

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to:

- (i) help decision makers fulfil their duties under the Equality Act 2010 and
- (ii) for you to evidence the positive and adverse impacts of the proposed change on people with protected characteristics and ways to mitigate or eliminate any adverse impacts.

## Using this form

This form must be updated and reviewed as your evidence evolves on proposals for a:

- project
- service change
- policy
- commissioning of a service
- decommissioning of a service

You must take into account any:

- consultation feedback
- significant changes to the proposals
- data to support impacts of the proposed changes

The key findings of the most up to date version of the Equality Impact Analysis must be explained in the report to the decision maker. The Equality Impact Analysis must be attached to the decision-making report.

**\*\*Please make sure you read the information below so that you understand what is required under the Equality Act 2010\*\***

## Equality Act 2010

The Equality Act 2010 applies to both our workforce and our customers. Under the Equality Act 2010, decision makers are under duty, to have due (that is proportionate) regard to the need to protect and promote the interests of persons with protected characteristics.

## Protected characteristics

The protected characteristics under the Act are:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

## **Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010**

Section 149 requires a public authority to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share those characteristics
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The purpose of Section 149 is to get decision makers to consider the impact their decisions may or will have on those with protected characteristics. By evidencing the impacts on people with protected characteristics decision makers should be able to demonstrate 'due regard'.

### **Decision makers duty under the Act**

Having had careful regard to the Equality Impact Analysis, and also the consultation responses, decision makers are under a duty to have due regard to the need to protect and promote the interests of persons with protected characteristics (see above) and to:

- (i) consider and analyse how the decision is likely to affect those with protected characteristics, in practical terms.
- (ii) remove any unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and other prohibited conduct.
- (iii) consider whether practical steps should be taken to mitigate or avoid any adverse consequences that the decision is likely to have, for persons with protected characteristics and, indeed, to consider whether the decision should not be taken at all, in the interests of persons with protected characteristics.
- (iv) consider whether steps should be taken to advance equality, foster good relations and generally promote the interests of persons with protected characteristics, either by varying the recommended decision or by taking some other decision.

## **Conducting an impact analysis**

The Equality Impact Analysis is a process to identify the impact or likely impact a project, proposed service change, commissioning, decommissioning or policy will have on people with protected characteristics listed above. It should be considered at the beginning of the decision-making process.

### **The Lead Officer responsibility**

This is the person writing the report for the decision maker. It is the responsibility of the Lead Officer to make sure that the Equality Impact Analysis is robust and proportionate to the decision being taken.

### **Summary of findings**

You must provide a clear and concise summary of the key findings of this Equality Impact Analysis in the decision-making report and attach this Equality Impact Analysis to the report.

# Impact

**An impact is an intentional or unintentional lasting consequence or significant change to people's lives brought about by an action or series of actions.**

## **How much detail to include?**

The Equality Impact Analysis should be proportionate to the impact of proposed change. In deciding this ask simple questions:

- who might be affected by this decision?
- which protected characteristics might be affected?
- how might they be affected?

These questions will help you consider the extent to which you already have evidence, information and data. It will show where there are gaps that you will need to explore. Ensure the source and date of any existing data is referenced.

You must consider both obvious and any less obvious impacts. Engaging with people with the protected characteristics will help you to identify less obvious impacts as these groups share their perspectives with you.

A given proposal may have a positive impact on one or more protected characteristics and have an adverse impact on others. You must capture these differences in this form to help decision makers to decide where the balance of advantage or disadvantage lies. If an adverse impact is unavoidable, then it must be clearly justified and recorded as such. An explanation must be stated as to why no steps can be taken to avoid the impact. Consequences must be included.

## **Proposals for more than one option**

If more than one option is being proposed, you must ensure that the Equality Impact Analysis covers all options. Depending on the circumstances, it may be more appropriate to complete an Equality Impact Analysis for each option.

**The information you provide in this form must be sufficient to allow the decision maker to fulfil their role as above. You must include the latest version of the Equality Impact Analysis with the report to the decision maker. Please be aware that the information in this form must be able to stand up to legal challenge.**

## Background information

Details	Response
<b>Title of the policy, project or service being considered</b>	Devolution to a Greater Lincolnshire (GL) Mayoral Combined County Authority (MCCA)
<b>Service area</b>	Joint assessment by Lincolnshire County Council, North East Lincolnshire Council and North Lincolnshire Council (LCC, NELC & NLC respectively)
<b>Person or people completing the analysis</b>	<p>Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) - Lee Sirdifield, Samantha Long, Matthew Garrard, Justin Brown, Daniel Larkin, Marie Mettam, Sarah Moody, Kate Sobstyl, Samantha Hardy</p> <p>North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC) - Stephen McGrath, Ian Hollingsworth, Paul Ellis</p> <p>North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) – Sophie Day</p>
<b>Lead officer</b>	Lee Sirdifield, Assistant Director for Corporate (LCC)
<b>Who is the decision maker?</b>	Three Upper Tier Councils/Executives (LCC, NELC and NLC)
<b>How was the Equality Impact Analysis undertaken?</b>	<p>Kick off Meeting (22 May 2023)</p> <p>Workshop Meeting (06 June 2023)</p> <p>Review Meeting (04 July 2023)</p> <p>Review Meeting (20 September 2023)</p> <p>Review Meeting (16 October 2023)</p> <p>Review of emerging consultation responses (11 December 2023 and 22 December 2023)</p> <p>Post Consultation Data Updates (16 -28 February 2024)</p> <p>Post Consultation Review and Public Health Annual Report Published (20 February 2024)</p> <p>Data Review with consultants (21 February 2024)</p> <p>Other sessions as relevant</p> <p>Analysis taken in conjunction with devolution deal asks and statistics from GL population, in addition to the formal consultation results.</p>

Details	Response
	<p>This document considers the feedback received from the eight-week devolution consultation which provided additional insight into the impact of the proposed changes across a range of protected characteristics.</p>
<p><b>Date of meeting when decision will be made</b></p>	<p>This analysis will be used as part of the decision-making process for the three authorities in March 2024 and if a decision is made to seek devolution from the Secretary of State, the document will form part of the pack of documents that will be submitted for consideration.</p> <p>We will review and update this document at all major milestones including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deal agreed</li> <li>• Proposal agreed</li> <li>• Consultation mid-way point (January 2024)</li> <li>• Consultation results (February-March 2024)</li> <li>• Statutory Instrument passed through Parliament</li> </ul>
<p><b>Is this a proposed change to an existing policy, service, project or is it new?</b></p>	<p>GL secured an initial devolution deal with central government and we have consulted on a proposal. This is being considered against the consultation findings and revised proposal.</p>
<p><b>Version control</b></p>	<p>v.2.3</p>
<p><b>Is it LCC directly delivered, commissioned, recommissioned, or decommissioned?</b></p>	<p>Joint assessment by Lincolnshire County Council, North East Lincolnshire Council and North Lincolnshire Council (LCC, NELC &amp; NLC respectively)</p>
<p><b>Describe the proposed change</b></p>	<p>A proposal for the establishment of a GL (GL) Mayoral Combined County Authority (MCCA). A proposal to devolve powers and budgets from the UK Government to GL to be managed by a new MCCA. The deal proposes changes in six key areas, as outlined in the Growth, Energy and Food vision document.</p>

# Equality Impact Assessment Context

This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) has been conducted in the context of the proposed GL Devolution Deal agreed between Central Government and the 3 Upper Tier Authorities of the region (Lincolnshire County Council, North Lincolnshire Council and North East Lincolnshire Council).

This deal will implement a transfer of funding and powers currently held at the level of central government and bring them closer to local people and controlled at a Greater Lincolnshire Level through a Mayoral Combined County Authority.

All 10 Local Authorities (Upper and Lower Tier) will see no change to their current structure and continue to have authority and responsibility over everything that they presently do, with the exception of transport powers which will transfer from the upper tier authorities to the Mayoral Combined County Authority. There will be no change to day-to-day practice. The GL MCCA if established, will consult with, and work alongside the Local Authorities in the GL area.

This EIA is a process to identify the impact or likely impact of this project upon the people of GL who are part of one of the protected characteristic groups listed above, and it seeks to consider a large variety of possible implications to ensure that it reflects and considers the diversity of GL.

This version of the EIA has been updated following the public consultation which ran between 4 December 2023 and 29 January 2024, to ensure any additional impacts that have been identified are given due consideration as part of the decision-making process.

## Understanding those with an interest in the decision

The EIA shows due consideration to those who have an interest in devolution to GL which covers a wide range of demographics. This emphasises the importance of making the entire process accessible and understandable for all within the region, and where negative implications have been identified it seeks to provide mitigations to limit any negative possible effects.

This EIA informed the public consultation process, which ran from 4 December 2023 to 29 January 2024. It was open to all residents and businesses, voluntary and community organisations, public sector bodies and representative bodies across GL and the wider area, and sought their views on the devolution proposal agreed with government, which will be considered again locally and nationally as a result of feedback.

The consultation methodology is set out in the consultation findings report produced by Alma Economics as independent experts in consultation analysis who were appointed on behalf of the constituent councils. The consultation was available in a variety of forms, including but not limited to; online access, paper copies in public locations, easy read to aid understanding, and accessible formats, such as British Sign Language (BSL) on request. This meant the often seldom heard were given a fair opportunity to participate so that their views are given due consideration.

# Supporting Evidence

## Consultation methodology

An open public consultation between 4 December 2023 and 29 January 2024 helped inform local decision makers regarding a way forward and potentially shape the final GL devolution proposal prior to submission to Government.

There were a number of ways in which individuals and stakeholder organisations could give their views to ensure the consultation reached the widest possible audience:

- Online survey
- Paper copy survey
- A written letter, sent via the Freepost address
- By email, via a dedicated consultation email address
- Alternative formats, such as easy read and large print were proactively shared or Braille and BSL were available on request
- Attend a variety of public and community events
- Telephone survey

Paper copy surveys were made available at various locations such as libraries and children's centres across the area. The paper survey was available with a freepost return address was available in:

- standard text
- large print
- easy read (simplified, pictorial version)
- additionally, on request, it could also be translated into Braille and audio format as well as different languages for those without English as a first language

Constituent Councils ran a communications campaign to promote the consultation. This included coverage in various forms of online, print, TV, radio, subtitled video and audio media.

The consultation received 4,101 responses. The majority of responses (94%, 3,887 respondents) were submitted through the online survey, while 214 responses (6%) were received directly via email, post, or telephone survey. The responses can be broken down by respondent type as follows:

(i) 3,844 responses were received from individuals, accounting for 96% of responses; and (ii) 157 (4%) respondents answered on behalf, or as a representative, of a business or organisation.

3980 responses provided their local authority area. In order of frequency, the representation of local authority areas was as follows: Lincolnshire County Council (64%) North Lincolnshire Council (20%), North East Lincolnshire Council (16%),

Within Lincolnshire, respondents can be further broken down against lower tier areas as follows, North Kesteven District Council (12%), East Lindsey District Council (12%), West Lindsey District Council (12%), City of Lincoln Council (9%), South Kesteven District Council (8%), Boston Borough Council (7%), and South Holland District Council (5%).

More than 50 engagement activities were held during the consultation, including in person, round table and online events. The objective of these activities was to help raise awareness of the proposal amongst the general public and seldom heard groups to encourage a consultation response, regardless



of their view on the topic. These events also gave attendees the opportunity to ask questions regarding the details of the proposal and raise any concerns.

Full details of the GL Devolution proposal consultation and stakeholder engagement can be found within the Alma report and the decision-making report of the constituent councils, published on the council's website.

## Greater Lincolnshire Geography, Statistics and Challenges Summary

GL is a large geographical area combining urban, rural and coastal areas. GL has coastal and low-lying regions and our diverse geography is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, with high risks from flooding impacting on homes, communities and limiting coastal tourism in the warmer seasons.

GL's population has grown by almost 55,000 people in the 10 years to 2021. The Lincoln City area grew the most (11%) increasing by over 10,000 since the 2011 Census. North East Lincolnshire was the only area with a decreased population, dropping over 2,000 (-2%).

