

# Enfield Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

# Introduction

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is to help Enfield Council make sure it does not discriminate against service users, residents and staff, and that we promote equality where possible. Completing the assessment is a way to make sure everyone involved in a decision or activity thinks carefully about the likely impact of their work and that we take appropriate action in response to this analysis.

The need to undertake an EqIA arises from Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010<sup>1</sup> which introduces a 'general duty' on all public sector bodies to have regard to the following considerations in the exercise of their functions:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The EqIA provides a way to systematically assess and record the likely equality impact of an activity, policy, strategy, budget change or any other decision.

The assessment helps us to focus on the impact on people who share one of the different nine protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010 as well as on people who are disadvantaged due to socio-economic factors. The assessment involves anticipating the consequences of the activity or decision on different groups of people and making sure that:

- unlawful discrimination is eliminated
- opportunities for advancing equal opportunities are maximised
- opportunities for fostering good relations are maximised.

The EqIA is carried out by completing this form. To complete it you will need to:

- use local or national research which relates to how the activity/ policy/ strategy/ budget change or decision being made may impact on different people in different ways based on their protected characteristic or socioeconomic status;
- where possible, analyse any equality data we have on the people in Enfield who will be affected eg equality data on service users and/or equality data on the Enfield population;
- refer to the engagement and/ or consultation you have carried out with stakeholders, including the community and/or voluntary and community sector groups you consulted and their views. Consider what this engagement showed us about the likely impact of the activity/ policy/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/149</u>



strategy/ budget change or decision on different groups.

The results of the EqIA should be used to inform the proposal/ recommended decision and changes should be made to the proposal/ recommended decision as a result of the assessment where required. Any ongoing/ future mitigating actions required should be set out in the action plan at the end of the assessment.



# Section 1 – Equality analysis details

Title of service activity / policy/ strategy/ budget change/ decision that you are assessing	School Streets delivery Plan
Team/ Department	Journeys and Places
Executive Director	Sarah Carey
Cabinet Member	Cllr Rick Jewel
Author(s) name(s) and contact details	Catalina Moreno
	(Catalina.Moreno@enfield.gov.uk)
Committee name and date of decision	Delegated Authority / Operational report
	To be signed by the Director Of Service

Date the EqIA was reviewed by the	19th July 2023
Corporate Strategy Service	
Name of Head of Service responsible	Richard Eason
for implementing the EqIA actions (if	
any)	
Name of Director who has approved	Brett Leahy
the EqIA	

The completed EqIA should be included as an appendix to relevant EMT/ Delegated Authority/ Cabinet/ Council reports regarding the service activity/ policy/ strategy/ budget change/ decision. Decision-makers should be confident that a robust EqIA has taken place, that any necessary mitigating action has been taken and that there are robust arrangements in place to ensure any necessary ongoing actions are delivered.

# Section 2 – Summary of proposal

Please give a brief summary of the proposed service change / policy/ strategy/ budget change/project plan/ key decision

# Please summarise briefly:

What is the proposed decision or change? What are the reasons for the decision or change? What outcomes are you hoping to achieve from this change?



Who will be impacted by the project or change - staff, service users, or the wider community?

School Streets are promoted by the Mayor of London as part of the Transport Strategy to promote the introduction of School Streets to encourage a modal shift away from car use and encourage more walking, cycling, and scooting to school to help reduce the environmental impact of pollution at school pick up and drop off times, reduce congestion and improve safety for children. These measures contribute towards enabling more active forms of travel as part of the wider Healthy Streets programme. This report considers the impact of implementing School Streets, Cycle Parking and Air Quality sensors for schools situated within the Borough of Enfield over the upcoming financial years and help ensure that equality values are taken into account in the feasibility stage of the programme.

To ensure a fair and informed decision in the implementation of the following School Streets, the council decided to deliver feasibility work to inform selection. This study was carried out on 15 school locations within the borough to determine the viability of implementing school streets, cycle parking and Air Quality Sensors. The objective is to ensure fairness in the distribution of the EPIC%<sup>2</sup> (Enfield Poverty and Inequality Commission). The goal is to create a transparent and inclusive process for prioritizing schools. The study carefully analysed the student population of each school with the aim of improving road safety for a larger number of students in the borough. This will contribute to increased awareness and promotion of active travel. Additionally, by evaluating the potential effects of school closures on local businesses, religious institutions, and health facilities, we identified potential complexities during the implementation at an early stage allowing us to propose a viable solution during the feasibility design.

