

Appendix A

Equalities Impact Assessment

Covid-19: Enabling Safer Travel in Camden – Cycle Permeability Programme 2021/22 Phase 1 – Permanent Proposals

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?

Introduction

The Cycle Permeability programme helps to overcome barriers to cycling, specifically improving cycle links and connections across the borough, through measures such as contra-flow cycling on one-way streets and the provision of cycle gaps through road closures, to help make more streets in Camden accessible to cyclists.

The aims of the Cycle Permeability programme are:

- To support the council's strategic objectives to increase cycling and walking trips and make these trips easier and safer
- To help mitigate the impact on Camden's communities of increased motor traffic as lockdown restrictions are relaxed and more people travel to work, study, or for leisure.
- To improve access to the transport network and local destinations and amenities for cyclists

The Phase 1 Cycle Permeability schemes (Linstead Street and St Paul's Crescent) were implemented as trial schemes via an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) for a period of 18 months that commenced on 24th September 2020. This report sets out the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) that has been carried out by the London Borough of Camden on proposals to make the trial schemes permanent.

This assessment is an appendix to the 'Covid-19: Enabling Safer Travel in Camden – Cycle Permeability Programme 2021/22 Phase 1 – Permanent Proposals' decision report and has been used to help inform the decision on whether or not to make the trial schemes permanent.

This EQIA seeks to establish the impacts, both positive and negative, that these proposed changes would have on the nine protected groups defined in the Equality Act 2010 and,

where necessary and appropriate, mitigate any negative impacts. These groups are: Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion/Belief, Marriage/ Civil Partnership, Sex, and Sexual Orientation.

This EQIA is informed by equalities data for Greater London, the London Borough of Camden, the two wards that the schemes are located in (Cantelowes and West Hampstead), and equality related responses to a 3-week public consultation carried out for each scheme between 23rd November 2021 and 14th December 2021.

Context

A programme of measures to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists, ‘Enabling Safer Travel in Camden’, has been agreed by the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden on 13th May 2020. Decision details can be found [here](#). Various locations across Camden have been identified for improvements to facilitate the safe travel and transport needs of people in Camden, considering Covid-19 and in response to the Department for Transport’s (DfT) statutory guidance to all English local authorities to rapidly change their streets to reallocate more space to pedestrians and cyclists and encourage those modes as an alternative to using public transport and to enable safe social distancing during the pandemic. It is important that people choosing to walk, and cycle can do so safely.

A decision was made on 4th September 2020 by the Director of Environment and Sustainability to implement the 2 schemes as a trial, under an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO). The report, which can be viewed [here](#), noted that a further consultation, after around 12 months of the trial schemes being constructed, would then take place on any proposed permanent arrangements.

The 2 trial schemes were constructed in October 2020 and have been in place for over 12 months. A 3-week public consultation was carried out for each scheme between 23rd November 2021 and 14th December 2021.

Stage 3 road safety audits were undertaken on both schemes during the ETO trial period. The auditor did not highlight any significant problems with the design of either scheme.

Officers now propose to make the 2 trial schemes permanent, and a decision for these schemes is now sought. The schemes help to overcome barriers to cycling, specifically improving cycle links and connections, through the introduction of cycle gaps through road closures to help make the streets at each location more accessible to cyclists.

The desired outcomes of the project align with the key objectives of Camden’s Transport Strategy (CTS). This can be found here: <https://www.camden.gov.uk/transport-strategies-and-plans>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic created new road safety challenges in Camden, and the Council responded by developing solutions in line with National Government’s

statutory COVID-19 guidance, which was originally issued on 9th May 2020 and has been updated a number of times since then.

Whilst all national restrictions in England were lifted on 8th March 2022, some people remain concerned about the use of public transport. Even during periods when restrictions have been lifted, public transport use in London has remained, typically (and at times substantially) below pre-pandemic levels (for details see here). There is a risk of a car-led recovery from the pandemic; traffic monitoring data collected in July 2021, 10 months following the start of the trial period for the scheme, indicate that traffic levels in Camden were already almost at pre-pandemic levels. There is also evidence, as shown in monitoring reports across a number of our “Safer Travel in Camden” schemes, of an uptick in pedestrian and cycling volumes on our streets, for which safe conditions need to be provided.

