

Section 75 Policy Screening Form

Part 1: Policy Scoping

The first stage of the screening process involves scoping the policy or policy area. 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.

You 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 or policy area:

Proposed Development of Integrated Belfast Transport Hub (Weavers Cross)

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy/policy area?

Existing	Revised	New
		X

Brief Description

Translink, as the operating arm of the Northern Ireland Transport Holding Company (NITHCo), recognises its statutory duties under Section 75 to promote equality of opportunity and good relations through all its functions relating to Northern Ireland. This extends to capital projects including the development of the Belfast Transport Hub, where Translink operates as the lead partner alongside a number of public and private sector organisations, including the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) and Strategic Investment Board (SIB).

'Weavers Cross' will be situated on an eight hectare site combining a modern high capacity transport hub with mixed use development proposals. The £175 million Belfast Hub facility, due for completion in 2021, is one of the flagship projects in the NI Programme for Government.

The chosen site for the Hub falls within the Northern Ireland Transport Holding Company (NITHCo.) existing site boundary, a considerable portion of which currently remains to be developed. The proposals will involve moving the existing bus and train stations westwards to form an integrated terminus, fronted by a civic space and also including office space on two fronts. The proposed Hub will enhance connectivity to the city,

delivering operational flexibility and meeting expected passenger growth. The Hub is envisioned to be a modern, multi-modal, transport interchange that will deliver an excellent first impression of Belfast for visitors while serving local communities and supporting the local economy. For example, bi-social clauses attaching to the project will guarantee at least 116 jobs for the local community in the construction phase, with longer term employment prospects also enhanced by the development.

The surrounding Weavers Cross neighbourhood offers considerable investment potential allowing for over 100,000 square metres of commercial space alongside significant residential and amenity space. This further development will be the subject of subsequent Section 75 scrutiny while the current screening will focus on the transport hub itself and immediate environs.

In line with best practice, Translink has endeavoured to ensure that Section 75 considerations have already been mainstreamed into the development of the project at successive stages of implementation to date. By way of example, at the design stage of the Hub, all private sector companies that tendered for the project were required to reflect on how Section 75 considerations had been integrated into their designs.

Subsequent to this competition, Arup and John McAslan + Partners were appointed by Translink as the lead architect and designer, together with Juno Planning as the planning consultant and Kennedy Fitzgerald Architects as local supporting architects.

In partnership, during 2016 these organisations then progressed options for The Hub, as outlined in the Stage Two Report (8/4/16). This outlined three preferred options for the Hub, and formed the basis for extensive public consultation that ended on December 2nd 2016.

During these successive public consultation exercises, Section 75 issues have been included as part of these engagements. For example, during the public consultation carried out between November and December 2016, the following four questions were included in the questionnaire:

- Do you have any personal need, access issue or priority concern in relation to the Belfast Hub proposals? If so, please specify.
- Do you envisage the Belfast Hub proposal having any positive or negative impact on certain user groups: age, gender, religion, political opinion, marital status, dependent status, disability, ethnicity, sexual orientation?
- Do you have any evidence or information to support your views? If so please specify.
- What changes to the Hub proposals would you suggest, if any? (Consider alternatives or enhancements that would ensure the Belfast Hub promotes equality for all, fairness and good relations)

Interest groups have shown a healthy level of engagement with the project to date, and have provided positive and constructive feedback that will continue to enhance the project, in the best interests of all potential users and local communities, thereby mitigating any potential adverse impacts at an early stage. (This work is now supported by a full-time designated Community Engagement Officer within Translink.)

To bring forward Section 75 work in line with best practice, as outlined by the Equality Commission, Translink has also engaged the services of an independent Section 75 advisor (Dr John Kremer) to provide support for officers through to full implementation. In line with Commission’s guidance, as contained in its Revised Guide to Section 75 (April 2010), the next stage of this work will involve the screening of the agreed Hub design, as provided by taking on board all accumulated primary and secondary data to date.

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

The overall purpose of the Hub project is to create an accessible, safe, comfortable and attractive environment for customers, visitors and employees alike that is functional and practical to operate, cost-effective to maintain, commercially attractive, efficient and sustainable.

The primary function of The Hub is to enable circulation of passengers with diverse needs safely around the concourse, to pay fares, board buses or trains with ease and equally to alight services and exit safely through the proposed masterplan area in comfort and with convenience.