The feasibility work was conducted in three stages. The initial stage took place in February 2023 and involved gathering information to identify all the schools in the borough. Data was collected from the STARS program as well as from schools that had previously submitted an Expression of Interest (EOI). The second stage involved the development of the feasibility design. The results helped identify the technical complexity in implementing the School Streets. Lastly, the third stage comprised the creation of a multi-criteria matrix, which provided a score for each school and generating a ranking as a result of the study. Each criteria had a percentage allocated depending on the importance for the School Streets programme. The criteria were based on:

- level of STARS accreditation (25%)
- percentage of households in poverty (5%)
- number of pupils (5%)
- number of closures (20%)
- number of child casualties in the past 10 years (15%)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> <u>https://www.enfield.gov.uk/services/your-council/enfield-poverty-and-inequality-commission</u>



- traffic level (10%)
- anticipated impact on local businesses (5%)
- volume of exemptions to be issued (5%)
- integration with journeys and places projects (10%)

The School Streets Delivery Plan FY23/24 aims to contribute to a reduction in road danger and improvement of air quality around schools, making journeys safer and easier. In an effort to achieve this goal and following the success of similar initiatives, the council has decided to install Air Quality Sensors in 10 schools in Enfield. According to the Air Quality Monitoring: London School Streets report 2020<sup>3</sup>, shows that school Streets have reduced nitrogen dioxide by up to 23% during morning drop off. 81% of parents and caregivers approved of the actions taken at their children's schools. Additionally, 18% of parents reported driving less to school as a result of School Streets. At drop-off and pick-up times, roads surrounding schools are closed to motor traffic, allowing children to walk or cycle to school, reducing car trips and improving air quality.

School Streets main goal is to restrict the use of motor vehicles during the school drop-off/pick-up periods. For this, some permits are available, to residents and businesses operating inside the closure zone. Schools are also given a limited number of exemptions to be distributed at their discretion and an unlimited number of exemptions for Blue Badge holders requiring access to the school. Dial-a-ride vehicles and the emergency services are also permitted to drive through the zone at all times.

In creating challenges to parking directly outside the school or just pulling up to drop off, School Streets encourage the uptake of active modes of travel by making driving the more challenging option for parents. These can include such as scooting, walking, and cycling enabling a few more minutes of quality time on the journey to school, leading to healthier communities.

The Council has committed to increasing the number of Schools that benefit from a School Street. This initiative aims to provide the children and youth of Enfield with optimal opportunities from the very beginning, ensuring their well-being, physical fitness, and overall development, so they can reach their fullest potential<sup>4</sup>.

Part of the wider Journeys and Places programme, a 'School Street' is when mitigations are put into place on the roads around a school to increase safety and encourage active travel. Typically, a School Street is a closure of the road(s) near a school, operating at pick up and drop off times during term time.

School Streets maintain the fundamental principles of the Healthy Streets (HS) indicators. The location of new school streets schemes is determined by a number of factors including but not limited to commitment to the TFL Stars Programme, geographical location, EPIC %<sup>5</sup> and other projects that are taking place in the area to ensure a holistic approach of the Journeys and Places

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> <u>https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/school-streets-improve-air-quality</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>https://www.enfieldsouthgate-labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/430/2022/04/Enfield-Labour-Manifesto-2022.pdf</u> <sup>5</sup> <u>https://www.enfield.gov.uk/services/your-council/enfield-poverty-and-inequality-commission</u>



programme. The Enfield Poverty and Equality Commission (EPIC, 2020) recommended of these there should be a focus on implementing School and Play Streets in the East of the borough.

The scheme will help to achieve the core objectives of the LBE Transport Strategy:

- Supporting measures which encourage more active travel in the borough.
- Promote safe, active, and sustainable transport to and from schools.
- Develop and deliver interventions which address local issues.

The council is committed to reducing road danger, air pollution and health inequality in and around our schools where the borough's young people are most vulnerable.

- These interventions are targeting traffic and road danger reduction near school gates, to protect our vulnerable children.
- They support a reduction in air and noise pollution.
- In addition, they encourage the uptake of active modes of travel, such as scooting, walking, and cycling enabling a few more minutes of quality time on the journey to school, leading to healthier communities.
- Active modes of travel also help to tackle childhood obesity and can improve attention and information retention in the classroom.
- Improve mental and physical health and wellbeing by increasing active travel

This scheme also delivers against the Transport for London healthy street objectives by:

- ✓ Improving clean air.
- ✓ Supporting pedestrians from all walks of life.
- ✓ Making streets easier to cross.
- ✓ Reducing noise pollution
- ✓ Encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport
- ✓ Making people feel safe
- ✓ Enabling people to see and do more
- ✓ People feel relaxed.



