

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Name of the policy or function being assessed: Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan

Directorate

Development and Renewal

Date Impact Assessment completed

10th November 2006

Is this a policy or function?

Policy

Function

Is this a new or existing policy or function?

New

Existing

Names and roles of the people carrying out the Impact Assessment:

(Explain why the members of the impact assessment team were selected i.e. the knowledge and experience they bring to the process).

1. Heather Cheesbrough, Urban Initiatives

Heather is the Project Director responsible for preparing the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan on behalf of LB Tower Hamlets. She has considerable experience of considering and involving a wide range of stakeholders in the preparation of masterplans.

2. Sophie Moreton, Urban Initiatives

Sophie is the project manager for the Bromley-by-Bow masterplan and experience of completing Equality Impact Assessments for an RDA as well as public engagement in regeneration projects

3. Hugh Chambers, London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Hugh is the Equalities and Inclusion Officer for LB Tower Hamlets, it is Hugh's role to ensure that this assessment is carried out in accordance with the Council's procedures

4. Debbie Allaire, London Borough of Tower Hamlets

Debbie is the Council's Access Officer and will be advising on access issues in relation to the masterplan

4. Shazia Hussain, Local Area Partnership

Shazia has excellent connections with the local community in Bromley-by-Bow and is able to advise on diversity and equality issues in the masterplan area.

Service Head	Owen Whalley
Signature	
Date	

Once you have filled in this document please send a copy to the Equalities Team.

If you have any questions regarding this form please call the Equalities Team on 020 7364 4723.

SECTION 1

AIMS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

Identifying the aims of the policy¹

Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan

The aim of the policy is to provide a visionary, inclusive and functional masterplan document, which will formulate part of the LBTH Local Development Framework, and will be adopted in due course as a Supplementary Planning Document.

The masterplan will provide a clear framework for development that is already coming forward and a comprehensive guide for delivering sustainable regeneration and securing benefits and opportunities for the existing community.

¹ Please note the term 'Policy' is used for simplicity. The broad term can also refer to a function or a service.

Rationale behind the policy and its delivery

(Please state the underlying policy objectives which underpin this service and what they are trying to achieve).

Are there associated objectives of the policy? If so, what are they?

The Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan defines the following vision for the area which was developed through consultation with the local community, landowners, businesses and key local stakeholders:

'Bromley-by-Bow – a distinctive, accessible and cohesive London neighbourhood with a strong community emphasis, a choice of shopping and a high quality environment'

Having an agreed vision for the area, which can be signed up to and can be worked towards by all key stakeholders, developers and the community will help coordinate the regeneration effort in Bromley-by-Bow. The vision and the objectives that flow from it will provide the framework in which cohesive development can come forward. The following objectives set out how the vision will be achieved:

OBJECTIVE 1

To structure and positively plan for development that will address the severance created by the A12, railway and waterside to support and enable regeneration, economic opportunity and an increased population.

OBJECTIVE 2

To develop a well connected, legible and cohesive neighbourhood by providing safe, direct and attractive routes that encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport.

OBJECTIVE 3

To provide a new neighbourhood centre that will give a focus to the area through the provision of local shops and community facilities.

OBJECTIVE 4

To enhance the public realm, create new open green space with a range of facilities space and improve riverside opportunities

OBJECTIVE 5

To retain the existing broad mix of uses, with a particular emphasis on increasing the diversity of housing choice, the raising in quality of commercial space and the need to provide local employment opportunities

OBJECTIVE 6

To ensure that new development fosters a positive identity for Bromley-by-Bow, through the use of appropriate height and scale and by optimising the existing assets of the waterside, St. Andrew's hospital, Three Mills and Kingsley Hall.

What outcomes do we want to achieve from this policy?

Better social and physical integration of the existing community
 Social and physical integration of new and existing residents of Bromley-by-Bow
 High quality urban environment which promotes the safety, security and health of it's residents and attracts new residents and businesses

Distinctive urban environment unique to Bromley-by-Bow
 A neighbourhood of which its residents can be proud
 A place which is accessible, permeable and legible

What factors could contribute/detract from the outcomes?

Lack of a clear implementation plan to deliver the masterplan
 Limitation of the existing built and natural environment
 Landowners not bringing forward land for development in accordance with the masterplan
 Lack of private and/or public funding to carry out major infrastructure improvements

Who is affected by the policy? Who is intended to benefit from it and how?

Who are the main stakeholders in relation to this policy?

The main stakeholders in this policy are:

London Borough of Tower Hamlets – the local planning authority who will be responsible for adopting and implementing the policy

Greater London Authority – to ensure complementarity with the London Plan, East London Sub-Regional Planning Framework and Opportunity Area Planning Framework for Leaside

Transport for London – to ensure that the masterplan takes account of issues relating to the rail and road network

Tower Hamlets Partnership – as representatives of the wider community and providers of key services to the community such as health, education, police

London Development Agency – as a landowner within the masterplan area and facilitator of regeneration

London Thames Gateway Development Corporation – as a key enabler of employment and housing in the Thames Gateway with planning powers and access to funding

Landowners – buy in of the landowners within the masterplan area and immediate surrounding is essential for the implementation of the plan. This includes the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) Poplar HARCA who own and manage much of the housing stock.

