

Ponsanooth Neighbourhood Development Plan

Equality Statement (Part 2)

1. Introduction

This Equality Statement has been prepared to demonstrate how the Ponsanooth Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has had due regard to the Equality Act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998. It provides an assessment of the draft NDP policies against the requirements to:

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

Protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 are:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Local Equality Profile: Ponsanooth Parish (Census 2021)

Characteristic	Figure / Percentage	Commentary / Relevance to EDI
Total population (usual residents)	1,538 people	Basis for all per-capita and proportional comparisons.
Gender / Sex	Male: ~ 753 Female: ~ 787	Fairly balanced. Ensures policies aren't skewed (e.g. housing, transport) by gender.
Age structure	0–17 years: 267 18–64 years: 797 65+ years: 465	A relatively large older cohort (30%+), meaning demand for accessible, adaptable housing, healthcare, mobility support.
Ethnicity	White: 1,513 Asian: 4 Mixed / multiple: 7 Other ethnic groups: 14	Highly homogenous community in ethnic terms, but inclusion of minority groups still relevant (cultural, community facility design).

Characteristic	Figure / Percentage	Commentary / Relevance to EDI
Country of Birth / Nationality	UK-born: 1,465 EU / other / non-UK: ~ ~ 73	Some residents may be migrants; language, integration, services, and cultural inclusivity matters.
Religion / Belief	Christian: 707 No religion: 725 Other religions: small numbers (Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish, etc.)	Reflects religious diversity (though small in number). Ensures community assets, events and facilities consider multiple faiths / beliefs.

2. Community Engagement and Inclusivity

The NDP has been developed through an open and inclusive community process. Steps taken include:

- Consultation events held at accessible venues within the parish,
- Use of online surveys and paper copies to reach people with different access needs,
- Engagement with local schools, older people's groups, and other forums,
- Publicity through parish newsletters, community noticeboards, and social media.

This process ensured that a wide cross-section of the community had the opportunity to participate.

3. Assessment of Plan Objectives

The NDP's objectives (summarised here) have been reviewed against equalities considerations:

Objective	Equality Implications	Assessment
Increase the amount of affordable housing	Provides for needs of older people, families, and affordable homes for younger residents	Positive
Enhance pedestrian and cycle connections	Improves accessibility for those without cars, promotes mobility for all ages	Positive
Protect community facilities	Maintains inclusive spaces for social interaction	Positive
Tackle climate crisis; environmentally, economically and socially sustainable	Protects vulnerable groups more exposed to climate risks (e.g. older people, low-income households in poor housing stock, people with health conditions sensitive to heat/flooding). - Improves air quality, reducing health inequalities that disproportionately affect children, older people, and disabled residents.	Positive
Protect Countryside, Green spaces and heritage	Benefits health and wellbeing across all groups	Neutral/Positive

4. Assessment of Policies

Each policy has been screened to identify any potential adverse impact on groups with protected characteristics. The policies have been assessed as noted below

1. **Grouped the policies thematically** (Housing, Employment/Economy, Design & Heritage, Natural Environment & Landscape, Facilities & Spaces, Climate & Energy, Infrastructure & Access).
2. **Summarised equality implications within each group**, noting who benefits (or where risks lie) in terms of the Equality Act 2010 protected characteristics.

4.1 Housing Policies (H1–H7)

Equality implications:

- **Positive impacts** for younger residents, low-income households, families and key workers via affordable and mixed housing (H2, H3, H5, H6).
- Older people and disabled residents benefit from adaptable homes, community-led housing, and scale-appropriate rural schemes (H2, H4, H6).
- Risk: rural sites (H4, H5) may isolate residents without cars. Needs mitigation through access to transport and services.
- Supporting working from home (H7) particularly benefits carers, parents (esp. women), disabled residents, and those seeking flexible economic participation.

Housing Policies (H1–H7) - Overall: Strongly positive for equality if inclusivity and accessibility are safeguarded.

