

# SSA EQUALITY IMPACT AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Environmental and Community Services</b>
<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Spatial and Transport Strategy</b>
<b>Service/policy/function being assessed</b>	<b>Hospital Bridge Road Corridor Scheme</b>
<b>Which borough (s) does the service/policy apply to</b>	<b>Richmond</b>
<b>Staff involved in developing this EINA</b>	<b>Shonelle Eccles, Transport Planner</b>
<b>Date approved by Directorate Equality Group (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Date approved by Policy and Review Manager</b> All EINAs must be signed off by the Policy and Review Manager	<b>23/01/2024</b>
<b>Date submitted to Directors' Board</b>	

## 1. Summary

**Please summarise the key findings of the EINA.**

Hospital Bridge Road is a classified road (B358) running north to south and maintains a 20mph speed limit. The road serves a broad mix of functions including residential properties, Turing House School, Bishop Perrin Church of England Primary School, Twickenham Day Nursery, the Whitton Corner Health and Social Care Centre and Twickenham Cemetery. The road is located in both Heathfield and Witton wards, however the proposed section of development is located in Heathfield. The road maintains an uncontrolled parking zone.

In its current state the road features a wide carriageway, narrow footways, and no dedicated cycle facilities. In turn these features have produced issues such as vehicle dominance and high vehicle speeds and a lack of cycling and pedestrian priority. Accordingly, a corridor study was commissioned for the entirety of the road and the findings were presented at the Transport and Air Quality Committee in February 2023. Approval was given to consult on walking, cycling and public realm improvements options between Ashley Drive and the A316 Chertsey Road.

Feedback was requested for three potential options between the Powder Mill Lane/ Percy Road junction and Ashley Drive and the potential for a Quietway link utilising Crane Park Road/ Hospital Bridge Road slip road. Each option included decluttering, an increase in street trees and new zebra crossings. The three options that were consulted were:

- Option 1: Two-way cycle track along Twickenham Cemetery.
- Option 2: With flow cycle tracks (separate northbound and southbound cycle tracks).
- Option 3: Southbound-only cycle track along Twickenham Cemetery.

The results of the consultation confirmed that Option 1 (17%) was the most favoured out of the three options provided. Regarding Crane Park Road and creating a Quietway route, 36% answered positively, 17% supported the changes in part, 5% did not know and 42% did not support the changes.

The positive impacts of the scheme include improved air quality, reducing vehicle speeds whilst retaining vehicle capacity, improved pedestrian and cycling spaces. Furthermore, it will address the current unmet need of safe cycle facilities for cyclists, particularly for children travelling to and from the local schools.

The potential negative impacts of the scheme include the likely increase in difficulty for people, including those in protected groups, to find a parking space. To help mitigate this, Option 2 has not been recommended as it would require the highest amount of parking removal compared to Option 1 and 3. Another negative impact is the removal of existing greenery to make way for the proposed works. To mitigate this, if Option 1 is approved, designs of the two-way cycle track will be amended to reduce the loss of mature trees.

**2. Evidence gathering and engagement**

**a. What evidence has been used for this assessment? For example, national data, local data via DataRich or DataWand**

Evidence	Source
National Data	2021 Census Area Profile – Richmond upon Thames Local Authority
Local Data	GLA 2020
Local Data	ONS 2020
Local Data	LBR Refugee Services Team data – 2023 and AfC Schools Data - 2023
Local Data	Marmot Indicators - ONS 2018 - 2020

