

Community Infrastructure Levy Equality Impact Analysis

October 2014

Name of Service Area	Environment and Planning
Author/editor/assessor	Karen Dower Kdower@chichester.gov.uk
Date of assessment	October 2014
Reason for assessment	<p>Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) – improving outcomes for disadvantaged groups</p> <p>The purpose of this assessment is to review the impacts that the council's Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) proposals are likely to have on those who reside, work or visit the area covered by the Chichester Local Plan. (This excludes the area within the district covered by the South Downs National Park). This EIA aims to ensure that the CIL does not have an adverse effect on disadvantaged and vulnerable groups by assessing the main potential impacts of the CIL on the Protected Characteristic Groups identified within the Equalities Act 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Race• Faith and Belief• Disability• Gender• Sexual Orientation• Age• Gender Reassignment• Marriage and Civil Partnership• Pregnancy and Maternity.

Description of the project being assessed

The subject of this assessment is the council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which the Council aims to adopt in Summer 2015. The levy will be charged on new development within the area covered by the Local Plan (This excludes the area covered by the South Downs National Park, because the South Downs National Park Authority is producing a separate CIL charging schedule for the South Downs National Park area). The levy is to be introduced in order to raise funds to meet the demands that new development will place on the infrastructure of the area, such as new and improved roads, public transport, cycleways, pedestrian routes, schools, green infrastructure, community and health facilities.

The Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) was introduced under the Planning Act 2008 and is a new tariff system that enables local authorities to make a charge on most forms of new development to fund infrastructure needed to support development. Unlike funding from Section 106 agreements, CIL funds can be spent on a wide range of infrastructure to support development without the need for a direct geographical or functional relationship with the development. The intention is that CIL will be a simpler, fairer, more transparent and more predictable system. The CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) set out the framework and statutory requirements for local authorities who intend to introduce a CIL. The overall purpose of CIL is to ensure that costs incurred in providing infrastructure to support the development of an area can be funded (wholly or partly) by owners or developers of land.

Under the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), the amount of CIL to be paid has to be set out in a formal document called a Charging Schedule. The Charging Schedule must set out the level of charge that is to be levied for different types of development, in different parts of the Local Plan area. It is charged per square metre on net additional floorspace of development and the charging schedule must set out how to calculate the level of CIL required for each scheme.

CIL is not charged on affordable housing and buildings used for charitable purposes. The amount payable for other forms of development will be set at the time planning permission is granted and payment will be due at the commencement of development. Larger amounts will be payable in instalments over fixed time periods.

CIL is intended to complement rather than replace other funding streams and is intended to promote development rather than hinder it. Its main advantages are that:

- It is modest, representing no more than 5% of total development costs and is not charged on types of development that cannot sustain it;
- It is a fixed, non-negotiable charge and is therefore transparent and predictable;

- It is less time-consuming and complicated than S106 planning obligations, with less need for protracted negotiations with applicants and the drawing up of legal agreements; and
- Parish and Town Councils' will receive a share (15-25% dependent upon whether they have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan), which they can spend on infrastructure of their choice, enabling communities to benefit from development in their area.

In accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), two rounds of consultation need to be carried out prior to Chichester adopting its Community Infrastructure Levy. The first being at the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation stage which took place from 10th March – 23rd April 2014; and the second for the Draft Charging Schedule consultation planned for 21st November – 5th January 2015.

The draft CIL Charging Schedule identifies two discrete charging zones in which different CIL charges will apply depending on the type of development that is being proposed.

Draft Charging Schedule – Charge rates

Table 1 – Proposed CIL Charges

Use of Development	Proposed Levy (£/m²)
*Residential – South of the District	£120 sqm
*Residential – North of the District	£200 sqm
Business (B1b, B1c, B2, B8)	£0 sqm
Retail (wholly or mainly convenience)	£125 sqm
Retail (wholly or mainly comparison)	£20 sqm
Student Housing	£30 sqm
Standard Charge (applies to all development not separately defined)	£0 sqm
*with the exception of residential institutions (C2)	

The CIL Regulations require that the CIL rates are underpinned by evidence relating to the economic viability of new development and the projected infrastructure needs over the period to which the CIL charge applies. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan which accompanies the draft Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 sets out key infrastructure requirements needed to support growth and the development objectives of the plan area. The draft regulation 123 List contains the list of generic infrastructure projects where CIL may be applied and where S106 will not be sought. Importantly, adopting the CIL in Chichester will help the Council achieve its spatial strategy as outlined in the draft Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029.

