

## COVID-19: enabling safe travel in Camden – Amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood Scheme

### Section 1: WHAT IS BEING ANALYSED?

#### Question 1: What is changing and why?

If the issue is going for decision, for example at Cabinet meeting, what are the decision makers being asked to decide? If you are reviewing a policy what are its main aims? How will these changes affect people?

Between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of December 2020, the London Borough of Camden carried out a joint public consultation on proposed amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood Experimental Traffic Order. This report sets out the Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) that has been carried out by the London Borough of Camden on these proposed changes. This assessment is in line with the Council's commitment to reducing inequality, as set out in Our Camden Plan and by Camden's Equality Taskforce. This assessment seeks to establish the impacts, both positive and negative, that these proposed changes will have on the nine protected groups defined in the Equality Act, 2010 and, where necessary, mitigate any negative impacts. These groups are: Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion/Belief, Sex, and Sexual Orientation.

#### Context

In response to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, the Department for Transport issued statutory guidance on 9th May 2020 (updated on 23rd May 2020 and replaced on 13 November 2020) '[Traffic Management Act 2004: network management in response to COVID-19](#)'. This requires local authorities to reallocate road space to walking and cycling to help encourage more people to choose alternatives to public transport when they need to travel, making healthier habits easier and helping make sure the road, bus and rail networks are ready to respond to future increases in demand. This includes:

*'Modal filters (also known as filtered permeability); closing roads to motor traffic, for example by using planters or large barriers. Often used in residential areas, when designed and delivered well, this can create low-traffic or traffic-free neighbourhoods leading to a more pleasant environment that encourages people to walk and cycle, and improving safety.'*

In line with this statutory guidance, a series of emergency measures have been proposed across Camden to respond to the need to facilitate the safe travel and transport needs of people in Camden, in light of COVID-19. On 13<sup>th</sup> May 2020 the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden signed off the Council's proposed approach to enabling safe travel in

Camden, in light of COVID-19. The [Council's response](#) to enabling safe travel in Camden following the COVID-19 pandemic seeks to improve road safety and help people in the borough social distance safely through providing more, safe space they can use to walk and cycle in.

The proposed amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood, assessed within this report, form part of Camden's transport response. More information on the Council's response can be found on the Council's Making Travel Safer [website](#).

We are proposing amendments at the following locations:

- Inverness Street junction with Arlington Road
- Mornington Place
- Arlington Road
- Albert Street
- Mornington Street

Further detail on the proposed amendments is provided in the Amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood Decision Report.

Through delegated authority from the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden, the Director of Environment and Sustainability will need to decide whether or not to approve the implementation of the proposed Amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood, which forms part of the Council's transport response to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

This EIA is an appendix to the Amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood Decision Report and will be used – together with other relevant information, e.g. monitoring data - to inform the decision taken by the Director of Environment and Sustainability on whether or not to proceed with these proposed transport improvements. This EIA shows that most impacts on protected groups will be positive and protected groups are unlikely to be significantly negatively affected by the proposed changes. Further detail on this assessment is provided with this report.

## Section 2: PLANNING YOUR EQUALITY ANALYSIS

**Question 2: Do those from protected groups benefit or will they experience specific and disproportionate impacts? Will there be any direct or indirect discrimination?**

Gather relevant equality data and information to show who will be affected by this decision and how. Set this out below. Include the results of any consultation or engagement. If you have identified any information gaps set out what these are.

This section of the EIA seeks to establish the wider equalities context in which the proposed amendments to Arlington Road Area Low Traffic Neighbourhood will be situated. This is done through looking at data for each of the protected equalities groups (Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion/Belief, Sex, and Sexual Orientation)

for London, wards in which these two schemes are located (Camden Town with Primrose Hill and Regent's Park) and the equalities responses and comments provided in the public consultation.