**b. Who have you engaged and consulted with as part of your assessment?**

Individuals/Groups	Consultation/Engagement results	Date	What changed as a result of the consultation
Residents, businesses, and groups of Hospital Bridge Road.	<p>Overall, 53% of respondents did not support any of the three options, 17% supported Option 1, 15% supported Option 2, 11% supported Option 3 and 3% did not know.</p> <p>For Crane Park Road and the establishment of a Quietway route, 36% answered positively, 17% said that they supported the changes in part, 5% did not know and 42% did not support the changes.</p> <p>The most cited reason for objecting to the scheme was concern over (uncontrolled) parking loss. Further concerns were raised in regard to the interference of existing greenery.</p> <p>Relative levels of support was requested for the introduction of segregated cycle facilities between Ashley Drive and the A316, new pedestrian crossings at Longford Road and by Twickenham Cemetery, raised tables across the side road, new greenery and sustainable drainage</p>	19/04/23 – 09/06/23	The options were narrowed down as a result of the consultation. Moving forward we are recommending Option 1 and following feedback, adjustments have been proposed for the two-way cycle track to reduce the loss of mature trees. Additionally, the option of extending the scheme to Montrose Avenue in a second phase, connecting to Turing House School, is under consideration. The scheme will result in the loss of some uncontrolled parking, however this option requires the least amount of parking loss, with the design of this

	<p>systems and decluttering. Support for all individual elements of the scheme exceeded the opposition, except for the segregated cycle facilities, which were opposed by 52% of respondents and supported by 35%. New greenery had the highest level of support (75%), followed by decluttering (64%), new pedestrian crossings (59%) and raised tables across side roads (41%).</p>	<p>scheme keeping it to a minimum. This loss would primarily be seen fronting Twickenham Cemetery.</p>
--	---	--

### 3. Analysis of need

#### Potential impact on this group of residents and actions taken to mitigate impact and advance equality, diversity and inclusion

Protected group	Findings																																																
Age	<table border="1" data-bbox="507 853 1431 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="507 853 1431 898">ONS Census 2021</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="507 898 949 943">Geography</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="949 898 1431 943">Richmond upon Thames</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="507 943 949 987">Measures</th> <th data-bbox="949 943 1189 987">Value</th> <th data-bbox="1189 943 1431 987">Percent</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="507 987 949 1032">Age</th> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1032 949 1077">Total: All usual residents</td> <td data-bbox="949 1032 1189 1077">195,278</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1032 1431 1077">100.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1077 949 1122">Aged 4 years and under</td> <td data-bbox="949 1077 1189 1122">11,103</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1077 1431 1122">5.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1122 949 1167">Aged 5 to 9 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1122 1189 1167">12,813</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1122 1431 1167">6.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1167 949 1211">Aged 10 to 15 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1167 1189 1211">15,531</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1167 1431 1211">8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1211 949 1256">Aged 16 to 19 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1211 1189 1256">7,849</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1211 1431 1256">4.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1256 949 1301">Aged 20 to 24 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1256 1189 1301">8,229</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1256 1431 1301">4.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1301 949 1346">Aged 25 to 34 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1301 1189 1346">22,049</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1301 1431 1346">11.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1346 949 1391">Aged 35 to 49 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1346 1189 1391">46,948</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1346 1431 1391">24.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1391 949 1435">Aged 50 to 64 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1391 1189 1435">39,309</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1391 1431 1435">20.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1435 949 1480">Aged 65 to 74 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1435 1189 1480">17,084</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1435 1431 1480">8.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1480 949 1525">Aged 75 to 84 years</td> <td data-bbox="949 1480 1189 1525">10,222</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1480 1431 1525">5.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="507 1525 949 1570">Aged 85 years and over</td> <td data-bbox="949 1525 1189 1570">4,141</td> <td data-bbox="1189 1525 1431 1570">2.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="507 1570 1431 1870">Figures show that the Richmond population is represented the most in the age group of 35 to 49 years (24%), followed by 50 to 64 years (20.1%). The least represented is 85 years and over (2.1%), followed by 16 to 19 years (4%). Despite the age group of 85 years and over being the least represented, it is assumed that they would be among the most affected by the proposal as majority of people in this group would rely on a vehicle to transport themselves along the road. This is similar for 65 to 74 years and 75 to 84 years, which together equals 13.9% of the Richmond population.</p>	ONS Census 2021			Geography	Richmond upon Thames		Measures	Value	Percent	Age			Total: All usual residents	195,278	100.0	Aged 4 years and under	11,103	5.7	Aged 5 to 9 years	12,813	6.6	Aged 10 to 15 years	15,531	8.0	Aged 16 to 19 years	7,849	4.0	Aged 20 to 24 years	8,229	4.2	Aged 25 to 34 years	22,049	11.3	Aged 35 to 49 years	46,948	24.0	Aged 50 to 64 years	39,309	20.1	Aged 65 to 74 years	17,084	8.7	Aged 75 to 84 years	10,222	5.2	Aged 85 years and over	4,141	2.1
ONS Census 2021																																																	
Geography	Richmond upon Thames																																																
Measures	Value	Percent																																															
Age																																																	
Total: All usual residents	195,278	100.0																																															
Aged 4 years and under	11,103	5.7																																															
Aged 5 to 9 years	12,813	6.6																																															
Aged 10 to 15 years	15,531	8.0																																															
Aged 16 to 19 years	7,849	4.0																																															
Aged 20 to 24 years	8,229	4.2																																															
Aged 25 to 34 years	22,049	11.3																																															
Aged 35 to 49 years	46,948	24.0																																															
Aged 50 to 64 years	39,309	20.1																																															
Aged 65 to 74 years	17,084	8.7																																															
Aged 75 to 84 years	10,222	5.2																																															
Aged 85 years and over	4,141	2.1																																															