In combination, the intended aim is:

Operating within available resources and working in partnership with both public and private sector bodies, to provide a state-of-the-art integrated transport hub for Belfast and the wider community in Northern Ireland that meets the diverse needs of all travellers, that offers facilities which are welcoming and accessible to all, that is sensitive to the history of the locale, and that in general enhances the local environment and community.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

YES	NO	N/A
X		

If YES, explain how.

The development of an integrated transport hub according to modern specifications and responsive to public consultation

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Translink have brought forward and overseen the project, in partnership with DfI and SIB and also with input from Belfast City Council. In turn, through robust procurement procedures, successive stages of the project, from design to full implementation, have been outsourced to private sector companies, including Arup and John McAslan + Partners (as lead architect and designer), Juno Planning (planning consultant) and Kennedy Fitzgerald Architects (local supporting architects).

Who owns and who implements each element of the policy?

The hub is being developed as a multi-agency project under the Northern Ireland programme for Government, with DfI as the lead government department, SIB providing ongoing support and Translink taking primary responsibility for the delivery of the project.

Implementation factors

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

YES	NO	N/A
X		

If YES, are they

Financial: YES (If YES, please detail)

The project is estimated to cost in the region of £175 million by 2021. Any extensions to this budget will have consequences for the Programme for Government, now and in the future. The current hiatus in government and uncertainty over the future of the Assembly may impact on future capital investment. The project is co-financed by the European Community Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T), which may be impacted by Brexit negotiations in the longer term.

Legislative: Y / N (If YES, please detail)

The Hub project is bound by a raft of planning regulations, along with all relevant anti-discrimination statutes including Section 75.

Other, please specify:

Not applicable

Main stakeholders affected

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

Staff:

Staff at the existing bus and rail stations, together with Translink employees generally, will be affected by the new Hub. Ongoing engagement with staff and their representatives aims to ensure that any concerns can be addressed at the design stage of the project.

Service users:

All those who use the new facilities will be impacted on, and again ongoing consultations have endeavoured to address concerns as the project rolls out.

Other public sector organisations:

The relevant partners (e.g. DfI, SIB, Belfast City Council)

Voluntary/community/trade unions:

Staff associations and trade unions; local community groups; Section 75 representative bodies

Other, please specify:

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

A wide array of policies, including the Programme for Government, linking to the Northern Ireland economy, as well as transport strategies for Belfast and Northern Ireland as a whole, are linked to the proposed Hub.

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.

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

Section 75 Category	Details of Evidence/Information
Religion Gender Age	<p>The Hub adjoins Blackstaff Ward, which at the time of the last census (2011) comprised 91.4% Protestant, 4.2% Roman Catholic and 4.4% Other/None.</p> <p>In June 2015, it was estimated that of the 4107 people living in the Ward, 2134 (52%) were male and 1973 (48%) were female. This was made up of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 771 children aged 0-15 years; • 1,865 people aged 16-39 years; • 1,067 people aged 40-64 years; and • 405 people 65 years and older. <p>Between 2005 and 2015 the population of Blackstaff Ward increased by 277 people or 7.2%.</p>
Disability Age Dependency Religious Belief Political Opinion Sexual Orientation Gender Race / Ethnic Origin	<p>In the latest round of consultation (November – December 2016), 1,845 responses were obtained, and including a questionnaire. Four questions in particular were asked of relevance to Section 75:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any personal need, access issue or priority concern in relation to the Belfast Hub proposals? If so, please specify. • Do you envisage the Belfast Hub proposal having any positive or negative impact on certain user groups: age, gender, religion, political opinion, marital status, dependent status, disability, ethnicity, sexual orientation? • Do you have any evidence or information to support your views? If so please specify. • What changes to the Hub proposals would you suggest, if any? (Consider alternatives or enhancements that would ensure the Belfast Hub promotes equality for all, fairness and good relations) <p>Responses to questions 7 & 8 are shown in Appendix One. In summary, these revealed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of pedestrian connections to the city centre (routes and signage)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for the station to be located closer to the city centre and concern regarding additional walking distance • Appropriate provision for people with mobility issues • Appropriate provision for people with visual and hearing impairments • Access points designed to accommodate large flows of people • Requirement for adequate seating provision – sheltered seating areas, quiet seating areas • Include child friendly spaces and family areas • Desire for building to be designed for hearing and visually impaired individuals • Desire for building to be designed for people with dementia • Desire for building to be designed for the elderly • Desire for the inclusion of sensory features and quiet areas • Desire for inclusion of covered areas and child friendly spaces • Desire for public realm to be designed for the visually impaired • Desire to retain the Boyne Bridge in situ • Suggestions for multilingual signage for tourists • Request for the design to promote the design which addresses safety and security
--	---