### Equality Data

Given the nature of the current emergency, it is not considered critical to gather exhaustive information on the equality data of the local population of Camden Town with Primrose Hill and Regent's Park. However, Table 1 below summarises the information available from the 2011 census for these residents.

Overall, there is a slightly younger age profile here especially in Regent's Park, compared to Greater London, though this is typical of inner London areas. Ethnically, there is a similar spread of people across all groups, apart from a marked higher proportion of people of Bangladeshi origins in Regent's Park. In addition, Regent's Park has a higher rate of 'limiting long-term illness' and lone-parent households compared to Greater London, and markedly lower rates of marriage or civil partnerships.

**Table 1: Information gathered in Census 2011, on certain protected characteristics in adjacent wards, compared to Greater London**

Protected Characteristic	Protected Characteristic type	Camden Town with Primrose Hill	Regent's Park	Greater London
Population	All resident	12,613	11,925	8,173,941
Sex/Gender	Male	49.8%	51.1%	49.3%
	Female	50.2%	48.9%	50.7%
Age	0-4	5.0%	5.2%	6.0%
	5-15	10.4%	10.7%	10.1%
	16-29	23.9%	33.7%	26.6%
	30-44	27.7%	22.9%	27.0%
	45-59	17.1%	14.6%	15.2%
	60-74	11.8%	8.0%	10.1%
	75-89	3.8%	4.5%	4.5%
	90+	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Ethnicity	White British	50.0%	36.7%	44.9%
	White Irish	4.1%	2.4%	2.2%
	Gypsy/Irish traveller	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	White Other	19.4%	16.5%	12.6%
	White and Black Caribbean	1.0%	0.9%	1.5%
	White and Black African	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%
	White and Asian	1.9%	1.4%	1.2%
	Other Mixed	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%
	Indian	2.0%	3.2%	6.6%
	Pakistani	0.3%	0.7%	2.7%
	Bangladeshi	4.8%	12.0%	2.7%
	Chinese	1.7%	4.2%	1.5%
	Other Asian	2.7%	4.6%	4.9%
	African	4.1%	6.2%	7.0%
	Caribbean	1.3%	1.7%	4.2%
	Other Black	1.4%	2.1%	2.1%
	Arab	1.0%	2.5%	1.3%
	Any other ethnic group	1.8%	2.4%	2.1%
Religion	Christian	35.2%	31.8%	48.4%

	Buddhist	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%
	Hindu	1.0%	1.7%	5.0%
	Jewish	3.9%	1.6%	1.8%
	Muslim	9.2%	19.8%	12.4%
	Sikh	0.1%	0.2%	1.5%
	Other religions	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%
	No religion	28.2%	21.1%	20.7%
	Not stated	20.8%	22.0%	8.5%
<b>Disability</b>	Limiting Long-term Illness	14.8%	15.9%	14.2%
<b>Pregnancy/ Maternity</b>	Lone Parent Households	8.3%	12.1%	8.5%
<b>Marriage/ Civil Partnership</b>	Married or Civil Partnership	30.8%	25.6%	40.2%
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual	Not available	Not available	25%
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Gender reassignment	Not available	Not available	Not available

### Public Consultation

In advance of a decision being taken on whether or not to implement these measures under an ETO and in line with current DfT guidance, the Council carried out a public consultation between 7 and 21 December 2020 on the proposed changes. More detail on this consultation is provided in Section 6 of the decision report and in the accompanying appendices. The consultation material was sent to all Ward Councillors for Camden Town with Primrose Hill and Regent's Park Wards, statutory consultees, borough-wide equality groups, resident groups/ associations, local businesses and local residents. No responses specifically about the nine protected equality characteristics were received from Ward Councillors or borough-wide equality groups.

In this consultation, consultees were asked, voluntarily, to provide equalities information about themselves. In response, 74 (31.4%) of respondents to the consultation responded to these questions. This information is summarised below, according to the nine characteristics protected by the Equality Act, 2010.

#### 2.3.1 Age

Respondents were asked 'What is your age?' A breakdown of the number and percentage of responses, according to age grouping, is provided below.

