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Summary and recommendations of equality analysis/impact assessment.

Context

At any given time, there is a range of people and organisations carrying out research into the heritage of south-east of England (in this case Kent, Surrey and East & West Sussex). Much of this work has significant financial and legal consequences, being carried under the development control legislation and policies of England. Other fieldwork or desk-based research may have more limited immediate consequences but is important because of what is learned about the region’s past. In a time of limited resources, it is essential that all this work contributes meaningfully to our understanding of the past and that it avoids waste and repetition.

From the 1990s onwards, English Heritage (now Historic England) has attempted to support this by developing ‘research frameworks’ – documents that summarise the state of current understanding and identify gaps in knowledge that can be filled by future research. A number of regions in England, notably the Eastern Counties, started to produce regional research frameworks from the mid-1990s. Kent County Council is leading on the production of the South East Research Framework. Such a framework is particularly needed for this region because of the high development pressure and large-scale infrastructure projects, combined with a very rich and varied archaeological resource and, in parts of the region, significant deprivation and regeneration issues. It is vitally important that research priorities are established at a national and regional level to ensure that limited resources are targeted most effectively.

Aims and Objectives
The principal aims of the project are to formulate an overview of the historic environment of the region and to provide a robust foundation for future historic environment investigation and interpretation for all.
The objectives are to:

- Provide a synthesis of historic environment information for the region.
- Promote better understanding of the historic environment of the region.
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in current understanding.
- Define agreed topics for future research in the context of regional, national and international priorities.
- Strengthen research networks within the regional historic environment community, particularly between local societies, universities, curatorial archaeologists and professional units.
- Inform future development-led work.
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in historic environment research resources within the region.
- Input into archaeological research in universities and elsewhere.
- Engage university and other researchers in work in the region.
- Improve awareness of archives and museum collections within the region.
- Provide information to inform community projects.
- Contribute to the development of the region’s sense of identity and sense of place.
- Provide information to help promote tourism within the region.

Summary of equality impact

Adverse Equality Impact Rating

Low

Attestation
I have read and paid due regard to the Equality Analysis/Impact Assessment concerning the South-East Research Framework. I agree with risk rating and the actions to mitigate any adverse impact(s) that has /have been identified.

Head of Service
Signed: TM
Name: Tom Marchant
Job Title: Head of Strategic Planning and Policy Date: 22 01 19

DMT Member
Signed: SHC
Name: Stephanie Holt-Castle
Job Title: Interim Director of Environment, Planning and Enforcement Date: 28 01 19
**Part 1 Screening**

Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect any Protected Group (listed below) less favourably (negatively) than others in Kent?

Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Group</th>
<th>Please provide a brief commentary on your findings. Fuller analysis should be undertaken in Part 2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>High negative impact EqIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some studies suggest disabled people are often neglected by heritage sector.

- Historic England’s Heritage Counts report (2014) noted that visiting heritage sites has a significant and independent positive relationship with life satisfaction. In addition, “there was some evidence (but not statistically significant) that people with a disability...derive higher wellbeing benefits from visiting heritage”.

- The DCMS 2016/17 “Taking Part” survey noted that there were some classes of heritage sites that people with disabilities were less likely to visit than people without disabilities including historic towns/cities, historic buildings, parks or gardens, monuments or sports heritage sites. The differences were statistically significant but less than 5%. It was also found that people with disabilities were less likely to be involved in planning decisions than people without disabilities.

- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand
Some studies suggest women’s history is often neglected by heritage sector.

The 2012 Historic England report (“Responses from consultation on under-represented heritages”) identified a number of ways that the heritage sector may be neglecting women’s interests in identifying and protecting heritage assets, for example:

- There may be a disconnect between academic approaches to women’s history and community-based interests
- A lack of awareness of the role that women have played in constructing the environment around us – e.g. architects, designers, builders etc
- A lack of representation of the women’s suffrage movement beyond London
- The role of women in churches and convents
- The role of women in industrial action, strikes and protest
- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gender identity/Transgender | None | None | No firm evidence but it is likely that this group is neglected by heritage sector. | There is potential for the interests of this group to be better reflected by the project following a public consultation  
- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners |
| Race | None | None | A number of studies suggest ethnic minorities are neglected by heritage sector. | The 'Taking Part' reports (DCMS, 2017) showed that heritage engagement (in terms of visiting heritage sites) was significantly higher for the white ethnic group than for the black and minority group across all types of heritage sites except those connected with sport.  
- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners |
| Religion and Belief | None | None | No firm evidence but the representation of | The 2012 Historic England report ("Responses from consultation on under- |
different religious groups is unbalanced within the sector. Consulted several faith groups about their perceptions of heritage. This produced a number of observations:

- There has been too much of a focus on flagship sites at the expense of smaller, more local sites.
- There has been too much of a focus on the main religious groups at the expense of smaller more diverse groups.
- There has been too much of a focus on religious sites and buildings, neglecting the fact that faith groups have lives and jobs beyond worship and cultural identifiers that may not be directly religious.
- It is often not appreciated that some places of worship were shared at different times by different faith groups. These will all have had an impact on the structure.
- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners.
| Sexual Orientation | None | None | No firm evidence but studies suggest LGBTQ people are probably under-represented by the heritage sector. | The 2012 Historic England report ("Responses from consultation on under-represented heritages") contained a number of observations from LGBTQ representatives:
- There was a concern that LGBTQ people are often defined only by their sexuality
- There was a concern that the role of people’s sexuality can be suppressed in how some sites and buildings are presented, even where the sexuality may explain some of the design or décor of the structure or when it was important to the famous individual
- Structures associated with campaigns and campaigners are under-represented in traditional heritage
- To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners |

| Pregnancy | None | None | No firm evidence | There is potential for the interests of this |
| Year and Maternity | | | group to be better reflected by the project following a public consultation
• To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners |
| Marriage and Civil Partnerships | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Carer’s Responsibilities | None | None | No firm evidence | There is potential for the interests of this group to be better reflected by the project following a public consultation
• To develop this potential a specific question has been added to the consultation questionnaire on how we can expand participation in heritage studies and any ideas suggested will be discussed with partners |
Part 2

Equality Analysis /Impact Assessment

Protected groups

Information and Data used to carry out your assessment
Please see under Protected Groups in the preceding section.

Who have you involved consulted and engaged?
We will be carrying out a Public Consultation programme. We aim to ensure that the consultation reaches groups that have not always been properly engaged by heritage projects.

We will be asking Consultees whether they understand the draft framework, whether they find the language clear and comprehensible and whether we have identified the right research questions. This will provide an opportunity to gain the perspective of all groups within society.

To draft the framework, we have consulted with:

• East Sussex County Council
• West Sussex County Council
• Surrey County Council
• Historic England
• University of Birmingham
• University of Reading
• University of Southampton
• University of Wales
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• University College London
• Canterbury Archaeological Trust
• Sussex Archaeological Society

Analysis

After the Consultation programme has been completed, we will update the EQiA accordingly, compile a Consultation Report and where appropriate modify the Research Framework.

To ensure that the Consultation helps us to address the neglected groups we have included two specific questions:

• Q17. Can you suggest ways in which the Research Framework could be used to help more people participate in the study of Kent’s historic environment?

• Q19. We have completed an initial Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) on the Resource Assessment and Research Agenda part of the Framework. We welcome your views on the EqIA.

Adverse Impact,
No adverse impacts have been identified by the Part 1 Screening.

Positive Impact:
The Part 1 Screening has identified some potential positive impacts for the project.

Updated 01/02/2019
In recent years there has been considerable research into the degree to which traditional approaches to the historic environment neglects some members of society. A 2012 Historic England report (“Responses from consultation on under-represented heritages”) identified several themes that traditional heritage approaches had neglected. These included:

- Sites of interest to neglected groups which had not previously interested the heritage sector. These included sites such as domestic spaces, places of work, schools, public lavatories, places of consumption and trade and cemeteries
- Multi-site heritage which had significance as a whole eg the group value of minor sites
- The hidden heritage behind more established sites eg the working-class history that enabled country houses, the history of transient, migratory communities
- The history of interaction between groups

The consequences of this under-representation are that some groups of people feel written-out of the UK’s narrative about its’ past and that their individual stories do not form part of the wider national story. The recommendations for improving the representation of marginalised groups in heritage protection included:

- Build community partnerships – in order identify new research evidence from the communities directly
- Create an advisory network – as a dedicated body with community representatives in order to provide feedback on new relevant sites
- Initiate a public call-out for information – in order to collect a large body of information in a one-off initiative

The draft Resource Assessment and Research Framework could under-represent marginalised people as UK heritage strategies have in the past. If their needs and interests of such people can be met, however, then the Research Framework can help to address under-representation in heritage management. It will therefore be important to ensure that all groups can participate in the consultation and input into the final Research Framework and Action Plan.

The Consultation should help to identify those and the draft Framework can then be modified accordingly.

Updated 01/02/2019
JUDGEMENT

- **No major change** - no potential for discrimination and all opportunities to promote equality have been taken
- **Adjust and continue** - adjust to remove barriers or better promote equality
- **Continue the policy** - despite potential for adverse impact or missed opportunity. Set out the justifications: there is no justification for direct discrimination; and indirect discrimination will need to be justified according to the legal requirements.
- **Stop and remove the policy** - policy shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination it must be stopped and removed or changed

Internal Action Required YES (see part 1)
There is potential for adverse impact on particular groups and we have found scope to improve the proposal...

Equality Impact Analysis/Assessment Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Issues identified</th>
<th>Action to be taken</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Cost implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>See Part 1 Screening</td>
<td>The initial action will be to make sure that our consultation methods make it possible for all protected groups to participate fully. The follow-on action will be to incorporate the</td>
<td>A range of responses from diverse consultees Suggestions for Framework recommendations that can help make Kent’s heritage more relevant and</td>
<td>Lis Dyson</td>
<td>30th April 2019</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in the final Research Framework where appropriate.</th>
<th>Accessible to people with protected characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have the actions been included in your business/ service plan?** (If no please state how the actions will be monitored)

Yes/No

The actions will be monitored as part of the Consultation Report where the consultation responses will be described and required actions identified with target dates.

**Appendix**

Please include relevant data sets

Please forward a final signed electronic copy and Word version to the Equality Team by emailing diversityinfo@kent.gov.uk
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If the activity will be subject to a Cabinet decision, the EqIA must be submitted to committee services along with the relevant Cabinet report. Your EqIA should also be published.

The original signed hard copy and electronic copy should be kept with your team for audit purposes.