# Section 3 – Equality analysis

This section asks you to consider the potential differential impact of the proposed decision or change on different protected characteristics, and what mitigating actions should be taken to avoid or counteract any negative impact.

According to the Equality Act 2010, protected characteristics are aspects of a person's identity that make them who they are. The law defines 9 protected characteristics:

- 1. Age
- 2. Disability
- 3. Gender reassignment.
- 4. Marriage and civil partnership.
- 5. Pregnancy and maternity.
- 6. Race
- 7. Religion or belief.
- 8. Sex
- 9. Sexual orientation.

At Enfield Council, we also consider socio-economic status as an additional characteristic.

"Differential impact" means that people of a particular protected characteristic (eg people of a particular age, people with a disability, people of a particular gender, or people from a particular race and religion) will be significantly more affected by the change than other groups. Please consider both potential positive and negative impacts and provide evidence to explain why this group might be particularly affected. If there is no differential impact for that group, briefly explain why this is not applicable.

# Please consider how the proposed change will affect staff, service users or members of the wider community who share one of the following protected characteristics.

Information has been gathered regarding groups with protected characteristics in Enfield as a whole, given that the School Streets programme covers the entirety of the borough. London Travel Demand Survey (LTDS), Census 2011 and where available, Census 2021 data has been used on selected characteristics. These have been the three primary data sources, though other data sources have been used, and are referenced throughout. For each protected characteristic, data has been collected and analysed, with comparisons made at borough, regional and national level where relevant. Figure 1 below shows the schools streets programme locations.



Т School Streets ENFIELD places h е A KEY Live School Streets 1 Keys Meadow Primary School 2 Worcesters Primary School 3 Lavender Primary School 4 Chase Side Primary School р r 5 George Spicer Primary School 6 Kingfisher Hall Primary Acades De Bohun Primary School 0 8 St Pauls CofE Primary School 9 St Monica's Catholic Primary 9 St Monica's Catholic Prima 10 Hazelbury Primary School 11 Oakthorpe Primary School j 12 Raynham Primary School е 13 Meridian Angel Primary School 13 Meridian Angel Primary School 14 St James' C Of E Primary School 15 St Mary's Catholia Primary School 16 Wilbury Primary School 17 Houndsfield Primary School 18 Hazelwood Primary School С t 19 St John & St James CofE Primary School School Streets in progress 1 Delta Primary School 2 Bowes Primary School 3 Bush Hill Park Primary School t е Schools FY23/24 (TFL) 1 Chesterfield Pr 2 Prince of Woles Prin ary Scho а 3 Eastfield Primary Scho AQ Grant Schools (DEFRA) m 1 Enfield Heights Academy 2 Enfield County Schools 3 St George's Catholic Primary Sc 4 Merryhills Primary School С 5 Eversley Primary School 6 Raglan Junior School Alma Primary School B Highfield Primary Scho 0 9 Firs Farm Primary School 10 Latymer All Saint CofE Primary School n Enfield Borough Boundary S i.

Figure 1: Map Showing Live School Streets, School Streets in progress, proposed School Streets to be delivered by FY23/24, and Schools that could be part of the Air Quality Grant.

der that there would be no disproportionate impact on gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnerships or sexual orientation as a protected group and therefore this has been excluded from the assessment.

Detailed information and guidance on how to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment is available here. (link to guidance document once approved)



# Age

This can refer to people of a specific age e.g., 18-year olds, or age range e.g. 0-18 year olds.

Will the proposed change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people of a specific age or age group (e.g. older or younger people)?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

According to 2021 Census data, Enfield's population is 329,987 residents. Table 1 presents the age distribution across Enfield, London and England. This shows the Borough average generally follow the trend outlined above across London and England with notable differences in the percentages of residents in the 25-34 age bracket higher than the London average.

Age distribution	Borough of Enfield	London (%)	England (%)
	(%)		
0-4	6.4	6.0	5.4
5-9	6.9	6.0	5.9
10-15	8.7	7.2	7.2
16-19	5.0	4.4	4.6
20-24	5.8	6.7	6.0
25-34	13.4	18.1	13.6
35-49	21.6	22.7	19.4
50-64	18.4	16.9	19.4
65-74	7.3	6.5	9.8
75+	6.3	5.4	8.5

Table 1: Age distribution for Borough, London and England average basedon the Census 2021 data.