16% of the population (175,000) (as of the 2021 census) are aged under 15 years. There are more people in this age group compared with 2011. However, as a proportion of the overall population, the size of the group has decreased (170,000, 16% in 2011).

61% of the GL population in 2021 (669,000) were aged 15 to 64 years. There are more people in this age group compared with 2011 (when 664,000 were aged 15 to 64 years), but as a proportion of the overall population there has been a decrease in the size of this group (64% in 2011).

The ageing population trend has continued, with more people than ever before in the older age groups. 23%, (249,000) of the population in 2021 were aged 65 years and over, up from 20% (206,000) in 2011. The size of the population aged 90 years and over (11,100 or 1.0% of the population) has increased since 2011, when 8,800 or 1% were aged 90 and over. GL's ageing population has increased 30% faster than the rest of the UK since 2020.

More people in GL define themselves as being religious compared to those who do not. 596,727 said that they were affiliated to a form of religion. This is equal to approximately 54% of the entire population.

According to 2021 Census Data, 10% (approximately 113,880) of the population belong to what would be identified as minority ethnic groups in GL which is less than the England figure of 18%.

GL has a higher rate of disability than the national figure, with a total of 211,250 people having a form of disability which either limits them a little or a lot. This equates to 19% of the population of the area and therefore above the national figure of 18%.

The 2021 Census information confirms that 24,207 people identified with an LGB+ orientation ("Gay or Lesbian", "Bisexual" or "Other sexual orientation"). This equates to 3% of those eligible to answer this question in GL, which is slightly lower than the England and Wales figure of 3%.

Census data analysis reveals that 62,648 people (approximately 6% of GL) don't have English as their main language.

GL faces increasing challenges which are not helped by the rurality and unique geography of the region. GL has few motorways, dual carriageways and limited public transport networks. This reduces the opportunity to travel to work, learning and leisure, contributing to greater inequality. Costs are often higher and greater investment is required. Access to both higher and further education is hampered by poor digital connectivity, limiting the development of the skill-base needed within the population.

There are also currently 149,700 people in GL (23%) that are economically inactive when compared to the UK figure of 21% which presents a wide challenge.

Public spending per head is below average when compared against the UK. The economy has an over-reliance on seasonal jobs, whether that is in tourism or agriculture. The area has carbon-rich heavy industry which is critical to the UK but sees challenges in terms of the green agenda. Education attainment lags behind our neighbours and the rest of the UK with only 29% of our working age residents having a Level 4 Qualification or above.

## Positive impacts

The proposed change may have the following positive impacts on persons with protected characteristics.

Protected characteristic	Response												
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic relating to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environment</li> <li>- Employment and skills</li> <li>- Nature</li> <li>- Transport</li> <li>- Innovation and trade</li> <li>- Digital</li> <li>- Housing</li> </ul> <p>which are detailed below and include potential positive impacts for young people (under 25), working aged people and older people (aged 65+). These have been updated to include relevant findings from the devolution consultation.</p> <p>The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,727 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of age. 26% of those who responded to this question in relation to age suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 28% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 1243 1528 1384"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected characteristic</th> <th>Positive Impact</th> <th>No Impact</th> <th>Negative Impact</th> <th>Don't know</th> <th>Number of Respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Age</td> <td>26%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>3,727</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Further analysis has been completed to understand the impact on different age groups where this information has been provided by respondents. However, it should be noted that many of the comments were general and not specific to a protected characteristic. The analysis highlighted:</p> <p>“Suggestions were raised on the impact of the devolution on different age groups. Respondents expressed support for the proposed improvements to transport. Improvements were anticipated to benefit the elderly population by increasing access to various locations across Lincolnshire, enhancing their well-being.”</p> <p><b>Young People (under 25's)</b></p> <p>Respondents to the consultation were asked to select their age group. Of the 3,811 responses to this question, 2% of respondents were under 18, 4% respondents were between 18-24. The 2021 census tells us that 27% of Greater Lincolnshire’s population is under 25 so this age group was underrepresented, but that is unsurprising as the youngest within the age range are unlikely to have sufficient understanding or interest to take part.</p>	Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents	Age	26%	30%	28%	17%	3,727
Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents								
Age	26%	30%	28%	17%	3,727								

## Environment

### Potential positive impacts:

- In GL 16.0% of the population (175,000) are aged under 15 years according to the 2021 census<sup>1</sup>. This generation will see the greatest impact of climate change on the environment in their lifetime. GL is pivotal to the nation becoming a net energy exporter by 2040 and achieving net zero. Devolution to GL is a fundamental part of investing in the North Sea and the onshore infrastructure required to expand our renewable capacity and innovate in carbon capture.
- Through working towards net zero and investing in renewable energy in GL, younger people will benefit from a green future, cleaner air and opportunities for highly skilled jobs, allowing them to develop a career locally. Through devolution, we are asking for a more co-ordinated approach between relevant stakeholders to the environment and green growth. This will enhance the reputation of GL as a technology leader in renewable energy and carbon capture, attracting further investment and people to the area which will secure a strong future for young people.

### Consultation findings:

- There were 202 respondents aged 24 or under on the question area regarding the proposals approach to the environment. Of those who responded:
  - o 135 young people strongly agreed or agreed with the proposals ambition.
  - o 44 young people disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to the environment would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

## Employment and Skills

### Potential positive impacts:

- Provisions within the devolution proposal for education and skills could have a potential positive impact on younger people improving their education and training, access to careers and wider determinants of health that could lead to a longer and healthier life.

The average increase in median age in 2021 when comparing to the 2011 census across GL was approximately 1.7 years<sup>2,3</sup>

West Lindsey, East Lindsey and South Kesteven all saw their median age increase by 3 years. The use of devolved funds for programmes led by DWP, DfE, and other government sponsored training provisions to a local level will enable support to be tailored to specific areas so that training can be commissioned and targeted on local need. The City of Lincoln was the only local authority area that saw a decrease in its median age, and this was by 1 year from 34 to 33.

Over 45,500 children under the age of 16 in GL were living in relative low-income families in 2022, equating to an average figure across all local authorities of 25% in GL. These figures were high across almost all areas, particularly Lincoln 31%, East Lindsey 31% and Boston 31%<sup>4</sup>.

The development of an industry-led GL Careers service will benefit people of all ages and will positively impact on those who may not currently be able to access career services.

Given that all areas apart from the City of Lincoln district have shown increases in the average age of the population from the 2011 Census to 2021, this has the potential to impact greatly on the population of GL and it is important that our residents are aware of the wide range of opportunities available to them.

- The addition of the opportunity to work with Government, to test and design viable solutions to the workforce challenges faced by further education and adult education, will support to remove those barriers faced by those who may be prepared to leave industries and teach the new generation of learners.
- Of specific benefit to younger people is the proposal to establish a duty to co-operate to enable support for employment and training provisions for those leaving care, along with increased support to access apprenticeships. This will benefit vulnerable young people in their transition from care to training and career or job opportunities.

#### Consultation findings:

- There were two questions regarding skills within the consultation, the first being focused on jobs and business growth. There were 203 responses from under 25s to this part of the consultation.
  - o 145 young people strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 39 young people strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- 203 people under 25 answered question two regarding education and training.
  - o 132 young people strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 48 young people strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Amongst those young people responding support is demonstrated for the proposals focus on education and skills. Outside of the numerical data, there were no additional themes identified directly from those under the age of 25 as to why they specifically were supportive of the ambitions

#### Nature

#### Potential positive impacts:

- The environment is of great interest to young people. Woodland Trust research published in March 2023 found that 16-24s are more likely to be 'very worried' about climate change, so devolution plans to address environmental matters will help this passion to be harnessed<sup>5</sup>. Taking local control of environmental policy will help improve and accelerate green economy benefits, in which northern Lincolnshire is a global leader. Ultimately young people and future generations will benefit most from protected resources and investment.
- Nature is close to most of our residents. However, a survey by Natural England in 2019 found that GL had the second lowest level of residents in England spending time visiting a nature site over the previous month that was recorded<sup>6</sup>. Having a variety of accessible wildlife sites that are well promoted is important for improving the physical and mental health of our residents. Improved access may have greatest health benefits for younger people over the whole of their lifetime.

- It is important to promote nature sites and coastal resorts in order to encourage residents to take part in physical activity. GL has statistics comfortably above the national average when considering weight and obesity levels. According to the latest public health data (2021/22), South Holland and West Lindsey have the two largest percentages of adults classed as overweight or obese in England across all district councils and unitary authorities. South Holland with 78% and West Lindsey with 77%. North East Lincolnshire is 11th on the list with 74%<sup>7</sup>. All but two local authority areas in GL have a score of over 70% with South Kesteven and East Lindsey the only two below this level with scores of 64% and 68% respectively. Improved access may have greatest health benefits for younger people over the whole of their lifetime.

#### Consultation findings:

- Whilst the consultation didn't identify any common themes for this protected characteristic, the consultation report did highlight calls for increased measures on climate change, conservation measures and protection of greenfield sites. If protection isn't provided, then this could have an adverse impact on young people.

#### Transport

##### Potential positive impacts:

- Of the 175,000 people aged under 15 years<sup>8</sup>, many rely heavily on public transport to get them to where they need to be and require an improved and reliable service which a devolution deal will allow GL to provide. The Campaign to Protect Rural England found 86% of the 16–25-year-olds who want to leave rural areas surveyed cite infrequent and unreliable public transport as an important concern<sup>9</sup>.
- The devolution proposal put forward has requested a multi-year transport infrastructure settlement to be devolved to local leaders to support the delivery of a joint local transport plan which covers road, rail, freight, public transport, walking and cycling. The freedom of controlling these powers and funding locally will allow the resources to be directed into the areas that need them most and support many of the young people who need these services. GL MCCA is also requesting, a multi-year transport and travel settlement to be devolved to local leaders which is to include all funding for public transport and active travel, all of which are currently disparate.
- Additionally, a devolved and consolidated integrated local transport budget for GL, would provide long term certainty and commitment to transport will assist young people.

#### Consultation findings:

- Within the consultation there was a question on the proposal's approach on roads, buses and transport. Of the 203 responses from people aged under 25,
  - o 137 young people strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 47 young people either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the approach.

- Young people under 25 showed broad support for the transport ambitions of the proposal. Whilst there weren't any widespread common themes that emerged from under 25's in this area there were comments particularly focused on public transport improvements, especially in relation to connections between rural and urban areas, which some thought would make an improvement to their lives. This would impact on this age group, as well as all others.

#### Innovation and Trade

##### Potential positive impacts:

- The growth of the Innovation and Trade sector in GL could be positive for young people providing future opportunities. In the devolution proposal we have requested to pilot four centres of innovation targeting food technology (Holbeach), advanced manufacturing (Scunthorpe), decarbonisation (Stallingborough) and defence (Lincoln). These cover wide ranging sectors and offer variety to young people who are looking for possible careers in GL. GL also wants to see a Regional Defence and Security Cluster which will be a positive option for those young people looking to move into GL's rich heritage of defence.

##### Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to innovation and trade would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

#### Digital

##### Potential positive impacts:

- More than three-quarters (76%) of young people who want to move away say that poor digital connectivity has influenced their desire to leave their rural area, according to research commissioned by the Campaign to Protect Rural England<sup>10</sup>. Speeding up access roll out as part of devolution could help slow this rate of departure and the resulting loss of skills.

Through a devolution deal for GL, additional funding will allow for a planned approach to strategic and long-term investment in digital infrastructure that closes the gap with other areas of the UK. The positive impact of this for young people will be that businesses will have the confidence to invest and relocate to the area and enable existing businesses in the area to improve productivity. This will enable them to provide more opportunities for young people to access highly skilled jobs in the future and build careers locally.

- Improved digital infrastructure will also give young people greater choice and flexibility over how they choose to work in the future and the jobs they can access. Reliable high-speed connectivity and mobile signal opens up learning and job opportunities outside of the area that would otherwise mean relocation was necessary. Young people will also benefit from the improved connectivity in educational and social settings which will enrich their life experience. Parents being able to access highly skilled, high wage jobs in GL will also benefit young people through growing up in an area with a thriving local economy which attracts investment and offers greater experiences and quality of life.