Age	Number of Consultation Respondents	
Under 16	0	0.0%
16 - 24	0	0.0%
25 – 34	7	3.0%
35 – 44	13	5.5%
45 – 54	20	8.5%
55 – 64	18	7.6%
65 – 74	10	4.2%
75 – 84	3	1.3%
85+	0	0.0%
Not Answered	165	69.9%

### 2.3.2 Disability

Respondents were asked 'Do you consider yourself to have a disability? In other words, a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on your ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities?'. In response, 52 (22.0%) respondents said 'No', 17 (7.2%) said 'Yes' and 167 (70.8%) did not respond to the question.

Respondents were asked for more information on the type of disability they have, if they have one. A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Disability Type</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
Physical impairment (including frailty)	6	2.5%
Sensory impairment	2	0.8%
Long-standing illness	6	2.5%
Mental health condition (including dementia)	3	1.3%
Substance misuse	0	0.0%
Learning disability/difficulty	3	1.3%
Other disability condition	9	3.8%
Not Answered	220	93.2%

### 2.3.3 Gender Reassignment

Respondents were asked 'Is your gender identity different to the sex you were assumed to be at birth?'. In response, 61 (25.8%) respondents answered 'No', 7 (3.0%) said 'Yes', 4 (1.7%) selected 'Prefer not to say' and 164 (69.5%) did not answer the question.

### 2.3.4 Marriage and Civil Partnership

Respondents were asked 'What is your relationship status?' A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
Never married and never registered a civil partnership	21	8.9%
Married	36	15.3%
Separated	1	0.4%
Divorced	6	2.5%
Widowed	1	0.4%
In a registered civil partnership	4	1.7%
Separated, but still legally in a civil partnership	0	0.0%
Formerly in a civil partnership which is now legally dissolved	0	0.0%
Surviving partner from a civil partnership	0	0.0%
Not Answered	166	70.3%

### 2.3.5 Pregnancy and Maternity

Respondents were asked 'Do you have dependant(s) aged 16 and under?'. In response, 45 (19.1%) respondents answered 'No', 25 (10.6%) said 'Yes' and 166 (70.3%) did not answer the question.

Respondents were asked 'If you are a woman, are you pregnant?'. In response, 35 (14.8%) respondents answered 'Not a woman', 1 (0.4%) said 'Yes', 28 (11.9%) answered 'Not pregnant' and 172 (72.9%) did not answer the question.

Respondents were asked 'If you are a woman, have you given birth within the past 26 weeks?'. In response, 33 (14.0%) respondents answered 'Not a woman', 1 (0.4%) answered 'Have given birth within the past 26 weeks', 27 (11.4%) answered 'Have not given birth within the past 26 past weeks' and 175 (74.2%) did not answer the question.

### 2.3.6 Race

Respondents were asked 'How would you describe your ethnicity?' A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/ British	46	19.5%
Irish	5	2.1%
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0.0%
White Other background	11	4.7%
Indian	2	0.8%
Pakistani	0	0.0%
Bangladeshi	0	0.0%
Chinese	0	0.0%
Any other Asian background	1	0.4%
Caribbean	1	0.4%
African	0	0.0%
Any other Black/African/Caribbean background	0	0.0%
White and Caribbean	0	0.0%
White and Black African	0	0.0%
White and Asian	2	0.8%
Any other mixed ethnic background	0	0.0%
Arab	0	0.0%
Any other ethnic group	1	0.4%
Not Answered	167	70.8%

### 2.3.7 Religion/Belief

Respondents were asked 'What is your religion or belief?' A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Religion/ Belief</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
Buddhist	0	0.0%
Muslim	0	0.0%
Christian	20	8.5%
Sikh	0	0.0%
Hindu	1	0.4%
Jewish	1	0.4%
No religion/belief	42	17.8%
Other (please state)	2	0.8%
Not Answered	170	72.0%

### 2.3.8 Sex/ Gender

Respondents were asked ‘*What is your gender?*’ A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
Male	39	16.5%
Female	28	11.9%
Transgender	1	0.4%
Prefer not to say	4	1.7%
Not Answered	164	69.5%

### 2.3.9 Sexual Orientation

Respondents were asked ‘*How would you describe your sexual orientation?*’ A breakdown of the responses given is provided below.