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 for each of the Section 75 categories

Section 75 Category	Details of Needs/Experiences/Priorities
All	<p>The development of a modern, integrated transport hub must take cognisance of the diverse needs of those who may choose to use the hub, and travel to and from the hub. Many of these issues relate to mobility and access, for example in relation to disability and age, while others could involve caring responsibilities, for example, children and older people.</p> <p>Signage must recognise that written English may not be accessible to all users, for example those of different nationality, or those with literacy problems more generally. Various Section 75 grounds can relate to these issues.</p> <p>As the Hub is likely to be in use 24 hours each day, the issue of</p>

	<p>safety for those who are vulnerable must be given due consideration.</p> <p>Facilities that are available within the hub must likewise be designed mindful of the diverse needs of potential users.</p> <p>The Hub will replace the existing bus and train stations at Great Victoria Street, and will increase the distance to the city centre by approximately 150 metres. This issue has been raised by a number of consultees.</p>
--	---

Part 2: Screening Questions

Introduction

1. If the conclusion is **none** in respect of all of the Section 75 categories, then you may decide to screen the policy **out**. If a policy is 'screened out', you should give details of the reasons for the decision taken.
2. If the conclusion is **major** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should be given to subjecting the policy to an EQIA.
3. If the conclusion is **minor** in respect of one or more of the Section 75 categories, then consideration should still be given to proceeding with an EQIA, or to measures to mitigate the adverse impact; or an alternative policy.

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 hence it would be appropriate to conduct an EQIA;
- 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 among 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 earlier evidence, consider and comment on the likely impact on equality of opportunity / good relations for those affected by this policy, by applying the following screening questions and the 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 grounds? Minor/Major/None		
Section 75 Category	Details of Policy Impact	Level of Impact? Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	Although the Hub falls predominantly within the predominantly protestant Blackstaff Ward, there has been much community engagement with West Belfast and Lower Falls on the Hub development and the benefits it could bring both sides of the community. The project should bring widespread benefits to the area through a range of social and physical initiatives in the short, medium and long term. For example, bi-social clauses will guarantee at least 116 construction jobs locally. Consequently the overwhelming majority of local residents have shown positive engagement to date. The new hub will be marginally closer to West Belfast (which is predominantly Roman Catholic) than the existing stations, but further from the city centre, which is mixed.	Minor (+ve)
Political opinion	Although the Hub falls predominantly within the predominantly protestant Blackstaff Ward, evidence to date suggests there is broad cross party support for the Belfast hub development.. The project should bring widespread benefits to the area through a range of social and physical initiatives in the short, medium and long term. For example, bi-social clauses will guarantee at least 116 construction jobs locally. Consequently the overwhelming majority of local residents have shown positive engagement to date. The new hub will be marginally closer to West Belfast (which is predominantly Roman Catholic) than the existing stations, but further from the city centre, which is mixed.	Minor (+ve)
Racial / ethnic group	Design of the new Hub will take into account language accessibility, and where possible rely on universal signage.	

	Alternative language formats will be considered during the design stage for all facilities. 24 hour safety within the Hub and its environs for users will be given due regard at all times.	Minor (+ve)
Age	Older people are often those more likely to have mobility problems, and the design of the Hub will aspire to accommodate these concerns. Access to the Hub will aim to ensure immediate and easy access for those with mobility problems, and access and egress routes to buses and trains will also take these matters into account. The increased distance to the city centre will be factored into design considerations.	Minor (+ve)
Marital status	Those who are married are statistically more likely to have dependants (see below).	None
Sexual orientation	LGB groups have prioritised safety in public spaces for the people that they represent. The design of the building and its surrounding will take public safety into account, for example with regard to lighting, security and monitoring.	Minor (+ve)
Men and women generally	Toilet and changing facilities will be designed to accommodate those of both genders, and those from the transgendered community. Staff training will help ensure consistent application of relevant policies. Women's groups have prioritised women's safety in public spaces, and the hub design will accommodate these concerns.	Minor (+ve)
Disability	Those with a physical or mental disability are likely to experience particular difficulties in accessing transport facilities. The design will accommodate those with a disability, and appropriate staff training will support the proper use of all available adaptations. The increased distance to the city centre will be factored into design considerations.	Major (+ve)
Dependants	Those with caring responsibilities for either young children, older people or those with a disability are likely to have particular needs accessing the Hub, using its facilities and	

