

**Consultation Response to HS2
EQIA SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY REPORT
WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1	EQIA SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY REPORT	1
	2	WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	2
	2.1	Council Comments.....	2
	a)	Introduction, Section 1.....	3
	b)	Scope and methodology, Section 2.....	3
	c)	Stakeholder engagement and public consultation, Section 3.....	4
	d)	Baseline, Section 4.....	4
	e)	Route-Wide Assessment, Section 5.	6
	f)	Development Area 2 assessment: Birmingham to Bolsover, Section 7.	9
	g)	Development Area 3 assessment: Bolsover to Leeds, Section 8.....	10
	h)	Next steps, Section 9.	10
	j)	Appendices.....	11

1 EQIA SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY REPORT

- 1.1.1 The Council has no comment to make on this report at this time but reserves its position to provide more detailed representation in the future.

2 WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

2.1 Council Comments

2.1.1 The Council's response to the Work Draft Equality Impact Assessment (WDEQIA) should be read in conjunction with the WDES response as many socio-economic issues are inter-related. The Council's comments are addressed in the order they appear in the document and sub divided by topic to aid the reader's understanding. Where the Council has not provided comment, this should not be taken as agreement or consent for the text. The order of comments are:

- a) Introduction
- b) Scope and methodology
- c) Stakeholder engagement and public consultation.
- d) Baseline
- e) Route-wide assessment
- f) Development Area 2 assessment: Birmingham to Bolsover
- g) Development Area 3 assessment: Bolsover to Leeds
- h) Next steps

Document: EQIA: Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment Report	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
General	<p>The purpose of the WDEQIA is to identify 'protected characteristic groups' within communities along the route and how the proposal impacts upon them. The WDEQIA will assess whether significant effects identified in the WDES (e.g. community; health; socio-economic; traffic and transport; air quality; sound, noise and vibration; or landscape and visual) would have disproportionate impacts on protected characteristic groups (PCGs). The identification of community areas as indicated in the draft WDES may hamper this as there appears to be little regard for actual communities with social or economic connection. To this end the impacts on other communities of interest such as wider residential communities and business community are picked up in the Councils response to the WDES.</p> <p>The WDEQIA identifies a number of assessments that will be made and discusses how these will be interpreted, including the environmental, social and economic impacts on affected groups. While the intention is good, these groups have not been identified and the assessments have yet to be completed, there is therefore, no data to be evaluated at this stage. What effect it will have on the progress and nature of the construction programme will depend on the rigor of its implementation. The Council reserves its position to provide more detailed comments when such information becomes available.</p>

General (cont)	The route has been divided into a number of 'community areas' which unfortunately do not coincide with local authority boundaries. Statistics relating to the number of properties/businesses, populations and protected characteristic groups affected are therefore difficult to interpret on a local level. This applies to all matters, not just the WDEQIA.
----------------	--

a) Introduction, Section 1.

Document: EQIA: Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment Report	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 10 1.3.2	<p>The Council does not agree with HS2's assessment and believes that this is not explicit enough. It should highlight that HS2 is seeking to identify and understand the likely impact upon people, their lives and well-being/ livelihood, who may have one of more of the nine protected characteristics. And then to see whether the scheme will adversely affect specific people/ groups or communities, so that measures can be considered to avoid or reduce these impacts. This should look at deprivation to all groups, including those outside protected categories.</p> <p>The Council is concerned there is no assessment for blight which is affecting the existing communities and businesses.</p>

b) Scope and methodology, Section 2.

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 12 2.2.3.	The Council does not agree with HS2's assessment of the spatial scope of the Equality Impact Analysis. Whilst the Development areas work as the spatial or administrative areas they effectively split administrative district and counties. From the DCC perspective, it is important to assess the impact across the whole area of Derbyshire, and specifically to consider the areas within Bolsover district as one for equality purposes. This makes it easier to consider data and to bring together feedback from the public which highlights how they view the scheme as impacting on them, their families and lives.
Page 13 2.3.1.	The bolded text in this paragraph needs to list the formal guidance in relation to the Equality Act 2010 and specifically the public sector equality duty, which can be found on the website of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, or the Government Equalities website.

Page 13. 2.3.3. and 2.3.4.	DCC is concerned that the use of maps and data which clusters only some of the protected groups could give the impression that there is no need to consider the impact where LSOAs are not shaded/ have lower number or proportions. When this is applied the extent to which the position of people in Derbyshire, (which is more rural and may have few people from some groups), is made to look unimportant. This does a dis-service to anyone from a protected group living in the county and potentially affected by HS2.
-------------------------------	---

c) Stakeholder engagement and public consultation, Section 3.

