Title of proposed EIA	CONSERVATION AREA REVIEW: IMPLEMENTATION OF FINDINGS
Reference No	EQUA211
EA is in support of	Amended Policy
Review Frequency	No preference
Date of first review	04/02/2019
Directorate	Economy
Division	Planning and Development
Service Area	City Design and Conservation
Responsible Officer(s)	☐ Andrew Fuller
Quality Control Officer(s)	☐ Richard Woodland
Accountable Officer(s)	☐ Waheed Nazir
Purpose of proposal	To seek approval to implement the recommendations of the Conservation Area Review for the continued management of all conservation areas within the city of Birmingham
What sources of data have been used to produce the screening of this policy/proposal?	Consultation Results
Please include any other sources of data	
PLEASE ASSESS THE POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THE FOLLOWING PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Protected characteristic: Age	Not Applicable
Age details:	
Protected characteristic: Disability	Not Applicable
Disability details:	
Protected characteristic: Gender	Not Applicable
Gender details:	
Protected characteristics: Gender Reassignment	Not Applicable
Gender reassignment details:	
Protected characteristics: Marriage and Civil Partnership	Not Applicable
Marriage and civil partnership details:	
Protected characteristics: Pregnancy and Maternity	Not Applicable
Pregnancy and maternity details:	
Protected characteristics: Race	Not Applicable
Race details:	

Protected characteristics: Religion or Beliefs	Not Applicable
Religion or beliefs details:	
Protected characteristics: Sexual Orientation	Not Applicable
Sexual orientation details:	
Please indicate any actions arising from completing this screening exercise.	
Please indicate whether a full impact assessment is recommended	NO
What data has been collected to facilitate the assessment of this policy/proposal?	
Consultation analysis	
Adverse impact on any people with protected characteristics.	No adverse impact, or potential for adverse impact, has been identified through the consulation process.
Could the policy/proposal be modified to reduce or eliminate any adverse impact on any particular group(s)?	All member of the community (re conservation area) were given an opportunity to reject/approve the recommendations of the review. The development of the policy and subsequent consultation process did not identify any potential to bring about an adverse impact on any protected group.
How will the effect(s) of this policy/proposal on equality be monitored?	Paragraph (2) of Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is clear that the local planning authority must review on a regular basis, existing conservation areas as well as consider if further areas need to be designated. Standard practice within the discipline is that this should be around every 5 years.

What data is required in the future to ensure effective monitoring of this policy/proposal?	
Are there any adverse impacts on any particular group(s)	No
If yes, please explain your reasons for going ahead.	No.
Initial equality impact assessment of your proposal	Statutory consultation (as required under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) has been undertaken in both Austin Village and Ideal Village. The Conservation Areas Review was publicised on the Council's internet and meetings were held in both areas following the erection of site notices throughout the areas and letters being sent to every resident/business. The meetings provided a forum to debate the cancellation of the conservation areas and the risk associated with the loss of this designation in terms of future management and the processing of planning applications. All Ward Councillors attended the meeting for Austin Village and Ward Members corresponded through email/letter following the Ideal Village meeting. Both communities in balance and cognisant of the restrictions in terms of available resources to maintain a conservaton area were in favour of de-designation. In terms of meeting the policy standards then there was support for the recommendation

	that both areas no longer met the requisite standard for designation as a conservation area. The decision and recommendations are particular to planning and are governed by the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In carrying out this review no potential to disadvantage any protected group has been identified.
Consulted People or Groups	The response by the community and interested parties and bodies concerning both areas raised issues for and against the cancellation of the conservation area designations (and Article 4 direction in the case of Austin Village). No issues were raised of relevance to equality or concerning discrimination.
Informed People or Groups	N/A
Summary and evidence of findings from your EIA	Full public consultation was undertaken for both Austin Village and Ideal Village in connection with the cancellation of their conservation areas. Whilst there were various opinions over the benefits and harm of implementing these proposals, no issues were raised of relevance to equality or concerning discrimination. In

	carrying out this review no potential to disadvantage any protected group has been identified.
QUALITY CONTORL SECTION	
Submit to the Quality Control Officer for reviewing?	No
Quality Control Officer comments	
Decision by Quality Control Officer	Proceed for final approval
Submit draft to Accountable Officer?	Yes
Decision by Accountable Officer	Approve
Date approved / rejected by the Accountable Officer	04/12/2018
Reasons for approval or rejection	Approved
Please print and save a PDF copy for your records	Yes

Content Type: Item
Version: 37.0
Created at 27/11/2018 01:53 PM by Andrew Fuller
Last modified at 04/12/2018 04:09 PM by Workflow on behalf of Waheed Nazir

Close