

DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

SECTION 75 EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY SCREENING ANALYSIS FORM

The purpose of this form is to help you to consider whether a new policy (either internal or external) or legislation will require a full equality impact assessment (EQIA). Those policies identified as having significant implications for equality of opportunity must be subject to full EQIA.

The form will provide a record of the factors taken into account if a policy is screened out, or excluded for EQIA. It will provide a basis for quarterly consultation on the outcome of the screening exercise, and will be referenced in the biannual review of progress made to the Minister and in the Annual Report to the Equality Commission.

Further advice on completion of this form and the screening process including relevant contact information can be accessed via the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) Intranet site ([Equality Intranet page](#)).

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#)

When considering the impact of this policy you should also consider if there would be any Human Rights implications. Guidance is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/articles/human-rights-and-public-authorities>

Should this be appropriate you will need to complete a Human Rights Impact Assessment. A template is at:

- <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/publications/human-rights-impact-assessment-proforma>

Don't forget to RURAL PROOF - refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#).

Part 1. Policy scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy under consideration. The purpose of policy scoping is to help prepare the background and context and set out the aims and objectives for the policy, being screened. At this stage, scoping the policy will help identify potential constraints as well as opportunities and will help the policy maker work through the screening process on a step by step basis.

Public authorities should remember that the Section 75 statutory duties apply to internal policies (relating to people who work for the authority), as well as external policies (relating to those who are, or could be, served by the authority).

Information about the policy

Name of the policy

Section 29 Planning Application – Proposed supermarket, Crescent Link, Derry

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

This is a decision taken by the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) to approve a planning application which the Department's Planning Business Area (Regional Planning Policy and Casework Directorate) is responsible for processing (Planning Application Ref: LA11/2019/0263/F)

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

Full Planning Permission has been sought by Lidl to build a new supermarket, associated car park, and amended access of approval A/2004/0897/F, landscaping and site works on undeveloped land to the east of Kilfennan Link Roundabout and 100m north-east of no.20 Crescent Link, Derry. The application seeks full planning permission for a supermarket with a gross floor area of 2269sqm and sales area of 1420sqm.

**Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?
If so, explain how.**

No Section 75 impacts have been highlighted during the consultation on the application.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Dfl initiated the process to approve the application.

Who owns and who implements the policy?

Dfl Regional Planning Policy and Casework (Ministerial decision taken by the Minister)

Background

The application, which constitutes a major development as defined by the Planning (Development Management) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015, proposes a retail development on vacant land adjacent to Crescent Link in Derry and was initially submitted to Derry City and Strabane District Council (DCSDC) on 21 March 2019.

The application was processed by DCSDC who resolved to approve the application, subsequent to a vote by the Council's Planning Committee in January 2021 which overturned their Planning Department's recommendation to refuse planning permission. Upon approving the application, the Council notified Dfl as required to do so under the provisions of The Planning (Notification of Application) Direction 2017, on 20 January 2021.

The application was then received by Dfl's Regional Planning Policy and Casework Directorate (RPP&C) for processing on 13 October 2021 following 'call in' of the Application under section 29 of the Planning (NI) Act 2011 by Dfl's Regional Planning Governance and Legislation Directorate (RPG&L) on 21 September 2021.

Since then, the application, seeking a proposed Lidl store on vacant lands at Crescent Link in Derry/Londonderry has been processed by RPP&C. The application was advertised in the local press as per The Planning Act (NI) 2011 and the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (NI) 2015 on 4/5

September 2025 (Derry Journal and Londonderry Sentinel) and neighbours were re-notified on 21 August 2025 and 15 September 2025.

A total of 66 no. representations have been received which include 42 letters of objection, 8 letters of support (including 1 petition containing 6 signatures) and 16 miscellaneous comments/submissions neither objecting nor supporting. Objections were received from surrounding neighbours which raised a number of concerns, these were: -

Traffic and Safety Concerns

- Congestion: The area is already heavily trafficked due to nearby schools, shops, and emergency services. Intensifying use of existing roundabouts and access onto protected route
- Emergency Access: Fears that increased traffic will delay emergency vehicles.
- Child Safety: Many residents highlight risks to children playing or walking near roads.
- Inadequate Traffic Assessment: The proposal lacks a robust transport impact analysis.
- Plans for new pedestrian access and cycle access is unsafe.