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 15 3.3.	The Council does not agree with HS2's assessment. There is insufficient explanation of the methodology used to engage with communities and the steps taken to ensure people from protected characteristic groups could participate equally, including the robustness of the methods of engagement which were used.

d) Baseline, Section 4.

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 17 4. Whole section	<p>The data referred to provide only a numerical or distributive picture of protected characteristic groups, albeit with some omitted. This is not an adequate approach towards describing potential or actual impact and deciding whether this might amount to a lack of equality, discrimination, poorer community relations or even adverse impact. Additional information which looks at the lives and position of people, which understand how the development will impact on their lives, futures, opportunities, long term well-being, and financial and housing situation is also necessary. There is nothing which identifies what it could be like for a particular group of people.</p> <p>Data sources – There is no detail on HS2 sources in relation to sex/ gender, gender re-assignment, marriage or civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and sexual orientation. There appears to be no reasons why HS2 chose to ignore these protected characteristics within the analysis. Whilst it may be more difficult to gain information in relation to some of these groups, plainly the census and other sources contain significant information in relation sex/ gender, and in other areas of public life a number of EIAs have highlighted the impact on women, families and children/ carers etc.</p>

Page 17/18 4.2.3.	Identifying disabled people is difficult because the meaning within the Census and those who could be covered by the Equality Act 2010 are dependent upon people self-identifying in a consistent way, and understanding the difference. That said, reliance on a count of people in receipt of DLA is unlikely to provide an accurate figure or to capture all ages of people who are entitled to protection under the Act. HS2 ought to consider using the Social Model of Disability when seeking to estimate the numbers and distribution of disabled people. Throughout the document discussion of access seems to focus solely on physical access, whilst a key barrier, is not necessarily the only or main barrier for many disabled people.
Page 18 4.2.5.	When considering the needs and potential impact on people from different lack and Minority Ethnicity (BME) communities this is hampered by limiting categories to Mixed, Asian, and Black etc. The areas in Derbyshire affected by HS2 have relatively lower proportions of the population from BME communities, compared to adjacent areas. It could be important to know and use more detailed data, and to explore what this could mean in relation to needs, culture and the way in which the line will impact on households, and result in different economic impacts. No assessment is made in areas such as Derbyshire of people from the EU, especially Eastern Europe, often the largest ethnic minority groups in areas such as Bolsover district.
Page 19 4.2.15	It is not clear why HS2 has not considered people aged 25 to 64 as an age group. Whilst it is not uncommon to focus on younger and older groups of people, not reviewing the position for the age groups between 25 and 64 years could mean that important impacts are not captured. This is of particular concern when it is likely a significant proportion of the HS2 patronage will be from this age group.

Development Area 2 assessment: Birmingham to Bolsover

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 23 4.5.2	Whilst DCC welcomes the fact that it is acknowledged that areas such as Newton are amongst some of the most deprived areas along this part of the proposed route, there is little information which shows an understanding of how the development will impact on this and other communities in Bolsover District which experience higher levels of deprivation.

Page 23 4.5.2 (cont)	It is not clear how HS2 will ensure that opportunities arising out of development will be available first to people from these communities, nor is it clear whether HS2 appreciates the impact that deprivation has on the capacity and resilience of people locally to cope with and adapt to the development. Adverse impacts are likely to be magnified for some groups of people in these communities. DCC is disappointed that no attempt is made by HS2 to overlay protected characteristics data and data in relation to levels of social and economic deprivation. Also no account is made of how coming from such communities tends to exercise limitations on the capacity of people to engage and have their views recorded properly. The Councils WDES response in relation to socio-economic impacts should be read in conjunction with the WDEQIA in this regard.
-------------------------	---

Development Area 3 assessment: Bolsover to Leeds

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 25. 4.6.2	DCC welcomes reference to levels of deprivation in the area Stonebroom to Clay Cross but believes insufficient attention is paid to this issue and the overlap of protected characteristics in this area of North-East Derbyshire. It is not clear whether any work will be carried out by HS2 to try and target opportunities at these communities, and whether there has been any assessment of the impact on these communities, especially those living in deprivation and from a protected characteristic group.
Page 26. 4.6.7	DCC welcomes reference to the distribution of disabled people in relation to the Tibshelf area but no assessment is made of the impact of the development on disabled people in these specific geographical communities.

e) Route-Wide Assessment, Section 5.

Document: EQIA: ROUTE WIDE ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 28. 5.2.2	The final EIA needs to explain in more detail how the Draft Code of Construction Practice will work in relation to the disruption that people will experience. It needs to outline the measures that will seek to minimise any adverse impact on the lives of those in the line of and adjacent to the routes, to those affected during construction, and to those left with the inheritance of communities being affected.