4.2 Employment & Economy Policies (EM1–EM3)

Equality implications:

- Small business development and diversification (EM1, EM2) broaden local employment options, reducing reliance on commuting — beneficial for carers, disabled residents, those without cars.
- Sustainable tourism (EM3) can create jobs for young people and low-skilled workers, but needs to ensure **accessibility of facilities** and avoid seasonal/low-wage dependence.

Employment & Economy Policies (EM1–EM3) Overall: Positive, with attention to job quality and accessible tourism.

4.3 Design & Heritage Policies (D1–D4, HA1, MC1, ARC1)

Equality implications:

- Inclusive design principles (D1, D4) benefit disabled residents, older people, families, and all users of public spaces.
- Local distinctiveness and heritage protection (D2, D3, HA1, ARC1) strengthen sense of identity and community pride, indirectly supporting mental wellbeing and community cohesion.
- Methodist Chapel policy (MC1) promotes community facility retention, potentially delivering inclusive space for all groups.

Design & Heritage Policies (D1–D4, HA1, MC1, ARC1) - Overall: Strong positive, provided affordability and accessibility are not undermined by higher design/heritage compliance costs.

4.4 Natural Environment & Landscape Policies (NEL1–NEL6)

Equality implications:

- Green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, trees/hedgerows, cherished views, dark skies policies all support **health, wellbeing and environmental quality** for all.
- Green and open spaces are especially important for families with children, older residents, and those on low incomes who may lack private gardens.
- No negative equalities impacts identified.

Natural Environment & Landscape Policies (NEL1–NEL6) - Overall: Positive, with universal community benefits.

4.5 Facilities & Spaces Policies (FAS1–FAS3)

Equality implications:

- Safeguarding and enhancing community facilities (FAS1), protecting local green space (FAS2), and providing recreation/open space (FAS3) all promote **social inclusion, intergenerational activity, and health equality**.
- Particularly beneficial for young people, families, and older residents at risk of isolation.
- Potential indirect benefit for protected groups (e.g. religious/ethnic minorities) if facilities provide culturally inclusive spaces.

Facilities & Spaces Policies (FAS1–FAS3) - Overall: Strong positive for social cohesion and health.

4.6 Climate & Energy Policies (CC1–CC8)

Equality implications:

- Support transition to renewable energy and low-carbon heating — reduces fuel poverty (benefiting low-income households, older residents in poorly insulated homes).
- Community-led energy (CC5) empowers local groups and ensures fairer distribution of benefits.
- Risks: retrofit/transition costs could disproportionately affect low-income groups if not subsidised.
- Natural flood management (CC8) protects vulnerable households in flood-risk areas.

Climate & Energy Policies (CC1–CC8) - Overall: Strong positive, with caveat that implementation must ensure a “just transition” so disadvantaged groups aren’t burdened.

4.7 Infrastructure & Access Policies (IA1–IA5)

Equality implications:

- Park & ride and rail halt (IA1) improve access for non-drivers, benefiting young people, older people, disabled residents and low-income households.
- Digital/mobile infrastructure (IA2–IA3) reduces rural isolation, supporting equal access to services and emergency support — key for disabled residents and older people.

- Transport, highways and communications (IA4) enhance sustainable mobility and safety.
- Footways, pedestrian links and rights of way (IA5) support inclusive active travel if accessibility standards are applied.

Infrastructure & Access Policies (IA1–IA5) - Overall: Positive, especially in tackling rural disadvantage and digital exclusion.

Overall Conclusion for Policies

- **Across all policy groups**, the NDP has **positive equality implications**: it broadens access to affordable homes, supports inclusive design, safeguards community facilities, improves transport access, addresses rural digital exclusion, reduces fuel poverty, and enhances green and open spaces.
- **Beneficiaries** include: younger households, families, low-income groups, disabled residents, older people, carers, and those without private transport.
- **Risks:**
 - Rural sites may isolate residents without adequate services or transport (H4, H5).
 - Higher design/heritage standards may increase costs (D1–D3, HA1).
 - Climate transition measures must be affordable to avoid disadvantaging low-income households.
- With these safeguards in place, the plan **complies with the Equality Act 2010** and advances equality of opportunity in line with neighbourhood planning basic conditions.