The latest version of the above guidance, issued on 30th July 2021, advises that the DfT continues to expect local authorities to take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling. The focus should now be on devising further schemes and assessing COVID-19 schemes with a view to making them permanent. The proposals assessed within this report, form part of Councils response and recovery (more information on this can be found on the Council’s Making Travel Safer website), and also aligns with key objectives outlined in the Camden Transport Strategy to improve walking and cycling in the scheme area.

Purpose of these reports

The main decision report provides details of these proposals, the results of the recent public consultations undertaken between 23rd November 2021 and 14th December 2021, and feedback received since the measures were introduced which, together with consideration of Camden’s wider policy context, inform Officers’ recommendations.

This report sets out the Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) that has been carried out by the London Borough of Camden on these proposals. This assessment is an appendix to the decision report and has been used to help inform the decision on whether or not to make these temporary schemes permanent.

This EIA seeks to establish the impacts, both positive and negative, that these proposed changes would have on the nine protected groups defined in the Equality Act, 2010 and, where necessary and appropriate, mitigate any negative impacts. These groups are: Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion/Belief, Marriage/ Civil Partnership, Sex, and Sexual Orientation. This EqIA is informed by equalities data for Greater London, the London Borough of Camden, the West Hampstead and Cantelowes wards, and equality related responses to the 3-week public consultations.

This Equality Impact Assessment is being carried out on the above locations, in order to give due regard to the potential positive and negative impacts of the proposals on groups, including residents and other stakeholders with protected characteristics, as defined by the

Equality Act 2010. Due regard is also given to the Council's commitment to reducing inequality, which is reflected in both Our Camden Plan and the outcomes of Camden's Equality Taskforce.

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.

The proposals to provide permanent cycle gaps on Linstead Street and St Paul's Crescent would enable cyclists to cross the footways to link with adjacent streets (Netherwood Street and Agar Grove respectively). This may result in conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians as well as wheelchair users using the footways. Officers note that older people and those with a disability make the majority of their journeys on foot (please see Evidence Report which forms part of the [Camden Transport Strategy](#)) and do not expect to encounter cyclists on the footway. However, the potential for conflict is expected to be minimal as the gaps are proposed in residential areas where footfall is relatively low. Stage 3 road safety audits were undertaken on both schemes during the ETO trial period. The auditor did not highlight any significant problems with the design of either scheme.

The shared area for pedestrians and cyclists on St Paul's Crescent (to the north of Agar Grove) is quite wide at just over 12 metres, with sufficient space to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians, and wheelchair users. The width of the space should be sufficient for cyclists and pedestrians to have sufficient advance sightlines of each other approaching. The same applies to Linstead Street.

St Paul's Crescent previously had guardrails at the entrance from Agar Grove which made this an unattractive through-route for cyclists, and particularly difficult for larger bikes such as cargo bikes, trailers, and adapted bikes, as well as wheelchair users to move through.

1. Feedback during scheme trial

Members of the public were able to provide Camden with their thoughts and comments on the schemes throughout the trial period, via the [Commonplace website](#) or the Safe Travel email Inbox.

Linstead Street:

No comments were made on the Commonplace website for Linstead Street. One equalities-related comment was received in the Safe Travel Inbox regarding the safety of children. The resident suggests the scheme does not create a safe environment for pedestrian users (including many school children).

Comment received:

"I am a resident on Linstead Street and am responding to letter CP1/2020/Linstead Street. I should point out that although you have dated your letter as of 17th September, the letter was only just delivered today (the day works are supposed to start). I strongly object to the proposed changes. By creating a space for cyclists, you are also creating a path for mopeds, who will travel at speed over the path. How can you ensure the path will not be misused by moped drivers? How will it be enforced? Linstead Street is used by lots of pedestrians (including many school children). How are you ensuring they will remain safe as a result? What health and safety checks have been carried out ahead of the implementation of your plan? Given the council is pushing through these changes without appropriate consultation, I assume it takes full responsibility for any injuries that result from inappropriate use of this new path."