Local Area Partnership 6 Steering Group – representatives of the residents and local service providers for Bromley-by-Bow and Mile End wards

Local Councillors – as democratically elected representatives of the community

Resident's Boards for the Crossways, Bow Bridge, Coventry Cross and Devons Estates
 Bromley-by-Bow Centre – as the local provider of community services such as café, crèche,

Tower Hamlets Access Group – A Borough-wide group which provides specific guidance and advise on issues relating to access and disability.

Streets of Growth – a local charity representing young people in Bromley-by-Bow. This is an important group given the high proportion of young people in the area.

What outcomes would other stakeholders want from this policy?

A number of workshops have been held with stakeholders and the outcomes of those workshops are detailed below in the consultation section.

Are there any groups, which might be expected to benefit from the intended outcomes but which do not?

It has been noted that the Bengali women are not well represented on the residents' groups

mentioned above. It is important that all the community are involved in the masterplanning process and consultation and engagement has been designed to seek the input of this group.

To this end a 'drop-in session' was held on 5th September 2006 at the Bromley-by-Bow Centre specifically to seek views on how Bangladeshi women consider the area could be improved and provide information as to how they can get involved in the development of the Masterplan. The main issues identified included: lack of open space, not enough large community facilities, fear of crime and the need for larger houses.

Similarly, there was a concern that the views of young people were not being represented through the residents' groups and therefore a further event was held to specifically engage them in the masterplanning process. The event was held on the 5th October 2006 at Tudor Lodge. The main issues identified included: lack of useable open space for football and other sports, poor environmental quality eg. broken pavements and litter, poor built environment – quality of the homes on the estates are poor, poor lighting and racial segregation.

It was noted that only young people from the White and Black community attended the event. This appeared to reflect racial tensions with the Young Asian community and the fact that the event was located within an estate with a higher concentration of white and black residents.

Promotion of good relations between different communities

(How does the policy or function contribute to better Community Cohesion?)

How do you promote good relations between different communities you serve based on mutual understanding and respect?

Currently the physical layout and building form of the masterplan area creates large blocks of development which are impermeable and often segregated by strategic infrastructure routes, such as the A12 and underground and C2C rail lines. This type of physical environment does not encourage people from different neighbourhoods to mix, as certain blocks of residential development feel intimidating to enter and do not encourage through traffic. There is a poor pedestrian environment and network of public spaces which does not encourage the use of the outdoor environment.

The local authority ownership and management of areas as individual estates has created an 'estate mentality' whereby residents of one estate compete with other estates for investment and resources and does not encourage the residents of the different estates to mix despite the shared physical and social problems.

The masterplan aims to influence the design of the public realm to break up these large blocks of development, improve both the numbers of pedestrian links across the A12 and rail lines and experience of existing crossings. This will result in a greater network of legible, pleasant, safe, inviting pedestrian routes and public spaces which will encourage greater pedestrian activity between and through the various neighbourhoods.

New development blocks will be planned with clearly demarcated private and public space and designed to encourage vibrant streets. In designing these new development areas the needs and aspirations of all stakeholders (new and existing) will be taken into account.

Clearly the physical environment alone cannot create mutual understanding and respect between different communities of geography, interest, faith etc. which is why representatives of service providers and community support have been included as key stakeholders in this project. The transformed physical environment will also need to be supported by strong social infrastructure.

What opportunities are there for positive cross cultural contact between these communities to take place e.g. between younger and older people, or between people of different religious faiths?

The design of new residential neighbourhoods can encourage cross-cultural contact by ensuring that there is a mixture of tenures, dwelling sizes and types which appeal to a cross-section of ages, income and ethnic background.

The new heart to Bromley-by-Bow focused around a civic spine providing a variety of community facilities such as places of worship, schools, parks and health care encourages residents from the surrounding area to meet and interact.

Public spaces which are inviting, safe, interesting and well managed encourage their use by a range of people.

(Specifically identify the relevance of the aims of the policy to the equality target groups and the Council's duty to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people of different racial groups).

The masterplan will have a positive impact on the integration of different racial, socio-economic and age groups through the design of the environment and recommendations for implementation of the policy.

Policy Priorities:

(How does the policy fit in with the council's wider aims? Include Corporate and Local Strategic Partnership Priorities)

How does the policy relate to other policies and practices within the council?