<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">ONS Census 2021</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Geography</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Heathfield (%)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Richmond upon Thames (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Day-to-day activities limited a lot</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6.1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Day-to-day activities limited a little</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Has long term condition but not limited</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5.7</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No long term conditions</td> <td style="text-align: center;">79.4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Figures identify that 6.1% of the ward, compared to 4.5% of the borough, indicated that they have a long-term condition, which limits their day-to-day activities a lot. Over 79% of the ward, compared to 81% of the borough, indicated that they have no long-term conditions. Residents who indicated they have a disability may be more reliant on vehicles and could be impacted by the removal of some parking.</p>	ONS Census 2021			Geography	Heathfield (%)	Richmond upon Thames (%)	Day-to-day activities limited a lot	6.1	4.5	Day-to-day activities limited a little	8.8	7.6	Has long term condition but not limited	5.7	6.9	No long term conditions	79.4	81.1			
ONS Census 2021																						
Geography	Heathfield (%)	Richmond upon Thames (%)																				
Day-to-day activities limited a lot	6.1	4.5																				
Day-to-day activities limited a little	8.8	7.6																				
Has long term condition but not limited	5.7	6.9																				
No long term conditions	79.4	81.1																				
<p><b>Sex</b></p>	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">ONS Census 2021</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Geography</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Richmond upon Thames</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Measures</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Value</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Sex</th> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All persons</td> <td style="text-align: center;">195,278</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td style="text-align: center;">93,961</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td style="text-align: center;">101,317</td> <td style="text-align: center;">51.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Figures outline that the percentage of female residents is higher at 51.9%.</p>	ONS Census 2021			Geography	Richmond upon Thames		Measures	Value	Percent	Sex			All persons	195,278	100.0	Male	93,961	48.1	Female	101,317	51.9
ONS Census 2021																						
Geography	Richmond upon Thames																					
Measures	Value	Percent																				
Sex																						
All persons	195,278	100.0																				
Male	93,961	48.1																				
Female	101,317	51.9																				
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>The 2021 Census recorded that 93.98% of the population are the same gender identity from sex registered at birth, 0.15% are a different gender identity from sex registered at birth, 0.09% are trans women, 0.07% are trans men, 0.04% are non-binary, 0.05% are 'All other gender identities and 5.63% abstained from answering the questions.</p>																					