Officer response:

The council has objectives to make walking and cycling more accessible. This is particularly important for younger and older people, for whom physical inactivity is a concern as these age groups are often the least active. Schemes such as the one on Linstead Street are designed to priorities cycling and make it more accessible to a range of residents. It is of vital importance that these schemes are safe, and the Council has carried out a range of Road Safety Audits on the scheme at Linstead Street. The most recent, RSA3 was conducted in February 2021 during the trial period. This audit found no significant concerns regarding the scheme design. The council welcomes stakeholders providing feedback on specific safety concerns and would welcome reports of any issues which officers will investigate and determine whether amendments to the scheme design are required.

St Paul's Crescent:

No comments were made on the Commonplace website for St Paul's Crescent. One equalities-related comment was received in the Safe Travel Inbox regarding the safety of children. The resident suggested the removal of guardrails as part of the scheme will make crossing Agar Grove unsafe for children going to school.

Comment received:

"I feel removing the barriers is a foolish idea and would make it unsafe especially for children to have to cross Agar Grove to get to school. Instead of using the crossing at this point it is possible a child would run straight across the road into the traffic, need I say more."

Officer response:

In removing the guardrails, we have provided wider pavements, making it easier for families with pushchairs to navigate this section of the street. There is a signalised pedestrian crossing located next to the cycle path. At this location, pedestrians have priority to cross the road when a green light appears. If pedestrians choose to cross the road informally (i.e., without using the pedestrian crossing) they will need to be on the lookout for both vehicles and cyclists. Removing the guardrails is also in line with Camden's policy of reducing 'street clutter'. This improves the street scene but, more importantly, has benefits for those with mobility and sight disabilities, by reducing obstructions on the pavement. Physical inactivity is a concern for young and older people, as these age groups are the least active. Therefore, making walking and cycling more accessible to these age groups has the potential to facilitate more active lifestyles and improve health among these groups, reducing health inequalities.

2. Public Consultation

An online consultation was held between 23rd November 2021 and 14th December 2021. Stakeholders were able to view details about the proposed schemes, published online, and respond to an online consultation to provide the council with their views. Businesses and households in the surrounding areas were also provided with flyers and posters were put up on lamp posts in the local areas. These documents gave basic information about the proposals and explained how to share views with the Council. The consultation areas for each scheme are provided in Section 6 of the accompanying Decision Report.

Public Consultation Equalities Themes

Consultees 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 (Gender and gender reassignment, Age, Ethnicity, Religion or belief, Disability, Sexual orientation, Marriage and Civil partnerships, Pregnancy and maternity)?’

In response:

Linstead Street: 100% of respondents said ‘No’.

St Paul’s Crescent: 77% of respondents said ‘No’, 18% said ‘Yes’ and 5% did not answer the question. Of the respondents that considered the proposals to have an impact on groups with protected characteristics (18% of the total consultation respondents): 80% considered this to be a ‘Positive’ impact.

- ‘Positive’ impact consultation responses included benefits for accessibility including stroller users, wheelchair users and cyclists.
- “As a parent, I find it easier to cross the road with a stroller without the guardrails in place and with the dropped kerb.”
- “I believe the crossing is now more accessible for wheelchair users as well.”
- “If I cycled through here, my medical condition means I am not as steady on my bike as I used to be. But here, if I wobbled, I wouldn’t get hit by a close passing car.”

20% (1 person) of respondents found the scheme to have a negative impact for accessibility: “the position of the cut-through makes it very dangerous for younger kids cycling. My son wanted to use the cycle lane, but I wouldn’t let him as joining traffic there is dangerous. Instead, he would use the pedestrian crossing. Adding a bike box or boxed junction markings on Agar Grove would keep the segment clear and ease joining traffic.”

Officer response:

The scheme implementation is to provide a through route for cyclists across St Paul’s Crescent (north to south of Agar Grove) where motor vehicles do not have access. Due to this, we still encourage users to use the signalised crossing to access St Paul’s Crescent (north of Agar Grove). Officers will consider the feasibility of adding a boxed junction where the cycle gap meets to the road to stop motor traffic blocking the route when waiting at the signalised crossing. For cyclists using Agar Grove, the cycle cut through is accessible without needing the use the pedestrian crossing when travelling eastbound.