Page 29 5.2.8	Whilst DCC welcomes that the Government has offered to go above the minimum legal requirements, it would be useful for the document to describe in more detail exactly what support and financial help is available, how people will be able to access this, and how disputes over this will be resolved. A scheme of this magnitude certainly warrants going above the minimum legal requirements in any events.
Page 32 5.2.20	This section should be further expanded to illustrate the level and nature of help and support.
Page 32 5.2.21	DCC welcomes the provision of apprenticeship opportunities and the Council would welcome working with HS2 to ensure that people from Derbyshire can access these opportunities. Contractors should be encouraged to recruit apprentices from groups and communities which are under-represented within the construction industry, including women, people from local BME communities, and where practical people with disabilities. Social value opportunities should be maximized through procurement and contracting.
Page 32 5.2.23	HS2 must ensure that all contractors use signage which is easy to read and makes clear which direction pedestrians should go. Where signage will be present for lengthy periods of time, signage which can aid disabled people and other adjustments should be made to ensure travel is easy and smooth.
Page 33 5.2.30	DCC requests that regular communication over road closures or diversions are notified to the local media as well as the Council and the emergency services. Where a specific road closure will impact on a geographical community, DCC asks that plenty of notice is provided and that every household and business, and schools are notified, with an explanation of diversions which are available. This should include a contact number for questions about specific access needs. During winter, spring and autumn, all closures should be clearly visible in the dark to avoid accidents, falls and injuries to the public.
Page 34 5.2.32	DCC requests that specific consultation is carried out with individual geographical communities over what reasonable adjustments will be required in that location, taking account, wherever practicable, of people with disabilities, older and younger people, and families with young children.
Page 34 5.2.35	Specific steps should be included to help protect vulnerable groups of people from traffic generated during construction. This should include ensuring contractors raise awareness with drivers about local schools, pedestrian crossings, and recreational facilities where children may be playing.
Page 34 5.2.36	DCC requests that contractors are specifically asked to brief workers to be good neighbors and to respect those who live in the towns and villages impacted upon. DCC encourages the use of local shops and other facilities so that some income is placed back into the hands of local people, and helps compensate for any adverse impact of road closures etc.

Page 34/5 5.2.37	DCC reminds HS2 that some protected characteristic groups can be more adversely affected by noise, such as people with autism, older people, and people who may be ill or disabled. Noise levels should also be managed to minimise the impact upon residential properties, schools and other local facilities, especially early in the morning and during the evenings or overnight, as this can impact on the people listed above, as well as the general population.
Page 35 5.2.39	DCC asks that HS2 ensure that such steps are taken well in advance of work commencing, and that all efforts are made to support households where alternative accommodation will be required over the move, including help where children would then have to travel further to school.
Page 35 5.2.40	The provisions for the management of the impact on air quality need to be outlined in this WDEQIA, with specific reference to people with respiratory illnesses, older and younger people, and people with disabilities.
Page 39 5.3.19	Loss of places of worship – Kingdom Hall, LA05. DCC hope that support is provided to the local organisation, should they wish to relocate their hall locally.
Page 39/40 5.3.21	The impact of raised areas of line adjacent to urban built up areas such as Long Eaton will have a major impact on the town, the environment, and local people. HS2 needs to take all possible steps to minimise the impact, especially on those nearest to the line, upon the townscape, and to reduce noise and disruption. During construction, the impact on Long Eaton is likely to be very substantial and we would request a specific plan be developed for dealing with the issues that will arise.
Page 40 5.3.25	Although Greenwood Community Centre is located outside of Derbyshire, it is near to Long Eaton and could be used by people from the town. DCC requests that specific consultation is carried out with the organisation to identify the impact upon the local community, and where possible, HS2 provide assistance to relocate services to other local community centres, supporting those providing the services.
Page 40/1 5.3.28	The development may lead to the relocation of Police and Ambulance emergency service depots. The potential impacts need to be considered carefully. The Council is concerned that relocation could delay response times especially by the ambulance service, thus further endangering the health of people in the area. The potential impacts of this need to be mitigated through meaningful dialogue with the Council and East Midlands Ambulance Service.
Page 43/4 5.3.39/40	The Council is concerned over the loss of Hilcote Royal Oak Meadows and Woodlands, and Nor Woods and Killarmarsh Ponds. These provide an asset and recreational facility for the local communities, support healthy lifestyles, and aid education. The WDEQIA needs to provide more specific information about what will be lost at each site listed in 5.3.39, and the impact on the local communities, including young and older people, families, people in poor health and people with a history of mental ill-health.