The median average age of someone in Enfield was 36.4 years in 2020 based on ONS estimates. Split by gender, the average female age is 37.6 years, and the average male is 35.1 years.

As shown in Figure 2, males outnumber females in every year of age up to age 21, after which there are more women than men in all but one single year (61 years). Males account for 47.3% of residents while females made up 52.3% of the total population of Enfield.

Figure 2: Age-band pyramid: Male and Female residents Census 2021





Census data for selected categories has now been made available, but there is currently no official ward-level mean age category. Figure 3 presents the spatial distribution of the mean age across Enfield's wards based on Census 2011 data and old ward boundaries. A clear trend can be observed whereby the northern and eastern wards have some of the lowest mean ages in Enfield and the southern and western wards some of the highest.





Source: UK Census 2011

Empowering Young Enfield 2021-25<sup>6</sup>, published by LB Enfield, illustrates several high-level statistics regarding young people within the borough:

- 84,309 children and young people reside in Enfield
- 57,870 children are of school age
- More residents under 20 than London / national averages
- One in three children are in poverty
- 42.3% of Year 6 children in 2018/19 are overweight or obese
- 60 primary schools
- 4 infants schools
- 4 junior schools
- 17 secondary schools
- 6 special schools

Figure 4 presents LTDS data on how people travel around Enfield within each age category.

In general, younger people in Enfield walk and cycle more, and drive less than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <u>https://www.enfield.gov.uk/\_\_\_data/assets/pdf\_\_file/0013/6034/empowering-young-enfield-2021-25-children-and-young-peoples-plan-your-council.pdf</u>



their elderly counterparts. The highest percentages of walking and cycling can be seen in those aged under 16, with 37 per cent of all trips made on foot or by bike. Those aged 65 and over have the lowest levels of walking and cycling, with 27 per cent of all trips, but the highest percentage of trips driven (or as a passenger in a car or van) at 52 per cent. Public transport use is disproportionally higher in 16 to 19-year-old group, making up 37 per cent of all journeys. This is 15 per cent higher than the nearest age group (those aged under 16).



Figure 4: Mode Share by Age in Enfield

## Source: LTDS (2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19)

The proportion of Killed or Seriously Injured (KSIs) and Slightly Injured casualties per age category is shown in Figure 5 below. KSIs are higher than average for those age 60 and over (19 per cent) and those aged Under 16 (14 per cent). A such, this indicates that these age groups are disproportionately more likely to suffer more severe consequences if they are a casualty in a collision.

# Figure 5: Percentage Killed or Seriously Injured in 2019 Road Accidents in Enfield by Age (proportional breakdown)



Source: DfT Road traffic statistics 2019

- School Street schemes will disproportionately benefit both young people (15 and under), and the elderly (60+), who are disproportionately impacted by road traffic accidents, being more likely to be killed / seriously injured than any age group in between. The feasibility study involved creating a multi-criteria matrix that includes factors such as the number of child casualties in the past 10 years, outlined in Annex B. As such the significant reduction of motor vehicles from the school street during school pick-up and drop-off times will benefit young people going to / from school, as well as elderly residents walking or cycling whilst going about their daily business in the vicinity of school street schemes.
- The schemes will disproportionately benefit young people attending school. The removal of motor traffic from outside of the school gates will enable them to travel to school via walking, cycling or scooting in safer conditions. As these modes of travel increase in popularity, this is likely to reduce vehicle trips on the local highway network, in turn improving air quality.
- The schemes will have no impact on local elderly residents who drive, as they will be granted an exemption to access / leave their properties via the school street.

## Mitigating actions to be taken

- Ensure that exemptions are in place for all residents and businesses owners on School Streets to access their properties.
- Ensure that residents on School Streets are fully engaged on the proposals, explaining the new restrictions and what this means for access to their properties. This engagement should pay particular attention to elderly people who may be less likely to have access to any



online engagement or social media.

• Consider the incorporation of School Streets within school travel planning objectives. School Streets could be used as a tool to achieve objectives of modal shift.

# Disability

A person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the person's ability to carry out normal day-day activities.

This could include: physical impairment, hearing impairment, visual impairment, learning difficulties, long-standing illness or health condition, mental illness, substance abuse or other impairments.

Will the proposed change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people with disabilities?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

In Enfield, Census 2021 data show that 86.4 per cent of residents feel that they have no limitations on their activities. This is similar to the London average and slightly higher than England (82.7 per cent). 13.6 per cent of the population of Enfield stated that they were limited by a long-term health problem or disability. Figure 6 presents this data.