##### Consultation findings:

<sup>10</sup> [CPRE survey reveals the factors pushing young people out of the countryside - CPRE](#)



- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

## Housing

### Potential positive impacts:

- National data shows how young people struggle to access housing in all areas, but especially rural places. Of the 16–25-year-olds surveyed by YouGov (alongside The Countryside Charity) in 2021, 72% of those living in rural areas say affordable housing is their top concern. 84% of those who want to leave their rural homes say it is an important factor in making their decision. Investment as part of devolution will make affordable, decent homes available in the right places, to address this challenge to remain in their communities or preferred choice of location<sup>11</sup>.

### Consultation findings:

- Housing is of significant importance to young people and the consultation sought to address this. Again 203 responses were received.
  - o 119 young people strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal.
  - o 56 young people strongly disagreed or agreed.
- Young people responding were supportive of the housing aims and ambitions of the proposal. No further themes from the under 25 age group were found as part of the consultation but there were comments from the wider consultation responses which focused on areas such as the stock of social and affordable housing and the impact that this can have on retaining young people within the area.

## Working aged people

6% of respondents were between 25-34, 10% were 35-44, 15% were 45-54, 21% were 55-64.

## Employment and Skills

### Potential positive impacts:

- By devolving the Adult Education Budget, we aim to widen participation of adult learning, improving access to better paid employment and higher-level qualifications. This will enable GL to access improved Higher Education (HE) & Further Education (FE) provisions through the devolution of the Adult Education Budget.
- The potential to innovate and adapt loans, allowances and funding rules to encourage more adults to train, will help support an increasingly older population, along with a devolved Adult Education Budget.

<sup>11</sup> [CPRE survey reveals the factors pushing young people out of the countryside - CPRE](#)

- The roll out of higher-level technical qualifications, working with the area's further education colleges in the area's priority economic sectors will support a more diverse range of ages through the range of educational opportunities. The use of Skills Bootcamps will help to raise skills levels in those occupations which have hard to fill vacancies in critical roles. The development of bespoke apprenticeship arrangements will further diversify the range of opportunities available to those who may have missed out on educational opportunities earlier in life.

#### Consultation findings:

- In relation to education and training 1,961 responses were received from people aged 25-64:
  - o 1,216 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 530 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- No additional themes outside of the data were identified, however there were comments from the wider results on emphasising the need for affordable adult education provision, ensuring that the cost of courses does not form a barrier to pursuing education. The consultation responses also reference the impact of AI on low and medium skilled jobs, which could impact on this and other age groups, along with other protected characteristics.

#### Environment

##### Potential positive impacts:

- 61% of the GL population in 2021 (669,000) were aged 15 to 64 years<sup>12</sup>. The working age population in GL will benefit from the devolution asks mentioned above in similar ways to young people. In addition to these asks, devolution also presents opportunities to ensure that timely investment decisions can be achieved locally to enable new technologies to come to the market faster. This will benefit working aged people in terms of the environmental benefits of these technologies as well as new job opportunities and access to greener, more secure forms of energy and water.

##### Consultation findings:

- In relation to the environment, there were 1,958 responses from people aged 25-64:
  - o 1,214 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 523 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- This age group is shown to be supportive of the plans for the environment and there were no further patterns from the data for those aged 25-64 that identified additional positive implications of the proposal.

#### Transport

##### Potential positive impacts:

- GL is a large geography with limited public transport networks. This reduces the opportunity to travel to work, learning and leisure, contributing to greater inequality. There are 149,700 people in GL (23%) (Q3, 2022 data) that are economically inactive when compared to the UK figure of 21%<sup>13</sup>. This has the possibility of being offset by the development of an improved and accessible transport offer, providing working age people with the opportunity to access employment and to return to or remain in the workplace.

- GL is also requesting a devolved and consolidated integrated local transport budget to provide long term certainty and a commitment to transport. This certainty and reliability is crucial for residents knowing that they can get from A to B without any concerns and this is what we strive to achieve through the freedom of devolution.

#### Consultation findings:

- From this age group of 25–64-year-olds, there were 1,963 responses.
  - o 1,227 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 567 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- No additional themes outside of the data were identified

#### Innovation and Trade

##### Potential positive impacts:

- GL is a High Potential Opportunity for industrial decarbonisation, and aquaculture. With support through devolution, these sectors will continue to grow through devolution and produce skilled jobs for the working aged population. Domestic and Foreign Investment will make GL a key player in these industries and will be appealing to the working aged population.

#### Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to innovation and trade would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

#### Digital

##### Potential positive impacts:

- With greater digital skills and access, brought about by devolution, flexible working opportunities will be enhanced for this group, which demonstrably enhances quality of life.
- Working aged people will benefit from the devolution asks around digital infrastructure and connectivity in a similar way to young people in terms of greater opportunities to access highly skilled and high wage jobs and the benefits of greater business productivity and investment in the area. Working aged people will also benefit from GL having the ability to develop a more collaborative approach to smart cities, smart homes and connected places. Smart cities use data and technology to create efficiencies, improve sustainability, create economic development, and enhance quality of life factors for people living and working in the city, this can be achieved with access to modern digital infrastructure.

#### Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

#### Housing

Potential positive impacts:

- The devolution deal will see a partnership with Homes England and the agreement of a pipeline of housing development. This will include a focus on affordable housing which could be of particular benefit to young adults or those seeking to move closer to employment opportunities.
- GLs housing asks have the ambition of enabling the possibility of home ownership to reach as many people as possible. This comes through the development of more affordable housing through collaboration with the private sector.

Consultation findings:

- 1,957 responses were received on the consultation question from 25–64-year-olds:
  - o 1,040 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 650 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to housing would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Older people**

There is an ageing population in GL, with more people than ever before in the older age groups. 23%, (249,000) of the population in 2021 were aged 65 years and over, up from 20% (206,000) in 2011. The size of the population aged 90 years and over (11,100 or 1.0% of the population) has increased since 2011, when 8,800 or 1% were aged 90 and over<sup>14</sup>.

22% of consultation respondents were 65-74, and 11% were 75 or above which exceeds the 2021 census figure of 23% in GL for this age group. This would suggest a significant amount of interest in devolution from this group.

Employment and skills

Potential positive impacts:

- Older workers looking to regain employment or to progress their skills, will also benefit from the devolution of an adult education budget.

Consultation findings:

- In relation to jobs and business growth the over 65 age group 1,260 responded to the question.
  - o 618 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 423 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- In relation to education and training, 1,255 responses were received.
  - o 670 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 414 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- No further additional positive implication themes were found in relation to this age group.

<sup>14</sup> [Greater Lincolnshire Census 2021 summary](#)

## Environment

### Potential positive impacts:

- Older people are known to be most at risk from climate related effects such as exposure to air pollution and overheating. In the past two decades, heat-related deaths among people aged 65 and above have almost doubled globally, reaching approximately 300,000 deaths in 2018. The 2022 European summer resulted in 9,226 heat-related deaths among people aged 65-79 years with an increase to 36,848 deaths for those aged 80 and over<sup>15</sup>. Devolution to GL and the opportunities this presents to expand our renewable energy capacity and develop carbon capture technology locally, will help to mitigate these effects and give older people a greener environment to help them live healthily for longer.

### Consultation findings:

- The consultation process saw 1,255 responses from people aged 65 and over.
  - o 669 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 412 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- No further common themes of possible positive results were identified from this age group.

## Transport

### Potential positive impacts:

- In GL we want investment in public transport connectivity and infrastructure so that it no longer holds back our economy, with improvements reducing isolation and loneliness for our more vulnerable residents.

The asks of the GL devolution deal want to see a planned approach to strategic and long-term investment for transport which will be achieved effectively with decision makers, funders and influencers and help deliver for all our residents including the older age group. Improved transport will also give greater access to healthcare, reduce isolation and improve independence for GL's older population.

- 'Addressing transportation challenges, especially in rural and coastal areas, is crucial to promote social inclusion and wellbeing for older individuals in Lincolnshire' according to the Director of Public Health's 2023 annual report. Adding that 'Ensuring accessible, affordable, and safe public transport is essential to support active, healthy ageing, community engagement, and access to essential services<sup>16</sup>.'

### Consultation findings:

- In relation to transport 1,261 responses were received from the 65 and over aged group.
  - o 685 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 436 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Consultation respondents suggested that the proposal would see improvements that would benefit the elderly population by increasing access to various locations across GL, enhancing their well-being.

	<p>Digital</p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to reliable high-speed digital connections could have a positive impact on older people since it will allow them to stay connected to friends and family. Improved digital connectivity allows for the development of more smart homes, with assistance around the home that will allow older people to stay and manage in their own homes for longer and avoid having to move into specialist facilities or care homes.</li> <li>- The Director of Public Health’s 2023 annual report says that ‘25% of over 65s do not currently use the internet, the Lincolnshire Digital Inclusion Group is working to reduce this inequality. But also highlights that ‘barriers to good digital communication are fourfold: lack of digital skills, inadequate digital infrastructure, affordability, and physical or sensory disability. Age is not a barrier in itself.’</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.</li> </ul> <p>Housing</p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation, net zero target control and energy security that form part of the proposal will reduce costs, helping those older people currently living in fuel poverty. In 2022, the Centre for Ageing Better reported that an estimated 2.5million over 60s would be in fuel poverty in 2023<sup>17</sup>.</li> <li>- Excess winter deaths are highest among older people. Housing is a known wider determinant of health and therefore providing decent, efficient homes can improve health and reduce negative outcomes for this group in particular.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1,257 responses were submitted from this age group as part of the consultation on housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 581 strongly agreed or agreed.</li> <li>o 493 strongly disagreed or disagreed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- No additional possible positive implication themes from the over 65s were identified.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic relating to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environment</li> <li>- Employment and skills</li> <li>- Transport</li> <li>- Digital</li> </ul>

- Housing

which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.

The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,680 respondents gave a view with 16% of those who responded to this question suggesting that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 20% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.

Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents
Disability	16%	43%	20%	22%	3,680

Further analysis has been completed to understand the impact as a result of disability where this information has been provided by respondents. However, it should be noted that many of the comments were general and not specific to a protected characteristic. The analysis highlighted:

*“In relation to disabled members of the population, respondents supported the proposed improvements to health and care services along with expanded transport links.”*

On the topic of devolution there was significant difference in the responses between those with a disability and those without. As highlighted within the consultation analysis report, 28% expressed that the devolution proposal would have a negative impact on individuals with disabilities (compared to 16% of respondents with no disability).

A total of 3,788 responses were received on the question regarding whether or not they had a disability.

- 2,748 (73%) did not have a disability,
- 646 (17%) did disclose a disability,
- 394 (10%) preferred not to say.

The narrative in the themes below will explore the statistics further and potential impacts for this protected characteristic group.

The consultation approached disability categorisation in a different way to that reflected in the Census Data. Rather than the severity of the disability itself, the consultation allowed respondents to categorise their disability/disabilities. Respondents could tick multiple boxes. Options included:

- physical
- learning
- sensory mental health.

The following figures include respondents who listed multiple disabilities which is why the overall figure will not add up to the 646 listed above.

- 450 respondents said that they had a form of physical disability.
- 123 respondents cited a mental health disability.
- 59 a form of learning disability and 143 with a sensory impairment.

