
Age 60 to 64	53,109	6.8	291,401	6.4	3,172,277	6.0
Age 65 to 74	77,221	9.8	414,713	9.1	4,552,283	8.6
Age 75 to 84	47,073	6.0	256,569	5.7	2,928,118	5.5
Age 85 to 89	12,268	1.6	67,862	1.5	776,311	1.5
Age 90 & over	5,885	0.7	33,804	0.7	403,817	0.8
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						

- 4.4 Consistent with both the national and regional pattern, Nottinghamshire has an ageing population with over a quarter of residents aged 45 and above. This is slightly higher than both the regional and national picture. Conversely, the percentage of those aged 18-44 is below the regional and national figures.

### Gender reassignment

- 4.5 There is no available data on gender reassignment specific to Nottinghamshire's population.

## Marriage and civil partnerships

- 4.6 The 2011 Census data includes information on marital and civil partnership status. This indicates that Nottinghamshire has a lower proportion of single people than both the regional and national picture. This is reflected in a higher proportion of married people. The proportion of those in a registered same-sex civil partnership is consistent across the local, regional and national scale.

Table 2: Marital and civil partnership status	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Population aged 16+	643,480	100.0	3,694,767	100.0	42,989,620	100.0
Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	192,587	29.9	1,192,443	32.3	14,889,928	34.6
Married	323,211	50.2	1,790,916	48.5	20,029,369	46.6
In a registered same-sex civil partnership	1,301	0.2	7,179	0.2	100,288	0.2
Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	15,994	2.5	96,149	2.6	1,141,196	2.7
Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	61,885	9.6	342,665	9.3	3,857,137	9.0
Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	48,502	7.5	265,415	7.2	2,971,702	6.9
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						

## Pregnancy and maternity/paternity

- 4.7 Data on pregnancy and maternity/paternity is available, however it relates to specific issues such as family type and births. This cannot provide a full picture, particularly in relation to paternity, but it does provide some insights into this group.

<b>Table 3: Births (2012)</b>	<b>Nottinghamshire</b>	<b>East Midlands</b>	<b>England</b>
Maternity Rate, maternities per 1,000 women aged 15-44	62.9	63.1	64.9
Teenage conception rate (under 18s), rate per 1000 in age group	10.3	10.2	9.1
Source: Office for National Statistics (ONS)			

<b>Table 4: Family Type</b>	<b>Nottinghamshire</b>		<b>East Midlands</b>		<b>England</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
All lone parent households with dependent children	21,632	100.0	126,927	100.0	1,564,681	100.0
Lone parent in part-time employment: Total	7,546	34.9	44,601	35.1	522,789	33.4
Lone parent in full-time employment: Total	6,260	28.9	34,775	27.4	407,873	26.1
Lone parent not in employment: Total	7,826	36.2	47,551	37.5	634,019	40.5
Male lone parent: Total	2,427	11.2	13,648	10.8	151,744	9.7
Male lone parent: In part-time employment	329	1.5	1,893	1.5	22,130	1.4
Male lone parent: In full-time employment	1,418	6.6	7,685	6.1	80,078	5.1
Male lone parent: Not in employment	680	3.1	4,070	3.2	49,536	3.2
Female lone parent: Total	19,205	88.8	113,279	89.2	1,412,937	90.3
Female lone parent: In part-time employment	7,217	33.4	42,708	33.6	500,659	32.0
Female lone parent: In full-time employment	4,842	22.4	27,090	21.3	327,795	20.9
Female lone parent: Not in employment	7,146	33.0	43,481	34.3	584,483	37.4
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						

- 4.8 Nottinghamshire's maternity rate is similar to that of the East Midlands, but lower than the national rate. Conversely however, the teenage conception rate is higher. In terms of lone parent families, the rates of employment (part and full time) of the lone parent are generally higher in Nottinghamshire than both the region and nation as a whole. This is true across male and female lone parents. The level of lone male parents is higher than the region and nation, whilst the level of lone female parents is lower.