# Figure 6: Proportion of those limited with long term health problems or disabilities



EqIA template approved by EMT 16<sup>th</sup> June 2020



daily travel (including old age) is shown in Figure 7. Mobility impairment represents the highest proportion (77 per cent) followed by impairment due to mental health (12 per cent). It should be noted that this data is based on a small sample, therefore results should be taken as a general indication only. It is important to note that various physical and mental disabilities can lead to travel limitations.



# Figure 7: Disability types stated by those with a disability affecting travel

Source: LTDS (2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19)

Focusing solely on cyclists who have a disability, the Wheels for Wellbeing annual survey<sup>7</sup> shows that 72 per cent of disabled cyclists use their bike as a mobility aid, and 75 per cent found cycling easier than walking. Survey results also show that 24 per cent of disabled cyclists' bike for work or to commute to work and many found that cycling improves their mental and physical health. Inaccessible cycle infrastructure was found to be the biggest barrier to cycling.

Over 75% of respondents indicated that they had experienced difficulties in accessing cycling, with individual freedoms being severely restricted as a result. Most significantly, the following barriers were identified as the most pressing ones for the third year running:

- Inaccessible cycling infrastructure
- The prohibitive cost of adaptive cycles (and lack of local inclusive cycling opportunities)
- The absence of legal recognition of the fact that cycles are mobility aids for many Disabled people (on a par with wheelchairs or mobility scooters)

Mode split for people with a physical or mental disability is shown in Figure 8. When compared to the LTDS mode split of trips made by all people, car use for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Wheels for Wellbeing Annual Survey 2018: <u>https://wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Survey-report-final.pdf</u>



those with disabilities is lower (42.6 per cent compared to 45 per cent), bus use is greater (17.5 per cent compared to 13.7 per cent) and walking is marginally higher (31.1 per cent compared to 30.8 per cent).



# Figure 8: Mode split by those with a physical or mental disability affecting daily travel – Enfield

Source: LTDS (2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19)

- The feasibility study, in its second stage, involved the development of the feasibility design. The results identified technical complexities in implementing School Streets, such as road types and potential cycle parking, detailed in Annex B. The feasibility study ensured the chosen road types are accessible to people with disabilities including those who use mobility aids like wheelchairs or have visual impairments and any road closures or changes in traffic flow does not create barriers for individuals in accessing schools or nearby facilities.
- Disabled people in Enfield are more likely to walk and take public transport, and less likely to drive than the average for the borough. As such, the implementation of School Street schemes will disproportionately benefit those with disabilities, creating quieter, safer areas to walk, wheel or cycle on. As disabled people are less likely to drive, or be driven around, they are less likely to be affected by the timed road closures.
- Those with physical or mental disabilities in Enfield are slightly less likely to use private vehicles compared to the London average but are more likely to use bus services. The enablement of modal shift away from private



vehicles can reduce congestion within Enfield Town, improving the reliability and attractiveness of bus services. Therefore, this demonstrates a material benefit to these disability groups.

- However, disabled people living within the vicinity of School Street that do rely upon the use of a car may be disproportionately impacted as School Street closures may result in longer journey times or diverted routes.
- It may be difficult for some school students who currently travel by car to their school to use alternative modes.
- Exemptions will be in place for those who require access, and as such those requiring access, including those with disabilities, will be unaffected by the proposals.
- The design and enforcement of School Street restrictions may disproportionately impact those with physical or mobility issues if they block any part of the footway or carriageway.

### Mitigating actions to be taken

- The design of the School Streets incorporates the requirements of disabled people, by facilitating access to level footways.
- Careful consideration should be given to exemptions to School Streets. Exemptions should be considered for children with disabilities who require dropping-off / picking-up close to the school gates (at the discretion of the school), or workers on the School Street who hold a Blue Badge. Blue badge holders who are unable to drive themselves will be able to nominate a vehicle to enable them to travel.



