

Community Infrastructure Levy Equality Impact Analysis

January 2014

Name of Service Area	Environment and Planning
Author/editor/assessor	Karen Dower Kdower@chichester.gov.uk
Date of assessment	January 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 Spring 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 are 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 charges 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 from 10th March – 23rd April 2014; and the second at the Draft Charging Schedule consultation planned for 18th August – 30th September 2014.

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
Industrial (B1b, B1c, B2, B8)	£0 sqm
Retail (wholly or mainly convenience)	£125 sqm
Retail (wholly or mainly comparison)	£20 sqm
Student Housing	£60 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 initial 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><tr><th>Population by age range Census 2011</th><th>Number of people</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><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></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.																																																												

		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.	<table><tr><th>Resident Population by Ethnic Group - Census 2011</th><th>Chichester district percentages</th></tr><tr><td>All persons</td><td>113,794</td></tr><tr><td>White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British</td><td>93.0%</td></tr><tr><td>White: Irish</td><td>0.7%</td></tr><tr><td>White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td><td>0.2%</td></tr><tr><td>White: Other White</td><td>3.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black Caribbean</td><td>0.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Black African</td><td>0.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group: White and Asian</td><td>0.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Mixed/multiple ethnic group: Other Mixed</td><td>0.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian/Asian British: Indian</td><td>0.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian/Asian British: Pakistani</td><td>0.0%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi</td><td>0.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian/Asian British: Chinese</td><td>0.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Asian/Asian British: Other Asian</td><td>0.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: African</td><td>0.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Caribbean</td><td>0.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: Other Black</td><td>0.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Other ethnic group: Arab</td><td>0.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Other ethnic group: Any other ethnic group</td><td>0.1%</td></tr></table>	Resident Population by Ethnic Group - Census 2011	Chichester district percentages	All persons	113,794	White: English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	93.0%	White: Irish	0.7%	White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.2%	White: Other White	3.1%	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%																																											
White: Irish	0.7%																																											
White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.2%																																											
White: Other White	3.1%																																											
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</p> <p>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"> <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																																																

		facilities that will benefit various disability groups including the accessibility of these facilities.	<table><tr><td>%</td><td>Day-to-day activities limited a lot: Age 16 to 64</td><td>Day-to-day activities limited a little: Age 16 to 64</td><td>Day-to-day activities not limited: Age 16 to 64</td></tr><tr><td>Adur</td><td>3.5</td><td>4.7</td><td>52.5</td></tr><tr><td>Arun</td><td>3.1</td><td>4.5</td><td>50.4</td></tr><tr><td>Chichester</td><td>2.3</td><td>3.8</td><td>53.1</td></tr><tr><td>Crawley</td><td>3.1</td><td>4.3</td><td>59.3</td></tr><tr><td>Horsham</td><td>2.1</td><td>3.6</td><td>56.1</td></tr><tr><td>Mid Sussex</td><td>2.1</td><td>3.5</td><td>56.9</td></tr><tr><td>Worthing</td><td>3.4</td><td>4.5</td><td>53.6</td></tr><tr><td>West Sussex</td><td>2.7</td><td>4.1</td><td>54.6</td></tr><tr><td>South East</td><td>2.7</td><td>4.1</td><td>57</td></tr><tr><td>England</td><td>3.6</td><td>4.6</td><td>56.5</td></tr></table> <p>Disability living allowance claimants 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><tr><td></td><td>Disability Living Allowance Claimants</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>3560</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged Under 16</td><td>460</td><td>13%</td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged 16-24</td><td>280</td><td>8%</td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged 25-49</td><td>900</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged 50-59</td><td>660</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged 60-69</td><td>820</td><td>23%</td></tr><tr><td>Claimants Aged 70 and Over</td><td>440</td><td>12%</td></tr></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	3560		Claimants Aged Under 16	460	13%	Claimants Aged 16-24	280	8%	Claimants Aged 25-49	900	25%	Claimants Aged 50-59	660	19%	Claimants Aged 60-69	820	23%	Claimants Aged 70 and Over	440	12%
%	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	3560																																																																						
Claimants Aged Under 16	460	13%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 16-24	280	8%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 25-49	900	25%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 50-59	660	19%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 60-69	820	23%																																																																					
Claimants Aged 70 and Over	440	12%																																																																					
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%																																																																				

		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.	of the 2011 population. <table><tr><th>Religion</th><th>Chichester district numbers</th><th>% of district</th></tr><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></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%																																		
SEXUAL ORIENTATI ON	Neutral/Negligible	No specific impacts are identified although the introduction of CIL will benefit all groups by	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. <table><tr><th>All Households</th><th>Same-sex couples</th><th>Percentage of all households in Chichester District</th></tr><tr><td>49848</td><td>66</td><td>0.1%</td></tr></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><tr><th>Same-sex couple households</th><th></th></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><tr><th>Marital Status</th><th>Chichester District</th><th>%</th></tr><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></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	Fertility rates & Conceptions 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</p>	<table> <tr> <th>Local Authority</th><th>Females aged 15-44</th><th>Live births</th><th>Birth rate per 1,000 females aged 15-44</th></tr> <tr> <td>Adur</td><td>10,939</td><td>775</td><td>71.8</td></tr> <tr> <td>Arun</td><td>24,355</td><td>1,619</td><td>67.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Chichester</td><td>18,645</td><td>1,136</td><td>62.3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Crawley</td><td>23,725</td><td>1,648</td><td>69.4</td></tr> <tr> <td>Horsham</td><td>22,710</td><td>1,290</td><td>58.1</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mid Sussex</td><td>25,369</td><td>1,545</td><td>61.3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Worthing</td><td>19,474</td><td>1,194</td><td>61.8</td></tr> <tr> <td>West Sussex</td><td>145,217</td><td>9,207</td><td>64.1</td></tr> <tr> <td>England</td><td>10,749,254</td><td>694,241</td><td>64.9</td></tr> </table>	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
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 will be put before Cabinet on 25th February 2014, and Council on 4th March 2014 and then public consultation will take place in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement from 17th March to 23rd April 2014.

The success of the consultation will then be monitored and representations will be taken into consideration prior to a second round of consultation on the draft Charging Schedule that is planned to take place from 18th August to 28th September 2014 after prior approval of Cabinet on 8th July 2014 and Council on 22nd July 2014.

Action Plan

Issue Identified	Action Required	Lead Officer	Timescale	Comments
The CIL has not yet been implemented and is still to undergo two rounds of consultation and examination. Subsequently there may be some alterations to the Charging Schedule before it is adopted	This EIA will be reviewed and updated where necessary in response to any 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: 18 August to 28 September 2014 Adoption expected: April/May 2015	The EIA will take account of any changes to the CIL Charging Schedule.
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	April/May 2015 onwards	The council will ensure that CIL is allocated in accordance with its policies on fairness and equalities.