## Disability

4.9 The majority of data on disability considers it alongside long-term health problems and care. In Nottinghamshire, the percentage of households which contain one person with a long-term health problem or disability is higher than the national and regional figures. This is reflected in other datasets, such as a higher than regional/national percentage of:

- working age people who are disabled (Table 6)
- people with long-term health problems or a disability where their day-to-day activities are limited (over 20%) (Table 7)
- people providing some care (Table 7)

Table 5: Long term health problem or disability	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
One person in household with a long-term health problem or disability	91,443	27.4	496,598	26.2	5,659,606	25.7
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						

Table 6: Permanent sickness and disability (2012)	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	%		%		%	
Percentage of working age people who are disabled	24.22		22.51		20.44	
Source: Nottinghamshire Insight						

Table 7: Disability, health and care	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All categories: Long-term health problem or disability	785,802	100.0	4,533,222	100.0	53,012,456	100.0
Day-to-day activities limited a lot	76,216	9.7	393,242	8.7	4,405,394	8.3
Day-to-day activities limited a little	83,456	10.6	451,055	9.9	4,947,192	9.3
Day-to-day activities not limited	626,130	79.7	3,688,925	81.4	43,659,870	82.4
Provides no unpaid care	695,104	88.5	4,042,973	89.2	47,582,440	89.8
Provides 1 to 19 hours unpaid care a week	57,426	7.3	311,813	6.9	3,452,636	6.5
Provides 20 to 49 hours unpaid care a week	11,592	1.5	63,603	1.4	721,143	1.4
Provides 50 or more hours unpaid care a week	21,680	2.8	114,833	2.5	1,256,237	2.4
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						



## Race

4.10 Data on the ethnic group profile of Nottinghamshire's population is readily available, as published by the Office for National Statistics. The 2011 Census provides a recent and comprehensive breakdown of the population in this regard.

Table 8: Ethnic Group	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All usual residents	785,802	100.0	4,533,222	100.0	53,012,456	100.0
White	750,803	95.5	4,046,356	89.3	45,281,142	85.4
English/Welsh/ Scottish/Northern Irish/British	727,938	92.6	3,871,146	85.4	42,279,236	79.8
Irish	4,133	0.5	28,676	0.6	517,001	1.0
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	456	0.1	3,418	0.1	54,895	0.1
Other White	18,276	2.3	143,116	3.2	2,430,010	4.6
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	10,716	1.4	86,224	1.9	1,192,879	2.3
White and Black Caribbean	5,174	0.7	40,404	0.9	415,616	0.8
White and Black African	961	0.1	8,814	0.2	161,550	0.3
White and Asian	2,719	0.3	21,688	0.5	332,708	0.6
Other Mixed	1,862	0.2	15,318	0.3	283,005	0.5
Asian/Asian British	17,139	2.2	293,423	6.5	4,143,403	7.8
Indian	7,204	0.9	168,928	3.7	1,395,702	2.6
Pakistani	3,470	0.4	48,940	1.1	1,112,282	2.1
Bangladeshi	600	0.1	13,258	0.3	436,514	0.8
Chinese	2,942	0.4	24,404	0.5	379,503	0.7
Other Asian	2,923	0.4	37,893	0.8	819,402	1.5
Black/African/Caribbean /Black British	5,102	0.6	81,484	1.8	1,846,614	3.5
African	1,754	0.2	41,768	0.9	977,741	1.8
Caribbean	2,782	0.4	28,913	0.6	591,016	1.1
Other Black	566	0.1	10,803	0.2	277,857	0.5
Other ethnic group	2,042	0.3	25,735	0.6	548,418	1.0
Arab	815	0.1	9,746	0.2	220,985	0.4
Any other ethnic group	1,227	0.2	15,989	0.4	327,433	0.6

Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]

4.11 Nottinghamshire's population has a considerably higher proportion of white people than both the regional and national figure, with correspondingly low proportions of all of the other ethnic groups. There are no non-white groups or sub-groups where the local figure is higher than the national or regional percentage.

## Religion and belief

- 4.12 Data on the religion and belief is collected through the census. The 2011 Census provides a recent and comprehensive breakdown of the population in this regard. The percentage of Nottinghamshire's population which consider themselves to have any religion is lower than the regional and national figure, but within this there is a higher proportion of Christians. There is a greater proportion who consider themselves to have no religion.

Table 9: Religion	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		England	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All categories: Religion	785,802	100.0	4,533,222	100.0	53,012,456	100.0
Has religion	500,835	63.7	2,975,723	65.6	36,094,120	68.1
Christian	481,994	61.3	2,666,172	58.8	31,479,876	59.4
Buddhist	1,860	0.2	12,672	0.3	238,626	0.5
Hindu	3,480	0.4	89,723	2.0	806,199	1.5
Jewish	717	0.1	4,254	0.1	261,282	0.5
Muslim	6,963	0.9	140,649	3.1	2,660,116	5.0
Sikh	3,132	0.4	44,335	1.0	420,196	0.8
Other religion	2,689	0.3	17,918	0.4	227,825	0.4
No religion	230,138	29.3	1,248,056	27.5	13,114,232	24.7
Religion not stated	54,829	7.0	309,443	6.8	3,804,104	7.2
Source: Census 2011 - ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis 2013]						

## Gender

- 4.13 The gender structure of the population is published by the Office for National Statistics on a regular basis, both in actual and estimated terms. The 2012 figures indicate that the ratio of males to females in Nottinghamshire is consistent with the national and regional picture (with a slightly higher percentage of females).