	boarding/disembarking trains and buses. The design of the hub and appropriate staff training will ensure that these needs are properly met.	Major (+ve)
--	--	-------------

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within any of the Section 75 categories?		
Section 75 Category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
ALL	To date, public consultation has been positive and constructive, raising awareness of a range of issues associated with Section 75 grounds. As the project continues to develop so public engagement will continue to play a central role in ensuring that these issues remain central and mainstreamed, and are addressed appropriately as and when necessary. The employment of a full-time Community Engagement Officer will help to consolidate this work.	

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? Minor/Major/None		
Good Relations Category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact Minor/Major/None
Religious belief	A number of people from the local community have raised concerns that the development may adversely impact on a heritage site that is closely linked to one community in particular, i.e. the Boyne Bridge. This could in turn impact on good relations should the matter not be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties.	Minor (-ve)
Political opinion	A number of people from the local community have raised concerns that the development may adversely impact on a heritage site that is closely linked to one community in particular, i.e. the Boyne Bridge. This could in turn impact on good relations should the matter not be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties.	Minor (-ve)
Racial group	No issues at this time.	None

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of

different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?		
Good relations category	If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
Religious Belief Political Opinion	Through the resolution of the issue regarding Boyne Bridge then community relations can be enhanced. Ongoing engagement with the local community has this objective in mind.	

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?

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

Where two or more identities coincide (e.g. age, disability, dependency) then accessing public transport can be especially problematic. The design of the Hub should recognise these circumstances and consider reasonable steps to accommodate particular issues that occur.

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

Available research would suggest that older people, those with a disability, those with dependants and those from minority ethnic communities may experience particular issues in relation to accessing public transport.

Part 3: Screening Decision

In light of your answers to the previous questions, do you feel that the policy should: (please underline one):

1. Not be subject to an EQIA (with no mitigating measures required)
2. Not be subject to an EQIA (with mitigating measures /alternative policies)
3. Be subject to an EQIA but not at this time
4. Be subject to an EQIA

If 1. or 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons why:

If 2. (i.e. not be subject to an EQIA), in what ways can identified adverse impacts attaching to the policy be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced?

In light of these revisions, is there a need to re-screen the revised/alternative policy at a future date? YES / NO

If 3. or 4. (i.e. to conduct an EQIA), please provide details of the reasons:

Translink remains confident that its significant investment in public consultation and engagement has ensured that issues relating to Section 75 have already been mainstreamed into the project design, and that those tasked with bringing the project forward have good awareness of responsibilities under Section 75, including private sector contractors.

A number of mitigating measures have already been introduced as a result of public engagement, and this work will continue to inform the project through to full implementation. As the project continues to evolve so due consideration will continue to be paid to the need to carry out an EQIA, and to screen particular elements of the project as and when necessary.

At this, the Stage 2 design phase, the need for an EQIA is not immediately apparent and in particular given that the specifics of the Hub design have yet to be finalised. Instead, it is proposed that an EQIA will be scheduled during completion of the enabling works for the Hub (e.g. site clearance and ground works) and prior to the commencement of the main works on the buildings themselves, and this is likely to be in the second half of 2018.

Timetabling and Prioritising EQIA

If 3. or 4., is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities? **NO**

If YES, please provide details:

Please answer the following questions to determine priority for timetabling the EQIA. 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 EQIA.

Priority criterion	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	1
Social need	1
Effect on people's daily lives	2
Relevance to a public authority's functions	2

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for EQIA. This list of priorities will assist you in timetabling the EQIA. Details of your EQIA timetable should be included in the quarterly Section 75 report.