<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	<b>ONS Census 2021</b>		
	<b>Geography</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames</b>	
	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Percent</b>
	<b>Legal partnership status</b>		
	Total: All usual residents aged 16 and over	155,834	100.0
	Never married and never registered a civil partnership	55,958	35.9
	Married or in a registered civil partnership	77,105	49.5
	Married	76,477	49.1
	In a registered civil partnership	628	0.4
	Separated, but still legally married or still legally in a civil partnership	3,005	1.9
	Divorced or civil partnership dissolved	12,518	8.0
	Widowed or surviving civil partnership partner	7,248	4.7
	Figures show that the highest percentage for partnership status in the borough is married or in a registered civil partnership at 49.5%.		
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	<b>ONS Census 2021</b>		
	<b>Geography</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames</b>	
	Birth rate per 1,000 females aged 15 to 44 years in 2021.	56.9	
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	<b>ONS Census 2021</b>		
	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Heathfield (%)</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames (%)</b>
	White	59.6	80.5
	Asian	25.8	8.9
	Mixed	5	5.5
	Other	4.9	3.3
	Black	4.6	1.9
	People of White background make up 59.6% of the Heathfield population, which is the largest ethnicity group for this ward. Besides this, people of Black, Asian & Ethnic Minority groups make up substantial combined total of 50.4% of the population in Heathfield. People of Black, Asian and Ethnic Minority groups are currently underrepresented in walking and cycling compared to people of white backgrounds (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). Therefore, people of Black, Asian & Ethnic Minority groups are more likely to rely on a vehicle for transportation, and in turn, being subject to greater negative impacts of the proposal.		

<p><b>Religion and belief, including non-belief</b></p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">ONS Census 2021</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Geography</th> <th>Heathfield (%)</th> <th>Richmond upon Thames (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Christian</td> <td>41.8</td> <td>45.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No religion</td> <td>25</td> <td>37.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not answered</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>7.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Muslim</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>4.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu</td> <td>7</td> <td>2.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sikh</td> <td>5.6</td> <td>1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Buddhist</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>0.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other religion</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>0.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jewish</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For both Heathfield and the borough, the most indicated religion was Christianity. Besides Christianity (41.8%), the next common religion for Heathfield was Muslim, with 12.9%. At least ¾ of the population in Heathfield are religious.</p>	ONS Census 2021			Geography	Heathfield (%)	Richmond upon Thames (%)	Christian	41.8	45.4	No religion	25	37.9	Not answered	5.8	7.1	Muslim	12.9	4.3	Hindu	7	2.1	Sikh	5.6	1.0	Buddhist	0.9	0.8	Other religion	0.7	0.7	Jewish	0.2	0.6						
ONS Census 2021																																								
Geography	Heathfield (%)	Richmond upon Thames (%)																																						
Christian	41.8	45.4																																						
No religion	25	37.9																																						
Not answered	5.8	7.1																																						
Muslim	12.9	4.3																																						
Hindu	7	2.1																																						
Sikh	5.6	1.0																																						
Buddhist	0.9	0.8																																						
Other religion	0.7	0.7																																						
Jewish	0.2	0.6																																						
<p><b>Sexual orientation</b></p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">ONS Census 2021</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Geography</th> <th colspan="2">Richmond upon Thames</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Measures</th> <th>Value</th> <th>Percent</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Sexual orientation</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total: All usual residents aged 16 years and over</td> <td>155,829</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Straight or Heterosexual</td> <td>138,752</td> <td>89.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gay or Lesbian</td> <td>2,894</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bisexual</td> <td>1,848</td> <td>1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pansexual</td> <td>120</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asexual</td> <td>93</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Queer</td> <td>57</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All other sexual orientations</td> <td>220</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not answered</td> <td>11,845</td> <td>7.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Figures outline that majority of the population in the borough is heterosexual (89%), with the next indicated sexual orientation being gay or lesbian (1.9%). It should also be noted that 7.6% of people did not answer.</p>	ONS Census 2021			Geography	Richmond upon Thames		Measures	Value	Percent	<b>Sexual orientation</b>			Total: All usual residents aged 16 years and over	155,829	100.0	Straight or Heterosexual	138,752	89.0	Gay or Lesbian	2,894	1.9	Bisexual	1,848	1.2	Pansexual	120	0.1	Asexual	93	0.1	Queer	57	0.0	All other sexual orientations	220	0.1	Not answered	11,845	7.6
ONS Census 2021																																								
Geography	Richmond upon Thames																																							
Measures	Value	Percent																																						
<b>Sexual orientation</b>																																								
Total: All usual residents aged 16 years and over	155,829	100.0																																						
Straight or Heterosexual	138,752	89.0																																						
Gay or Lesbian	2,894	1.9																																						
Bisexual	1,848	1.2																																						
Pansexual	120	0.1																																						
Asexual	93	0.1																																						
Queer	57	0.0																																						
All other sexual orientations	220	0.1																																						
Not answered	11,845	7.6																																						
<p><b>Across groups i.e older LGBT service users or Black, Asian &amp; Minority Ethnic young men.</b></p>	<p>There is no service data available to determine any findings across groups. Feedback from consultation has not identified any impacts.</p>																																							