<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	<b>Number of Consultation Respondents</b>	
Heterosexual or straight	51	21.6%
Gay	8	3.4%
Lesbian	1	0.4%
Bisexual	2	0.8%
Prefer not to say	8	3.4%
Not Answered	166	70.3%

### **Benefits and disproportionate impacts for protected groups**

Pedestrians, wheelchair users and people who have pushchairs, as well as road users including those on bikes, car users, taxi drivers and taxi passengers are likely to be affected by the amendments. Residents and businesses on the streets listed above, or on nearby streets will also be affected. Access by motor vehicle to every property on Inverness Street and Mornington Place will be retained. This will enable access for emergency services, environmental services and home deliveries with a possible slight increase on some journey times.

Officers do not consider that the proposals will impact negatively on any protected group (as per the Equality Act 2010). The proposals affect journeys made by motor vehicle; while some of them restrict direct access to the streets subject to the ETO trials, they do not prevent those vehicle journeys being made using other streets. Alternative opportunities to access the streets are still maintained, for residents and visitors who have an essential need for a motor vehicle and for deliveries. It is accepted that those vehicle journeys may take longer, but they can still be made, while there will be positive impacts of reductions in traffic flow, improvements for air quality and safety for everyone, particularly for safe social distancing for the majority of households in this area who do not have access to a car or van.

Officers consider that the proposals will positively impact on older people and those with a disability. Evidence shows that these groups undertake the majority of their journeys on foot (or by public transport), and most journeys are local. Both groups are more vulnerable to constraints presented by the built environment: their physical surroundings can play a significant role in shaping everyday activities, social interactions, and the ability to be independent and achieve wellbeing. In particular road infrastructure and traffic have been viewed as a barrier to freedom of movement and mobility, and older people are more delayed in their activities and movements than any other age group when traffic volumes rise (please

see Evidence Report and EQIA to the CTS <https://www.camden.gov.uk/transport-strategies-and-plans>). The biggest concern for mobility impaired people is sufficient width on the footway and obstacles presented by street clutter, as well as road danger.

All groups will also benefit from opportunities for cycling as a safe alternative to public transport: fear of motor traffic is the single biggest barrier to more people cycling, particularly for excluded groups such as older people, those with a disability, children and women. While it is often assumed that residential streets would be the preferred environment for cycling, evidence shows this is not the case due to faster travelling vehicles and rat runs; such streets are the second least preferred streets for cycling (after 'busy road') for both men and women compared to other sorts of routes with cycle infrastructure, and the second least preferred routes when carrying a child, with a child, or letting a child cycle.

Cycling, particularly on adapted bikes, is seen by health professionals as a mobility aid for people with a disability; it is easier than walking as it is not weight bearing, so people can go further independently and access more opportunities. Older people, younger people, and those with a disability are also the least active groups in Camden; they have the most to gain from the health benefits of being physically active, particularly in an ageing population where sustained physical activity is paramount to ageing well and continued personal mobility (particularly to travel independently) is a key factor in well-being by preventing social exclusion. These groups also have greater need for an enabling street design to undertake active travel.

The proposed improvements will therefore positively contribute to health outcomes, mobility, independence, access to opportunities and social inclusion.

### ***Public Consultation Equalities Themes***

The public consultation also asked respondents about their views on the impacts (both positive and negative) of the proposals on the protected equality characteristics. The questions asked and the responses provided are summarised below.