Page 46 5.3.52	The assessment of which groups benefit from exercise and recreation is too limited and can extend across all protected characteristics, including specific BME communities with higher incidence of heart disease or conditions such as diabetes.
Page 47 5.3.56	Please refer to earlier feedback on restriction to access. All new pedestrian access routes to stations should take account of access needs and the safety of vulnerable groups of people. Improvements will also be required at existing stations to be served by HS2, including Chesterfield.
Page 47 5.3.57	The Council is particularly concerned over the likelihood of villages such as Newton becoming more cut off as roads are closed or diversions are put in place. This will have a detrimental impact on the well-being of local people, restrict access to services and facilities which help avoid isolation, and will impact adversely on businesses, potentially threatening their futures. During construction, where a settlement will become more isolated, HS2 should put in place additional means to help people from those settlements to continue to access facilities, support, leisure and other resources that can help people stay well and resilient. This could, for example, include additional bus services.
Page 48 5.3.60.	The provisions for the management of the impact on air quality need to be outlined in this WDEQIA, with specific reference to people with respiratory illnesses, older and younger people, and people with disabilities.

f) Development Area 2 assessment: Birmingham to Bolsover, Section 7.

Document: EQIA: DEVELOPMENT AREA ASSESSMENT – BIRMINGHAM TO BOLSOVER	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 64/5 7.10 – 7.10.7	The Council is concerned over the impact of the demolition of the Nook given its important role in providing housing to some vulnerable groups of people. It also aids the release of family housing within Long Eaton and Erewash, reducing the supply of rented/ affordable housing. Given that Bonsall Court will also be lost, this means a significant detrimental impact on the tenants and the housing association's ability to help people in the town with affordable and suitable housing. DCC are aware that tenants are likely to be entitled to rehousing and assistance with moving costs from their landlord, but the lack of other housing could force people to move away from where they have family, support or need specific access to services.
Page 65/6 7.11 -7.11.5	DCC repeats is concern over the loss of this valuable supply of social and affordable housing for mature people in Long Eaton, and Erewash.

Page 66/7 7.13 – 7.13.4	Although Greenwood Community Centre is located outside of Derbyshire, it is near to Long Eaton and could be used by people from the town. DCC request that specific consultation is carried out with the organisation to identify the impact upon the local community, and where possible, HS2 provide assistance to relocate services to other local community centres, supporting those providing the services.
Page 68 7.15	The impact of temporary closure and reduction in site is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the Moo-Haven centre, those who use it and the animals that are helped. DCC encourage continued consultation with the owners as detailed within paragraph 7.15.4.

g) Development Area 3 assessment: Bolsover to Leeds, Section 8.

Document: EQIA: DEVELOPMENT AREA 3 ASSESSMENT: BOLSOVER TO LEEDS	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 69 8.2	DCC is disappointed by the lack of information provided in the draft WDEQIA in relation to the likely adverse impacts arising out of the demolition of this depot, on local communities of Bolsover, Holmewood, Heath and surrounding villages. Some of these are areas of higher levels of deprivation, higher levels of ill-health and any reduction in service or lengthier wait for services, especially ambulance services, could increase the likelihood of death or injury to the local population.

h) Next steps, Section 9.

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Page 75. 9	DCC requests that HS2 should provide more information to describe the stakeholder engagement that is to be carried out. This should explain the methods being used, when this will take place, with whom and where. DCC believes that specific engagement needs to be carried out in locations along the route, offering a chance for inclusive engagement.

j) Appendices

Document: EQIA: WORKING DRAFT EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
Paragraph reference	Full EQIA comment
Appendix A.	<p>Whilst DCC understand why regional data has been used, DCC would have suggested using data from the LSOAs affected, as these could be significantly different to the regional average, and would better inform the EIA. DCC also believe that actual numbers as well as % figures would be useful. When it comes to disability DCC understand that the measures within the census do not equate easily to the definition of disability under the Equality Act 2010, so an estimate may also have been useful. It would also be useful to further break down into the types of disability, as this could have an importance when assessing likely impact for the many different disabilities which exist. For example, noise could prove problematic for people with autism people with mental ill health, but a lack of clear signage and poor repair could prove to be problematic for people with a visual impairment or mobility difficulties.</p> <p>No data is presented in relation to gender which is of concern and DCC would have expected some kind of estimation of the other measurable protected characteristics.</p>
Appendix B	<p>Whilst helpful, the WDEQIA does not give any examples of why the sub-groups could be important when considering likely impact, culturally or otherwise.</p>
Appendix C	<p>Again the lack of explanation or supporting text means the relevance of groups who could experience multiple discrimination/ inequality is not made clear, from an impact assessment perspective.</p>
Appendix D.	<p>These narratives may be helpful in seeking to understand the relative position and impact, but the actual text draws sometimes on stereotypes or generalisations. Whereas reporting on actual feedback from communities would serve better in describing “what it might mean” for people in relation to issues such as housing, community and open space, employment and business, transport and accessibility, noise and air quality, crime and safety, and social capital. Using a mixture of actual local data and the findings of consultation would provide a more accurate assessment of possible impact.</p>