Proposed date for commencing EQIA: **Summer / Autumn 2018**

Any further comments on the screening process and any subsequent actions?

Screening will continue to be applied at appropriate stages during the development of the scheme, together with EQIA where appropriate.




Part 4: Monitoring

Effective monitoring will help identify any future adverse impacts arising from the policy which may lead you to conduct an EQIA, as well as help with future planning and policy development. You 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, then you should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Please detail proposed monitoring arrangements below:

Translink will continue to engage with a wide range of stakeholders representing diverse Section 75 interests. If, during the course of this engagement, significant matters arise then these will be dealt with appropriately. Routine monitoring of all community engagement will enable Translink to identify issues attaching to specific Section 75 grounds at an early stage, and to take appropriate remedial action if required.

Part 5: Approval and Authorisation

Screened by:	Signature	Position/Job Title	Date
Duncan McAllister		Senior Programme Manager	11.9.17
Dr John M D Kremer		External Consultant	11.9.17
Approved by:			
John Glass			20/2/18

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 your website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.

APPENDIX 1: Belfast Transport Hub – Public Consultation November – December 2016 Equality Impact Questions & Responses

Question 7 Review

Do you have any particular personal need, access issue or priority/concern in relation to the Belfast Hub proposals? If so, please specify.

Results

No – 69%

Yes – 31%

Further analysis of the qualitative aspect of Question 7 is provided in the break-down of the responses provided in respect of this question. The main topics are summarised below into "Primary-Categories."

Primary Category: General Comment Response Theme.

#	Positive	#	Neutral	#	Negative
10	Accommodate Passenger Volume	17	Safety Concerns	12	General Resident Concern
		10	Funding	3	Detrimental to Local Business
		1	Staff Concerns	1	Impacted Utilities
				1	Litter

Primary Category: Service Suggestions

- Improved Timetables (20 responses)
- Commuter Services Provided (11 responses)
- Off-Peak Service Provision – Early Morning/Night (21 responses)
- Limit/Prevent Price Increase (6 responses)
- Improved Customer Service (3 responses)
- Maintain Affordable Parking (1 response)
- Cater to Disadvantaged Areas (1 response)

Primary Category: Impact Outside Redline Boundary

- Consideration of impact on local community
 - Congestion controls (16 responses)
 - Air quality (3 responses)
 - Noise impact– residents and local businesses. (2 responses)

Primary Category: Wider Transportation Infrastructure

- Integrated Transport Infrastructure
 - Full integration with Bus and Trains – link with transportation not offered in the Hub, wayfinding from train to metro bus. (16 responses)
 - Link to Belfast Rapid Transit Network (5 responses)
- Improve Wider Transport Infrastructure
 - Priority for buses leaving the city (1 response)
- Connections to specific destinations
 - International Airport (8 responses)
 - Royal Victoria Hospital (7 responses)
 - Belfast City Airport (6 responses)
 - Lisburn (3 responses)
 - City Centre (2 responses)
 - Downpatrick (2 responses)
 - Derry – Londonderry (2 responses)
 - Dublin Airport (1 response)
 - Dublin (1 response)
 - Larne (1 response)
 - Jordanstown (1 response)
 - East Belfast (1 response)

- Fermanagh (1 response)
- Strangford (1 response)
- Armagh (1 response)
- Banbridge (1 response)
- Coleraine (1 response)
- Ards/North Down (1 response)
- South of Belfast (1 response)

Primary Category: Design Considerations - Access

- Designated pick up/drop off areas (5 responses)
- Better access to site than currently provided (2 responses)
- Grosvenor Road entrance is important for West Belfast (1 response)

Primary Category: Design Considerations – Hub Design

Bike Infrastructure

- Secure Bicycle Parking – e.g. Manchester. (11 responses)
- Connection and building of Belfast Cycle Network (14 responses)
- Belfast Bike Station (2 responses)
- Public Bicycle Pump (1 response)
- Repair Shop (1 response)
- Connection to Transport Hub Greenway (1 response)

Boyne Bridge

- Keep the structure of the bridge in full (12 responses)
- History and heritage of bridge retained – e.g. naming plaza or street. (2 responses)
- Remove the bridge entirely (2 responses)

Architectural Design

- Ensure full coverage of platforms (1 response)