3. Groups Consulted

At the start of the public consultation, Officers emailed Age UK Camden and the Camden Child Development Team to invite their views on the proposals.

Evidence from the consultation shows the schemes can positively contribute to health outcomes, mobility, independence, access to opportunities and social inclusion.

Table 1 below provides data on each of the protected groups, in the West Hampstead (for Linstead Street) and Cantelowes (for St Paul's Crescent) Wards, the London Borough of Camden and in Greater London. This table shows that:

- West Hampstead has a higher proportion of adults aged 30-44 than Camden or London as a whole; this is a group that may benefit from improved cycling connections for commuting trips.
- In terms of school age children, Cantelowes has a higher proportion than West Hampstead.
- Cantelowes has a higher than average (for the area) proportion of those living with long-term disability.

The impacts, both positive and negative, that these proposed changes could have on the protected groups are discussed in **Table 2** below.

Table 1: Information gathered in Census 2011 on certain protected characteristics in Camden and relevant wards, compared to Greater London

Cycling Permeability scheme:		Linstead Street	St Paul's Crescent		
Protected Characteristic	Protected Characteristic type	West Hampstead	Cantelowes	London Borough of Camden	Greater London
Population	All resident	12,060	11,925	220,338	8,173,941
Sex/Gender	Male	48.3%*	48.5%	49.0%	49.3%
	Female	51.7%*	51.5%	51.0%	50.7%
Age	0-4	5.5%	5.9%	6.0%	6.0%
	5-15	7.1%	10.3%	10.1%	10.1%
	16-29	28.1%	30.5%	26.6%	26.6%
	30-44	34.4%	24.9%	27.0%	27.0%
	45-59	12.7%	15.6%	15.2%	15.2%
	60-74	8.9%	9.0%	10.1%	10.1%
	75-89	3.0%	3.5%	4.5%	4.5%
90+	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	
Ethnicity	White British	44.7%	48.5%	44.0%	44.9%
	White Irish	3.9%	3.5%	3.2%	2.2%
	Gypsy/Irish traveler	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	White Other	20.9%	16.1%	19.0%	12.6%
	White and Black Caribbean	1.2%	1.5%	1.1%	1.5%
	White and Black African	1.2%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
	White and Asian	1.7%	1.3%	1.8%	1.2%
	Other Mixed	1.8%	2.2%	1.9%	1.5%
	Indian	3.4%	1.6%	2.8%	6.6%
	Pakistani	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%	2.7%
	Bangladeshi	2.4%	5.5%	5.7%	2.7%
	Chinese	2.2%	2.5%	2.9%	1.5%
	Other Asian	4.1%	2.7%	4.0%	4.9%
	African	4.5%	6.2%	4.9%	7.0%
	Caribbean	1.9%	2.1%	1.6%	4.2%
	Other Black	1.7%	2.2%	1.7%	2.1%
Arab	1.5%	1.0%	1.6%	1.3%	
Any other ethnic group	2.1%	1.7%	2.3%	2.1%	
Religion	Christian	34.8%	32.0%	34.0%	48.4%
	Buddhist	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	1.0%
	Hindu	1.4%	0.9%	1.4%	5.0%
	Jewish	5.8%	1.4%	4.5%	1.8%
	Muslim	9.0%	11.8%	12.1%	12.4%
	Sikh	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	1.5%
	Other religions	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
	No religion	25.2%	32.4%	25.5%	20.7%

Cycling Permeability scheme:		Linstead Street	St Paul's Crescent		
Protected Characteristic	Protected Characteristic type	West Hampstead	Cantelowes	London Borough of Camden	Greater London
	Not stated	21.5%	19.7%	20.5%	8.5%
Disability	Limiting Long-term illness	12.5%	15.1%	14.4%	14.2%
Pregnancy/ Maternity	Lone Parent Households	8.0%	12.8%	10.0%	8.5%
Marriage/ Civil Partnership	Married or Civil Partnership	19.1%	21.0%	28.1%	40.2%
Sexual Orientation	Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual	Not available	Not available	Not available	25%
Gender reassignment	Gender reassignment	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available

Table 2: Summary of positive and negative impacts for each protected characteristic