Residential Amenity and Zoning concerns

- Loss of Privacy and Daylight: Homes near the site would be directly overlooked and affected by lighting and noise.
- Noise and Disturbance: Concerns about deliveries, customer traffic, and construction noise.
- Zoning Conflicts/Plan led system: The site is zoned for residential use (H27), not retail, and lies outside designated commercial zones.
- Visual Intrusion: No visual impact assessment provided; fears of the development dominating views.
- Section 75 issue raised relating to enjoyment of family/private life/religion.

Environmental Impact concerns

- Air Pollution: Increased vehicle emissions pose health risks.
- Light Pollution: Insufficient information on floodlighting and its impact.
- Waste and Odour: Concerns about garbage disposal and smells.
- Litter and Anti-social Behaviour: Fears of misuse of the car park after hours.

Retail Redundancy concerns

- No Demonstrated Need: The area is already served by multiple supermarkets (Tesco, SuperValu, Costcutter, etc.).
- Impact on Existing Retail Centres: Potential harm to nearby retail hubs.
- Recent Retail Expansion: Craig's shop has added new units, further reducing demand.

Consultation and community transparency concerns

- Lack of Notification: Many residents claim they were not informed or consulted.
- Misleading Information: Buyers were told the site would be used for housing or a park.
- Political Influence and Bias: Allegations of non-local support and political involvement.
- Request for Re-advertisement: Due to significant changes in site plans.

Community and Social Impact concerns

- Loss of Community Character: Fears of turning a quiet residential area into a commercial zone.
- Crime and Anti-social Behaviour: Concerns about increased disturbances.
- Mental and Physical Health: Preference for green space or park to support wellbeing.
- Property Values: Anticipated decline in house prices.

Planning Policy Conflict concerns

- Contrary to Derry Area Plan 2011: Site designated for housing.
- Contrary to RDS and SPPS: Fails to meet town centre-first retail policy.
- Contrary to PPS3: Intensifies use of a protected route.

The letters of support raised a number points including:-

- Expected social and economic benefits including job creation, improved convenience, and more shopping choice for the local community.
- Benefits for local families, especially those on low incomes without car access, improved affordability, employment opportunities, and accessibility. Valuable community and economic asset for both urban and nearby rural residents.
- £5 million local investment, around 70 temporary construction jobs, and 35 long-term roles. Environmental Health approval.
- Key asset for the Waterside area that will create local jobs and provide greater shopping choice. Store will complement rather than harm existing retailers.

- Create construction and long-term jobs, provide affordable shopping choice for Waterside residents, and deliver economic benefits without undermining town centre retail policy.
- Positive signals for sustainable investment in Derry. Presence of a committed operator (Lidl) and retail impact assessment aligns with planning policy (SPPS).
- Positive effect on nearby residential property values, offering convenience for residents without any anticipated negative impact.

One of the objections received was from one resident who resides in a dwelling directly opposite the proposed application site. They stated that the proposed development would affect their home/private family life as there was potential for HGV delivery drivers travelling to the proposed store (if the development was approved) during delivery times, to have views into their family home. They stated that in accordance with their religious beliefs and cultural background family members would be required to cover their heads inside their own house as a result. This EQIA screening has been undertaken to address this representation. All other environmental issues raised within the representations have been reviewed and addressed as part of the statutory consultation process and through the planning assessment contained within the development management report.

The application has been assessed by RPP&C taking into account all comments and objections received from consultees and other considerations including economic benefits. A recommendation was then made to the Minister for Infrastructure on 09/01/2026 and a decision taken was taken by the Minister on 14/04/2026.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

No.

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

- Members of the general public using the development/supermarket

- local residents/local community/local commuters

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

what are they?

- Regional Development Strategy (NI) 2035 (RDS)
- Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) 2015
- Derry City and Strabane District Council Local Development Plan 2032 – Adopted Plan Strategy July 2025
- Derry Area Plan (DAP) 2011 (Maps only)

who owns them?

- Department for Infrastructure (Dfi)
- Derry City and Strabane District Council

Available evidence

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data. The Commission has produced this guide to [signpost to S75 data](#). Also refer to the [Equality Intranet page](#) for some evidence sources.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

The proposed Lidl supermarket proposal is proposed to be situated within Derry City and Strabane District.

