



**SEND NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2019 – 2034**

Equalities Impact Assessment

February 2021

If you would like this document in a different format, different language, Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01483 444471.

Screening/Scoping Pro Forma

Service	Strategic Services		Officer responsible for the screening/scoping	Gavin Stonham	
Name of the activity to be assessed	Send Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019 – 2034	Date of Assessment	23 / 02 / 2021	Is this a proposed new or existing activity?	Proposed new activity
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the activity?		To 'make' (adopt) the Send Neighbourhood Plan covering the parish of Send.			
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the activity? Please explain.		To implement a series of policies contained within the plan that will form part of the Council's statutory Development Plan and will assist developers in preparing planning proposals for sites within the Send Neighbourhood Area and guide the Council when determining planning applications within this area.			
3. Who is intended to benefit from this activity and in what way?		Those living, working or visiting Send Parish/Send Neighbourhood Area will benefit from the improvements that would arise from policies in the Plan aimed at improving local design, character and biodiversity, the local economy, green and blue infrastructure, local green space, sustainable and community transport initiatives, car parking provision, business, leisure and community facilities.			
4. What outcomes are wanted from this activity?		To deliver the vision for Send (set out in the Plan) which is (paraphrased): "By 2034, Send Parish will be vibrant and sustainable with a distinct character, good facilities, a strong sense of community and retain a rural village feel. Send will have an enhanced local centre and provide a mix of housing types for all, whilst retaining the character, environmental and heritage assets of the parish and separate identities of the various settlements, which have not merged into			

	surrounding towns and villages.”		
5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	None known.		
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the activity?	Send Parish Council, residents of Send Parish.	7. Who implements the activity, and who is responsible for the activity?	The Send Neighbourhood Plan was prepared by Send Parish Council. Guildford Borough Council, appeal inspectors and the Secretary of State (the planning decision makers) are responsible for implementing the plan’s policies in planning decisions.
8. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?		N	
What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?	None of the policies have implications for racial bias. The plan relates to new development irrespective of developer or occupant of new buildings, and to the development or improvement of local facilities that would benefit all racial groups equally.		
9. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on grounds of gender?		N	
What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?	The Plan provides a range of land-use policies that provide benefits which are unlikely to impact differentially based on gender. None of the policies have implications for gender bias.		
10. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on those who have		N	

a disability?			
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, there are no policies that would have an adverse impact for those with disabilities.</p>		
<p>11. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on grounds of sexual orientation?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan provides a range of land-use policies that provide benefits for all people regardless of their sexual orientation. None of the policies have implications for differential or adverse impact in regard to this protected characteristic.</p>		
<p>12. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on grounds of age?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan's land-use policies will benefit people regardless of their age. There are no policies that would have a differential or adverse impact for certain age groups.</p>		
<p>13. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on grounds of religious belief?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, it is not likely to have an adverse impact on people of different religious beliefs. It does however support new community facilities and protect existing community facilities, including places of worship.</p>		

<p>14. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on those who have caring responsibilities?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, it is not likely to have a specific differential impact on people with caring responsibilities specifically. However, the plan supports community facilities that would typically include day care centres and childcare facilities that would benefit those caring for children or adults with special needs.</p>		
<p>15. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact on grounds of marital status or civil partnership?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, it is not likely to have a specific differential impact on people of different marital/civil partnership status.</p>		
<p>16. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact due a woman's pregnancy or maternity?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, it is not likely to have a specific differential impact due to a women's pregnancy or maternity. However, the plan supports healthcare facilities and community facilities which could include childcare options, which would benefit women who are pregnant or caring for young children.</p>		

<p>17. Are there concerns that the activity <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender reassignment?</p>		<p>N</p>	
<p>What existing evidence, local or national, actual or presumed, do you have to support your response?</p>	<p>The Plan aims to promote a high standard of development throughout the Send Neighbourhood Area; therefore, it is not likely to have a specific differential impact on transgender or gender reassigned people.</p>		
<p>18. Could any differential impact identified in 8-17 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this activity?</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>It is very unlikely that there would be any differential adverse impact on any sections of the community. Overall impact would be either neutral or an improvement for some of the protected groups.</p>
<p>19. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one or more of the protected groups or any other reason?</p>			<p>No adverse impacts identified.</p>
<p>20. If the activity is of a strategic nature, could it help to reduce inequalities associated with socio-economic disadvantage?</p>	<p>Y</p>		<p>The plan seeks to deliver affordable housing and promote public and sustainable transport options which will help to reduce inequalities around shelter and movement related to socio-economic disadvantage. The plan conforms with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure communities are a mix of socio-economic groups.</p>
<p>21. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above protected groups?</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>No concerns.</p>
<p>22. Does ‘differential impact’ or ‘unmet need’ cut across one or more of the protected</p>		<p>N</p>	<p>No specific differential impact or unmet need identified.</p>

groups (e.g. elder BME groups)?			
23. If yes, should a full EIA, if necessary, be conducted jointly with another service area or contractor or partner or agency?			Not applicable.
24. Is there a missed opportunity to improve this activity to meet the general duties placed on public bodies to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and to promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics and those who do not?		N	No inequalities have been identified in the Plan and as a land-use plan it is limited to addressing development. The land-use policies generally will lead to a betterment for the protected groups where this is possible. The Council has not prepared the Plan and cannot amend it so cannot use it to further advance equality or promote good relations between protected groups.

25. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment? Please use the scoring process in the right hand column to guide you.		N	<p>0 – no possible relevance or adverse impact</p> <p>1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 0-11 points - low adverse impact, no need for full EIA</p> <p>2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 12-20points - medium adverse impact, full EIA required</p> <p>3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 21-27 points - high adverse impact, full EIA required</p> <p>4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact</p>										
			Age	Disability	Mat	Gender	Marriage	Race	Trans	Sexuality	Religion	Total	Impact
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26. If a full EIA is not required, are there any changes required to the proposal to improve it around the equality agenda?			None identified.										
27. How will any actions identified in 20. to 26. above be taken forward?			Not applicable.										

Signed
(completing officer)

Gavin Stonham

Date

Signed
(Policy Lead – Planning Policy)

Stuart Harrison

Date

Signed
(Equalities lead – Human Resources)

Ali Holman

Date