The introduction of CIL should, in principle, benefit all groups by contributing to the delivery of strategic and local infrastructure and helping to achieve more sustainable development. CIL payments will be used to fund infrastructure such as delivery of new school places, health facilities, sports and leisure facilities, open space projects and therefore it is anticipated it will generate benefits for all equality groups. Any possible impacts would arise at the time money is secured through CIL and new or improved infrastructure is actually delivered; impacts will not arise directly as a result of the CIL Charging Schedule itself.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) undertook an Equalities Impact Assessment of CIL legislation and regulations in January 2012. Part of this assessment states that:

“The Community Infrastructure Levy is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any social group. By making communities more sustainable, the Community Infrastructure Levy will facilitate economic growth and liveability and so create opportunity for all. The infrastructure and services that the Community Infrastructure Levy will provide (such as medical and community facilities and transport networks) will enhance accessibility and liveability for all sectors of society, and could help to deliver new infrastructure that serves different needs within the community, for example, by increasing mobility and accessibility. We do not anticipate the reforms to the Community Infrastructure Levy changing this assessment.”

DCLG, Jan 2010 <http://www.parliament.uk/documents/impact-assessments/iA11-010AG.pdf>

It is clear that the Government do not expect the implementation of CIL to cause any adverse impact on any equality groups; indeed they anticipate that it will in general have a positive influence on a number of equalities groups.

Chichester District Council is required to undertake equality monitoring. Where possible the most up to date data has been used as the benchmark. Monitoring is undertaken using the following categories:

- Gender reassignment
- Age

- Ethnicity
- Disability
- Religion and belief
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Sex (gender)

Equalities Impact Analysis

Target Groups	Impact: Positive Neutral/Negligible Negative Not applicable Unknown	Impact analysis	Data sources
GENDER REASSIGNMENT	Unknown	No specific impacts are identified although the introduction of CIL will benefit all groups by contributing to the provision of infrastructure.	The Council does not have access to any data on gender reassignment.
AGE	Positive	The provision of new and	The table below shows the breakdown of age ranges in the district as at Census 2011. The highest amount of people by age is 8,550 people aged 60-

		improved public transport, pedestrian facilities and cycle facilities should benefit all age groups particularly the older and younger age groups.	<p>64, or 7.5% of the population. The population between ages 25 – 64 is 49.1%, between ages 0 and 24 it is 26.4%, and the over 65's represent 20.7%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Population by age range Census 2011</th> <th>Number of people</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All persons</td> <td>113,794</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 0-4</td> <td>5652</td> <td>5.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 5-9</td> <td>5630</td> <td>4.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 10-14</td> <td>6092</td> <td>5.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 15-19</td> <td>6517</td> <td>5.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 20-24</td> <td>6200</td> <td>5.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 25-29</td> <td>5150</td> <td>4.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 30-34</td> <td>5205</td> <td>4.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 35-39</td> <td>6121</td> <td>5.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 40-44</td> <td>7497</td> <td>6.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 45-49</td> <td>8312</td> <td>7.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 50-54</td> <td>7795</td> <td>6.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 55-59</td> <td>7179</td> <td>6.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 60-64</td> <td>8550</td> <td>7.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 65-69</td> <td>7551</td> <td>6.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 70-74</td> <td>6219</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 75-79</td> <td>5515</td> <td>4.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 80-84</td> <td>4317</td> <td>3.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All persons aged 85+</td> <td>4292</td> <td>3.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Population by age range Census 2011	Number of people	Percentage	All persons	113,794		All persons aged 0-4	5652	5.0%	All persons aged 5-9	5630	4.9%	All persons aged 10-14	6092	5.4%	All persons aged 15-19	6517	5.7%	All persons aged 20-24	6200	5.4%	All persons aged 25-29	5150	4.5%	All persons aged 30-34	5205	4.6%	All persons aged 35-39	6121	5.4%	All persons aged 40-44	7497	6.6%	All persons aged 45-49	8312	7.3%	All persons aged 50-54	7795	6.9%	All persons aged 55-59	7179	6.3%	All persons aged 60-64	8550	7.5%	All persons aged 65-69	7551	6.6%	All persons aged 70-74	6219	5.5%	All persons aged 75-79	5515	4.8%	All persons aged 80-84	4317	3.8%	All persons aged 85+	4292	3.8%
Population by age range Census 2011	Number of people	Percentage																																																													
All persons	113,794																																																														
All persons aged 0-4	5652	5.0%																																																													
All persons aged 5-9	5630	4.9%																																																													
All persons aged 10-14	6092	5.4%																																																													
All persons aged 15-19	6517	5.7%																																																													
All persons aged 20-24	6200	5.4%																																																													
All persons aged 25-29	5150	4.5%																																																													
All persons aged 30-34	5205	4.6%																																																													
All persons aged 35-39	6121	5.4%																																																													
All persons aged 40-44	7497	6.6%																																																													
All persons aged 45-49	8312	7.3%																																																													
All persons aged 50-54	7795	6.9%																																																													
All persons aged 55-59	7179	6.3%																																																													
All persons aged 60-64	8550	7.5%																																																													
All persons aged 65-69	7551	6.6%																																																													
All persons aged 70-74	6219	5.5%																																																													
All persons aged 75-79	5515	4.8%																																																													
All persons aged 80-84	4317	3.8%																																																													
All persons aged 85+	4292	3.8%																																																													
ETHNICITY	Positive	The provision of new and improved	The table below shows the ethnicity of the resident population in the district as at Census 2011. This shows that 7% of the population are non-British.																																																												