### Gender Reassignment

This refers to people who are proposing to undergo, are undergoing, or have undergone a process (or part of a process) to reassign their sex by changing physiological or other attributes of sex.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on transgender people?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

**No differential impact -** the scheme should not disproportionately affect anyone from this protected group.

Mitigating actions to be taken

N/A

## Marriage and Civil Partnership

Marriage and civil partnerships are different ways of legally recognising relationships. The formation of a civil partnership must remain secular, where-as a marriage can be conducted through either religious or civil ceremonies. In the U.K both marriages and civil partnerships can be same sex or mixed sex. Civil partners must be treated the same as married couples on a wide range of legal matters.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people in a marriage or civil partnership?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

**No differential impact -** the scheme should not disproportionately affect anyone from this protected group.

## Mitigating actions to be taken

N/A



## Pregnancy and maternity

Pregnancy refers to the condition of being pregnant or expecting a baby. Maternity refers to the period after the birth and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth, and this includes treating a woman unfavourably because she is breastfeeding.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on pregnancy and maternity?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

According to Census 2021, The General Fertility Rate (GFR<sup>8</sup>) in Enfield was 58.0 per 1,000 women aged 15-44, slightly lower average than London and England and Wales GFR. Therefore, there are statistically more likely to be pregnant and maternal people who reside in Enfield than the national average, however this is near equal to Outer London.

# Table 2: Birth and Fertility rates in Enfield, London, England and Wales (2021)

Area	Live births	GFR (per 1000 females aged 15-44)
Enfield	3936	58
London	110,961	56
England and Wales	624,729	56

- The feasibility study, in its second stage, involved the development of the feasibility design. The results identified technical complexities in implementing School Streets, such as road types and potential cycle parking, detailed in Annex B. It ensured the chosen road types are accessible and any road closures or changes in traffic flow does not create barriers for individuals in accessing schools or nearby facilities. This has led to a more inclusive and accessible School Streets that benefits all members of the community.
- The scheme is likely to disproportionately benefit mothers with buggies / prams to transport their children as the removal of motor traffic outside of the school gates will create a safer environment to drop off and collect children. Furthermore, they may feel more comfortable waiting outside the school gates with young children, as the lack of conflicting vehicles will improve both road safety and localised air pollution concerns.
- The removal of motor traffic from outside the school gates will create a more relaxed environment to wait around, facilitating greater informal interactions between parents, carers and children.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> <u>https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/births-and-fertility-rates-borough</u>



### Mitigating actions to be taken

- The design of each School Street should ensure that dropped kerbs/ crossings facilitating are provided to improve access for those pregnant and /or pushing buggies / prams.
- During both the consultation, monitoring and evaluation processes, we are aiming to gather input from pregnant women and mothers of young children as it is likely that their experiences will vary on a case-by- case basis.

#### Race

This refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship), ethnic or national origins.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people of a certain race?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

Figure 9 presents the population of Enfield by ethnicity. Based on Census 2021 data, 52.1 per cent of the Enfield's residential population is 'White', making it the most common ethnicity in the Borough. It is lower than the average across London, England and Wales.

The second most populous ethnicity is 'Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African', of which 18.3 per cent of the population identify. This is followed by 'Other ethnic group' and 'Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh', at 12.1 and 11.5 per cent of the population.

Figure 9: Population of Enfield by ethnicity (versus London; England and Wales) 2021



Source: UK Census 2021

The most popular languages for which Enfield Council receives translation and interpreting requests are Turkish, Polish, Albanian, Somali, Bulgarian, British Sign Language and Romanian.

The Spring 2021 School Census<sup>9</sup> records 189 languages or dialects being spoken by pupils who live in Enfield. As of Spring 2021, the top five non-English languages spoken by Enfield school pupils were:

Language	% of pupils
Turkish	13.7
Comoli	2.7
Somali	3.7
Albanian	2.6
Polish	2.4
Bengali	2.3
Bulgarian	2.3
Romanian	1.9
Greek	1.4
Arabic	1.3
Akan(Twi/Asante)	1.2

# Table 3: Top non-English languages spoken by Enfield school pupils 2021.

Based on average travel modes from the LTDS data presented in Figure 10, in Enfield all ethnic groups except for 'Other Ethnic Group' are more than likely to drive or be driven in a car or van than use any other mode. 'Other Ethnic Group', 'Asian or Asian British' and 'Mixed or multiple ethnic groups' are most likely to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Enfield Borough profile 2022



walk and cycle, with a mode share of between 35 and 43 per cent. It is important to note that the sample size of LTDS data is small, therefore these percentages may not precisely reflect the travel behaviours of each ethnic group.