**Socio-economic status (to be treated as a protected characteristic under Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010)**  
**Include the following groups:**

- **Deprivation (measured by the 2019 English Indices of Deprivation)**
- **Low-income groups & employment**
- **Carers**
- **Care experienced people**
- **Single parents**
- **Health inequalities**
- **Refugee status**

**Deprivation – Indices of Deprivation 2019**

The English Indices of Deprivation 2019 rank each small area (Lower Super Output Area) in England from most deprived to least deprived, with 1 being the most and 10 being the least. Income, employment, education, health, crime, barriers to housing and services and living environment are the seven domains of deprivation.

Between 2015 and 2019 Richmond was within the 10% least deprived Local Authorities in England and was the least deprived London Borough. The borough ranks amongst the least deprived third of LAs in England for five of the seven deprivation domains (Barriers to Housing & Services; Education, Skills & Training; Employment; Health Deprivation & Disability; Income) and is the least deprived in England for Education, Skills and Training. All LSOAs in Heathfield, where the scheme is located, were amongst the 50% most deprived locally on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).

**Low-income groups & employment – DWP 2023**

Measures	Richmond population (%)	London population (%)
People on Universal Credit	7.9	16.2
People claiming out of work benefits	2.3	5

Richmond has a considerably lower percentage of residents claiming Universal Credit or out of work benefits compared to London.

**Income and Poverty- DWP and ONS**

Measure	Richmond population (%)	London population (%)
Households living in fuel poverty (2020)	8	NA
Children living in families with Relative Low Income (2021/22)	5.1	15

**Occupation (Carers) – ONS Census 2021**

7.2% of the borough’s population were providing unpaid care and 2.8% were providing more than 20 hours of care a week. Over 3000 carers are registered with the Richmond Carers Centre.

**Households - ONS Census 2021**

Measures	Value
Total: Out of married or civil partnership couples, cohabiting couple family, lone parent family and other single-family household in RuT.	45922
Lone parent family	7078

<b>Health Inequalities – ONS Marmot indicators</b>		
<b>Measures</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames (years)</b>	<b>London (years)</b>
Inequality in life expectancy at birth – females (2018 – 20)	1.2	5.4
Inequality in life expectancy at birth – males (2018 – 20)	5.3	7.5
The figures above outline that Richmond has a lower inequality in life expectancy at birth compared to London for both females and males.		
<b>Measures</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames (years)</b>	<b>England (years)</b>
Life expectancy at birth in least deprived decile – females (2018 – 20)	85.9	86.3
Life expectancy at birth in least deprived decile – males (2018 – 20)	84.3	83.2
Life expectancy at birth in most deprived decile – females (2018 – 20)	83.4	78.3
Life expectancy at birth in most deprived decile – males (2018 – 20)	77.2	73.5
<p>The figures above show that Richmond has a higher life expectancy in both its least and most deprived deciles compared to England, for both female and male residents. In addition, the most deprived deciles had a lower life expectancy, compared to higher deciles in Richmond for both male and female.</p> <p>Life expectancy interconnects with people’s socio-economic situations. Characteristically, lower decile people will live shorter lives as they are subject to greater health inequalities. Among other factors, inequalities range from a lack of access to quality health services, the wider environments such as poor-quality housing, work settings, education, or access to green space, and behavioural risks to health such as drinking, smoking, physical inactivity, or poor diet. In turn, these inequalities can lead to long term health conditions and mental illness.</p> <p>Refugees or migrants can be exposed to greater health challenges from sever health inequalities. This is worsened as they tend to use fewer health services compared to that of the local populations.</p>		