		<p>public transport, pedestrian facilities and cycle facilities and community facilities should benefit all people particularly minority ethnic groups who may be less reliant on the private car.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="936 197 1610 280">Resident Population by Ethnic Group - Census 2011</th> <th data-bbox="1617 197 1935 280">Chichester district percentages</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 280 1610 323">All persons</td> <td data-bbox="1617 280 1935 323">113,794</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 323 1610 403">White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British</td> <td data-bbox="1617 323 1935 403">93.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 403 1610 555">Please note that due to a census 2011 re-classification White Irish, White Other and White gypsy and traveller have now been classified as black and ethnic minority</td> <td data-bbox="1617 403 1935 555">7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 555 1610 635">Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black Caribbean</td> <td data-bbox="1617 555 1935 635">0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 635 1610 715">Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black African</td> <td data-bbox="1617 635 1935 715">0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 715 1610 758">Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Asian</td> <td data-bbox="1617 715 1935 758">0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 758 1610 801">Mixed/multiple ethnic group: Other Mixed</td> <td data-bbox="1617 758 1935 801">0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 801 1610 844">Asian/Asian British: Indian</td> <td data-bbox="1617 801 1935 844">0.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 844 1610 887">Asian/Asian British: Pakistani</td> <td data-bbox="1617 844 1935 887">0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 887 1610 930">Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi</td> <td data-bbox="1617 887 1935 930">0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 930 1610 973">Asian/Asian British: Chinese</td> <td data-bbox="1617 930 1935 973">0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 973 1610 1016">Asian/Asian British: Other Asian</td> <td data-bbox="1617 973 1935 1016">0.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1016 1610 1059">Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African</td> <td data-bbox="1617 1016 1935 1059">0.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1059 1610 1139">Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean</td> <td data-bbox="1617 1059 1935 1139">0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1139 1610 1219">Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black</td> <td data-bbox="1617 1139 1935 1219">0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1219 1610 1262">Other ethnic group: Arab</td> <td data-bbox="1617 1219 1935 1262">0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1262 1610 1321">Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group</td> <td data-bbox="1617 1262 1935 1321">0.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Resident Population by Ethnic Group - Census 2011	Chichester district percentages	All persons	113,794	White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	93.0%	Please note that due to a census 2011 re-classification White Irish, White Other and White gypsy and traveller have now been classified as black and ethnic minority	7%	Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black Caribbean	0.2%	Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black African	0.1%	Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Asian	0.3%	Mixed/multiple ethnic group: Other Mixed	0.3%	Asian/Asian British: Indian	0.4%	Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	0.0%	Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi	0.1%	Asian/Asian British: Chinese	0.3%	Asian/Asian British: Other Asian	0.6%	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African	0.3%	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean	0.1%	Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black	0.1%	Other ethnic group: Arab	0.1%	Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group	0.1%	
Resident Population by Ethnic Group - Census 2011	Chichester district percentages																																							
All persons	113,794																																							
White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	93.0%																																							
Please note that due to a census 2011 re-classification White Irish, White Other and White gypsy and traveller have now been classified as black and ethnic minority	7%																																							
Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black Caribbean	0.2%																																							
Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black African	0.1%																																							
Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Asian	0.3%																																							
Mixed/multiple ethnic group: Other Mixed	0.3%																																							
Asian/Asian British: Indian	0.4%																																							
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	0.0%																																							
Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi	0.1%																																							
Asian/Asian British: Chinese	0.3%																																							
Asian/Asian British: Other Asian	0.6%																																							
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African	0.3%																																							
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean	0.1%																																							
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black	0.1%																																							
Other ethnic group: Arab	0.1%																																							
Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group	0.1%																																							