## Employment and Skills

### Potential positive impacts:

- A more comprehensive industry led approach to GL's careers service will lead to a higher awareness of jobs that can be performed by those with different abilities. This is of particular importance within GL as there is a higher rate of disability than the national level, with GL having a total of 211,250 people having a form of disability which either limits them a little or a lot<sup>18</sup>. This equates to 19% of the population of the area and therefore above the national figure of 18%.
- Being able to innovatively use funding will open more possibilities to direct resources to tackle employment barriers for people with disabilities. East Lindsey is the area where the highest percentage of the population had a form of disability, with 22%, which translates to 31,591 people. South Kesteven saw the lowest figure in relation to this with 17% of the population or 24,521 residents<sup>19</sup>.
- Within the area of GL, all three upper tier local authorities have a higher-than-average figure for the disability employment gap in 2022/23. Lincolnshire at 28%, North Lincolnshire at 34% and North East Lincolnshire at 29% are all higher than the UK figure of 28%<sup>20</sup>. The devolution proposal to work with Government to test and design viable solutions to workforce challenges would provide significant benefit to those with a disability as they traditionally face greater workforce challenges. The pilot will include supporting those with a disability into the teaching workforce from industry. In addition, it could support carers of those with a disability to overcome workforce challenges.

### Consultation findings:

- With regards to Jobs and Business Growth 645 responses were received:
  - o 338 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 192 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 59 respondents with a learning disability,
  - o 36 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 11 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 123 respondents with a mental health disability,
  - o 71 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 30 strongly disagreed or disagreed
- Of the 449 declaring a physical disability,
  - o 229 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 142 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 143 respondents citing a sensory impairment disability,
  - o 74 strongly agreed or agreed
  - o 47 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- On the second question on education and training 642 responses were received.
  - o 359 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 192 strongly disagreed or disagreed.



- 84 neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Of the 59 respondents with a learning disability,
  - 40 strongly agreed or agreed
  - 12 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 123 respondents with a mental health disability,
  - 76 strongly agreed or agreed
  - 33 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 450 declaring a physical disability,
  - 241 strongly agreed or agreed
  - 142 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Of the 143 respondents citing a sensory impairment disability,
  - 75 strongly agreed or agreed
  - 46 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- The figures above show that across disability groups there is broad support for the proposals on education and skills.

### **Transport**

#### Potential positive impacts:

- The devolution deal will positively impact those with disabilities in GL and help make their lives in terms of the journeys they make, as easy as possible. Devolution will present the ability to work with agencies and providers to improve the transport arrangements within Greater Lincolnshire over time, which will be of a significant benefit to those with disabilities.
- A multi-year transport infrastructure settlement devolved to local leaders will support the delivery of a joint local transport plan which covers road, rail, freight, public transport, walking and cycling and crucially help the large number of those in our area that are disadvantaged and help to make it as accessible as possible.

#### Consultation findings:

- 644 consultation responses from those with a disability were received in relation to the transport question.
  - 376 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - 206 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Respondents supported the proposed improvements to health and care services along with expanded transport links.
- Improvements to roads were also seen to benefit cyclists, older people and disabled people. Disabled respondents also called for safer road crossings.

### **Environment**

#### Potential positive impacts:

- Although it is recognised that there are significant environmental benefits to be gained by all through the devolution deal, it is believed unlikely that the devolution proposal will result in any significant impacts on people with this protected characteristic.

Consultation findings:

- 642 responses were received from people with declared disabilities.
  - o 365 strongly agreed or agreed.
  - o 193 strongly disagreed or disagreed.
- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to environment would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Digital**

Potential positive impacts:

- People with disabilities will benefit from improved digital connectivity through increased reliability of access, allowing them to stay connected more easily. Improved digital connectivity could open up more employment opportunities for people with disabilities as it gives them more flexible working options including the ability to work from home full time if they desire.
- People with any type of disability can also benefit from GL having further ability to develop more smart homes as a result of improved digital connectivity which will be supported by a devolution deal. For example, those with more minor care requirements could be aided by support through digital means, for instance where a carer may need to provide advisory help rather than physical assistance. This will also help to provide a more efficient care service and particularly help those with more complex needs.
- Digital improvements will allow people in some instances, to manage more easily around the home, have more choice over their living arrangements, and the ability to stay in their own homes for longer. This is particularly relevant in more isolated, rural areas where if digital connectivity can be improved and can be relied upon, help and assistance can more easily be provided but it will also ensure people can maintain independence for themselves.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Housing**

Potential positive impacts

- People with disabilities will benefit from investment in housing. This will see affordable, good quality accommodation be developed, which meet the latest standards for planning and housing development.

	<p>Consultation findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Analysis of the consultation responses suggested that the proposals could be more explicit about the impact on people with disabilities, with particular reference to a desire for new housing developments to include single level accommodation which people with disabilities require.</li> </ul>												
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of positive impacts across all areas which could benefit those that have this protected characteristic.</p> <p>The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,608 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of gender reassignment. 5% of those who responded to this question in relation to gender reassignment suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 13% who perceived a negative impact, with 54% suggesting no impact, as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 813 1528 981"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected characteristic</th> <th>Positive Impact</th> <th>No Impact</th> <th>Negative Impact</th> <th>Don't know</th> <th>Number of Respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gender reassignment</td> <td>5%</td> <td>54%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>3,608</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The consultation analysis did not identify any further themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are 1,924 people in GL who have a gender identity that is different to birth. In addition, a total of 4,082 people across the region either have a different gender identity to birth, are Transgender, Non-Binary or other gender identities. There were 709 Trans Women in GL in 2021 and 732 Trans Men. 422 Identified as non-Binary and 295 identified as Other<sup>21</sup>.</li> <li>- A high quality, industry led careers service as part of a devolution deal will help to encourage more diverse workforces and contribute to breaking down stereotypes which may exist in certain industries, therefore opening more career prospects for all.</li> <li>- The impact of being able to adapt and use innovative approaches to funding would mean we could target training to address any imbalance in the workforce in our local industries as there will be increased opportunities to train. This would be further supported by having flexibility with how the Adult Education Budget (AEB) is spent and would mean GL could target training to support adequate representation in relation to our local industries.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 7 responses were received from individuals who stated they have a different gender identity to their birth. The consultation analysis did not identify any further themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.</li> </ul>	Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents	Gender reassignment	5%	54%	13%	27%	3,608
Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents								
Gender reassignment	5%	54%	13%	27%	3,608								

<sup>21</sup> [Gender identity, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://www.ons.gov.uk/people-in-the-uk/population-and-demography/gender-identity)

<p><b>Marriage and civil partnership</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies that overall the proposal should benefit people across the area irrespective of their marital or civil partnership status.</p> <p>Consideration of this protected characteristic has been reviewed to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation. The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,677 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of marriage and civil partnership.</p> <p>8% of those who responded to this question in relation to marriage and civil partnership suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact this group, compared to 14% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 629 1528 797"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected characteristic</th> <th>Positive Impact</th> <th>No Impact</th> <th>Negative Impact</th> <th>Don't know</th> <th>Number of Respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Marriage and civil partnership</td> <td>8%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>3,677</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Analysis of the consultation did not identify any further themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.</p>	Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents	Marriage and civil partnership	8%	56%	14%	22%	3,677
Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents								
Marriage and civil partnership	8%	56%	14%	22%	3,677								
<p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>GL as of 2021 has a birth rate of 1.62 children per woman. The England and Wales figure was 1.61<sup>22</sup>.</p> <p>A Government Equalities Office Report from 2019 showed that nationally, fewer than one-in-five of all new mothers, and 29% of first-time mothers, return to full-time work in the first three years after maternity leave. This falls to 15% after five years<sup>23</sup>. It is important that any devolution deal for GL helps to improve these figures and make the workplace accessible for those returning.</p> <p>The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,451 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of pregnancy and maternity.</p> <p>10% of those who responded to this question in relation to pregnancy and maternity suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 14% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 1727 1528 1895"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected characteristic</th> <th>Positive Impact</th> <th>No Impact</th> <th>Negative Impact</th> <th>Don't know</th> <th>Number of Respondents</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pregnancy and maternity</td> <td>10%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>3,451</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Further analysis has been completed to understand the impact on pregnancy and maternity where this information has been provided by respondents. However, it should be noted that many of the comments were general and not specific to a protected characteristic. The analysis highlighted:</p>	Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents	Pregnancy and maternity	10%	51%	14%	24%	3,451
Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents								
Pregnancy and maternity	10%	51%	14%	24%	3,451								

*“respondents supported the proposed improvements to care and health services and improved transport.”*

### **Employment and Skills**

Potential positive impacts:

- The proposals for employment and skills may also benefit women who wish to re-enter employment after having a family. The use of devolved funds to shape and deliver a high quality, industry led GL careers service will provide more flexible opportunities and support for parents returning to work following a career break. Additionally, where retraining is needed for career switchers, innovative use of loans, allowances and funding rules along with the development of boot camps could support parents returning to work. This advantage will also be contributed to by flexible use of the Adult Education Budget (AEB).
- Working with Government to test and design viable solutions to the workforce challenges faced by further and adult education can help get residents moving from low value jobs that can be automated, into high value jobs.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation did not identify any common themes on how the approach to Employment and Skills would impact on this protected characteristic group.

### **Transport**

Potential positive impacts:

- A multi-year transport infrastructure settlement will allow GL to make the improvements necessary to public transport to assist pregnant women and those on maternity leave with young children to access better transport facilities and receive an improved service.
- The availability of good and reliable public transport can be particularly important for families which have no access to their own vehicle or to single vehicle owning households, to enable them to access services. The improved choice and availability of housing will also offer more flexibility for extended families.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to transport would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

### **Digital**

Potential positive impacts:

- Although not a replacement for in-person pregnancy and maternity care, improved digital connectivity in GL will help expectant and new mothers to access services where they are offered online to support the midwife and hospital care they receive in-person. Health visitor activities (where appropriate) could be delivered through a digital means, for example roles where the Health Visitor is acting in an advisory or review capacity where they do not need to see the child in person. An improved digital offer through devolution will help to improve the efficiency of the service on offer.

- This can help prevent them from having to travel long distances to clinics, especially if they live in rural areas. Services like online forums to ask questions to midwives and health care professionals can be made easier for people to access with reliable, high-speed connections and improved mobile network coverage.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

## Race

This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.

The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,669 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of race.

9% of those who responded to this question in relation to race suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 17% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.

Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents
Race	9%	51%	17%	22%	3,669

According to 2021 Census Data 10% (approximately 113,880) of the population belong to what would be identified as minority ethnic groups in GL which is much less than the England figure of 18%<sup>24</sup>. Those who identified as White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British across GL totalled 981,636 out of the total population of 1,095,000, a percentage of 90% in this group. Some areas have a distinctly higher representation of this group, with East Lindsey for example totalling 96% of its population. The lowest figure was seen in Boston with 75% of the population in this data set<sup>25</sup>.

Within the consultation, respondents identified

- o 3,167 as White (English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish or British)
- o 100 as alternative White Background
- o 23 as Asian or Asian British
- o 18 as Black or Black British
- o 43 as Mixed Race
- o 24 as Other Ethnic Groups

Black or Black British respondents were most likely to believe that devolution would have a positive impact (22%). Respondents that identified as White were least likely to believe the proposals would have a negative impact (15%), compared to 17% of those identifying as Black or Black British, 23% of those identifying as Mixed, and 26% of those identifying as Asian or Asian British.

Further analysis has been completed to understand the impact on different groups where this information has been provided by respondents. However, it should be noted that many of the comments were general and not specific to a protected characteristic. The analysis highlighted:

c group, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk)

<sup>25</sup> [Ethnic group, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

*“respondents hoped that devolution would attract individuals from diverse ethnic and religious backgrounds, contributing to a more multicultural environment. In addition, respondents called for more diverse governance boards to ensure effective representation and inclusive decision-making processes.”*

**Employment and Skills**

Potential positive impacts:

- It is the ambition that the proposal will help to encourage more diverse workforces and open more career prospects for all. There is an opportunity through a more aligned careers service, led by industry, to ensure that there is a greater understanding of which sectors are actively trying to increase their BAME representation. The opportunity to use devolved funds to work with DfE to shape and deliver a high-quality industry led careers service, will support this. This provides the opportunity to increase the diversity of the area.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to employment and skills would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group. More generally some respondents hoped that devolution would attract individuals from diverse ethnic and religious backgrounds, contributing to a more multicultural environment.