<b>LBR Refugee Services Team data – 2023 AfC Schools Data - 2023</b>	
<b>Geography</b>	<b>Richmond upon Thames</b>
<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Value</b>
Syrian Resettlement scheme (2015 – October 2023)	32
Afghan Resettlement scheme (2021 – October 2023)	19
Homes for Ukraine scheme (2022 – November 2023)	975
Unaccompanied Asylum – seeking children	26
Hong Kong BNO scheme	No exact data available, however proxy data shows 696 primary and secondary pupils are from Hong Kong. Further, 985 people indicated there were born in Hong Kong in the 2021 Census.

**Data gaps**

<b>Data gap(s)</b>	<b>How will this be addressed?</b>
<b>No data gaps identified</b>	

**4. Impact**

<b>Protected group</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Negative</b>
<b>Age</b>	While all age groups would experience benefits from the proposed options, it is considered that school age children, parents, and guardians would be among the most positively impacted. This is given that multiple education facilities currently exist along the road, in which cyclist and pedestrians have limited priority over vehicles. By providing designated cycling facilities where none currently exist, it helps to reduce the risk of accidents, particularly for cyclists that have limited experience in navigating traffic. All age groups would benefit from improved air quality and reduced traffic congestion.	Elderly people who rely solely on their vehicles to get to businesses along Hospital Bridge Road could potentially be adversely affected by the proposal as it may become more difficult to find a parking space immediately on the road. In order to mitigate this, the Council have recommended proceeding with Option 1, which requires the least amount of parking removal. Further, the Council would maintain carefully located parking spaces where the majority of businesses are located along the road.

<p><b>Disability</b></p>	<p>Currently there is no safe or accessible cycle facilities along the road so cyclists using accessible cycles may be deterred. By providing separate cycle facilities that cater for all types of cyclists, it will encourage people of all abilities to use this active travel option. Additionally, improved footpaths and increased pedestrian crossings will help overall accessibility for all people. All people would benefit from better air quality and reduced traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Individuals with disabilities who rely on vehicles to access amenities on the road could potentially be negatively affected as finding vehicle parking spaces immediately on the street could become more difficult. To mitigate this, the Council would maintain sufficient locations where car parking by blue badge holders is permitted. Further, people with accessible cycles may be limited by the lack of existing accessible cycle parking options. To mitigate this, the Council would install accessible cycle parking options near the high amenity areas along the road.</p>
<p><b>Sex</b></p>	<p>In 2022/23 London wide, males averaged 0.49 vehicle trips per person per day, compared to females who averaged 0.38 trips per person per day (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). This is supported by London wide walking data, as females average 0.85 walking trips per person per day, while males averaged 0.76. In contrast, males averaged 0.09 trips per person per day via cycle, while females averaged 0.02 (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). While both males and females would receive benefits from the proposal, females are more likely to be advantaged by the pedestrian improvements and males by the cycle facilities. It is assumed that numbers for active travel modes would further increase for females when commuting alone at night or with children, as some may be more comfortable navigating Hospital Bridge Road in its current state by vehicle or public transport. By providing alternative active travel options that are well-design, safe and accessible, more women would feel confident enough to take up walking or cycling. Both males and females would receive positive impacts from reduced traffic congestion and improved air quality.</p>	<p>As outlined in the adjacent paragraph, data suggests that males are more likely to drive, therefore they would receive slightly greater impacts by the removal of parking spaces compared to that of females. However, the Council have recommended proceeding with Option 1, which requires the least amount of parking removal. Further, safe cycling and walking facilities would be provided as alternative transport options.</p>
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b></p>	<p>There is no data suggesting impacts specific to gender reassignment.</p>	<p>There is no data suggesting impacts specific to gender reassignment.</p>