DISABILITY	Positive	<p>The Council is not proposing to charge CIL on new healthcare or community facilities which will mean that CIL will not represent a barrier to the development of such new facilities. Rather, funds collected through CIL from other forms of development will be used to help deliver new social infrastructure which includes healthcare and community</p>	<p>Long term health problem or disability Chichester District is generally in line with county, regional and national averages in terms of daily activities that are limited due to a long term health problem or disability, for all people.</p> <p>Showing All people: daily affected by a long term health problem or disability for 2011 compared to county, regional and national averages. All areas highlighted are the highest in West Sussex.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1099 528 1749 1011"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Day-to-day activities limited a lot</th> <th>Day-to-day activities limited a little</th> <th>Day-to-day activities not limited</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adur</td> <td>9.1</td> <td>11.0</td> <td>79.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Arun</td> <td>9.4</td> <td>11.7</td> <td>78.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chichester</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>10.2</td> <td>82.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Crawley</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>8.2</td> <td>85.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horsham</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>85.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mid Sussex</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>85.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Worthing</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>10.5</td> <td>80.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Sussex</td> <td>7.5</td> <td>9.8</td> <td>82.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South East</td> <td>6.9</td> <td>8.8</td> <td>84.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>England</td> <td>8.3</td> <td>9.3</td> <td>82.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Chichester District is slightly lower than County, Regional and National averages for daily activities limited by long term health problem or disability for people aged 16-64.</p> <p>Showing 16 – 64 year olds: daily activities affected by a long term health problem or disability for 2011. Compared to county, regional and national averages. All areas highlighted are the highest in West Sussex.</p>		Day-to-day activities limited a lot	Day-to-day activities limited a little	Day-to-day activities not limited	%				Adur	9.1	11.0	79.9	Arun	9.4	11.7	78.9	Chichester	7.3	10.2	82.5	Crawley	6.6	8.2	85.3	Horsham	6.0	8.8	85.2	Mid Sussex	5.8	8.4	85.8	Worthing	8.9	10.5	80.6	West Sussex	7.5	9.8	82.8	South East	6.9	8.8	84.3	England	8.3	9.3	82.4
	Day-to-day activities limited a lot	Day-to-day activities limited a little	Day-to-day activities not limited																																																
%																																																			
Adur	9.1	11.0	79.9																																																
Arun	9.4	11.7	78.9																																																
Chichester	7.3	10.2	82.5																																																
Crawley	6.6	8.2	85.3																																																
Horsham	6.0	8.8	85.2																																																
Mid Sussex	5.8	8.4	85.8																																																
Worthing	8.9	10.5	80.6																																																
West Sussex	7.5	9.8	82.8																																																
South East	6.9	8.8	84.3																																																
England	8.3	9.3	82.4																																																