**Environment**

Potential positive impacts:

- It is important that the engineering and other sectors within GL is made more diverse and accommodates all groups of people since currently this is not the case on a wide scale. The asks within the devolution deal particularly around the development of the infrastructure to enable carbon capture and storage innovation and the development of the renewable energy sector in GL, presents a unique opportunity to do this in a way which promotes accessibility for the long term. This will help to give people from minority ethnic groups more opportunities to forge a career in this sector.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to environment would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Religion or belief**

This equality impact analysis identifies that overall the proposal should benefit people across the area irrespective of their religion or belief. The analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic relating to which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.

The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,659 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of religion or belief.

7% of those who responded to this question in relation to religion or belief suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 15% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.

Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents
Religion or belief	7%	55%	15%	23%	3,659

Very few respondents discussed the impact of devolution on their religion or belief. The consultation analysis did not identify any further themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

When analysing religion, more people in GL define themselves as being religious compared to those who do not. 596,727 said that they were affiliated to a form of religion. This is equal to approximately 54% of the entire population<sup>26</sup>.

The total of non-religious people was 432,787 which is 40% and is just above the England and Wales figure of 37%<sup>27</sup>.

- 572,106 Christians, (96% of the entire religious community in GL)<sup>28</sup>.
- 11,534 Muslims,
- 2,647 Buddhists,
- 3,337 Hindus,
- 623 Jewish Population,
- 1,430 Sikhs,
- 5,050 Other religion<sup>29</sup>.

The consultation process saw respondents declare a religion that they affiliate with:

- 1,710 were Christians,
- 18 were Muslim,
- 11 were Buddhist,
- 2 were Hindu,
- 14 were Jewish,
- 2 were Sikhs and
- 64 said they were of another form of religion.

### Transport

Potential positive impacts:

- Improved transport would enhance connectivity for different groups to their religious communities, which a multi-year transport infrastructure settlement will be able to contribute to, as we want this to cover road, rail, freight, public transport, walking and cycling, so that there is accessibility for all. Improved transport could improve connectivity to religious communities, particularly in rural areas.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to transport would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

### Digital

Potential positive impacts:

<sup>29</sup> Religion, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk)



- The improved digital connectivity that will be made possible through the devolution asks could benefit people who practice a religion as it will give them the ability to connect more easily with people of the same faith both locally and further afield. The ability to do this is a positive benefit as not all people are able to attend a place of worship.
  - Improved digital connectivity will also allow places of worship to connect with people and make them aware of community worship, events, without having to find the funds to do so as they will have the opportunity to spread their message at low cost online.
- Consultation findings:
- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to digital would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Sex**

This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential positive impacts on this protected characteristic relating to which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.

The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,693 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of gender.

10% of those who responded to this question in relation to gender suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 16% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below. Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents
Sex	10%	52%	16%	21%	3,693

The gender pay gap within the East Midlands in 2022 stood at 12%. This is much lower than the levels of 1997 where the figure was 21% (full-time employees)<sup>30</sup>. This figure is higher than the 2022 UK figure of 8%<sup>31</sup>.

A devolution deal has the potential to help aid the reduction of the gender pay gap through the availability of more skilled jobs, greater training opportunities and re-skilling. A place-based and joined-up approach to careers education locally will allow GL to further develop a specialised local offer which encourages all sexes into our key sectors (such as engineering and manufacturing). These sectors are in need of skilled individuals.

These skills-based proposals will help to get more women into higher paid jobs in the long-term and help to reduce the pay gap locally.

Within GL, gender is almost evenly split across the entire area, the figures are 536,952 for Males and 558,058 for Females which is an approximate split of 49% Male and 51% Female which directly matches the national average for England and Wales<sup>32</sup>.

Within the consultation results, 1,411 respondents identified as female and 2,031 as male.

<sup>32</sup> Sex - Office for National Statistics ([ons.gov.uk](https://ons.gov.uk))

**Employment and Skills**

Potential positive impacts:

- A high quality, industry led careers service will help to encourage more diverse workforces and contribute to local industries as there will be increased opportunities to train. This would be further supported by having flexibility with how the Adult Education Budget (AEB) is spent and would mean we could target training to support adequate representation in relation to our local industries.
- The use of Skills Bootcamps to target less represented groups will lead to more choice for our residents and therefore more fulfilling careers for all genders.

Consultation findings:

- Analysis of the consultation responses did not identify any common themes on how the approach to employment and skills would impact on this protected characteristic group.

**Sexual orientation**

This equality impact analysis identifies that overall the proposal should benefit people across the area irrespective of their sexual orientation.

Consideration of this protected characteristic has been reviewed to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation. The consultation survey asked respondents whether they believed that the proposal would have a positive or negative impact on individuals because of a protected characteristic. 3,645 respondents gave a view as to whether an impact would be seen as a result of sexual orientation. 6% of those who responded to this question in relation to sexual orientation suggested that the proposals would have a positive impact on this group, compared to 14% who perceived a negative impact, as shown below.

Analysis of the consultation did not identify any further themes on how the proposal would potentially impact on this protected characteristic group.

Protected characteristic	Positive Impact	No Impact	Negative Impact	Don't know	Number of Respondents
Sexual orientation	6%	56%	14%	23%	3,645

The Census 2021 information confirms that 24,207 people identified with an LGB+ orientation (“Gay or Lesbian”, “Bisexual” or “Other sexual orientation”). 815,857 people in GL who answered said that they were straight or heterosexual.

Within the final consultation results,

- o 2,856 said that they were Heterosexual or Straight,
- o 102 identified as Gay or Lesbian,
- o 84 identified as Bisexual,

- 661 preferred not to say.

Respondents that identified as bisexual and gay or lesbian were most likely to believe devolution would have a negative impact (24% and 23% respectively). This compared to 11% among respondents that identified as heterosexual or straight.

These results suggest that there is some scepticism among certain sexual orientation groups. However, there was no overwhelming suggestion from this protected characteristic group that there would be a specific positive or negative impact.

## Positive impacts – other groups

If you have identified positive impacts for other groups not specifically covered by the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010 you can include them here if it will help the decision maker to make an informed decision.

Other group	Positive impacts
<b>Business community</b>	<p>The Proposal specifically aims to help generate and improve the area’s economy to attract financial investment, improve skills and address skills shortages. It also seeks to ensure that land, resources and transport are improved to support investment by the private sector in GL.</p> <p>This is intended to support the expansion and development of businesses and industry, modernising the area’s economy and making it more competitive. Dependent upon the different approaches which are taken, this could mean that individual businesses and sectors of the economy receive financial and other support, as well as investment.</p> <p>This will also be the case for housing developers and contractors stemming from the housing related priorities.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development of an industry led GL careers service will lead to people thriving in a career that is better for them and the area and will clearly lead to benefits for the local economy and business community.</li> <li>- The connections between learning, training and employment will be enhanced and the requirements of the business community are much more likely to be met. Subsequently there will be increased potential to attract more business to the area as they will know that innovative approaches are being used to meet demand.</li> <li>- With the economic difficulties faced within the area of GL at the same time as the exciting opportunities which exist moving forward, the proposals relating to employment and skills have the opportunity to drive a significant positive impact on the business community.</li> <li>- Many of our key sectors are already struggling to recruit and the predicted growth in our game changing sectors means that that the gap will widen further. By having a GL careers service and greater AEB flexibility we can work with our businesses to develop talent pipelines.</li> <li>- The opportunities outlined in our prospectus, in the energy sector, our ports and the UK Food Valley, have the potential, collectively, to create over 50,000 brand new jobs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o UK’s Food Valley: ambition to deliver 11,000 jobs by 2030 (Local Skills Report 2022<sup>33</sup>)</li> <li>o Humber Freeport: ambition to deliver on 7,000 jobs by 2040 (Local Skills Report 2022)</li> <li>o Energy through maximising offshore wind, decarbonisation, and hydrogen opportunities, to create over 32,000 jobs by 2040 across the Humber (Offshore to create approx. 10,000 by 2030; taken from Humber Offshore Wind Cluster)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>33</sup> [Greater Lincolnshire Local Skills Report January 2022.pdf \(greaterlincolnshirelep.co.uk\)](https://www.greaterlincolnshirelep.co.uk/Local-Skills-Report-2022.pdf)

Other group	Positive impacts
	<p>(Decarbonisation 22,800 by 2040, from Humber Industrial Cluster Plan<sup>34</sup>).</p> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On question one of the consultation regarding new jobs and business growth, 54 replied on behalf of a business, 33 replied on behalf of local government, and 70 replied as ‘other’ categories. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 56% of business were supportive in this area.</li> <li>o 33% also expressed an opinion that disagreed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- On the second question on education and training, 55 replied on behalf of a business, 33 replied on behalf of local government, and 69 replied as ‘other’ categories. Across all respondent categories, the majority of respondents agreed with the proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Those replying on behalf of businesses showed wide scale support for the proposal at 65%.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>These results show that the business community is broadly supportive of the approach being taken for employment and Skills.</p> <p><b>Nature</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal to develop the Lincolnshire Food Security and Natural Capital Delivery Group will support biodiversity and agriculture in protected landscapes for a number of years. The new Environmental Land Management Scheme and Biodiversity Net Gain are opportunities to provide new funding in this area. This group will help ensure a strategic overview is achieved and best practice from the Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) informs projects across the rest of GL therefore serving to benefit the business community in GL.</li> <li>- The strengthening of partnerships between GL and government agencies is key to delivering more coherent and better outcomes and to assist in finding the right balance between economic growth and protecting and enhancing our natural assets.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Around 45% of employment in GL is in businesses with fewer than 50 employees, far higher than the national figure<sup>35</sup>. The devolution deal looks to specifically help SME’s (Small and Medium-sized Enterprises) through piloting an investment model which incentivises the switch to low or non-carbon energy models, the cost of which could be prohibitive otherwise. The ability to switch to low or non-carbon energy models will have positive consequences for the environment and give</li> </ul>

<sup>34</sup> [Talkbook portrait template \(humberindustrialclusterplan.org\)](http://humberindustrialclusterplan.org)

<sup>35</sup> [Analysis of enterprises in the UK by SME employment size band for specified unitary and local authorities in the East Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber regions and LEPS 2022 - Office for National Statistics](#)

Other group	Positive impacts
	<p>SME's the ability to trade with larger organisations seeking green supply chains allowing them to grow, provide more jobs and invest in the future.</p> <p>Consultation Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question 5 of the consultation look at the proposals ambitions for the environment. 55 replied on behalf of a business, 33 replied on behalf of local government, and 72 replied as 'other' categories. Those replying as 'other' showed the highest levels of agreement (79%) and the lowest levels of disagreement with the proposals (15%). Following this, 67% of those replying on behalf of local government and businesses expressed agreement, as well as 56% of individuals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Digital</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Businesses in GL are currently hampered by poor digital connectivity and mobile phone signals. Through devolution, this problem can be tackled in a much shorter timescale which will enable businesses to improve productivity. Greater availability of high-speed connectivity will also drive business growth, innovation, and sustainability which in turn, will attract businesses and skilled people to invest in the area as they will have access to excellent high speed digital technology. Improvements in digital infrastructure in GL will also contribute to improved movement of goods across the UK from the ports and field to support the UK economy which will bring wider benefits to businesses and communities.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p>
<p><b>Armed Forces Community (Veterans, reservists and those still serving)</b></p>	<p>Approximately 59,500 GL residents have served in the armed forces (7% of the eligible population) as of 2021<sup>36</sup>; one of the highest figures in the UK and significantly higher than the UK number of 4%.</p> <p>Given the commitment of the constituent authorities to the Armed Forces Covenant and the recent introduction of the Armed Forces Public Duties, the MCCA is expected to engage with this community and ensure that within its functions, it takes account of the duties, especially those relating to employment and housing.</p> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Traditionally there has always been Armed Forces presence in GL and there is a significant Armed Forces Community with specific needs to support them.</p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An industry led GL Careers service will lead to people thriving and will provide the Armed Forces community with more career options. This is particularly the case for those who are leaving the forces and will serve to open opportunities that may not have been available. In addition, the Adult Education Budget (AEB) will be of particular importance to adults from a variety of</li> </ul>