Respondents were asked '*if implemented, what do you think you might like about the proposed changes?*'. Respondents were given several responses to choose from, including a couple of responses about protected characteristics. In response to this question:

- 78 (33.1%) of the respondents considered the proposed amendments to make walking, cycling and scooting easier and safer for children
- 75 (31.8%) of the respondents considered the proposed amendments to make walking, cycling and scooting easier and safer for older people
- 69 (29.2%) of the respondents considered the proposed amendments to make walking, cycling and scooting easier and safer for people with disabilities
- 56 (23.7%) of the respondents considered the proposed amendments to make using a wheelchair or mobility aid easier and safer

Respondents were asked '*If implemented, what do you think you might not like about the proposed changes?*'. Respondents were given several responses to choose from, including a couple of responses about protected characteristics. In response to this question:



- 40 (16.9%) of the respondents considered that walking, cycling and scooting will still be unsafe or less safe for children
- 39 (16.5%) of the respondents considered that walking and cycling will still be unsafe or less safe for older people
- 42 (17.8%) of the respondents considered that walking and cycling will still be unsafe or less safe for people with disabilities
- 48 (20.3%) of the respondents considered that using a wheelchair or mobility aid will be harder

Furthermore, respondents were asked ‘Do you think the proposals may have an impact on you (or others) with reference to any one or more of the following protected characteristics? (Protected characteristics are: Gender and gender reassignment, Age, Ethnicity, Religion or belief, Disability, Sexual orientation, Marriage and Civil partnerships, Pregnancy and maternity)?’ as part of the consultation. In response: 49.8% of respondents said ‘No, I can’t think of any right now’, 40% ‘Yes, I can think of some positive/negative impacts’ and 10.2% did not answer the question.

Of the respondents that considered the proposals to have an impact on groups with protected characteristics (40.7% of the total consultation respondents): 11.9% considered this to be a ‘Positive’ impact, 28.0% considered the proposals to have a ‘Negative’ impact and 0.8% considered the proposals to have both a ‘Positive’ and a ‘Negative’ impact.

Table 2 below, provides a summary of the key positive and negative themes from respondents’ comments, specifically to do with impact of the proposals on groups with the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010. Positive and negative impacts on Age and Disability were cited significantly more than impacts on other protected groups.

**Table 2: Summary of Key Equalities Themes from Respondents Response to the Public Consultation**

	Key themes emerging from public consultation, for each protected group
Age	<p><b><u>Positive Themes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved safety and mobility for children and older people.</li> <li>• The proposals will encourage a more active lifestyle. It will be safer for children and older people to cycle.</li> <li>• Reducing through traffic will improve access to Inverness Street and Gloucester Crescent for ambulances and will reduce critical response times.</li> <li>• Crossing the road will be easier and safer for older people.</li> <li>• Air quality will improve and benefit children and older people.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Negative Themes</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments highlighting perceived issues that have been created by the previous schemes implemented as part of the Arlington Road</li> </ul>

	Key themes emerging from public consultation, for each protected group
	<p>area Low Traffic Neighbourhood and negatively affecting older people. Those comments concern displaced traffic, increased pollution, longer journey times, no access to property and shops, driving will become harder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Older people that rely solely on motor vehicle for transport will be impacted by longer journey times.</li> </ul>
Disability	<p><b><u>Positive Themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved safety and mobility for people with a physical disability.</li> <li>• Reducing through traffic will improve access to Gloucester Crescent for ambulances and will reduce critical waiting times.</li> <li>• Crossing the road will be easier and safer for people with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Negative themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments highlighting perceived issues that have been created by the previous measures implemented as part of the Arlington Road area Low Traffic Neighbourhood and negatively affecting people with a disability. Those comments concern displaced traffic, increased pollution, longer journey times, no access to property and shops, driving will become harder, impeded access to taxis for disabled people.</li> <li>• People with a disability that rely solely on motor vehicle for transport will be impacted by longer journey times.</li> <li>• Traffic and pollution will get worse and affect people with breathing disorders.</li> </ul>
Gender reassignment	<p>No individual responses to the public consultation identified any negative or positive impacts on those sharing the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. Therefore, there is no data available to be able to analyse the impacts on this protected group. However, no unlawful discrimination or disproportionately negative impacts are realistically anticipated for those sharing this protected characteristic.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	<p><b><u>Positive Themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing through traffic will help reduce stress levels, which have been highlighted in the consultation as caused by permanent traffic jams. This was highlighted in a factor that would help the respondents marriage</li> </ul>