<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	There is no data suggesting impacts specific to marriage and civil partnerships.	There is no data suggesting negative impacts specific to marriage and civil partnerships.
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	The proposal will provide a safer environment for parents who are wanting to transport their children via cargo bikes or simply navigate the footpaths with a stroller. Babies, children, and pregnant women will benefit from reduced congestion and improved air quality.	It is assumed that pregnant women or people caring for babies or young children may rely on a vehicle as a quick and reliable transportation option, particularly if they have a newborn. As outlined above, the proposal could increase difficulty when looking for a parking space. To mitigate against the negative impacts identified, the Council would maintain carefully located on street parking spaces that are around key amenities on the road.
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	People of Black and Asian minority ethnic groups are currently underrepresented in walking and cycling compared to people of white backgrounds (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). In 2022/23, 29% of people with white backgrounds in London have cycled at least once in the last year, compared to 15% of people from Asian backgrounds and 15.2% of people with Black backgrounds (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). In terms of walking, in 2022/23 people of white backgrounds average 0.95 trips per person per day, while people of Asian backgrounds average 0.7 and people of Black backgrounds average 0.65 (Travel in London Annual Overview, 2023). It is considered that all ethnicities would benefit in some way from the proposed works. Further, it is assumed that people of Black or Asian minority ethnic groups would be more likely to cycle or walk if safe and accessible facilities are provided.	Minority groups are more likely to rely on a vehicle for transportation rather than walking or cycling. Among other factors, the potential reasons for this are time and cost, safety concerns on public transports, and access to reliable public transport. Therefore, it is considered that people of Black and Asian minority ethnic groups would be affected by the proposal due to removal of some on street parking. Like the above, the mitigating options would be to maintain carefully located on street parking spaces that are around key amenities on the road. Further, safe cycling and walking facilities that are well-designed, well-lit and accessibly would be provided as alternative transport options.
<b>Religion and belief, including non belief</b>	There is no data suggesting impacts specific to religion and beliefs.	There is no data suggesting negative impacts specific to religion and beliefs.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	There is no data suggesting impacts specific to sexual orientation.	There is no data suggesting negative impacts specific to sexual orientation.
<b>Socio-economic status (to be treated as a protected characteristic)</b>	It is assumed that different socio-economic groups would benefit from well-connected and well-designed cycle facilities as it enables people to	Data shows that low-income households are well represented in walking but underrepresentation in cycling (Travel in London Annual

<p><b>under Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010)</b>  <b>Include the following groups:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Deprivation (measured by the 2019 English Indices of Deprivation)</b></li> <li>• <b>Low-income groups &amp; employment</b></li> <li>• <b>Carers</b></li> <li>• <b>Care experienced people</b></li> <li>• <b>Single parents</b></li> <li>• <b>Health inequalities</b></li> <li>• <b>Refugee status</b></li> </ul>	<p>access different locations quickly, safely and easily within the city. This is particularly beneficial if people have tight timeframes going between jobs or activities. Further, cycling or walking is typically more reliable and an affordable option when compared to that of a private vehicle or some forms of public transportation. All socio-economic groups outlined would receive positive impacts from reduced traffic congestion and improved air quality.</p>	<p>Overview, 2023). In 2021, 78.7% of households in Heathfield owned 1 or more vehicles (ONS Census, 2021). In some instances, owning a vehicle may be the cheapest and most feasible option for some low-income households, besides walking. It is also considered that single parents and carers would rely on vehicles to assist with essential daily tasks. Therefore, it is assumed that low-income households, along with single parents and carers, would be adversely affected by the removal of parking spaces. Similar to above, Option 1, which requires the least amount of parking removal has been recommend. Further, the Council would maintain carefully located parking spaces where the majority of businesses are located along the road. Lastly, the Council would maintain sufficient locations where car parking by blue badge holders is permitted.</p>
--	--	---

**5. Actions to advance equality, diversity and inclusion**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
<p>If Option 1 is approved, designs of the two-way cycle track will be amended to reduce the loss of mature trees. This will be accomplished by ‘splitting’ the two-way cycle track around mature trees and making a slight adjustment to the location of the middle zebra crossing to the north.</p>	<p>Margo Turner</p>	<p>Prior to implementation</p>
<p>To make the road feel safer in hours of darkness, the Council will review the lighting for the proposal.</p>	<p>Margo Turner</p>	<p>Prior to implementation</p>