<sup>36</sup> [UK armed forces veterans, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

Other group	Positive impacts
	<p>marginalised groups such as veterans and should make a significant impact on their choices and future development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A number of proposals, including the availability of greater opportunities for accessing alternative high-level qualifications in the area’s priority economic areas, as opposed to university, and the development of bespoke apprenticeship arrangements may be of particular value to the Armed Forces community. These proposals have the potential to create opportunities that otherwise might not be available to them by widening participation, access to training and subsequent highly skilled jobs that they may not have previously known about. Additionally, skills bootcamps will support further widening of participation and will support those adults without Level 3 qualifications to train in an in-demand sector.</li> <li>- Although the whole area has significant proportions classed as part of the Armed Forces Community, North Kesteven had the second highest figure for percentage of the population that had served in any of the UK Armed Forces nationwide, at 10% or 10,009 people<sup>37</sup>. Through devolved funds, the creation of skills programmes specific to local need with greater alignment between services, will benefit individuals that are unemployed where they currently have several service providers with similar offers.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p> <p><b>Nature</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is recognised that the positive impacts on wellbeing created by the availability of great natural environments could serve to benefit those groups known to suffer higher levels of distress and ill health. Having a variety of accessible wildlife sites that are well promoted is important for improving the wellbeing of all people.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p>
<b>Deprived communities</b>	<p>In North East Lincolnshire, 19.0% of the population was income-deprived in 2019, this is approximately 29,800 residents. Of the 106 neighbourhoods in North East Lincolnshire, 42 were among the top 20% most income deprived in England. North East Lincolnshire overall ranks 26<sup>th</sup> most income deprived out of all the 316 local authority areas in England. Of the 57 neighbourhoods in the Lincoln local authority area, 19 of these were in the top 20% most income deprived in England and Lincoln overall ranked 66<sup>th</sup> most income deprived. East Lindsey also ranked highly on this list (56/316), meaning it has high levels of income deprivation<sup>38</sup>.</p> <p>The proposal should specifically impact positively on people living in the area’s poorest and deprived communities, and it would be expected that significant focus is placed, especially within skills related activities, transport, and housing on improving opportunities for people from these communities.</p>

<sup>37</sup> [UK armed forces veterans, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

<sup>38</sup> [Exploring local income deprivation \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

Other group	Positive impacts
	<p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>There are significant areas of deprivation within the GL area and the importance of employment and skills to make a difference cannot be understated.</p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The greater alignment of a careers service which means better access to training and support to employment, can help to make a positive impact upon the levels of deprivation within GL. The Adult Education Budget (AEB) will be of particular importance to adults from a variety of marginalised groups, including those from deprived communities. The proposal works to provide greater opportunities for access to careers and to improve the availability of alternative high-level qualifications.</li> <li>- Those in deprived areas often lack qualifications and a range of proposals seek to address this including skills bootcamps, creating skills programmes specific to local need and widening participation in apprenticeships to those without Level 3 qualifications, will serve to greatly improve the life chances and options available. Additionally, a total of 45,500 children under the age of 16 in GL were living in relative low-income families in 2022. This equates to an average figure across all local authorities of 25% in GL. These figures were high across almost all areas, particularly Lincoln 31%, East Lindsey 31% and Boston 31%<sup>39</sup>.</li> <li>- Specifically in relation to younger people, the improved access to training and support to employment will lead to those from deprived communities being able to access more flexible opportunities for their own development.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p> <p><b>Nature</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Having a variety of accessible wildlife sites that are well promoted is important for improving the wellbeing of all people. Innovation and net zero targets that form part of the proposal will stabilise energy security and reduce costs, which will also likely impact families on lower incomes.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p> <p><b>Digital</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p>

<sup>39</sup> [Children in low income families: local area statistics - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/children-in-low-income-families-local-area-statistics)



Other group	Positive impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In a similar way to businesses in GL, deprived communities are also hampered by poor digital connectivity and mobile phone signals. Deprived communities, particularly in rural areas will benefit from the many and varied improvements realised by faster fixed line and mobile connectivity. Through devolution, powers over infrastructure and resources could be held locally to create investment in infrastructure, accelerate growth and level up opportunities for all. Improved digital connectivity will open up opportunities for deprived communities through easier access to services to support them and improved opportunities to make their voices heard and collaborate on the things that will make the biggest difference to their lives.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p>
<b>Visitors</b>	<p>Those visiting GL will be offered better public transport infrastructure and connectivity which will also benefit local businesses.</p> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group.</p>
<b>Digitally Excluded</b>	<p>Most parts of GL are classified as rural. People living with a disability have been identified as more likely to be digitally excluded and many of these people, including people with severe mental illness, already experience health inequalities.</p> <p>According to Quickline’s spring update in 2023, they deployed ultrafast fixed wireless access broadband to 4000 rural premises in postcode areas prefixed by LN and DN. By the end of 2023, this number will rise to 8000 and devolution has the potential to accelerate this further<sup>40</sup>. It is also important to consider that older people are more likely to be digitally excluded. The proposal will encourage further investment in digital infrastructure in ultrafast broadband and 5G that GL needs for the future, ensuring that within the region, digital connectivity improves.</p> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The devolution of the Adult Education Budget (AEB) aims to widen participation of those furthest from the labour market. This may include supporting those that are digitally excluded by flexing the funding rules to support people's access to digital training offers.</li> <li>- Digital skills are part of the core AEB entitlement offer and will remain free for adults to access.</li> <li>- Having an open access careers service, that is face to face rather than website based, will help to support those that are digitally excluded by having a contact that can support and signpost them to the training that they may need.</li> </ul>

<sup>40</sup> [Rural Broadband Update: Postcodes LN and DN Areas – Lincolnshire County Council](#)

Other group	Positive impacts
	<p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p>
<p><b>Coastal or rural communities</b></p>	<p>In 2021, the then Chief Medical Officer highlighted deprivation issues in coastal towns and the impact of this on physical and mental health. As well as experiencing poorer health, higher disability rates and shorter life expectancy, access to healthcare was also limited by a lack of skilled staff and services. There were 15% fewer postgraduate medical trainees, 15% fewer consultants and 7% fewer nurses per patient in coastal towns when compared with the national figures.<sup>41</sup></p> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The devolution of the Adult Education Budget in conjunction with an aligned careers service, aims to ensure that those in our rural and coastal communities can benefit from the same learning and career opportunities as the rest of GL.</li> <li>- Some providers are unable to reach those in smaller communities due to the viability of funding small, remote classes. Devolution would enable the MCCA to flex the funding rules of certain courses or for certain geographies to ensure equality of provision.</li> <li>- The current fragmentation of the careers service means that the access to high quality careers guidance is limited for our rural and coastal residents, and aligning this service to a GL Careers service aims to increase access for these groups.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p> <p><b>Nature</b></p> <p>Potential positive impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development of a Coastal Partnership for GL will bring together the many interest groups along the coast in GL and serve to benefit coastal communities within GL.</li> </ul> <p>The consultation process did not produce any applicable evidence for the potential positive impacts for this group set out in this theme.</p>

<sup>41</sup> [Chief Medical Officer's Annual Report 2021 - Health in Coastal Communities \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)



## Adverse or negative impacts

Protected characteristic	Response
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential negative impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>Overall 28% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 27 young people believe devolution will have a negative impact on them,</li> <li>- 442 working-age respondents believe devolution will have a negative impact on them,</li> <li>- 380 respondents over the age of 65 believe devolution will have a negative impact on them.</li> </ul> <p>Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the proposals would have a potential negative impact by age. The consultation analysis highlighted that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“concerns were raised regarding the extent and quality of transport connections between rural and urban areas. In addition to transport-related issues, respondents called for the greater representation of younger and older members of the population in government structures. Further suggestions were raised regarding increased investment into social care for the elderly population due to rising demands and pressure faced by the sector.”</p> <p><b>Employment and skills</b></p> <p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst no specific decisions have yet been made about where investment will occur to generate employment opportunities or in education and improving skills, those who have retired or retired early and are seeking a return to work may be disadvantaged if the focus is overly placed on providing employment and skills opportunities for young and working-aged people.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respondents generally wanted some areas of the proposal relating to employment and skills to go further. However, there was overall support for the current approach in the way that it seeks to make improvement within this key area and there weren't any specific patterns of concerns raised by particular age groups on how in its current form the proposal document would negatively impact Employment and Skills.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on older people but offer provide useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when developing future policy, particularly in delivering the adult education function</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on age expressed concerns around the extent and quality of existing transport connections between rural and urban areas but provided a positive narrative around the ambitions set out in the proposal. Poor quality connections could limit access to education and training, as well as preventing access to services.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal seeks to improve transport connectivity and provide the funding platform for investment decisions to be taken that could address these concerns.</li> </ul> <p><b>Digital</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst there are many benefits to greater digital connectivity, not all ages have the skills and confidence to use digital technology to its full advantage and those in older age groups may feel they are being left behind and feel more excluded. This needs to be researched further and understood so that skills gaps can be identified, and people can be signposted to programmes to help them improve their skills, to enable all ages to realise the benefits of improved digital inclusion.</li> <li>- Younger and/or people on lower incomes may be adversely impacted due to increases in the cost-of living resulting in them having difficulty affording the digital technology. This will need to be further researched and understood in terms of locations and scale of this problem.</li> </ul> <p>Digital connectivity wasn't a concern raised within the consultation.</p> <p><b>Adult Social Care</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> <li>- Through the consultation process suggestions were raised regarding increased investment into social care for the elderly population due to rising demands and pressure faced by the sector.</li> </ul>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adult social care falls outside of the scope of the devolution proposal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqIA.</li> <li>- Through the consultation process suggestions respondents commenting on age called for the greater representation of younger and older members of the population in government structures.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by age.</li> <li>- The ability to stand for election onto local government structures is open to all adults.</li> <li>- The Committee structure of the proposed GLCCA will provide opportunities to co-opt or engage a range of voices that can provide additional expertise in delivering its functions.</li> </ul>
<b>Disability</b>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>Overall, when considering the ambitions in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 people with a learning disability felt devolution would have a negative impact on them.</li> <li>- 28 people with a mental health disability felt devolution would have a negative impact on them.</li> <li>- 35 people with a sensory impairment felt devolution would have a negative impact on them.</li> <li>- 138 people with a physical disability felt devolution would have a negative impact on them.</li> </ul> <p>No significant difference in responses was observed between those that reported a disability and those that reported no disability.</p> <p>Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the proposals would have a potential negative impact by age. The consultation analysis highlighted that:</p> <p><i>“the needs of people with disabilities should be more carefully considered throughout the consultation. For housing, respondents called for more single-level accommodation such as bungalows. In relation to transport, the need for safer crossings was emphasised. Regarding education, it was suggested that Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) should become an integral part of training and education. More</i></p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p><i>training and understanding of non-visible disabilities were also suggested by respondents.”</i></p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on disability suggested that Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) should become an integral part of training and education. More training and understanding of non-visible disabilities were also suggested by respondents.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SEND falls outside of the scope of the devolution proposal.</li> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by disability but provide useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when collaborating with other public service providers and when developing future policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on disability identified a need for safer crossings was emphasised.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by disability but provide useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when developing future policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on disability identified a need for more single-level accommodation such as bungalows.</li> </ul>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by disability but provide useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when developing future policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Digital</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- People with disabilities are identified as more likely to be digitally excluded.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications or mitigations for this protected characteristic group.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns weren't raised directly in the consultation on this issue but it will continue to be closely monitored as the process progresses.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>13% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of gender reassignment.</p> <p>The consultation analysis did not highlight any themes commenting on the impact on this protected characteristic.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuing misunderstanding means that some may not wish to participate or feel able to benefit from devolution. YouGov data (working alongside the charity Stonewall) from 2018 shows that one in eight (12%) trans people had been attacked in work. Almost a third of non-binary people (31%) and one in five trans people (18%)<sup>42</sup> don't feel able to wear work attire representing their gender expression. There is a possibility that heterosexual people might benefit more from changes resulting from devolution.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications or mitigations for this protected characteristic group.</li> </ul>

