

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## NICE quality standards

### Equality impact assessment

#### Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health

The impact on equality has been assessed during quality standard development according to the principles of the NICE equality policy.

#### 1. TOPIC ENGAGEMENT STAGE

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during this stage of the development process?

There is geographical variation in the occurrence and concentration of pollution with higher concentrations typically found in urban and more socially disadvantaged areas.

Children, older people and people with chronic health problems are among the most vulnerable to air pollution. Short-term (for example day-to-day) peaks of elevated air pollution are linked with increased hospital admissions for people with respiratory and cardiovascular conditions. It can also affect the growth of an unborn baby and may be linked to premature birth.

Interventions which restrict higher polluting vehicles or impose charges on them may adversely affect disadvantaged groups as they may be more likely to rely on older, more polluting vehicles. People with some mobility disabilities may be more reliant on access by private motor vehicles than other groups, and may find replacements harder to come by.

Any specific needs of these groups will be highlighted during development of the quality standard.

1.2 Have any population groups, treatments or settings been excluded from coverage by the quality standard at this stage in the process. Are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?

No population groups have been excluded from coverage at this stage.

Completed by lead technical analyst \_\_Melanie Carr\_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

Date 25/4/18\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead Mark Minchin\_\_\_\_\_

Date 3/5/18\_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

### 2. PRE-CONSULTATION STAGE

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the quality standard (including those identified during the topic engagement process)? How have they been addressed?

The committee highlighted the importance of ensuring local authority strategic plans prioritise areas with the highest levels of air pollution. Statement 2 therefore includes an equality and diversity consideration to ensure local authority strategic plans identify areas where air pollution is highest and, in particular, locations where people that are vulnerable to air pollution may be exposed to high levels of air pollution, such as schools, nurseries, hospitals and care homes, so that targeted approaches can be put in place.

The importance of ensuring the needs of people with mobility difficulties are taken into consideration is highlighted as an equality and diversity consideration in statement 3 which states that local authorities should ensure that proposals to encourage active travel in planning applications for new or improved developments are accessible to people with limited mobility or disabilities.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope of the quality standard been made as a result of topic engagement to highlight potential equality issues?

No changes have been made to the scope of the quality standard at this stage.

2.3 Do the draft quality statements make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

The draft quality statements do not make it more difficult in practice for specific groups to access services.

2.4 Is there potential for the draft quality statements to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

The draft quality statements do not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

2.5 Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in questions 2.1, 2.2 or 2.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

There are no further explanations that the committee could make to alleviate barriers to services.

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

Completed by lead technical analyst: Melanie Carr \_\_\_\_\_

Date\_20/7/18\_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Mark Minchin \_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_17/9/18\_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

### 3. POST CONSULTATION STAGE

3.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation stage, and, if so, how has the committee addressed them?

Stakeholders highlighted that if charges on polluting vehicles are included in the local approach to air pollution it will be important to mitigate the impacts on low paid staff. Statement 1 therefore includes an equality and diversity consideration to ensure that local authorities assess the impact on vulnerable groups if local charges are proposed. If necessary, actions to mitigate the impact of charges on specific groups should be identified.

3.2 If the quality statements have changed after the consultation stage, are there any that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

The statement on advice for vulnerable groups is now focussed on giving people with chronic respiratory or cardiovascular conditions advice at routine health appointments to support self-management. Advice for people in other vulnerable groups such as pregnant women, children and older people who do not have chronic respiratory or cardiovascular conditions is no longer included in the statement. The committee agreed to focus the population to make it practical to implement. The revised statement does not make it difficult for specific groups with chronic respiratory or cardiovascular conditions to access advice.

3.3 If the quality statements have changed after consultation, is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

The statements do not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

3.4 If the quality statements have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in questions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

There are no additional considerations that could be included.

Completed by lead technical analyst Melanie Carr \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ 22/11/18 \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead \_\_\_ Mark Minchin \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ 17/1/19 \_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0.7 DOC EIA

### After Guidance Executive amendments

4.1 Outline amendments agreed by Guidance Executive below, if applicable:
No changes were agreed by Guidance Executive

Completed by lead technical analyst Melanie Carr \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ 5/2/19 \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead \_\_\_ Mark Minchin \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ 5/2/19 \_\_\_\_\_

© NICE 2018. All rights reserved. Subject to [Notice of rights](#).