	Key themes emerging from public consultation, for each protected group
	<p><b><u>Negative themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For married couples and those in civil partnerships: differing opinions between the two parties may well increase tension and negatively affect their relationship.</li> </ul>
Pregnancy and maternity	<p><b><u>Positive Themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be safer for pregnant women and those with prams to cross the road.</li> <li>• Women will be more likely to cycle with, or take by bike, their children to school/nursey.</li> <li>• It will be safer for pregnant women and those with small children to walk around.</li> <li>• Air quality will improve.</li> </ul>
Race	<p><b><u>Positive Themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals will encourage a more active lifestyle and ethnic minorities to use bikes.</li> </ul>
Religion or belief	<p>No positive impacts on religion or belief were cited in the responses to the public consultation. As such, there is no data available to be able to analyse the impacts on this protected group. No individual or organisation responses identified any negative or positive impacts on those sharing the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. However, no unlawful discrimination or disproportionately negative impacts are realistically anticipated for those sharing this protected characteristic.</p>
Sex/gender	<p><b><u>Negative themes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals have been highlighted as potentially having a negative impact on women due to lack of police access</li> </ul>
Sexual orientation	<p>No individual responses to the public consultation identified any negative or positive impacts related to sexual orientation. Therefore, there is no data available to be able to analyse the impacts related to sexual orientation. However, no unlawful discrimination or disproportionately negative impacts are realistically anticipated for those sharing this protected characteristic.</p>

## Section 3: ANALYSING YOUR EQUALITY INFORMATION AND ASSESSING YOUR IMPACT

Question 3: Does the proposed decision have an impact (positive or adverse) on our duty to eliminate discrimination/harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations between different groups in the community (those that share characteristics and those that do not)?

Within this section, an analysis is carried out of the positive and negative impacts of the proposed amendments on each of the protected equalities groups, identified by the Equality Act, 2010. In addition, Table 2 on page 14 provides a summary of the impacts on each of the nine protected groups. This analysis of the impacts is based on the equalities data and engagement responses summarised in Section 2 of this report, as well as officers' own assessment of the impacts.

### Positive impacts

- Safer and more pleasant streets: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would make the streets safer and more pleasant for children, older people, people with disabilities, pregnant women and women with young children.
- More active lifestyle: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would encourage cycling among children, older people, ethnic minorities and women with young children.
- Improved access for ambulances: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would improve access to Inverness Street and Gloucester Crescent for ambulances and will reduce critical response times.
- Improved air quality: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would improve air quality and benefit children, older people, people with breathing disorders and pregnant women.
- Reduced stress levels: One respondent to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would reduce the stress associated with traffic jams and positively affect marital relationships.

Officers consider that even in the absence of social distancing requirements, an improved walking and cycling environment would provide considerable benefits to many people with protected characteristics by facilitating and encouraging walking and cycling.

Despite low participation levels, a [Sustrans report](#) found that 55% of people from ethnic minority groups who do not currently cycle would like to start. Sustrans note that tackling safety, through protected cycle lanes and low-traffic neighbourhoods, is critical.

In the 2011 census, 5.1% of cycle commuters in England and Wales reported having a physical disability, as compared to 6.8% of all commuters. Closer to home, around 15% of disabled people in London actively cycled for transport in 2014, which is not much less than the 18% of non-disabled people living in London.