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 or gender	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on sex or gender.	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may be able to contribute to delivering (by increasing opportunities to cycle) a more pleasant environment for men and women and improved air quality. These proposals may help to encourage men and women to walk or cycle in their local area (and for 'through-trips'), thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.
Age	Officers believe the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent will not have any significant negative impact on age. The amendments to St Paul's Crescent make the cut through easier to use on a bike. Some respondents to the consultation were concerned that this could be dangerous for children and other users cycling due	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to making the streets a safer and more pleasant environment for people of all ages, if they are able to encourage more cycling trips. Enabling safe cycling has many benefits for people of all age groups including mental and physical health, independent

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
	to the proximity of vehicles travelling on Agar Grove. These issues and concerns have been responded to by officers in the Decision Report. This included undertaking a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit during the trial period. The auditor did not highlight any significant problems with the design of the scheme.	mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.
Ethnicity or race	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on ethnicity or race.	It is hoped that the proposals to make the trial schemes permanent would help make the streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all, regardless of ethnicity or race, by encouraging safe and accessible cycling trips. This would help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.
Religion or belief	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on religion or belief.	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden's overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all, regardless of religion or belief. Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.

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
Disability	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on disability.	<p>The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden’s overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all. Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.</p> <p>The schemes have been implemented with due consideration to those representing the interests of some disability groups, for example the RNIB.</p>
Pregnancy / Maternity	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on pregnancy and maternity.	<p>The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden’s overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all. Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.</p>
Marriage and civil partnership	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on marriage and civil partnership.	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden’s overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all.

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
		Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.
Sexual orientation	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on sexual orientation.	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden’s overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all. Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.
Gender reassignment	Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on gender reassignment.	The proposals to make the trial schemes permanent may contribute to Camden’s overall goal to make our streets a safer and more pleasant environment for all. Cycling permeability schemes can help to encourage people to walk or cycle, thereby improving their mental and physical health, independent mobility, social inclusion and improved access to amenities, services, and opportunities.

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)?

Officers do not consider that the proposed decision will impact either positively or negatively on this duty. The proposal to make the 2 trial schemes permanent could improve relations between pedestrians and cyclists through the retention of well signed and clearly marked cycle gaps through road closures at each scheme location.

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?

Officers do not consider the proposals to make the 2 cycling permeability schemes permanent to have any negative impact on any groups with protected characteristics. No amendments are proposed for either scheme on Linstead Street or St Paul's Crescent.

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 CTS to transform our streets to enable an increase in cycling.

The Transport Strategy Team is experienced in dealing with requests from residents/stakeholders regarding schemes such as this and are therefore able to foster good relations with stakeholders during scheme trials, though to making schemes permanent.

The proposal to make the 2 trial schemes permanent could improve relations between pedestrians and cyclists through the retention of well signed and clearly marked cycle gaps through road closures at each scheme location.

In addition, by helping to overcome barriers to cycling, these proposals will help to enable more people (particularly protected groups) to cycle and enjoy the health benefits of and opportunities for increased physical activity, while reducing the health impacts of poor air quality which affects everyone.

The EIA is posted on our website as an appendix to the CTS:
<https://www.camden.gov.uk/transport-strategies-and-plans>

Section 5: OUTCOME OF THE EIA

Outcome of analysis	Description	Select as applicable
Continue the activity	The EQIA shows no potential for discrimination and all appropriate opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations have been taken.	X
Change the activity	The EQIA identified the need to make changes to the activity to ensure it does not discriminate and/ or that all appropriate opportunities to advance equality and /or foster good relations have been taken. These changes are included in the planning for improvement section of this form.	
Justify and continue the activity without changes	The EQIA has identified discrimination and / or missed opportunities to advance equality and / or foster good relations but it is still reasonable to continue the activity. Outline the reasons for this and the information used to reach this decision in the box below.	
Stop the activity	The EQIA shows unlawful discrimination.	
Comments (if required):		

Section 6: CHECK AND SIGN OFF

EIA prepared by: Georgie Wells, Consultant Principal Transport Planner

Date: 22nd February 2022

EIA checked by: Steve Cardno, Public Realm and Planning Team Manager

Date: 25th February 2022

EIA approved by: Richard Bradbury, Director of Environment and Sustainability

Date: 9th March 2022

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.