Community Plan

The Bromley-by-Bow masterplan will contribute to:

- a better place for living safely by designing out crime
- a better place for living well by designing in quality public open spaces, improving access to the river, designing in health care and community uses and retail and providing a variety of housing types to meet the varying needs of a diverse community.
- a better place for creating and sharing prosperity by ensuring that certain areas are safeguarded for industry and by designing mixed use developments that meet modern business needs
- a better place for learning, achievement and leisure by allocating space for a new primary school (in line with the AAP)

Regeneration Strategy

The Bromley-by-Bow masterplan will have regard to the aims of the regeneration strategy and delivery of the masterplan will contribute to the 'Developing Places' aim of the strategy

Local Development Framework

The Bromley-by-Bow masterplan will be in conformity with the Local Development Framework and will assist the delivery of the LDF aims in Bromley-by-Bow

Leaside Area Action Plan

The Bromley-by-Bow masterplan will be in conformity with the Leaside Area Action Plan and will assist the delivery of the AAP aims in Bromley-by-Bow

What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?

This masterplan is very well embedded in the policy framework for East London, the Lee Valley and Tower Hamlets policies, it has had the involvement and commitment from all the key delivery agencies and is therefore a robust piece of policy. However, the full implementation of the masterplan will require substantial investment in infrastructure to Bromley-by-Bow station and the A12 and the commitment to making these investments are the key threat to its delivery. As with any masterplan, once adopted it is reliant on the private sector to bring forward sites for redevelopment, unless the Council or LTGDC

acquire the sites themselves.

How do these outcomes meet or hinder other policies, values or objectives of the council?

The masterplan will compliment and expand on the Local Development Framework and Leaside Area Action Plan, it will also undergo a sustainability appraisal which checks for any conflicts between different policy areas and recommends how they should be dealt with.

How the policy is implemented

(How is, or will, the policy be put into practice and who is, or will be, responsible for it?)

Who defines or defined the policy?

The need for a masterplan for Bromley-by-Bow was identified in the Leaside Area Action Plan prepared by LB Tower Hamlets and the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity Area Framework prepared by the Greater London Authority.

Urban Initiatives, as an independent consultant, will prepare the policy taking into account the views of all the stakeholders mentioned above and in accordance with the brief supplied by London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Throughout the design process there will be an ongoing dialogue with the steering group to ensure that the masterplan meets their needs.

Once the masterplan has been endorsed by the steering group it will then be taken forward for adoption by London Borough of Tower Hamlets as a Supplementary Planning Document within the Local Development Framework.

Who implements the policy?

London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the London Thames Gateway Development Corporation will be responsible for leading the implementation of the policy. The policy will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and provide a framework for public and private sector investment in the area. However, the timeframe for delivery will be dependent on landowners bringing forward development proposals which meet the needs of the masterplan, unless the Council or London Development Agency compulsory purchase the land to bring it forward for development themselves.

How does the council interface with other bodies in relation to the implementation of this policy?

When schemes come forward for planning permission the Council has a duty to consult with statutory consultees and the local residents before making a decision on whether to grant planning approval.

Is the service provided solely by the Department or in conjunction with another department, agency or contractor?

The masterplan describes a series of interventions in spatial planning terms that will be delivered by land and property owners, developers and the Council.

If external parties are involved then what are the measures in place to ensure that they comply with the Council's Equal Opportunities policy?

Where applicable the LDF requires that an impact assessment is completed for major planning applications. This should ensure that external parties give an equalities focus to their proposals.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

SECTION 2

CONSIDERATION OF DATA AND RESEARCH

List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data available that will enable the impact assessment to be undertaken (include information where appropriate from other directorates, Census 2001 etc.)

General Population

Population size and growth

The approximate population of the masterplan area is 7900 – this is based on the best fit of Lower Level Super Output Areas at the Census in 2001.

Population density

The population density of LB Tower Hamlets is 10,462 people per square kilometre, compared with an average of 10,000 for London (2002) and according to Tower Hamlets Partnership Ward Data Report of January 2006 the Bromley ward has one of the highest levels of overcrowding of all Tower Hamlets wards.

Population by age

Note the high proportion of under 25's in Bromley-by-Bow and Tower Hamlets in comparison to the rest of London.

Age Group	No of people	% of population	% in Tower Hamlets	% in London
0-5	963	12	8	8
5-16	1510	19	15	14
17-25	1288	16	17	13
26-35	1527	19	23	20
36-45	999	13	13	15
46-55	563	7	8	11
56-65	519	6	6	8
66-80	451	6	7	8
80+	129	2	2	3
Total	7949	100	100	100

Population by ethnic group

Note the high level of people of Bangladeshi origin and the number of black people living within the masterplan area.