General Data evidence / information:

The local population for Waterside D area on Census day 2021 was 1,995 with 905 households.

The 2021 Census indicated that 51% of the local population were economically active and 3% unemployed. This indicates that this development may not have an impact economically.

A thorough assessment which included a review of the planning drawings submitted in support of the application and site visit to investigate the existing site conditions and surrounding context has been undertaken of the Lidl application in terms of its impact upon residential amenity with regards to neighbouring dwellings within the immediate area. In exercising professional planning judgment, and in assessing material considerations, in this instance it was concluded that there will be no impact on residential amenity.

The consultation on the proposed development resulted in a total of 66 representations have been received which include 42 letters of objection, 8 letters of support (which included a petition containing 6 signatures) and 16 miscellaneous comments/submissions neither objecting nor supporting.

Religious belief evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census states 33% of the surrounding area to the proposed development (i.e. Waterside D Super Data Zone) were recorded as Catholic and 58% were recorded as Protestant and other Christian religions. 7% of the

surrounding area said they had no religion did not state one and 2% stated other religions.

This compares with 46% Catholic and 43% Protestant and other Christian religions, 9% said they had no religion or did not state one and 1% stated other religions in the whole Northern Ireland population.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the planning application would affect people of different religious beliefs. A concern was raised by a local resident who advised that the proposed development would affect their home/private family life as there was potential for HGV delivery drivers travelling to the proposed store (if the development was approved) during delivery times, to have views into their family home. They stated that in accordance with their religious beliefs and cultural background certain family members would be required to cover their heads inside their own house as a result.

A site visit to the objector's property established that the road which the objector is referring to is an existing operational public road - HGVs /delivery drivers already utilise this road. The objector's house is c. 63metres from the nearest point to the proposed building (which is not where the service yard is proposed- it is further away).

The finished floor level of the objector's dwelling is 82.30metres. The finished floor level of the proposed store is to be 80.600 and it will therefore be at a lower level than the objector's home. In any case, if the dwellings approved under the previous permission (A/2004/0897/F) were to be built out instead of the proposed Lidl store, the dwellings (and any first floor windows) on the opposite side of the road would be in closer proximity to the objector's dwelling and private amenity space in comparison to the location of the proposed Lidl store. In consideration of the separation distance, finished floor level, building height and existing screening, it is the professional planning judgement that the proposed development was not considered to cause overshadowing nor is it considered to be overbearing or over dominant.

As we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Although the composition of the surrounding local community may be dominated by one particular religious group, the analysis has concluded that there will be no significant impact on any receptors.

It is considered after carrying out a development management assessment that there will be no impact on any of these religious groups as a result.

Political Opinion evidence / information:

The 2023 Local Election Results for the Waterside District Electoral area of Derry City and Strabane District Council are broken down as follows; Sinn Fein 27.2%, Democratic Unionist Party 22.79%, Social Democratic and Labour Party 19.03%, Alliance 6.85%, Ulster Unionist Party 20.58%, People Before Profit 3.56%

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Racial Group evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census provides an ethnicity breakdown of the NI population as follows: White 96.55%; Irish Traveller 0.14%; Roma 0.08%; Indian 0.52%; Chinese 0.50%; Filipino 0.23%; Pakistani 0.08%; Arab 0.10%; Other Asian 0.28%; Black African 0.42%; Black Other 0.16%; Mixed 0.76%; and Other ethnicities 0.19%.

For the study area (Waterside D) the 2021 Census data indicates that there were 93.4% who categorised themselves as 'White ethnicity: British/Irish/Northern Irish only and Christian/no religion/religion not stated', 2.9% who categorised themselves as 'White ethnicity: all others' and 3.6% who categorised themselves as 'Non-white ethnicity'.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would affect different Racial. impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Age evidence / information:

The 2021 NI Census recorded the statistics in the surrounding area of the application site specifically Waterside D Super data zone as 18% between 0-14

years, 28% between 15-39 years, 36% between 40-64 years and 65+ years were 19%. This compares with Northern Ireland population as 19.19% between 0-15 years old, 31.23% between 16-39 years old, 32.43% between 40-64 years old, whilst 17.15% were 65+

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Marital Status evidence / information:

43.77% of the Waterside D Super Data Zone were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as married or in a civil partnership or separated and 37% were recorded as single, divorced or widowed. This compares with 44% married or in a civil partnership and 20% separated, divorced or widowed for Northern Ireland as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Sexual Orientation evidence / information:

92% of the Waterside D Super Data Zone population were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as heterosexual and 2% as gay, lesbian or other sexual orientation with 6% preferring not to say.