# Figure 10: Mode share by ethnicity in Enfield

Source: LTDS (2018/19)

- During the feasibility stage, the multi-criteria matrix considered factors such as the percentage of households in poverty, which can be associated with specific racial or ethnic groups. This helped to identify any potential disparities or barriers faced by different racial or ethnic groups in accessing safe and sustainable transportation options.
- The dominant mode shares for all the primary ethnic groups comprises public transport, alongside walking and cycling, of which all journeys will start/end via walking/wheeling. All users of these modes will benefit where road safety is improved. As a result, expanding the number of School Street schemes in the borough will make these modes more appealing for those who presently drive to drop their children off at the school gates, offering a safer and more amenable alternative.
- Driving, however, constitutes a large proportion of total mode shares for the dominant ethnic groups, and as such the schemes are likely to disproportionately negatively impact those who drive more, which across Enfield comprises White and Asian / Asian British ethnic groups. However, due to the scope and scale of the road closures, alongside the relevant exemptions, the overall impact is concluded to be minimal and is intended to encourage modal shift.

Mitigating actions to be taken



• There is often poor awareness of local walking and cycling schemes amongst those who rarely walk, cycle or travel outside their immediate area, particularly in those who do not speak fluent English, or it is not their first language. As such, all consultation and engagement communications should aim to ensure that these groups are reached, for example by offering materials in appropriate languages and or engaging through relevant community organisations.



# **Religion and belief**

Religion refers to a person's faith (e.g. Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Sikhism, Hinduism). Belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (e.g. Atheism). Generally, a belief should affect your life choices or the way you live.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people who follow a religion or belief, including lack of belief?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

Figure 11 presents Census 2021 data on religion and belief in Enfield. Enfield is a predominantly Christian borough, with 46 per cent of the population identifying as Christian. 27 per cent of people do not follow a religion or did not state a religion. 16.7 per cent of residents identify as Muslim, making it the second most common religion or belief. Enfield is also home to smaller proportions of residents compared to the other faiths including Buddhist (0.5 per cent), Hindu (3.1 per cent), Jewish (1.1 per cent) and Sikh (0.4 per cent).



## Figure 11: Breakdown of religion/belief within Enfield 2021



observances can have an impact on travel patterns. Places of worship and faithbased schools are major destinations for large populations from different groups.

- The feasibility study considered any religious institutions or places of worship that may be located along the proposed School Streets. Potential road closures and changes in traffic patterns could affect the accessibility of these religious places and may have implications for religious practices and community engagement. Therefore, in Annex B, it is reflected how the religious institutions identified in the feasibility design negatively impact the site evaluation to avoid future complexities during implementation and communities affected in their religious practices during closure hours.
- The timings of the School Streets road closures mean they are unlikely to impact religious events during the week as these are not commonly held during the times of school pick up / drop off. However, periodic events such as funerals are more likely to be affected and will require engagement between the place of worship and school to enable access when required.
- Where religious events take place at similar timings to the timed road closures, they will disproportionately benefit those arriving by public transport, walking, and cycling, but disproportionately negatively impact those arriving by vehicles
- There have been no religious centres identified that would be affected by the closures

### Mitigating actions to be taken

- Engagement should consider developing effective communication between places of worship and schools, in order to devise appropriate strategies to mitigate against the impact of religious events occurring at the same time as school drop-off and pick-up times.
- Access to places of worship will be considered by the council on a case-by case basis should there be an issue arise during the during closure times (e.g., for access for a funeral to a church). However, no places of worship were identified within the proposed closures. Organisations which employ staff would be treated the same as a business operating within the zone so would not be unfairly impacted.

## Sex

Sex refers to whether you are a female or male.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on females or males?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.



According to the Census 2021, in Enfield 47.7 per cent of residents identify as male and 52.3 per cent as female. This is very similar to the percentage split for London as a whole (48.5 per cent male, 51.5 per cent female).

Figure 12 presents the mode share by sex in Enfield. Walking is the most used type of transport by females, making up 33 per cent of all trips. This is 5 per cent higher than males. On average, females drive slightly less than males, making up 44 per cent of trips vs 46 per cent with males. Females are also use the bus more than males (15 per cent vs 13 per cent).



# Figure 12: Mode share by sex in Enfield

Source: LTDS (2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19)

Across Greater London, research undertaken by TfL shows walking is the most used type of transport by females (95 per cent walk at least once a week). Females are also more likely to use buses than males (62 per cent compared with 56 per cent) but are less likely to use other types of transport including the Tube (38 per cent women compared with 43 per cent males).

Female Londoners take more trips on a weekday than male Londoners, 2.5 compared to 2.3. This pattern however is reversed amongst older adults, with older female Londoners taking fewer weekday trips than older male Londoners, 2.0 compared to 2.2. It is important to recognise that females are more likely than males to be travelling with buggies and/or shopping, and this can affect transport choices.