No policies are considered to have a negative or discriminatory effect.

5. Human Rights Considerations

The NDP has been prepared in general conformity with the Local Plan and national policy. It is considered compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998, particularly:

- Article 6 (right to a fair hearing),
- Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life),
- Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

6. Conclusion

This Equality Statement (Part 2) demonstrates that the Ponsanooth Neighbourhood Development Plan:

- Has been prepared in line with the Equality Act 2010 and the Human Rights Act 1998,
- Promotes equality of opportunity and inclusivity,
- Does not discriminate against any individual or group,

- Delivers policies that have neutral or positive impacts on residents with protected characteristics.

Accordingly, the NDP meets the relevant **basic conditions** for neighbourhood planning.

Following the Regulation 14 consultation amendments were made to the Policies; Appendix A provides a review of those changes and the EDI implication of each

The revised policies **do not introduce new equality risks**. Instead they **slightly strengthen positive equality outcomes**

Overall, the revised NDP **continues to support equality of opportunity and inclusive community development** consistent with the Equality Act 2010.

APPENDIX A

Following the Regulation 14 consultation amendments were made to the Policies; below is a review of those changes and the EDI implication

Equality Impact Review of Revised Policies

(Comparison with previous EDI assessment)

Housing Policies

<u>Policy</u>	<u>Key Change</u>	<u>Difference from Previous Version</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
H1 – Development Boundary	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
H2 – Housing Mix	Reference to demonstrate response to local need	Earlier wording was more general	Strengthened positive EDI impact.
H3 – Land behind Old School	Reference to demonstrate response to local need	Earlier wording was more general	Strengthened positive EDI impact.
H4 – Infill at Rural Settlements	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
H5 – Rural Exception Sites	Stronger wording on local connection and limiting market housing	Previously focused on criteria but less explicit about local connection	Stronger positive equality impact. Prioritising local connection helps local low-income households and younger residents remain in the parish.
H6 – Community-Led Housing	Simplified wording but retains support for community-led housing	Essentially same intent	No change to EDI implications. Continues to support inclusive housing delivery models.
H7 – Working from Home	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.

Employment Policies

<u>Policy</u>	<u>Key Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
EM1 – Small Business Development	Stronger wording on local connection	Previously focused on criteria but less explicit about local connection	Stronger positive equality impact. Prioritising local connection helps local low-income households and younger residents remain in the parish.
EM2 – Rural Diversification	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
EM3 – Sustainable Tourism	More explicit limits on impacts (traffic, disturbance) and potential holiday occupancy conditions	Earlier version broader	No change to EDI implications. Tourism employment opportunities remain positive but limited impact on equality groups.

Design & Heritage Policies

(D1–D4, HA1, MC1, ARC1)

<u>Change</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
Explicit reference to neurodivergent individuals and those with limited mobility	Stronger positive equality impact .

Natural Environment Policies

(NEL1–NEL6)

<u>Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
No significant Change	N/A	N/A.

Community Facilities Policies

(FAS1–FAS3)

<u>Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
No significant Change	N/A	N/A.

Climate Change Policies

(CC1–CC8)

<u>Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
No significant Change	N/A	N/A.

Infrastructure & Transport Policies

<u>Policy</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Updated EDI Implication</u>
IA1 – Rail Halt / Park & Ride	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
IA2 – Digital Infrastructure	Clear support for improved broadband	Previously similar	No change to EDI implications. Continues to address rural digital exclusion.
IA3 – Mobile Infrastructure	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
IA4 – Transport & Highways	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.
IA5 – Footways and Rights of Way	No significant Change	N/A	N/A.

Overall EDI Impact of Policy Revisions

Positive Changes

The revised policies slightly strengthen equality outcomes in several areas as highlighted above

Many revisions simply clarify wording rather than changing policy intent, therefore EDI implications remain the same