Ethnic Origin	No. of people	% of total	% Tower Hamlets	% London
White	2885	36	51	71
Mixed	260	3	2	3
Asian or Asian British	3609	45	37	12
Asian or Asian British: Indian	144	2	2	6
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	84	1	1	2
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	3322	42	33	2
Asian or Asian British: Other Asian	59	1	1	2
Black or Black British	989	12	6	11
Chinese	109	1	2	1

Other Ethnic Group	100	1	1	2
Total	7952	100	100	100

Housing

Household tenure

Tenure	No. of Dwellings	% of Dwellings	% in Tower Hamlets	% in London
Owned	571	20	29	56
Owned: Shared ownership	81	3	2	1
Social rented: Rented from Council	1438	49	37	17
Social rented: Other social rented	548	19	15	9
Private rented	221	8	16	15
Other	68	2	2	2
	2927	100	100	100

Housing type

The majority of people in the study area live in purpose-built flats or maisonettes and there are also a number of houses but very few semi-detached and detached properties resulting in a lack of sizeable properties in the area consistent with the rest of Tower Hamlets where 3.2% of local authority dwelling stock are low rise flats, 54.4% are high rise flats, 36.3% are high rise flats and 6.1% are houses (April 2004)
(source: Housing Revenue Account Forms).

Council Tax Band

Council Tax Band	No. of Dwellings	% of Dwellings
Band A	207	7.2
Band B	1428	49.7
Band C	880	30.6
Band D	295	10.3
Band E	50	1.7
Band F	4	0.1
Band G	1	0.0
Band H	7	0.2
Band X; Unallocated	0	0.0

Health

Life Expectancy

The life expectancy in Tower Hamlets is 78.9 for women and 72.9 for men which is 1.9 years less than the London average for a woman and 3.1 years less for a man (source: 2001 Census).

Self-assessment of health

64% of the area's residents describe their overall health as good, which is lower than London as a whole (71% do) further 25% say they have fairly good health.

Number of people with a limiting illness

London Borough of Tower Hamlets has a high number of people with a limiting long-term illness (18% of the population) (source: 2001 Census).

Economy & Employment

Qualifications

Level of Qualification	% in study area	% in Tower Hamlets	% in London
No qualifications	44	36	25
Level 1 qualifications	14	11	14
Level 2 qualifications	14	13	18
Level 3 qualifications	8	10	10
Level 4 / 5 qualifications	20	31	33
	100	100	100

Employment type

Category	No. of people	%	% in Tower Hamlets	% in London
Economically active	2726	34	38	42
Economically active: Employee: Part-time	458	6	5	5
Economically active: Employee: Full-time	1437	18	23	26
Economically active: Self-employed with employees	82	1	1	2
Economically active: Unemployed	442	6	4	3
Economically active: Full-time Students	192	2	2	2
Economically inactive	2645	33	26	20
	5371	100	100	100

Employment Type by Ethnicity (2004)

Data was only available at the local authority level, at not at the ward or study area level. The source of this c Annual Employment Survey (2004).

Employment Status and Ethnicity	No. of people in Tower Hamlets
Employed; White	48200
Employed; Mixed	2000
Employed; Indian	1000
Employed; Pakistani and Bangladeshi	13500
Employed; Black or Black British	4100
Employed; Other Ethnic	5300
Employed Full-Time; White	42300
Employed Full-Time; Mixed	2000
Employed Full-Time; Indian	800
Employed Full-Time; Pakistani and Bangladeshi	8100
Employed Full-Time; Black or Black British	3400
Employed Full-Time; Other Ethnic	3300
Employed Part-Time; White	6000
Employed Part-Time; Mixed	0
Employed Part-Time; Indian	0
Employed Part-Time; Pakistani and Bangladeshi	5400
Employed Part-Time; Black or Black British	800
Employed Part-Time; Other Ethnic	2000

Employment by Gender

Note that the number of both women and men in full time employment and self-employment is lower than for as a whole.

Note that the number of females looking after the home/family is considerably higher than the Tower Hamlets average.
 Note that youth employment, over 50's unemployment and long term unemployment are considerably lower than Tower Hamlets average.

Crime & Safety

According to the Tower Hamlets Partnership Ward Data Report of January 2006 the Borough of Tower Hamlets has made progress in terms of reducing overall crime levels, domestic burglary, robbery and vehicle crime.

	Females aged 16-74		Males aged 16-74	
	London Borough Tower Hamlets	BBB sustainability appraisal area	London Borough Tower Hamlets	BBB sustainability appraisal area
Economically active: Employees Part-time	7.82	7.75	6.2	6.2
Economically active: Employees Full-time	30.53	21.49	41.4	41.4
Economically active: Self-employed	3.02	1.12	8.5	8.5
Economically active: Unemployed	4.08	4.89	9.0	9.0
Economically active: Full-time student	3.43	3.44	3.3	3.3
Economically Inactive: Retired	8.34	7.31	7.0	7.0
Economically Inactive: Student	9.51	10.29	8.3	8.3
Economically Inactive: Looking after home / family	18.69	25.11	2.0	2.0
Economically Inactive: Permanently sick / disabled	5.56	5.80	7.3	7.3
Economically Inactive: Other	9.02	12.79	6.1	6.1
Unemployed females aged 16-74: Aged 16-24	31.09	1.41	21	21
Unemployed females aged 16-74: Aged 50 and over	7.82	0.22	11.8	11.8
Unemployed females aged 16-74: Who have never worked	22.37	0.62	10.2	10.2
Unemployed females aged 16-74: Who are long-term unemployed	30.2	1.85	34.3	34.3

The reported incidence of burglary has fallen sharply between 2002 and 2005 and the incidence of robbery year from 2001 to 2005.