Table 10: Total Population (2012)	Nottinghamshire		East Midlands		Great Britain	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
All usual residents	790,200	100	4,567,700	100	61,881,400	100
Males	388,900	49	2,252,100	49	30,420,500	49
Females	401,300	51	2,315,700	51	31,460,900	51
Source: ONS mid-year population estimates						

## Sexual orientation

- 4.14 There is limited data available on sexual orientation. The 2011 Census reported 0.2% of Nottinghamshire's population as being in a registered same-sex civil partnership, a figure consistent with the national and regional picture.

## 5.0 Assessment of Minerals Local Plan policies

- 5.1 Having established a baseline profile of Nottinghamshire in relation to the protected characteristic groups, an assessment of the Minerals Local Plan was completed, based on the methodology set out in Chapter 3. A series of tables setting out in detail the results of the policy by policy assessments can be found in Appendix A.

### Key findings

#### Vision and Strategic Objectives

- 5.2 The impact of the vision on all of the protected characteristics groups was considered to be neutral as reference to the protection of quality of life does not prejudice or promote any group above another.
- 5.3 For the majority of the strategic objectives no clear link was found with matters of equality. The exception was Strategic Objective 5 – Minimising Impacts on Communities where again there was a neutral impact on all groups.
- 5.4 No recommendations for changes to the vision or strategic objectives were made.

#### Strategic Policies

- 5.5 All but one of the strategic policies were found to have a neutral impact on all of the protected characteristic groups (with SP2 – Biodiversity-led Restoration having no clear link). The policies tended to make reference to residential amenity, or in some way were related to impacts on the population. However, in all instances these references were not considered to either significantly prejudice or promote one group above another and as such the impact was neutral.
- 5.6 Only one slight differential impact was identified. This was in relation to SP3 – Climate Change whereby through the seeking of minimisation of long term negative impacts of minerals development, future generations are afforded greater protection. However, this impact was not considered great enough to be considered as a positive impact in terms of the 'scoring'.
- 5.7 No recommendations for changes to the strategic policies were made.

#### Mineral Provision Policies

- 5.8 The majority of the mineral provision policies were found to have no clear link to matters of equality. Where a link was identified, the impact was considered to be neutral in all instances. This was due to policy wording that promoted the protection of residential/community amenity, but in doing so did not either prejudice or promote any of the protected characteristic groups.
- 5.9 No recommendations for changes to the mineral provision policies were made.

### **Development Management Policies**

- 5.10 Just six of the 18 development management policies were found to have any impact on the protected characteristic groups. Where impacts were identified, all of the impacts were found to be neutral across all groups.
- 5.11 Two opportunities for promoting equality were identified. Both relate to the provision of public access to open countryside and restored minerals workings. It was considered that reference to the protection and enhancement of public access in Policies DM7 and DM11 could be more explicit in their support of equal access, e.g. for those in wheelchairs or those with pushchairs. This is particularly important when considered in light of the higher than regional and national average of those with disabilities and long term illnesses.

### **Review of Submission Draft**

- 5.12 The final Submission Draft was reviewed to identify if any of the changes made to the vision, strategic objectives and policies from the Preferred Approach version need to be re-assessed in terms of their impact on equality. Details of the review are set out in Appendix B. None of the changes made were identified as being significant enough to require further detailed assessment or to require further recommended changes to the Plan.
- 5.13 No recommendations for additional changes to the vision, strategic objectives or policies were made at this stage.

### **Review of Proposed Modifications**

- 5.14 Following the period for formal representations and prior to submission for public examination, a schedule of proposed modifications was completed. This schedule was reviewed to identify if any of the changes to be made would need to be re-assessed in terms of their impact on equality. None of the changes made were identified as being relevant to equality and so no further assessment has been completed. As such, no recommendations for additional changes to the vision, strategic objectives or policies were made at this stage.