This compares with 90.0% straight or heterosexual, 2.0% as gay, lesbian, bisexual or other sexual orientation and 7.9% preferring not to say or not stated of the Northern Ireland population as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Men & Women generally evidence / information:

The Waterside D Super Data Zone population was recorded in the 2021 NI Census as 51 % female and 49% as male.

This compares with 50.8% female and 49.2% as male in the Northern Ireland population as a whole.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Disability evidence / information:

25.2% of people in Waterside District Electoral Area (DEA) were recorded in the 2021 NI Census as having a long-term health problem or disability which limits day to day activities. This compares with 24.3% of the Northern Ireland population having a long-term health problem or disability and 44.9% of households in Northern Ireland have one or more people in the household with a long-term health problem or disability.

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

Dependants evidence / information:

No evidence has been presented through the various consultations carried out on the proposal that approval or refusal of the application would impact negatively on people in this s75 category, however as we all have multiple Section 75 identities an impact on one category could impact on others.

The 2021 NI Census indicated that 30.7% per cent of households in Northern Ireland contained at least one dependent child and 44.9% contained at least one person with a long-term health problem or disability; made up of those households with dependent children (10.1%) and those with no dependent children (34.8%).

Also recorded in the Census is out of a population of 1.79 million (over 5 years old) the following statistics were recorded for Provision of Unpaid Care:

12.4% of the population provides more than one hour of unpaid care per week.

6.8% provides more than 20 hours unpaid care per week, with

3.8% providing more than 50 hours per week.

20.2% of those aged 40-64 provided unpaid care of any duration per week compared to 9.5% of those aged between 15-39.

Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision?

(Specify details of the needs, experiences and priorities for each of the Section 75 categories below).

Religious belief

A religious and cultural concern was raised by a local resident who advised that the proposed development would affect their home/private family life as there was potential for HGV delivery drivers travelling to the proposed store (if the development was approved) during delivery times, to have views into their family home. They stated that in accordance with their religious beliefs and cultural background certain family members would be required to cover their heads inside their own house as a result.

The impact on private amenity was assessed as part of the development management process and is outlined above in the Available Evidence section. It was concluded through the assessment that the proposed application would not cause any further loss of privacy and as such it is determined that there is to be no impact on religious belief.

Political Opinion

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Racial Group

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Age

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Marital status

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Sexual orientation

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Men and Women Generally

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Disability

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Dependants

No needs, experiences or priorities have been identified for this s75 category.

Part 2. Screening questions

Introduction

In making a decision as to whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment, the public authority should consider its answers to the questions 1-4 which are given on pages 66-68 of this Guide.

If the public authority's conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then the public authority may decide to screen the policy out. If a policy is 'screened out' as having no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations, a public authority should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.

If the public authority's conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to the equality impact assessment procedure.

If the public authority's conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 equality categories and/or good relations categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an equality impact assessment, or to:

- measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or
- the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In favour of a 'major' impact

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there is insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are

concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;

- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

In favour of 'minor' impact

- a) The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
- b) The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
- c) Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
- d) By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

In favour of none

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.
- b) The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.

Taking into account the evidence presented above, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity and good relations for those affected by this policy, in any way, for each of the equality and good relations categories, by applying the screening questions given overleaf and indicate the level of impact on the group i.e. minor, major or none

Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories?

(Please provide details of the likely policy impacts and determine the level of impact for each S75 categories below i.e. either minor, major or none).

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**:

The application proposes to construct a Lidl supermarket in the Crescent Link area. As there are already a number of supermarkets in the area it has no impact on equality of opportunity.

As noted in the background there have been objections to this development. One of the objections received was from one resident who stated that the proposed development would affect their home/private family life as there was potential for HGV delivery drivers travelling to the proposed store (if the development was approved) during delivery times, to have views into their family home. They stated that in accordance with their religious beliefs and cultural background family members would be required to cover their heads inside their own house as a result.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**:

No impacts on equality of opportunity have been identified for this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? None.