There is also a low incidence of car crime, partly due to the low levels of car ownership in the area.

Incidences of racial harassment reported to LB Tower Hamlets Housing Department fell by 50% between 2003 and 2005 in the housing neighbourhood area of Bow and Poplar North which covers the masterplan and hinterland areas.

The amount of reported drug crime in the Bromley-by-Bow ward has increased year on year between 2003 and 2005. Levels are still low in comparison with other wards in Tower Hamlets.

Equalities profile of users or beneficiaries

(Use the Council's approved diversity monitoring categories and provide data by target group of users or beneficiaries to determine whether the service user profile reflects the local population or relevant target group or if there is over or under representation of these groups)

The policy focus is to benefit the wider community identified above. However, from the available data there is a possible gap in respect of the Lesbian / Gay and Bisexual

community. At this point it is not possible to determine whether there is a need for differential provision for this group.

Equalities profile of staff

(Indicate profile by target groups and assess relevance to policy aims and objectives e.g. Workforce to Reflect the Community. Identify staff responsible for delivering the service including where they are not directly employed by the council).

It is not known at this stage exactly which staff will implement the Masterplan.

Evidence of Complaints against the service on grounds of discrimination

(Is there any evidence of complaints either from customers or staff (Grievance) as to the delivery of the service, or its operation, on the equality target groups?)

There were no complaints received by LBTH during the masterplan preparation process but LBTH should monitor and identify any complaints within the Bromley-by-Bow area resulting from planning applications.

Barriers

(What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups?)

The masterplan team has been informed by the Local Area Partnership that historically it has been difficult to engage the Bengali community in plans and programmes which affect them.

Consultation fatigue is a general barrier to engagement across all groups. The Bromley-by-Bow area has been the subject of a variety of plans and programmes of change in recent months, including consultation on the Bow flyover, Twelvetrees junction and Poplar HARCA consultation on the future of the housing estates as part of the Housing Choice agenda.

The masterplan team will therefore use any relevant information gathered from other consultation events to avoid duplication of effort and add to the consultation fatigue.

Recent consultation exercises carried out

(Detail consultation with relevant interest groups, other public bodies, voluntary organisations, community groups, trade unions, focus groups and other groups, surveys and questionnaires undertaken etc. Focus in particular on the findings of views expressed by the equality target groups)

Full details of the consultation undertaken can be found in the accompanying consultation report.

Regular steering group meetings have been held during the masterplan development process – the steering group is made up representatives from LBTH, Tower Hamlets

Partnership, London Development Agency, London Thames Gateway Development Corporation, Greater London Authority, Transport for London.

A strategic visioning workshop was held on the 23 May 2006 with the steering group and major landowners in the Bromley-by-Bow area.

The outcome of the workshops was a preferred scenario of high-quality residential led development which recognises the need to provide social infrastructure and small business premises in order for the development to be sustainable.

A workshop with an extended Local Area Partnership Steering Group was held on 16th May 2006.

The workshops outlined the following key issues that the community want from this masterplan:

Less crime and anti-social behaviour
 More and higher quality open space
 Better access across the A12 to Tesco and the waterfront

A collaborative design workshop was held on 4th July 2006 with the steering group, key stakeholders and landowners to test the masterplan options and the options were refined in light of this workshop.

A collaborative design workshop was held on 13th July 2006 but was poorly attended. The workshop was subsequently re-run on the 19th September, supported by out-reach work from the Bromley-by-Bow centre to ensure a much better representation of the local community attended. The workshop tested the masterplan options and the options were refined in light of this workshop.

A morning workshop with 34 Bengali women was held on 5th September in the Bromley-by-Bow Centre.

An evening workshop with 10 young people was held on the 5th October in Tudor Lodge on the Bow Bridge estate

A Public Exhibition will be held during the statutory consultation period in the new year presenting the preferred masterplan to the public for comment. The responses from this exhibition will be analysed and taken into account in the production of the final document where appropriate.

Identify areas where more information may be needed and the action taken to obtain this data.

(You will need to consider data that is monitored but not reported, data that could be monitored but is not currently collected and data that is not currently monitored and would be impossibly/extremely difficult to collect).

Gaps in information:

Data is unavailable for:

Population by ethnic group and age
Housing tenure by ethnic group and gender
Life expectancy by ethnic group
Health by ethnic group
Qualifications by ethnic group and gender
Limited data for the Gay Lesbian and Bi-sexual community

Action needed:

(Include short-term measures to be taken to provide a baseline where no or little information is available)

The Council has a broad objective to improve data collection and monitoring in this area.