Women generally travel less actively than men. Despite increases in cycling in London and some other UK cities, the gender split for cycling remains unequal. In England, men travel on average 86 miles per year by bike compared with the average of 21 miles for women. Women make just 27% of cycle trips in London, and research shows that women have a stronger desire for protected cycling infrastructure and direct routes.

Over the next two decades, London's population is expected to age in relative terms. In 2041, older people are projected to comprise 15 % of London's population, with a corresponding fall in the proportion of younger people to 29%. The health of the young and the old are affected disproportionately by the effects of poor air quality levels as well as fear of road danger and traffic which can result in isolation and exclusion. Inactivity is also a concern: these age groups are the least active, so more active lifestyles will improve health among these groups, reducing health inequalities.

Further information on the equality impacts of increasing cycling mode share for different protected characteristics can be found in the Camden Transport Strategy EIA 2019-2025 and supporting "Evidence Base" document:

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/transport-strategies-and-plans>

## **Negative impacts**

- Issues perceived as created by the Arlington Road Area LTN scheme: Some respondents to the consultation highlighted perceived issues that have been created by the previous measures implemented as part of the Arlington Road area Low Traffic Neighbourhood and negatively affecting older people. Those comments concern displaced traffic, increased pollution, longer journey times, no access to property and shops, driving will become harder.
- Longer journey times: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would increase journey times for older people and people with disabilities.
- Reduced air quality: Some respondents to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would increase pollution and decrease air quality children, older people, people with breathing disorders and pregnant women.
- Increased tensions in between married couples or couples in a civil partnership: One respondent to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would create differing opinions between the two parties that may well increase tension and negatively affect their relationship.
- Negative impact on women: One respondent to the consultation considered that the proposed amendments would have a negative impact on women during night-time due to lack of access for Police Officers

**Table 2 Summary of negative and positive impacts for each protected group**

Protected Group	Summary of negative impacts for each protected group, and the impact for the development of the activity	Summary of positive impacts or potential opportunities to advance equality or foster good relation for each protected group
Sex / Gender	<p>Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on sex or gender. As highlighted above a respondent to the consultation did highlight that the proposals would have a negative impact on women as the zone was inaccessible to Police Officers. Officers note that Police vehicles are exempt from the ANPR cameras on Inverness Street and can access all sections of Mornington Place by motor vehicle.</p>	<p>Providing safer cycling conditions will increase the propensity of women (as well as less confident males) to cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health and access to services and employment.</p>
Age	<p>Relocation of residential car parking spaces may cause inconvenience to older people, if reliant on a car for transport. However, parking relocation has been kept to a minimum and the parking spaces have been relocated close to their original location.</p> <p>Increased journey times via motor vehicle, if reliant on the car, may have an impact for some journeys to some locations from certain properties within the area.</p>	<p>Providing safer walking and cycling conditions will increase the propensity of children and older people to walk and cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to opportunities. Moreover, reducing through traffic will allow unimpeded access to Inverness Street and Gloucester Crescent for ambulances, reducing critical response times.</p> <p>Reinstatement of residents' parking spaces and conversion of Paid for' to 'Shared use' parking spaces for Resident Permit Parking holders and the Paid for Parking near to an older person's home, may increase their access to services, if reliant on a car for transport.</p>

