

Community Impact Assessment: Summary

1. Name of service, policy, function or criteria being assessed:

Planning and Environmental Management – City of York Local Plan – Preferred Sites Consultation.

2. What are the main objectives or aims of the service/policy/function/criteria?

The purpose of the report is to ask Members to approve the publication of a document entitled 'Local Plan – Preferred Sites 2016' for consultation. It draws on previous stages of consultation and technical work undertaken to support the Plan. Its purpose is to allow the public and other interested parties to comment on additional work on housing and employment land need and supply.

3. Name and Job Title of person completing assessment:

Martin Grainger – Head of Planning and Environmental Management

4. Have any impacts been Identified? (Yes/No)

Yes

Community of Identity affected:

- Disability
- Race

Summary of impact:

It should be noted that the proposals included within the Preferred Sites Document are for the purposes of consultation and as such don't constitute the publication version of the plan which will be reported to members later this year. Within this context the following have been identified:

- The report includes a new site for 'assisted living' at Land to the Rear of the Square, Tadcaster Road (Site H6). This would create a positive impact for people with vision disabilities.
- The Report identifies that a Needs Assessment for Gypsies and Travellers is not yet complete. However, sites

previously included in the last iteration of the plan are considered in the report: Rufforth (GT1 – Land at Moor Lane and B1224, Rufforth) – which is rejected on Green Belt and Access to Services grounds, and Naburn (GT2 – Acres Farm) – which is rejected on Green Belt grounds. A further site for travelling showpeople at Elvington (SP1 – Land at the Stables, Elvington) is identified as a potential site in the Report.

- As indicated the document has been produced for consultation. The provision for Gypsy and Travellers and travelling showpeople will need to be considered further in light of the new needs assessment as the plan develops.

5. Date CIA completed: 17/6/16

6. Signed off by: Mike Slater

7. I am satisfied that this service/policy/function has been successfully impact assessed.

Name: Mike Slater

Position: Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development)

Date: 17/6/16

8. Decision-making body:	Date:	Decision Details:
Local Plan Working Group	27/6/16	
Executive	30/6/16	

Send the completed signed off document to equalities@york.gov.uk. It will be published on the intranet, as well as on the council website.

Actions arising from the Assessments will be logged on Verto and progress updates will be required

Community Impact Assessment (CIA)

Community Impact Assessment Title:

'Local Plan – Preferred Sites 2016'

What evidence is available to suggest that the proposed service, policy, function or criteria could have a negative (N), positive (P) or no (None) effect on quality of life outcomes? (Refer to guidance for further details)

Can negative impacts be justified? For example: improving community cohesion; complying with other legislation or enforcement duties; taking positive action to address imbalances or under-representation; needing to target a particular community or group e.g. older people. NB. Lack of financial resources alone is NOT justification!

The content of the Report addresses the potential site allocations in the Local Plan based on housing and employment land need and supply. At this strategic level, there are considered to be potential impacts on the following 'Protected Characteristics': Disability & Race, as outlined in this CIA. There are considered to be no specific impacts on any of the other 'Protected Characteristics' (Age, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy & maternity, religion & belief, or sexual orientation). However, as any site which is included as an allocation in the Local Plan progresses to a masterplanning stage in future, such impacts on a number of 'protected characteristics' may become evident at that point.

Community of Identity: Age

Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Details of Impact	Can negative impacts be justified?	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Community of Identity: Carers of Older or Disabled People				
Evidence		Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A
Details of Impact	Can negative impacts be justified?	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Community of Identity: Disability		
Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Staff Impact (N/P/None)

<p>The report identifies a new site for 'assisted living' at Land to the Rear of the Square, Tadcaster Road (Site H6). This would create a positive impact for people with vision disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard of Living 	P	None
<p>Details of Impact</p> <p>The inclusion of a new site for 'assisted living' will create a positive impact for people with vision disabilities as it would create a safe, independent living environment for them.</p>	<p>Can negative impacts be justified?</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Reason/Action</p> <p>Martin Grainger</p>	<p>Completion Date</p> <p>Autumn 2016</p>

Community of Identity: Gender			
Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>Details of Impact</p> <p>Can negative impacts be justified?</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Reason/Action</p>	<p>Lead Officer</p>	<p>Completion Date</p>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Community of Identity: Gender Reassignment					
Evidence		Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)	
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	
Details of Impact	Can negative impacts be justified?	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Community of Identity: Marriage & Civil Partnership					
Evidence		Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)	
N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	
Details of Impact	Can negative impacts be justified?	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Community of Identity: Pregnancy / Maternity

Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Details of Impact	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date
Can negative impacts be justified? N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Community of Identity: Race

Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Report identifies that a Needs Assessment for Gypsies and Travellers is not yet complete. However, sites previously included in the last iteration of the plan are considered in the report: GT1: Land at Moor Lane and B1224, Rufforth – which is rejected on Green Belt and Access to Services grounds, and GT2: Acres Farm, Naburn – which is rejected on Green 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard of Living 	N	None

<p>Belt grounds. A further site for travelling showpeople at Elvington (SP1 – Land at the Stables, Elvington) is identified as a potential site in the Report.</p> <p>As indicated the document has been produced for consultation. The provision for Gypsy and Travellers and travelling showpeople will need to be considered further in light of the new needs assessment as the plan develops.</p>					
Details of Impact	Can negative impacts be justified?	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date	
<p>The rejection of sites for gypsies and travellers may create pressure in terms of these groups housing needs – this will need to be considered at the Local Plan progresses to its publication stage.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The sites at Rufforth and Naburn have been rejected on the grounds of impact on the Green Belt and Access to Services grounds (GT1: Land at Moor Lane and B1224, Rufforth) and Green Belt grounds (GT2: Acres Farm, Naburn) because it is considered that overall, these grounds are very important in protecting the character of the City in the longer term, in accordance with the overall methodology for the site selection process. The methodology does not identify any exceptional circumstances</p>	<p>Martin Grainger</p>	<p>Autumn 2016</p>	

		based on individual groups or communities.	
--	--	--	--

Community of Identity: Religion / Spirituality / Belief			
Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Details of Impact	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date
Can negative impacts be justified? N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Community of Identity: Sexual Orientation			
Evidence	Quality of Life Indicators	Customer Impact (N/P/None)	Staff Impact (N/P/None)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Details of Impact	Reason/Action	Lead Officer	Completion Date
Can negative impacts be justified?			

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----