		<p>facilities that will benefit various disability groups including the accessibility of these facilities.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1115 204 1796 721"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1115 204 1272 379">%</th> <th data-bbox="1272 204 1435 379">Day-to-day activities limited a lot: Age 16 to 64</th> <th data-bbox="1435 204 1603 379">Day-to-day activities limited a little: Age 16 to 64</th> <th data-bbox="1603 204 1796 379">Day-to-day activities not limited: Age 16 to 64</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 379 1272 411">Adur</td><td data-bbox="1272 379 1435 411">3.5</td><td data-bbox="1435 379 1603 411">4.7</td><td data-bbox="1603 379 1796 411">52.5</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 411 1272 443">Arun</td><td data-bbox="1272 411 1435 443">3.1</td><td data-bbox="1435 411 1603 443">4.5</td><td data-bbox="1603 411 1796 443">50.4</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 443 1272 475">Chichester</td><td data-bbox="1272 443 1435 475">2.3</td><td data-bbox="1435 443 1603 475">3.8</td><td data-bbox="1603 443 1796 475">53.1</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 475 1272 507">Crawley</td><td data-bbox="1272 475 1435 507">3.1</td><td data-bbox="1435 475 1603 507">4.3</td><td data-bbox="1603 475 1796 507">59.3</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 507 1272 539">Horsham</td><td data-bbox="1272 507 1435 539">2.1</td><td data-bbox="1435 507 1603 539">3.6</td><td data-bbox="1603 507 1796 539">56.1</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 539 1272 571">Mid Sussex</td><td data-bbox="1272 539 1435 571">2.1</td><td data-bbox="1435 539 1603 571">3.5</td><td data-bbox="1603 539 1796 571">56.9</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 571 1272 603">Worthing</td><td data-bbox="1272 571 1435 603">3.4</td><td data-bbox="1435 571 1603 603">4.5</td><td data-bbox="1603 571 1796 603">53.6</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 603 1272 635">West Sussex</td><td data-bbox="1272 603 1435 635">2.7</td><td data-bbox="1435 603 1603 635">4.1</td><td data-bbox="1603 603 1796 635">54.6</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 635 1272 667">South East</td><td data-bbox="1272 635 1435 667">2.7</td><td data-bbox="1435 635 1603 667">4.1</td><td data-bbox="1603 635 1796 667">57</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1115 667 1272 721">England</td><td data-bbox="1272 667 1435 721">3.6</td><td data-bbox="1435 667 1603 721">4.6</td><td data-bbox="1603 667 1796 721">56.5</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="920 756 1473 788">Disability living allowance claimants</p> <p data-bbox="920 794 1980 900">The table below shows the total number of those in the district who were claiming Disability living allowance (as at August 2010) this also shows the percentage of Claimants by age range.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="920 938 2058 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="920 938 1435 1018"></th> <th data-bbox="1435 938 1796 1018">Disability Living Allowance Claimants</th> <th data-bbox="1796 938 2058 1018">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1018 1435 1050">Total</td><td data-bbox="1435 1018 1796 1050">3780</td><td data-bbox="1796 1018 2058 1050"></td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1050 1435 1082">Claimants Aged Under 16</td><td data-bbox="1435 1050 1796 1082">470</td><td data-bbox="1796 1050 2058 1082">12%</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1082 1435 1114">Claimants Aged 16-24</td><td data-bbox="1435 1082 1796 1114">320</td><td data-bbox="1796 1082 2058 1114">8%</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1114 1435 1145">Claimants Aged 25-49</td><td data-bbox="1435 1114 1796 1145">930</td><td data-bbox="1796 1114 2058 1145">25%</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1145 1435 1177">Claimants Aged 50-59</td><td data-bbox="1435 1145 1796 1177">710</td><td data-bbox="1796 1145 2058 1177">19%</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1177 1435 1209">Claimants Aged 60-69</td><td data-bbox="1435 1177 1796 1209">860</td><td data-bbox="1796 1177 2058 1209">23%</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="920 1209 1435 1289">Claimants Aged 70 and Over</td><td data-bbox="1435 1209 1796 1289">490</td><td data-bbox="1796 1209 2058 1289">13%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	%	Day-to-day activities limited a lot: Age 16 to 64	Day-to-day activities limited a little: Age 16 to 64	Day-to-day activities not limited: Age 16 to 64	Adur	3.5	4.7	52.5	Arun	3.1	4.5	50.4	Chichester	2.3	3.8	53.1	Crawley	3.1	4.3	59.3	Horsham	2.1	3.6	56.1	Mid Sussex	2.1	3.5	56.9	Worthing	3.4	4.5	53.6	West Sussex	2.7	4.1	54.6	South East	2.7	4.1	57	England	3.6	4.6	56.5		Disability Living Allowance Claimants	%	Total	3780		Claimants Aged Under 16	470	12%	Claimants Aged 16-24	320	8%	Claimants Aged 25-49	930	25%	Claimants Aged 50-59	710	19%	Claimants Aged 60-69	860	23%	Claimants Aged 70 and Over	490	13%
%	Day-to-day activities limited a lot: Age 16 to 64	Day-to-day activities limited a little: Age 16 to 64	Day-to-day activities not limited: Age 16 to 64																																																																				
Adur	3.5	4.7	52.5																																																																				
Arun	3.1	4.5	50.4																																																																				
Chichester	2.3	3.8	53.1																																																																				
Crawley	3.1	4.3	59.3																																																																				
Horsham	2.1	3.6	56.1																																																																				
Mid Sussex	2.1	3.5	56.9																																																																				
Worthing	3.4	4.5	53.6																																																																				
West Sussex	2.7	4.1	54.6																																																																				
South East	2.7	4.1	57																																																																				
England	3.6	4.6	56.5																																																																				
	Disability Living Allowance Claimants	%																																																																					
Total	3780																																																																						
Claimants Aged Under 16	470	12%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 16-24	320	8%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 25-49	930	25%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 50-59	710	19%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 60-69	860	23%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 70 and Over	490	13%																																																																					
RELIGION & BELIEF	Positive	The Council is not	The table below details the breakdown of the district's religious beliefs as at the Census 2011. The highest number is Christian with 75,248 making up 66.13%																																																																				