SECTION 3

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT

Race – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on different race groups from information available above.

The Masterplan is being produced to address the needs of the whole of the local community. Care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the local demographics and to consult as widely as possible (including specific race consultations) to ensure that the impacts on different race groups are taken into account and addressed.

Greater physical integration of different racial groups within the area will improve as a result of the masterplan due to the intensification of development and the introduction of new dwellings into the area.

The greater range of housing, including accommodation for larger family units will benefit those with large or extended families.

The masterplan proposes improvements to the physical fabric of the Islamic centre on Powis Street.

The masterplan proposes improvements to the amount and quality of greenspace in the area, which was a particular request of the Bengali women at the consultation event.

Where negative impacts remain efforts will be made in the Action Plan to militate against them and evidence gathered to ensure that the proposed benefits are achieved.

How is the race target group reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local BME community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on race groups once implementation commences.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect, racial groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. For example, a broad range of housing and community facilities will be provided if the masterplan is implemented fully

and this should therefore offer choice for all racial groups. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination. Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there is an adverse impact, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one racial group or for another legitimate reason?

There is no likely adverse impact that will not be militated.

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate in terms of Race. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate.

Gender – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on gender groups from information available above.

The Masterplan is being produced to address the needs of the whole of the local community. Care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the local demographics and to consult as widely as possible to ensure that the different gender impacts are taken into account and addressed.

The masterplan proposes improvements in permeability and vitality of the streets which improves safety and security and reduces opportunity for crime and also fear of crime, which is more likely to affect women than men.

The masterplan proposes a step free underpass by the station and step free access to the station itself, which makes it easier for people with pushchairs and with mobility problems, which is more likely to be women rather than men.

Where negative impacts remain efforts will be made in the Action Plan to militate against them and evidence gathered to ensure that the proposed benefits are achieved.

How are the gender groups reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on gender groups.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect, gender groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination. The improvements mentioned above will benefit everyone in the community. However, given that women tend to fear crime more than men, are more likely to be the carers of small children and live longer and therefore encounter mobility problems, the Masterplan has a particularly positive impact on women.

Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there an adverse impact, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one gender group or for another legitimate reason?

There is no likely adverse impact that will not be militated against.

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate in terms of Gender. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate.

Disability – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on the disability strand from information available above.

The Masterplan is targeted is being produced to address the needs of the whole of the local community. Care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the local demographics and to consult as widely as possible (including specific disability consultation with the Access Group) to ensure that the disability impacts are taken into account and addressed.

The masterplan proposes introducing a step free underpass next to the station and a step-free access to the station itself making access to the station and across the A12 much easier for those with limited mobility.

The masterplan also proposes introducing more direct routes through the area for pedestrians, as well as key structuring principles which will make navigation around the area much easier for those with limited mobility or visibility.

However, two pedestrian/public transport bridges are proposed – one from Imperial Street to Bow Locks and one from the Community Spine into St Andrew's Hospital site. Although this will improve connectivity through the area for most people due to height required to clear the railway line they will have to include a long ramp to ensure that access is available for all.

The masterplan also advocates the use of lifetime homes standards which ensures that dwellings meet certain standards of accessibility.

Finally, the masterplan concentrates community facilities into the community spine and neighbourhood centre at the heart of the community to ensure they are located in the most accessible place for all, which will also benefit those with limited mobility.

How are disabled people reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on disabled people.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect, disability groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination. The improvements mentioned above will benefit everyone in the community. For example, the masterplan does

not discriminate against those with disabilities and improves the accessibility, permeability and legibility of the area for all.

Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there is an adverse impact, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group or for another legitimate reason?

There is no likely adverse impact that will not be militated against

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate in terms of Disability. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate. In particular, the masterplan does not discriminate against those with disabilities and improves the accessibility, permeability and legibility of the area for all.

Age – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on different age groups from information available above.

The area has a high proportion of young people, who at the present time are poorly provided for in terms of recreation and leisure and there is also a requirement for an additional primary school in the area.

The consultation carried out with young people identified a need for better football, basketball and cricket facilities in the area along with general improvements to the physical and natural environment.

The masterplan responds to these needs by including a new primary school in the neighbourhood centre, new parks and public spaces and the provision of play equipment, football kick-about areas, cricket nets and basketball hoops.

There is currently only one elderly persons home in the area, William Guy House. The masterplan proposes redeveloping this home to allow for the station and station approach improvements. However, the accommodation would be reprovided in a location accessible to public transport and the neighbourhood centre and/or community spine.

How are young and old people reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on different age groups.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect, age groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination.

The masterplan aims to readdress the balance of provision of facilities for young people in the area and therefore suggests development guidance that will create facilities that will appeal to young people.

All age groups will benefit from the other elements of the masterplan, such as the neighbourhood centre, station improvements, parks and open space etc.

Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there is an adverse impact, can be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group or for another legitimate reason?

There is no likely adverse impact that will not be militated against.

The justification of promoting new facilities for young people is the current under provision of facilities.

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly, and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate in terms of Age. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate.

Lesbian, gay bisexual – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) groups from information available above.

The Masterplan is targeted is being produced to address the needs of the whole of the local community. Care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the local demographics and to consult as widely as possible.

However, there is a deficiency of monitoring information relating to LGB groups and therefore it is not possible to identify all possible affects. Improved consultation with LGB groups will form part of the Action Plan.

How are LBG groups reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on LBG Groups.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect LBG groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination.

Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there is an adverse impact which, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group or for another legitimate reason?

There is no likely adverse impact that will not be militated against.

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate in terms of Age. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate.

Religion/Belief – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on different religious/belief groups from information available above.

The Masterplan is targeted is being produced to address the needs of the whole of the local community. Care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the local demographics and to consult as widely as possible.

The majority of the existing population in the study area are Muslim, and the area is currently well served with regard to Islamic places of worship, adult education courses such as ESOL, and support networks. The masterplan aims to introduce significant additional population into the area which may reduce the proportion of Muslim population overall. The masterplan proposes improving the existing Islamic Centre on Powis Street and maintaining the facilities at Kingsley Hall and the Bromley-by-Bow centre, all well used by the Muslim population.

However, there is currently some evidence of racial segregation in the area and the masterplan hopes to integrate people of different religions through the design and layout of streets and house types and the provision of shared facilities within the neighbourhood centre.

There are two places of Christian worship within the masterplan study area and hinterland but there are no places of worship for other religions, and no recommendations within the masterplan to provide any.

How are the religious/belief groups reflected in the take up of the service?

The nature of the Masterplan means that there is no specific take up of service in the traditional sense. As stated above the proposals within the Masterplan have been developed with an understanding of the needs and aspirations of local community as far as that is possible.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of impact of the Masterplan on different religious or belief groups.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect, religious or belief groups differently and if so do any of the differences amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination?

The Masterplan has been developed specifically to address disadvantage in line with various Council strategies. It is therefore likely to have a positive impact. Any identified differential treatment does not amount to adverse impact or unlawful discrimination.

It is noted however that Non-Christian and Non-Muslim people living within or moving to the masterplan area will not be able to visit a place of worship locally.

Systems of monitoring, where practicable, will be put in place to assess and evaluate the extent to which the identified disadvantage has been addressed.

If there is an adverse impact, can it be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group or for another legitimate reason?

The very small number of non-Christian or non-Muslim people in the area does not justify the provision of additional places of worship as they would not be viable. Should the religious composition of the area change dramatically in the future the masterplan is flexible enough to accommodate such provision at a later date.

Could the policy discriminate, directly or indirectly, and if so is it justifiable under legislation?

Yes, the Masterplan could have been developed in such a way that it could discriminate against different religious or belief groups. However, great care has been taken in the development of the Masterplan to understand the needs of the local community in an effort to produce a plan that does not discriminate.

Health Impact – testing of disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify the effect of the policy on physical or mental health of service users and the wider community from any information that is available. (This might include an increased risk to health for some groups in the community, which although not intended, may have still occurred. The impact on health might include: increased mental stress, greater risk of accident or injury, reduced opportunities to have a quality diet, reduced opportunity for physical exercise, or greater incidence of diseases such as heart disease and diabetes.)

The masterplan aims to promote a healthy lifestyle by improving the routes for walking and cycling and providing additional open space, access to open space and the facilities provided within the open space such as children's play equipment, goal posts, basketball hoops and cricket wickets.

The masterplan shows the retention of the allotments which gives local people the opportunity to grow their own food. It also promotes a more varied retail offer which could offer improved choice and quality of food.

The masterplan promotes walking, cycling and public transport over the private car, which could improve air quality in the area. Poor air quality is linked to respiratory diseases such as asthma. It also improves road crossings both at surface level and by underpasses and bridges which aims to reduce the number of people in traffic accidents.

The masterplan also shows the location of a new health centre as part of the redevelopment of the St Andrew's hospital site.

From the evidence above does the policy affect, or have the potential to affect the health of groups differently? If so, which groups and how does the impact occur?

The masterplan will have a positive impact on asthma sufferers if air quality improves in the long term.

The masterplan will also benefit users of the new health centre and potentially new sports facilities.

Additional groups which may experience a disproportionate or adverse impact

Identify if there are groups, other than those already considered, that may be adversely affected by the policy?

The masterplan aims to provide additional employment opportunities in the area which can be accessed by local people and help address unemployment and deprivation in the area.

The masterplan proposes additional family housing in the area, of which there is currently a serious shortage in the area, which will benefit those currently living in overcrowded accommodation and wanting to stay in the area and new families moving to Bromley-by-Bow.