Protected Group	Summary of negative impacts for each protected group, and the impact for the development of the activity	Summary of positive impacts or potential opportunities to advance equality or foster good relation for each protected group
Ethnicity or race	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on ethnicity or race.	As outlined above, 55% of people from ethnic minority groups who do not currently cycle would like to start. Reducing the levels of traffic would benefit these people via providing a safer space to cycle. Londoners from Ethnic Minority groups are more at risk of being killed or seriously injured on London's roads, with children in this group being on average 1.5 times more likely to be affected than non-BAME children. Reducing the levels of traffic across the residential streets will improve road safety for this protected group.
Religion or belief	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on religion or belief.	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any positive impact on religion or belief.
Disability	<p>Relocation of residential car parking spaces may cause inconvenience to people with physical, visual or cognitive disabilities, if reliant on a car for transport. However, parking relocation has been kept to a minimum and the parking spaces have been relocated close to their original location.</p> <p>Increased journey times via motor vehicle, if reliant on the car, may have an impact for some journeys to some locations from certain properties within the area.</p>	<p>Providing safer walking and cycling conditions will increase the propensity of people with a disability, who are able to walk (including the use of wheelchairs) and cycle (including the use of adapted bicycles such as hand cycles) thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to opportunities. Moreover, reducing through traffic will improve air quality and benefit people with breathing disorders and allow unimpeded access to Inverness Street and Gloucester Crescent for ambulances, reducing critical response times.</p> <p>Reinstatement of residents' parking spaces and conversion of 'Paid for' parking spaces to 'Shared use' parking spaces (for CPZ Permit Parking holders and the Paid for Parking users) near to a home of a person with physical, visual or cognitive disability, may increase their access to services, if reliant on a car for transport.</p>



Protected Group	Summary of negative impacts for each protected group, and the impact for the development of the activity	Summary of positive impacts or potential opportunities to advance equality or foster good relation for each protected group
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Relocation of residential car parking spaces may cause inconvenience to pregnant women or people with very young children, if reliant on a car for transport. However, parking relocation has been kept to a minimum and the parking spaces have been relocated close to their original location.</p> <p>Increased journey times via motor vehicle, if reliant on the car, may have an impact for some journeys to some locations from certain properties within the area.</p>	<p>Providing safer walking and cycling conditions will increase the propensity of pregnant women or with very young children to walk, scoot and cycle (including the use of adapted bicycles) thereby improving their mental and physical health.</p> <p>Reinstatement of residents' parking spaces and conversion of 'Paid for' parking spaces to 'Shared use' parking spaces (for CPZ Permit Parking holders and the Paid for Parking users) near to the home of a pregnant woman or a person with very young children, may increase their access to services, if reliant on a car for transport.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on marriage and civil partnership.	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any positive impact on marriage and civil partnership.
Sexual orientation	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on sexual orientation.	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any positive impact on sexual orientation.
Gender reassignment	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any negative impact on gender reassignment.	Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have any positive impact on gender reassignment.

#### Section 4: PLANNING FOR IMPROVMENT

Question 4: If there is any adverse impact, can it be avoided? If it can't be avoided, what are we doing to mitigate the impact?

Older people, people with disabilities, pregnant women or women with very young children who rely on car for transport will be inconvenienced by the proposal for motor vehicle restrictions as they may create longer journeys in some cases.

Officers do not consider the proposed changes to have other adverse impacts on any protected characteristic.

Question 5: Could any part of the proposed activity discriminate unlawfully? Can we advance equality of opportunity via this decision / policy? Can we foster relations via this decision / policy?



It is not considered that the schemes would discriminate unlawfully. These proposals are in line with objectives in the Camden Transport Strategy (CTS). These objectives seek to transform our streets to enable an increase in walking and cycling.

The Transport Strategy Team has received significant levels of correspondence from residents of this area requesting implementation of changes to the Arlington Road Area LTN scheme. The locations for these proposals have been identified through local stakeholder engagement to date during the ETO period. Therefore, they could foster good relations with local stakeholders if they are implemented.

## Section 5: OUTCOME OF THE EIA

For the reasons set out above, it is not considered that the proposed schemes will discriminate unlawfully.

## Section 6: CHECK AND SIGN OFF

EIA prepared by: Margarita Tsavdaroglou

Date: 14/01/21

EIA checked by: Karl Brierley

Date: 14/01/21

EIA approved by: Richard Bradbury

Date: 15/01/21

## What to do upon approval

For organizational change: If your EIA relates to internal staff, please send to your HR Business Adviser

For all other EIAs: Please add to the discussion on the [Equalities in Camden](#) Yammer group, you can do this by using the “Share something with this group” box, attaching your draft to your message.