		<p>proposing to charge CIL on religious institutions which means that CIL will not be a barrier to the delivery of such facilities. It should be noted that the CIL regulations declare buildings proposed by charities and used for charitable purposes are exempt from paying CIL.</p>	<p>of the 2011 population.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="934 268 2047 775"> <thead> <tr> <th>Religion</th> <th>Chichester district numbers</th> <th>% of district</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All people</td> <td>113,794</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christian</td> <td>75,248</td> <td>66.13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buddhist</td> <td>492</td> <td>0.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu</td> <td>276</td> <td>0.24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jewish</td> <td>163</td> <td>0.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muslim (Islam)</td> <td>419</td> <td>0.37%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sikh</td> <td>31</td> <td>0.03%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other religion: Total</td> <td>516</td> <td>0.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No religion: Total</td> <td>27,947</td> <td>24.56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Religion not stated</td> <td>8,702</td> <td>7.65%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Religion	Chichester district numbers	% of district	All people	113,794	100%	Christian	75,248	66.13%	Buddhist	492	0.43%	Hindu	276	0.24%	Jewish	163	0.14%	Muslim (Islam)	419	0.37%	Sikh	31	0.03%	Other religion: Total	516	0.45%	No religion: Total	27,947	24.56%	Religion not stated	8,702	7.65%
Religion	Chichester district numbers	% of district																																		
All people	113,794	100%																																		
Christian	75,248	66.13%																																		
Buddhist	492	0.43%																																		
Hindu	276	0.24%																																		
Jewish	163	0.14%																																		
Muslim (Islam)	419	0.37%																																		
Sikh	31	0.03%																																		
Other religion: Total	516	0.45%																																		
No religion: Total	27,947	24.56%																																		
Religion not stated	8,702	7.65%																																		
<p>SEXUAL ORIENTATION</p>	<p>Neutral/Negligible</p>	<p>No specific impacts are identified although the introduction of CIL will benefit all groups by</p>	<p>Same sex couples The table below indicates the number of households aged over 16 and the number of same sex couples in the district as at the Census 2011.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="920 1193 1888 1318"> <thead> <tr> <th>All Households</th> <th>Same-sex couples</th> <th>Percentage of all households in Chichester District</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>49848</td> <td>66</td> <td>0.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	All Households	Same-sex couples	Percentage of all households in Chichester District	49848	66	0.1%																											
All Households	Same-sex couples	Percentage of all households in Chichester District																																		
49848	66	0.1%																																		