The masterplan proposes a greater mixture of housing tenures. The majority of existing residents rent from a social landlord, whilst the masterplan proposes the introduction of shared ownership and private housing which will benefit those aspiring to become home owners.

Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact

Management Arrangements
(How is the Service managed, are there any management arrangements which may have a disproportionate impact on the equality target groups?)

It should be ensured that planning applications for new development in the area are dealt with fairly and decisions given in accordance with the masterplan to ensure that direct or indirect discrimination does not occur during the implementation of the masterplan.

What is the custom and practice in the provision or allocation of this service?
(Could these have a disproportionate impact on the equality target groups?)

Not applicable.

The Process of Service Delivery

(In particular look at the arrangements for the service being provided).

Not applicable.

Operation Times

(When is the service provided; are there seasonal issues; are there barriers to the service based on the time and delivery of the service which may affect the target groups?)

Not applicable.

Methods of communication to the public and internally

(What methods do you use to communicate this service? Include review and assessment of methods, media, translations, interpretation etc. bearing in mind the extent to which these media forms are accessible to all sections of the community)

The masterplan will be available for inspection at the Council's planning offices and will be made available on the Council's website.

Awareness of Service by Local People

(Assessment of the extent to which local people are aware of the service based on available data. What measures do you undertake to reach traditionally excluded communities?)

See earlier section on public consultation.

Evidence of disproportionate or adverse impact

(Is there any evidence or view that suggests that different equality, or other, target groups in the community have either a disproportionately high or low take up/impact of/from this service/function?)

yes no

If yes, what and why (State below)

SECTION 4

MEASURES TO MITIGATE DISPROPORTIONATE OR ADVERSE IMPACT

Specify measures that can be taken to remove or minimise the disproportionate impact or adverse effect identified at the end of Section 3. If none were identified in Section 3, identify how disproportionate impact or adverse effect could be avoided in the future. (Consider measures to mitigate any adverse impact and better achieve the promotion of equality of opportunity).

There are no known disproportionate or adverse impacts at this stage. The Masterplan specifically seeks to improve opportunities for all groups within the community.

During the consideration of Masterplan options, specific issues were identified – for example the option (not progressed) which proposed that Tesco would stay in its current location would not have generated sufficient development value to address the severance caused by the A12. This could have meant that people with disabilities would have had difficulties in accessing the proposed neighbourhood centre.

Where practicable, monitoring will be put in place to gain an understanding of the impacts of the Masterplan on different groups within the community. If it is identified that the Masterplan is having a disproportionate impact on a particular group, then the Action Plan will be updated to include specific measures to address this impact.

SECTION 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Does the policy comply with equalities legislation, including the duty to promote race equality? Take into account your findings from the impact assessment and consultations and explain how the policy was decided upon its intended effects and its benefits.)

yes no

What are the main areas requiring further attention?

Need to improve data collection, specifically to identify:

- Population by ethnic group and age
- Housing tenure by ethnic group and gender
- Life expectancy by ethnic group
- Health by ethnic group
- Qualifications by ethnic group and gender
- Limited data for the Gay Lesbian and Bi-sexual community

Important to consider further how to engage GLB groups within consultation process.

Important to facilitate cross cultural consultation events, particularly for young people.

Summary of recommendations for improvement

The Borough's Annual Monitoring Report will need to develop the necessary data sets to address the above omissions.

The consultation plan for the Masterplan will need to be updated to ensure that GLB Groups are actively engaged during the statutory consultation period and that provision is made for cross cultural consultation events, particularly for young people.

How will the results of the IA feed into the performance planning process?

The IA is part of the Masterplan process itself, informing policy development and specific Masterplan proposals.

Future Monitoring and Consultation

How and when will the policy be monitored?

Through the Borough's Annual Monitoring Report.

Suggested consultation for the future.

(Identify areas for future consultation and any barriers to participation in consultation with proposals to overcome these).

As stated above, the consultation plan for the Masterplan will need to be updated to ensure that GLB Groups are actively engaged during the statutory consultation period and that provision is made for cross cultural consultation events, particularly for young people.

SECTION 6 – ACTION PLAN

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones	Officer Responsible	Progress
Need to improve data collection, specifically to identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population by ethnic group and age - Housing tenure by ethnic group and gender - Life expectancy by ethnic group - Health by ethnic group - Qualifications by ethnic group and gender - Limited data for the Gay Lesbian and Bi-sexual community 	Improved data collection through Annual Monitoring Report	Inclusion of additional data in Annual Monitoring Report.	J Haynes	Ongoing
Important to consider further how to engage GLB groups within consultation process.	Specific amendment to Masterplan Consultation Plan.	Ensure GLB are engaged in statutory consultation	M Bell	Ongoing
Important to facilitate cross cultural consultation events, particularly for young people.	Specific amendment to Masterplan Consultation Plan.	Ensure cross cultural consultation event is included within statutory consultation	M Bell	Ongoing