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?

(Detail opportunities of how this policy could promote equality of opportunity for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below).

Religious Belief - No.

The proposal contained in the application seeks planning permission for proposed retail development. A recommendation was made from Dfl's Regional Planning Policy and Casework Directorate to the Dfl Minister and

after consideration by the Minister, a decision was taken by them on 14/04/2026. The development Management Report carried out an assessment of the application. It was considered there would be no impacts in terms of religious belief. As such there have been no opportunities identified to better promote equality of opportunity for people in this s75 category.

Political Opinion – No – As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Racial Group – No – As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Age – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Marital Status – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Sexual Orientation – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Men and Women generally – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Disability – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

Dependants – No - As outlined above in Religious Belief.

3. **To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?**

Please provide details of the likely policy impact and determine the level of impact for each of the categories below i.e. either minor, major or none.

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious belief**:

The proposal seeks permission for a proposed retail development, it is not anticipated to impact on good relations on people in this s75 category.

What is the level of impact? [None](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**:
[As outlined above in Religious Belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [None](#)

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**:
[As outlined above in Religious Belief.](#)

What is the level of impact? [None](#)

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Detail opportunities of how this policy could better promote good relations for people within each of the Section 75 Categories below:

Religious Belief – No. [The proposal in the application seeks to build a Lidl supermarket on existing housing land. The policy being screened is the Minister’s decision to approve the application. The approval of this application has no impact on good relations within this category. There are no opportunities to promote good relations in this s75 category.](#)

Political Opinion - No. [As outlined above in Religious Belief.](#)

Racial Group - No. [As outlined above in Religious Belief.](#)

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?

(Every citizen belongs to more than one group - For example: disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

Each Section 75 category combines to make society in general; all people fall into more than one category. The proposed application has been assessed as part of the development management process, which did not present any negative impacts on s75 group/s and as such the decision to approve this application by the Minister for Infrastructure has no negative impacts on people with multiple identities.

Provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

As above.

Part 3. Screening decision

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

The application constitutes a major development proposes a retail development on vacant land adjacent to Crescent Link in Derry.

Following planning processes, the application was advertised in the local press and neighbours to the site duly notified of it. This led to 66 responses of which 42 were objections. A recommendation was made to the Minister for their consideration

During the planning application process the proposal was not found to have any negative impacts on any of section 75 groups and multiple identities, therefore a full equality impact assessment is not considered necessary.

This decision has been taken at a Ministerial level on 14/04/2026 to approve the application.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced - please provide details of this consideration.

N/A.

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

N/A

All public authorities' equality schemes must state the authority's arrangements for assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies adopted or proposed to be adopted by the authority on the promotion of equality of opportunity. The Commission recommends screening and equality impact assessment as the tools to be utilised for such assessments. Further advice on equality impact assessment may be found in a separate Commission publication: Practical Guidance on Equality Impact Assessment.

Mitigation

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is 'minor' and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

N/A

If so, **give the reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

Timetabling and prioritising

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been ‘**screened in**’ for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

Priority criterion [choose 1 2 or 3 if a full EQIA is to take place]

Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Social need **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Effect on people’s daily lives **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Relevance to a public authority’s functions **Rating 1, 2 or 3**

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

No

If yes, please provide details.

Part 4. Monitoring

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission's Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by: [Eimear McKeever](#)
Position/Job Title: [Planning Officer](#)
Date: [01/05/2026](#)

Approved by: [Kathryn McFerran](#)
Position/Job Title: [Director – Regional Planning Policy and Casework](#)
Date: [12/6/26](#)

Note: A copy of the Screening Template, for each policy screened should be 'signed off' and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy, made easily accessible on the public authority's website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

For Equality Team Completion:

Date Received: [24/10/2025](#)

Amendments Requested: [13/11/2025](#); [20/11/2025](#); [04/12/2025](#); [06/01/2026](#)
[26.05.26](#); [05.06.2026](#)

Date Returned to Business Area: [14/11/2025](#); [25/11/2025](#); [19/12/2025](#);
[08/01/2025](#); [28/05/2026](#); [08.06.2026](#)

Date Final Version Received / Agreed: [23.06.26](#)

Date Published on Dfl's Section 75 webpage: [25.06.26](#)