## 6.0 Assessment of Minerals Local Plan public consultation

- 6.1 The Minerals Local Plan has been developed in conjunction with a range of consultees and stakeholders. Those consulted have included:
- Local residents (both those expressing an interest and targeted consultation to those living with 250m of a proposed mineral site)
  - Resident and interest groups
  - Landowners and agents
  - Mineral operators and industry bodies
  - Local businesses
  - Organisations representing different groups of people (e.g. Age Concern)
  - Statutory bodies.
- 6.2 Consultation has occurred at five stages of plan production:
- Issues and Options: January – March 2012
  - Preferred Approach: October – December 2013
  - Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision: May – July 2014
  - Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision - Shelford West: October – December 2014
  - Submission Draft: February – March 2016
- 6.3 All public consultation has been conducted in line with the Nottinghamshire County Council Statement of Community Involvement<sup>2</sup>. This has the purpose of involving as many people and organisations as possible in the planning process, part of which is addressing ensuring hard to reach groups are not marginalised.
- 6.4 The public consultation exercise for the Minerals Local Plan was first considered through an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) at the Preferred Approach stage. This initial EqIA identified that two groups (those with visual disabilities and those who cannot read English) could be disadvantaged in terms of access to the mainly written format of the consultation material. As such the EqIA suggested that the consultation material be available in alternative formats on request.
- 6.5 In terms of the Submission Draft, the recommendations from the initial EqIA were carried forward. No additional differential or adverse impacts on any of the other protected characteristic groups were identified in relation to the public consultation process.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/planning/local-development-framework/sci/>

## Appendix A: Policy Impact Assessments

N.B The policies listed here are as they appeared in the Preferred Approach/Additional Consultation on Sand and Gravel Provision as the EqIA was completed as part of the development of the Submission Draft.

The final Submission Draft was reviewed to identify if any of the changes made from the Preferred Approach need to be re-assessed in terms of their impact on equality (see Appendix B).

### Key of likely impacts

Likely impact	
✓	Positive
0	Neutral/negligible
-	Negative
n/a	Not applicable

Vision/Strategic Objective	Protected Characteristics Groups										Commentary
	Age	Gender reassignment	Marriage and civil partnership	Pregnancy and maternity	Disability	Race	Religion and beliefs	Gender	Sexual orientation		
<b>Vision</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The impact of the vision across all groups will be neutral, as the statement 'The quality of life and health of those living, working in, or visiting Nottinghamshire will be protected' does not prejudice or promote any group above another
<b>SO1 – Improving the sustainability of minerals development</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO2 – Providing an adequate supply of minerals</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO3 – Addressing climate change</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO4 – Safeguarding mineral resources</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO5 – Minimising impacts on communities</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The objective does not prejudice or promote any group above another and it does state that wider involvement and targeting of groups will be completed where appropriate.
<b>SO6 – Protecting and enhancing natural assets</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO7 – Protecting and enhancing historic assets</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality
<b>SO8 – Protecting agricultural land</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this objective and equality

Policy	Protected Characteristics Groups									Commentary
	Age	Gender reassignment	Marriage and civil partnership	Pregnancy and maternity	Disability	Race	Religion and beliefs	Gender	Sexual orientation	
<b>SP1 - Sustainable development</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy seeks to deliver development that '...improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'. In doing so, it will be impacting on communities. However, it is not considered to either prejudice or promote any group above another.
<b>SP2 – Biodiversity-led restoration</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>SP3 – Climate Change</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy seeks to minimise the impact of minerals development on the causes of climate change and on flood risk. The impacts of climate change and flooding are felt by all. It is considered that the only (slight) differential impact from this policy could be a positive impact on future generations (i.e. in relation to age) as it is seeking to minimise long term impacts of development.
<b>SP4 – Minerals provision</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	In seeking the avoidance of adverse social, economic and environmental impacts or the use of appropriate mitigation, the policy does not prejudice or promote any group above another.
<b>SP5 – Sustainable transport</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy seeks to avoid the impact of transporting minerals on residential areas, but it is not considered that in doing so it prejudices or promotes any group above another.
<b>SP6 – The built and natural environment</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy seeks to protect the amenity of communities, but it is not considered that in doing so it prejudices or promotes any group above another.
<b>SP7 – The Nottinghamshire Green Belt</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Through seeking the protection of the green belt, this policy promotes the qualities and benefits of the green belt. These can include access to countryside and visual amenity.



These benefits are considered to neither prejudice nor promote any group above another.