		contributing to the provision of infrastructure.	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Same-sex couple households</th> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dependent Children</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No dependent children</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </table>	Same-sex couple households		Dependent Children	5	No dependent children	61																		
Same-sex couple households																											
Dependent Children	5																										
No dependent children	61																										
MARRIAGE & CIVIL PARTNERSHIP	Neutral/Negligible	No specific impacts are identified although the introduction of CIL will benefit all groups by contributing to the provision of infrastructure.	<p>The table below details marital status in the district as at the Census 2011. 49,642 people are married. This is 52.2% of the population, which is the highest level in the district. The total number of people single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership) is second highest and equates to 25,801, which is 27.1% of the total population.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Marital Status</th> <th>Chichester District</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All categories: Marital and civil partnership status</td> <td>95161</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)</td> <td>25801</td> <td>27.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Married</td> <td>49642</td> <td>52.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In a registered same-sex civil partnership</td> <td>175</td> <td>0.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)</td> <td>2153</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved</td> <td>8890</td> <td>9.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership</td> <td>8500</td> <td>8.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Marital Status	Chichester District	%	All categories: Marital and civil partnership status	95161		Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	25801	27.1%	Married	49642	52.2%	In a registered same-sex civil partnership	175	0.2%	Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	2153	2.3%	Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	8890	9.3%	Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	8500	8.9%
Marital Status	Chichester District	%																									
All categories: Marital and civil partnership status	95161																										
Single (never married or never registered a same-sex civil partnership)	25801	27.1%																									
Married	49642	52.2%																									
In a registered same-sex civil partnership	175	0.2%																									
Separated (but still legally married or still legally in a same-sex civil partnership)	2153	2.3%																									
Divorced or formerly in a same-sex civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	8890	9.3%																									
Widowed or surviving partner from a same-sex civil partnership	8500	8.9%																									
PREGNANCY & MATERNITY	Positive	The Council is not proposing to charge CIL on new	<p>Fertility rates & Conceptions</p> <p>This data is from the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment – West Sussex 2012 and shows all the districts and boroughs in West Sussex. Chichester district is highlighted and shows 1136 registered births from the total of 18645 females aged 15-44.</p>																								

healthcare or community facilities which will mean that CIL will not represent a barrier to the development of such new facilities. Rather, funds collected through CIL from other forms of development will be used to help deliver new social infrastructure which includes healthcare and community facilities that will benefit various groups including the

Local Authority	Females aged 15-44	Live births	Birth rate per 1,000 females aged 15-44
Adur	10,939	775	71.8
Arun	24,355	1,619	67.0
Chichester	18,645	1,136	62.3
Crawley	23,725	1,648	69.4
Horsham	22,710	1,290	58.1
Mid Sussex	25,369	1,545	61.3
Worthing	19,474	1,194	61.8
West Sussex	145,217	9,207	64.1
England	10,749,254	694,241	64.9

		accessibility of these facilities.	
SEX (GENDER)	Positive	The CIL will benefit all groups of people by contributing to the delivery of strategic and local infrastructure as identified in the draft Regulation 123 list as necessary to support proposed levels of development.	According to the Census 2011, the total district population was 113,794. Of this, 59,393 were females and 54,401 were male. This indicates that 52.2% of the total population are female and 47.8% are male.

Gaps in evidence base

There are gaps in the evidence base for the areas of gender reassignment. However, it is not considered that further information in these areas will influence the CIL charging schedule. Given CIL contributions will be spent on local infrastructure, it is expected that funds collected from CIL should result in positive impacts on this group as well as all other equality groups.

Engagement and consultation with stakeholders

The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was published for public consultation in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement from 17th March to 23rd April 2014.

Responses received to this consultation resulted in the Council commissioning an update of its viability evidence which has informed the production of the Draft Charging Schedule, which once approved by the Cabinet on 4th November 2014 will be published for a second round of public consultation from 21st November 2014 to 5th January 2015. The representations will be considered and modifications may be prepared and agreed by Council on 10th March 2015 before being submitted for independent Examination on 10th March 2015.

Action Plan

Issue Identified	Action Required	Lead Officer	Timescale	Comments
The CIL has not yet been implemented and is still to undergo its second round of consultation and examination. Subsequently there may be some alterations to the Charging Schedule before it is adopted	This EIA has been reviewed and updated in response to relevant issues raised during consultation of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule.	Karen Dower	CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation: 10 March to 23 April 2014 CIL draft Charging Schedule consultation: 21 November 2014 to 5 January 2015 Adoption expected: July 2015	The EIA has been updated to take account of changes to the CIL Charging Schedule. The change has been the reduction of the purpose built student housing from £60sqm to £30sqm
It will be important to review the impact of CIL on equalities issues once it is adopted.	Consider and review the impact of CIL once it has been adopted.	Karen Dower	July 2015 onwards	The Council will ensure that CIL is allocated in accordance with its policies on fairness and equalities.