Station Technology

- Improved service announcement infrastructure (3 responses)
- Implementation of automated gate access/electronic ticketing (3 responses)

Pedestrianisation and Walkability (1 response)

Parking

- General ask for increased private parking provision – prevent parking in local neighbourhoods. (4 responses)
- Retain Great Northern Mall parking – used by local businesses. (3 responses)
- Improve park and ride facilities to Belfast (3 responses)
- Private bus parking provision (1 response)
- Staff Parking (1 response)
- Align with Belfast City Council's Parking Strategy (1 response)

Waiting Areas (7 responses)

Wayfinding

- Signage – distance to specific locations, space to consider. (4 responses)

Station Layout

- Distance from bus/train to street (1 response)

Primary Category: Design Considerations – Site Location

Distance Away from City Centre

- Further from City Centre than current location – potential shuttle. (52 responses)
- Does not feel a part of City Centre (3 responses)
- Location will be less safe at night (1 response)

Primary Category: Design Considerations – Interest Groups

Inclusive Design

- Disabled/Accessibility needs – e.g. seating, accessible toilets, connection to other transportation, wheel chair access. (28 responses)
- Dementia-friendly design (4 responses)
- Hearing-Impaired infrastructure (3 responses)

Families

- Design to accommodate young families (3 responses)
- Child-friendly spaces (2 responses)

Local Businesses

- Vehicular access needed on Glengall Street – Puddleducks Nursery, Central Mission, Garden Remembrance, Grosvenor House. (5 response)

Visually Impaired Concerns

- Shared surfaces (4 responses)
- General concern (3 responses)
- Large open space (2 responses)
- Guide dog consideration (1 response)

Question 8 Review

Do you envisage the Belfast Hub proposal having any positive or negative impact on certain user groups? (consider factors including: Age, Gender, Religion, Political Opinion, Marital Status, Dependents Status, Disability, Ethnicity, Sexual Orientation)

Results

No – 68%

Yes – 32%

Further analysis of the qualitative aspect of Question 8 is provided in the break-down of the responses provided in respect of this question. The main topics are summarised below into “Primary-Categories.”

Primary Category: General Comment Response Themes

#	Positive	#	Neutral	#	Negative
70	Generally Positive Impact	10	Socio-Economic Status (Prices)	17	Political
18	Visitors	2	Political	10	Generally Negative Impact
12	Political			3	Historians
1	Students			3	Socio-Economic Status (Prices)
1	Safety				

Primary Category: Service Suggestions

Safety Considerations

- Require adequate safety provision (7 responses)

Primary Category: Design Considerations – Interest Groups

Residents

- Positive - Improve political relations– less marginalized, improve image of area, neutral space. (8 responses)
- Positive - Improvement of businesses and jobs in Sandy Row. (7 responses)
- Positive - Local development in Sandy Row. (3 responses)
- Positive - Contribute to 6 p.m. economy. (1 response)
- Positive – Alleviate congestion (1 response)
- Negative - Removal of Boyne Bridge – will exacerbate political tensions, create a new interface. (8 responses)
- Negative – Gentrification. (4 responses)
- Negative - Will not be a shared space. (3 responses)
- Negative - Noise pollution. (3 responses)
- Negative - Further isolation of Sandy Row. (3 responses)
- Negative - Need Sandy Row incorporated into Design. (2 responses)
- Negative - Air pollution. (2 responses)
- Negative – Local shops will suffer. (1 response)

Mobility Issues/Disability

- Against – Proposed distance/access City Centre – asking for free shuttle bus to run to City Centre. (64 responses)
- Support – If disabled access and journeys are in mind – need consultation to take place, include non-physical disabilities, provision of dropped kerbs. (19 responses)
- Support – Easier access to Belfast. (9 responses)

Individuals Living with Dementia

- Support – Increased independence – require effective signage. (2 responses)
- Against – Changes can be quite unsettling. (3 responses)

Visual Impairment

- Against – Shared surfaces are dangerous. (4 responses)
- Against – Distance from City Centre. (2 responses)
- Against - Durham Street Crossing. (1 response)
- Support – If area for guide dogs. (1 response)
- Support – Benefit from improved public transportation experience. (1 response)

Gender Identity

- Gender neutral toilet provision (2 responses)

Visual Impairment

- Breast feeding accommodation (1 response)