<sup>42</sup> [lgbt in britain work report.pdf \(stonewall.org.uk\)](https://www.stonewall.org.uk/resources/reports/lgbt-in-britain-work-report.pdf)



Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When more detailed decisions are taken, people whose gender is not the same as was assigned at birth are seen as a priority group within the work and projects to support employment, skills and qualifications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the reasons highlighted by data in the employment and skills section above, some people might not feel comfortable taking part in face-to-face consultation.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications or mitigations for this protected characteristic group.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation reached out to minority communities via organisations representing their interests to allow people to feel more comfortable taking part in engagement on devolution. The use of inclusive, non-judgemental venues ensured people could feel welcome, and to try and make sure no one felt they would face ridicule or discrimination. An online engagement and telephone offer was also available if people decided not to join face-to-face events so that everyone had the opportunity to express their views in their preferred way.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Marriage and civil partnership</b></p>	<p>No potential negative impacts have been identified for this protected characteristic.</p> <p>Through the Devolution consultation, 14% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of marriage and civil partnership.</p> <p>Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the proposals would have a potential negative impact by age. The consultation analysis:</p> <p><i>"critiqued the lack of focus on 'single parents' as a protected characteristic."</i></p> <p>It was believed unlikely prior to the consultation, that the proposal will result in adverse impact or any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic in any theme areas, and the consultation results did not raise any additional concerns.</p>
<p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p>No potential negative impacts were identified for this protected characteristic as part of the original equality impact assessment.</p> <p>Through the Devolution consultation, 14% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of pregnancy and maternity. Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the proposals would have a potential negative impact by pregnancy and maternity. The consultation analysis highlighted that:</p> <p><i>"respondents also expressed concerns about the impact of lockdown on children's education. It was recommended that additional support should be provided to children and their</i></p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p><i>teachers in managing anxiety and mental health. Respondents furthermore raised concerns around the lack of sufficient funding for maternity services, given current pressures on the health system.”</i></p> <p><b>Impacts of lockdown on children’s education</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on pregnancy and maternity referenced the impact of lockdown on children’s education and proposed that additional support should be provided to children and their teachers in managing anxiety and mental health</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education and mental health services falls outside of the scope of the devolution proposal.</li> <li>- The devolution proposal is not the cause of this potential negative impact and the comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by pregnancy and maternity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sufficient funding for maternity services</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqlA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Through the consultation process respondents commenting on pregnancy and maternity raised concerns around the lack of sufficient funding for maternity services, given current pressures on the health system.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maternity services falls outside of the scope of the devolution proposal.</li> </ul> <p>It is believed unlikely, that the proposal will result in adverse impact or any type of prohibited conduct upon people with this protected characteristic in any theme areas.</p>
<b>Race</b>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic relating to which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>17% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of race. Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>proposals would have a potential negative impact by Race. The consultation analysis also highlighted:</p> <p><i>“concerns around the conflation of the terms race and ethnicity in the consultation due to their conceptual differences.”</i></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decisions are currently made centrally, based on national populations which are more diverse than Lincolnshire. Moving decision making closer to local people can benefit a majority, but misconceptions and lack of awareness/understanding could unintentionally disadvantage some cultures.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On specific theme areas within the consultation, no patterns emerged from those in this protected characteristic group as to how and why the proposal could negatively impact them.</li> <li>- Concerns were raised regarding the conflation of the terms race and ethnicity in the consultation due to their conceptual differences. In addition, respondents called for more diverse governance boards to ensure effective representation and inclusive decision-making processes.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed GLCCA will be subject to Section 149 of the Equalities Act which requires a public authority to have due regard to the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act</li> <li>o Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share those characteristics</li> <li>o Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The terminology used in the impact question refers to race and ethnicity (with the latter in brackets). As identified in the Equality Act 2010, race is one of the nine protected characteristics. It refers to a group of people defined by their colour, nationality (including citizenship), ethnic or national origins. The government’s preferred style recommends using ethnicity and not race. This is because ethnicity is more commonly used within diversity questionnaires in the UK and using consistent terms helps people to understand our data.</li> </ul> <p>We have used an ethnic group question as recommended by ONS for use on a survey in England. Ethnic groups have been defined through equality case law and Census</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>classification. Ethnic groupings are useful for monitoring and addressing racial discrimination and inequalities.</p> <p>We continuously review our practice to ensure it is in line with the latest Government Standards for ethnicity data to ensure responsible and accurate reporting on race and ethnicity.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A national CIPD report found that BAME employees are significantly more likely to say your identity or background can have an effect on the opportunities you're given than white British employees<sup>43</sup>, particularly those from an Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi background.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation did not produce any common themes on how the approach to Employment and Skills would impact negatively on specific racial groups.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Face to face engagement has taken place in a mix of welcoming, non-judgemental venues. An online engagement offer was also available, if people decided not to join face-to-face events, so everyone who desired could express their views in their preferred way.</li> <li>- The national CIPD provides useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when developing future policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Census data analysis reveals that English proficiency for residents whose main language is not English is lower in Lincolnshire than in England. In England, 80% of people who speak a foreign language could speak English well or very well, compared to 78% on average for GL. Census data analysis reveals that 62,648 people (approximately 6% of GL) don't have English as their main language. 5% of the population in Boston cannot speak English and across GL the average figure is 3%. Subsequently, there are still significant numbers who will be excluded from understanding the technicalities if translations are not available<sup>44</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p>

<sup>43</sup> [36057 \(peoplemanagement.co.uk\)](http://36057.peoplemanagement.co.uk)

<sup>44</sup> [Language, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk/language)

Protected characteristic	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation did not produce any common themes on how the approach to the consultation could impact negatively on specific racial groups.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A subscription to DA Languages services was made available so that key devolution information can be translated for those speaking the top languages in target areas. Accessible html pages were added to the council website for easy translation and Let's talk Lincolnshire offered an inbuilt translation tool so potential respondents could see text and questions in their chosen language.</li> </ul>
<b>Religion or belief</b>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic which is detailed below and has been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p> <p>15% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of religion or belief.</p> <p>Limited comments were received explaining the negative responses or how the proposals would have a potential negative impact by religion or belief. The consultation responses did not produce any significant themes as to why the proposal may negatively impact religious or belief groups, however comments were received that highlighted that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"It was noted, however, that there were no proposals for protected or at-risk buildings which included religious buildings. This was seen to merit further attention in proposed policies."</i></p> <p><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Different religious and belief groups may not feel directly addressed by the specifics of the proposal, so it is important that they are involved and consulted throughout the process.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation did not produce any common themes on how the approach to the consultation could impact negatively by religion or belief.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reach out to communities via leaders and organisations representing their interests so people feel more comfortable taking part. Face to face engagement took place in a mix of welcoming, non-judgemental venues. An online engagement and paper copies were available, so everyone could express their views in their preferred way.</li> </ul> <p><b>Protected or at-risk buildings including religious buildings</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqIA.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation identified that there were no proposals for protected or at-risk buildings which included religious buildings. This was seen to merit further attention in proposed policies.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by religion or belief but provide useful evidence for consideration by the proposed GLCCA when developing future policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Sex</b>	<p>No potential negative impacts were identified for this protected characteristic as part of the original equality impact assessment.</p> <p>Through the Devolution consultation 16% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of sex. The consultation responses did not produce any significant themes as to why the proposal may negatively impact on this protected characteristic, however comments were received that highlighted that:</p> <p><i>“some respondents raised concerns over the composition of government structures that were dominated by white men from middle-class backgrounds. Instead, respondents called for equal gender representation on any governance structures within the proposed authority. Other respondents requested more information on the proposed devolution to better ascertain its impact on gender and sex of the population.”</i></p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No potential negative impacts were identified in the original EqIA.</li> <li>- Through the consultation process suggestions respondents commenting on sex called for the equal gender representation in government structures.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The comments received do not suggest a potential negative impact on people by sex.</li> <li>- The ability to stand for election onto local government structures is open to all adults.</li> <li>- The Committee structure of the proposed GLCCA will provide opportunities to co-opt or engage a range of voices that can provide additional expertise in delivering its functions.</li> </ul>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p>This equality impact analysis identifies a number of potential adverse impacts on this protected characteristic relating to which are detailed below and have been updated to include relevant findings from the Devolution consultation.</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>14% of respondents suggested that the proposals would have a negative impact on individuals because of sexual orientation. No further themes or potential negative impacts were identified from the consultation comments in relation to the impact the proposal would have on sexual orientation.</p> <p><b>Employment and Skills</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A 2018 Stonewall report showed that more than a third of LGBT staff (35%) have hidden or disguised that they are LGBT for fear of discrimination and nearly two in five bisexual people (38%) have not disclosed their sexuality to anyone at work. There is a possibility therefore that they might not benefit from employment and skills improvements to the same extent as their heterosexual colleagues<sup>45</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were no themes in the consultation responses that related to this potential negative impact or potential mitigations.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reach out to minority communities via organisations representing their interests so people feel more comfortable taking part in engagement to identify the best methods to engage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuing discrimination means that some may not wish to participate in open engagement.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation did not produce any common themes on how the approach to the consultation could impact negatively by religion or belief.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To reach out to minority communities via organisations representing their interests so people feel more comfortable taking part. Public events were held in inclusive, non-judgemental venues so everyone would be feel welcome, and no one would feel they would face ridicule or discrimination. An online, paper version and telephone offer were all also available if people decided not to join face-to-face events so that everyone could express their views in their preferred way.</li> </ul>

<sup>45</sup> [lgbt in britain work report.pdf \(stonewall.org.uk\)](https://www.stonewall.org.uk/resources/reports/lgbt-in-britain-work-report.pdf)

## Negative impacts - other groups

If you have identified negative impacts for other groups not specifically covered by the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010 you can include them here if it will help the decision maker to make an informed decision.

Other Groups	Negative impacts
	<p>There is a risk that the exercise of certain functions by the GL MCCA will mean that decisions will be remote from the needs of those groups and individuals who are most reliant upon the services provided by local government in the area.</p> <p>However, this risk will be mitigated by the safeguards set out in the proposal, which include: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Constituent Councils' membership of the GL MCCA</li> <li>- the role and participation of district and borough councils in the GL MCCA</li> <li>- the role and participation of other groups and voices in the GL MCCA</li> <li>- the GL MCCA's proposed governance arrangements and decision-making processes, and the phased transfer of some powers to the GL MCCA over time.</li> </ul>
<b>Businesses</b>	<p>No negative impacts are expected for businesses. Businesses have been actively engaged in stakeholder discussions, both throughout the development of the original proposal and through the consultation exercise.</p> <p>Businesses provided positive feedback on the proposal and showed a desire for ambitions to go further, considering wider factors such as increased business support and increased involvement in future steps.</p>
<b>Armed Forces Community (Veterans, reservists and those still serving)</b>	<p>Those belonging to the Armed Forces Community may not feel that the proposal directly addresses their concerns. The MoD will continue to make operational decisions and support this community. All three upper tier councils are committed to the Armed Forces Covenant and the recently introduced Armed Forces Public Duties, so their needs will be considered at all stages of the deal, including a variety of ways to participate in engagement and test assumptions made in this EIA.</p> <p>The formal consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications on this protected characteristic group.</p>



Other Groups	Negative impacts
<b>Deprived Communities</b>	<p>There is potential for the MCCA to be formed and high-profile projects to be developed, but for the poorest and most deprived to miss out on the potential benefits as funding may be used in different areas. The MCCA will need to ensure that it has a robust evidence base for decisions and funding allocations.</p> <p>The formal consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications on this protected characteristic group.</p>
<b>Visitors</b>	<p>The formal consultation process didn't produce any possible negative implications for this group.</p>
<b>Digitally excluded communities / individuals</b>	<p>The formal consultation process didn't produce any possible negative implications on this group</p> <p>To ensure accessibility of the consultation, a range of engagement methods were used.</p> <p>These are set out within the consultation report.</p>
<b>Single parents</b>	<p>In response to equality questions about the potential negative impacts of the proposal by the protected characteristic of marriage and civil partnership a number of respondents critiqued the lack of focus on 'single parents' as a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Potential negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No negative impacts were identified in the original EqIA.</li> <li>- It is envisaged that the proposal may have a potential positive impact on this group through the creation of a more vibrant job mix across Greater Lincolnshire that may offer more flexible employments supporting those managing sole parenting and employment. Improved digital connectivity may also support flexible working from home that could better suit those with specific childcare arrangements.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation process didn't produce any further possible negative implications or mitigations for this group.</li> </ul> <p>Potential mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No further actions are proposed.</li> </ul>

## Summary

This EIA shows clearly the wide and varied population of GL and the importance of keeping residents as informed as possible as devolution progresses. It is clear from the findings that a devolution deal for GL can have a positive impact on a wide number of protected characteristics groups in a variety of ways.