Policy	Protected Characteristics Groups									Commentary
	Age	Gender reassignment	Marriage and civil partnership	Pregnancy and maternity	Disability	Race	Religion and beliefs	Gender	Sexual orientation	
<b>MP1 – Aggregate provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP2 – Sand and gravel provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP3 – Sherwood Sandstone provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP4 – Limestone provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP5 – Secondary and recycled aggregates</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy seeks to support the use of secondary and recycled aggregates, subject to there being no 'unacceptable impacts'. Such impacts could include that on communities, but there is no prejudice or promotion of any group above another.
<b>MP6 – Brick clay provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP7 – Gypsum provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP8 – Silica sand provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP9 – Industrial dolomite provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP10 – Building stone provision</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>MP11 – Coal</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy includes various references to amenity (both its protection and delivering benefits to) and as such there is potential for impact on communities. It is not however considered that any impact as a result of this policy would differ between the protected characteristics groups.
<b>MP12 – Hydrocarbon minerals</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy includes various references to the protection of residential amenity, but it is not considered that in doing so it prejudices or promotes any group above another.

Policy	Protected Characteristics Groups									Commentary
	Age	Gender reassignment	Marriage and civil partnership	Pregnancy and maternity	Disability	Race	Religion and beliefs	Gender	Sexual orientation	
<b>DM1 – Protecting local amenity</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The purpose of this policy is the protection of local amenity and thus will directly affect any population living within proximity to a proposed minerals site. However, it is not considered that any of the criteria listed either prejudice or promote any group above another.
<b>DM2 – Water resources and flood risk</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The policy includes various references to amenity (both its protection and delivering benefits to), specifically in relation to water and flooding matters and as such there is potential for impact on communities. It is not however considered that any impact as a result of this policy would differ between the protected characteristics groups.
<b>DM3 – Agricultural land and soil quality</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM4 – Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM5 – Landscape character</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM6 – Historic environment</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM7 – Public access</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy seeks the protection and enhancement of public access to countryside and restored mineral workings. As such it could impact on the population. The policy is not considered to have a negative impact on any of the groups. However, there is potential for this policy to more explicitly promote matters of equality through reference to <i>equal</i> public access, e.g. access for those in wheelchairs, with pushchairs.
<b>DM8 – Cumulative impact</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy includes reference to the protection of amenity for local communities and as such relates to impact on the population.

											However, it is not considered that any impacts as a result of this policy would differ between the protected characteristics groups.
<b>DM9 – Highways safety and vehicle movements/ routing</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy includes various references to the protection of amenity for local communities and as such relates to impact on the population. However, it is not considered that any impacts as a result of this policy would differ between the protected characteristics groups.
<b>DM10 – Planning obligations</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM11 – Restoration, after-use and after-care</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	This policy seeks the provision of benefits to the local and wider community through restoration. The list of example benefits is not considered to prejudice or promote any group above another. It does include reference to public access. As per DM7, this could include more explicit reference to equal access.
<b>DM12 – Airfield safeguarding (bird strike)</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM13 – Mineral safeguarding and consultation areas</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM14 – Incidental mineral extraction</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM15 – Irrigation lagoons</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM16 – Borrow pits</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM17 – Associated industrial development</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality
<b>DM18 – Mineral exploration</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	There is no clear link between this policy and equality

## Appendix B: Review of EqIA for Submission Draft

N.B. Policies with no changes, minor/terminology/typographical changes or where the changes have no clear link to the EqIA are not included.

Vision/Strategic Objective changes	Commentary	Recommended action
<b>SO5 – Minimising impacts on communities</b> – reference is now made to the provision of public rights of way and access to open space.	No change to previous commentary. The additional sentence refers to access, but not equality of access. However, the details of provision of access (and the importance of equality of access) are covered in DM7 and DM11.	None

Strategic Policy changes	Commentary	Recommended action
<b>SP2 – Minerals provision</b> – wording changes, including addition of reference to use of mitigation and then compensation measures.	In seeking the avoidance of adverse social, economic and environmental impacts or the use of appropriate mitigation and compensation, the policy does not prejudice or promote any group above another.	None

Development Management Policy changes	Commentary	Recommended action
<b>DM7 – Public access</b> – changes to supporting text made to address EqIA recommendations. Additional change relating to definitive rights of way in policy itself.	This policy seeks the protection and enhancement of public access to countryside and restored mineral workings. The supporting text now makes specific reference to equality of access.	None
<b>DM11 – Restoration, after-use and after-care</b> – various changes with no link to equality.	This policy seeks the provision of benefits to the local and wider community through restoration. The list of example benefits is not considered to prejudice or promote any group above another. No changes have been made in relation to equal access.	None