The proposal will reduce barriers to upskill the local labour force across all age groups and reduce the productivity gap which GL faces nationally. The power to be able to innovatively use funding will open more possibilities to direct resources to tackle employment barriers for people with disabilities. The impact of being able to adapt and use innovative approaches to funding would mean we could target training to address any imbalance in the workforce in our local industries, as there will be increased opportunities to train. There is an opportunity through a more aligned careers service, led by industry, to ensure that there is a greater understanding of which sectors are actively trying to increase their BAME representation.

Improved digital infrastructure will also give people greater choice and flexibility over how they choose to work in the future and the jobs they can access.

Improved transport infrastructure will provide GL residents with reliable means of getting from A to B, whether this be to school, work or socially, throughout the region. An improved transport system will also give the older generation greater access to healthcare, reduce isolation and improve independence. The ambition is to also improve accessibility to public transport for those who currently don't feel it meets their needs and requirements.

The EIA also clearly identifies some possible negative implications which will need due consideration before full implementation of the changes that arise as a result of devolution in GL.

Across many areas, budgets and decisions will move from Government to the GL MCCA. Within Employment and Skills for example, no specific decisions have yet been made about where investment will occur to generate employment opportunities or in education and improving skills. It is a possibility that this could inadvertently benefit one group over another. Therefore, due consideration and process must take place prior to implementation of any policy to ensure that this risk is reduced as much as possible.

When striving to improve digital connectivity, there is a risk that those who aren't currently confident with the technology could be left further behind and feel more excluded and subsequently increase the gap that is currently exists. Therefore, it is crucial that this is researched further so that skills gaps can be identified, and people can be signposted to programmes to help them improve their skills to enable people of all ages to realise the benefits of improved digital inclusion.

The public consultation on the key themes of the proposal shows broad support towards the ambitions and targets of the GL MCCA. There is broad support across protected characteristics groups which has been shown by the data analysis in this document.

# Stakeholders

Objective(s) of the EIA consultation or engagement activity
<p>This EIA has informed the devolution consultation stakeholder analysis.</p> <p>To ensure everyone has a fair and open opportunity to share their views on the devolution deal.</p> <p>To test assumptions made about potential impacts of devolution on the general population, but particularly those with protected characteristics and additional communities identified in this document or as part of stakeholder conversations.</p> <p>To consider areas where the proposal may need to be changed as a result of feedback through the consultation.</p>

Who was involved in the EIA consultation or engagement activity?

Detail any findings identified by the protected characteristic.

Protected characteristic	Response
Age	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot – Young People LCC</b></p> <p>Lincoln University            Bishop Grosseteste            Lincoln, Grantham, Boston College            Lincolnshire Youth Council (LYC) / Youth Parliament (YP)            Expert by experience LCC            LEAP            Barnados            Carers First young carers            Future Focus            Spalding college            4all Children's Disability Register            Bardney Gateway Centre (Bardney Youth Club)            Young Farmers            Pelican trust            Ruskington Youth Centre            Wrangle Youth Club            Deeping Youth group            Schools Admissions            Building resilience in Communities            Children's Links            Circles of Support            Early support care coordination</p> <p><b>NEL</b></p> <p>Young people Navigo Internal comms            Franklin College            Grimsby Institute</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p><b>Stakeholder mail shot</b>  <b>Older people</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Age UK x 2  U3A  Good Homes Alliance</p> <p><b>NEL</b>  Friendship at Home (Later Life Partnership) - internal comms,</p> <p><b>Promotional material (paper copies - survey, executive summary, proposal, posters, and post cards)</b>  <b>Older people</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Age UK  Age UK Lincoln &amp; Kesteven  48 libraries/community hubs (older people)  Lincoln Community Foundation</p> <p><b>Promotional material (paper copies - survey, executive summary, proposal, posters, and post cards)</b>  <b>Young people</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Lincoln University  Bishop Grosseteste  Lincoln College  Boston College  Grantham College  YMCA  Lincoln Community Foundation  Young Inspectors (LCC)  Voices for Choices (LCC)</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b>  <b>Older people</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Extra time drop-in session for older people  Pop up stand at libraries</p> <p><b>Easy read version</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Adult care services</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b>  <b>Young People</b>  <b>LCC</b>  Lincoln college group  SEG (Stakeholder Engagement Group – LCC Children’s Services)  Lincoln college library  Bishop Grosseteste University</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>Grantham Youth centre Boston college Lincoln University</p> <p><b>NL</b> Adult Education and Community Learning Youth Council</p> <p><b>NEL</b> Employability Forum</p>
<b>Disability</b>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b></p> <p><b>LCC</b> Healthwatch Lincolnshire Care Association (LinCA) H&amp;W Network Bulletin on a weekly basis VoiceAbility (Lincs Disability partnership) Shine Mental Health network Healthwatch Every-One Lincolnshire Partnership Foundation Trust (LPFT) Autism partnership board (LCC) Blind society x2 Carers First British Deaf association Lincs sensory services Dementia support Disability Hub Sleaford BID Services Children's Hearing Services Working Group Day Break – Grantham college County Care Day Time Opportunities Skegness/Holbeach Diversity Adult Support Services LTD ECLIPS (Extended Communication and Language Impairment Provision for Students) FocusAbility - Day Opportunities Centre - Market Rasen Gainsborough Family Support Group @ GAPA Going Forward social group Spalding Headway Lincolnshire Inspire Lincs KIDS Lincolnshire Lincolnshire Down's Syndrome Support Group PAACT Umbrellas Lincoln Stamford Diversity CIC Grantham Disabled Children society Lincolnshire sensory service Don't lose Hope Bourne MindSpace Stamford</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p><b>NEL</b> NEL All Age Learning Disability Partnership People with disabilities Navigo Internal comms</p> <p><b>Promotional material and paper copies of Easy Read version</b> <b>LCC</b> Autism Partnership Children’s services VoiceAbilty Disability social network Talking Newspaper article in Boston and South Holland</p> <p><b>Audio version of the exec summary and the consultation information</b> <b>LCC</b> South Lincs Blind Society, including talking newspaper article Lincoln and Lindsey Blind Society VoiceAbilty Lincolnshire Sensory Service</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b> <b>LCC</b> LCC Staff disability group (Evolve) LCC staff carers network H&amp;W Network Boston Lincolnshire Military, Veterans &amp; Families Wellbeing Network Dementia Carers support group</p>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b> <b>LCC</b> Just Lincs Think2speak Lincoln Pride Lincoln Alternative LGBT Network LGBT Lincoln university group</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b> <b>LCC</b> LCC LGBT staff network</p>
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	<p><b>Stakeholder Mailshot</b> <b>LCC</b> CAB Lincolnshire</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p><b>Promotional material (paper copies - survey, executive summary, proposal, posters, and post cards)</b>  <b>LCC</b>            CAB- South Lincs            CAB- Mid Lincs</p>
<p><b>Pregnancy and maternity</b></p>	<p><b>Stakeholder Mailshot</b>  <b>LCC</b>            Children's Links            Circles of Support            Early support Care coordination</p> <p><b>Promotional material (paper copies - survey, executive summary, proposal, posters, and post cards)</b>  <b>LCC</b>            48 Childrens centres            7 Family centres</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b>  <b>LCC</b>            Lincoln toy library</p>
<p><b>Race</b></p>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b>  <b>LCC</b>            Black and Ethnic Minority employee group (LCC)            Lincolnshire Gypsy Liaison Group            Traveller education service            Acts Trust ESOL            Lincolnshire Polish Society            Aspire - ESOL            Lincoln Arabic School for All            PAB Boston ESOL            Polish Saturday Club Ltd Boston            Boston Lithuanian Community group            Chinese Association Lincoln            Polish Saturday school Spalding            Lincolns Muslim Sisters Forum</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b>  <b>LCC</b>            LCC BAME staff group</p>
<p><b>Religion or belief</b></p>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b>  <b>LCC</b>            Just Lincs            Lincoln University multi faith group            The Centre of Reconciliation            Alive church</p>

Protected characteristic	Response
	<p>Lutheran church</p> <p><b>NE</b> Faith Leaders across North East Lincolnshire</p>
<b>Sex</b>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b></p> <p><b>LCC</b> Womens Aid Boston Womens Aid Eden WI South Lincolnshire WI North Lincolnshire Lincoln Muslim Sisters Forum Business Women’s Link</p> <p>Men's Shed</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<p><b>Stakeholder mailshot</b></p> <p><b>LCC</b> Just Lincs Think2speak Lincoln Pride Lincoln Alternative LGBT Network LGBT Lincoln university group</p> <p><b>NEL</b> LGBTQ – Navigo Internal comms</p> <p><b>Attendance at community events (in person/Teams)</b></p> <p><b>LCC</b> LGBT staff network</p>
<p><b>Are you confident that everyone who should have been involved in producing this version of the Equality Impact Analysis has been involved in a meaningful way?</b></p> <p>The purpose is to make sure you have got the perspective of all the protected characteristics.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



Protected characteristic	Response
<p><b>Once the changes have been implemented how will you undertake evaluation of the benefits and how effective the actions to reduce adverse impacts have been?</b></p>	<p>The proposed GLCCA will be subject to the public sector equality duty and have regard to this in its decision making processes and the delivery of its functions.</p>

## Further details

Personal data	Response
Are you handling personal data?	No
If yes, please give details	

Version	Description	Created or amended by	Date created or amended	Approved by	Date approved
V5	Cleaned up core version created after input from representatives from across GL.	Samantha Long & Equality Impact Analysis Team I	11/07/23		
V0.06	Review	Daniel Larkin	21/08/23		
V.0.7	Reviewed version in preparation for review meeting	Samantha Long	22/08/23		
V.0.8	Reviewed and partially cleaned up	Daniel Larkin	25/08/23		
V.0.9	Meeting to discuss the text for positive impacts	Samantha Long & Equality Impact Analysis Team	20/09/23		

Version	Description	Created or amended by	Date created or amended	Approved by	Date approved
V.0.9	Reviewed and developed further	Daniel Larkin/ Samantha Long	28/09/23 – 29/09/23		
V0.10	Legal comments considered and reviewed	Daniel Larkin/ Samantha Long	04/10/23		
V0.10	Version further developed during meeting	Equality Impact Analysis Team	16/10/23		
V0.11	Questions from meeting addressed and meeting and cleaned up	Daniel Larkin/ Samantha Long	18/10/23		
V1.0	Final cleaning up for version 1.0	Samantha Long	20/10/23		
V1.1	Amendments following legal review	Daniel Larkin/ Samantha Long	14/11/23		
V1.2	Final editing and proofread	Daniel Larkin	17/11/23		
V2.0	Post Consultation Update and Data Analysis	Daniel Larkin	16/02/24		
V2.1	Post Consultation Update and Data Analysis (Editing)	Daniel Larkin	25.02.24		

Version	Description	Created or amended by	Date created or amended	Approved by	Date approved
V2.2	Post Consultation Update, Data Analysis and review	Daniel Larkin	27.02.24		
V2.3	Post Consultation Update, Data Analysis and review	Daniel Larkin	29.02.24	LS / MG	29.2.24