Females aged 17 or over who are living in London are less likely than males to EqIA template approved by EMT 16<sup>th</sup> June 2020



have a full driving licence (58 per cent compared with 72 per cent) or have access to a car (63 per cent of all females compared with 66 per cent of all males). These factors are likely to be related to the frequency of car use as a driver.

Women's travel needs can often be more complex than men due to a range of factors; the increased likelihood of travelling with a buggy and/or shopping affects the travel choices women make, women are also more likely to be carers of children, older people, sick and disabled further affecting the choices they make.

Women are more likely to use buses (where walking will form the start/end of the trip) and walk then men. As such the proposals removal motor traffic through timed road closures is likely to disproportionately benefit those using these modes of transport, as they are likely to feel safer doing so, and impacts of localised air pollution should be reduced.

However, driving constitutes a major part of women's mode share in London, as such those who drive are likely to be disproportionately negatively impacted by the proposals. However, the scale and scope of the proposals mean that they may be encouraged to undertake the journey by other means, as they will feel safer taking the children under their care up to the school gates, with a lower impact from localised air pollution. As a result, the proposals will disproportionately benefit those who undertake modal shift.

Women are additionally more likely to be pushing prams/strollers, and as such will be disproportionately negatively impacted by measures/structures impacting comfort levels of footways and crossings, alongside the removal/blocking of dropped kerbs.

### Mitigating actions to be taken

- The scheme's design should look to avoid reducing comfort levels on footways, whilst maintaining full access to existing dropped kerbs, in order to enable full access to those pushing prams/strollers.
- Enfield should ensure that engagement and consultation sufficiently seeks out and listens to the concerns of women, and particularly the impact of poor road safety during the school run, and impact of measures on footways.



## **Sexual Orientation**

This refers to whether a person is sexually attracted to people of the same sex or a different sex to themselves. Please consider the impact on people who identify as heterosexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, non-binary or asexual.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people with a particular sexual orientation?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

**No differential impact -** the scheme should not disproportionately affect anyone from this protected group.

### Mitigating actions to be taken

N/A

## Socio-economic deprivation

This refers to people who are disadvantaged due to socio-economic factors e.g. unemployment, low income, low academic qualifications or living in a deprived area, social housing or unstable housing.

Will this change to service/policy/budget have a **differential impact [positive or negative]** on people who are socio-economically disadvantaged?

Please provide evidence to explain why this group may be particularly affected.

As outlined within the Enfield Transport Plan (2019), Enfield is one of the most deprived Outer London boroughs, notably the 9th most deprived London borough, whereas it was 12th in 2015. The Borough's overall ranking in the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation showed that Enfield is the 74th most deprived out of 316 English local authorities.

Figure 13 presents a visual representative of deprivation level across Enfield based on the new (2022) ward boundaries, based on average scores for constituent LSOAs with 2022 wards. The eastern and southern sections of the borough are the most deprived, with the western and north-western sections being the least deprived.

Figure 13: Deprivation in Enfield (showing new borough boundaries revised in 2022)



Source: UK Census 2021

Enfield has a lower percentage of households without access to a car or van compared to the London average, Table 4 presents this.

Table 4: Percentage of households with cars or vans in Enfield and L	ondon
(Census 2021)	

Number of households with:	Borough of Enfield (%)	London (%)
0 cars or vans	31.0	42.1
1 car or van	44.3	40.3
2+ cars or vans	24.6	17.6

Figure 15 presents the percentage of households without access to a car or van (with old ward boundaries). Areas with lower percentages without access to a car and van broadly mirror the least deprived sections seen in Figure 14, with the east of the borough having some of the highest percentages without access to a car/van, and the west having the least.

Figure 15: Percentage of Enfield Households Without Access to a Car or Van





Data source: UK Census 2011

According to Census 2021 data, Enfield has lower proportion of full-time employees than London as a whole (64.7 per cent vs 72.0 per cent), but a higher proportion of part-time employed people (35.3 per cent vs 28.0 per cent). Enfield has a relatively high proportion of people who are economically inactive due to being long-term sick or disabled (4.2 per cent vs 3.6 per cent).

Enfield's median household income in 2018 (according to CACI 2018 data) was  $\pounds 34,000$ , lower than the Outer London average. According to CACI Ltd estimate<sup>10</sup>, the average (mean) household incomes increased from  $\pounds 42,790$  to  $\pounds 49,200$  between 2021 and 2022, while the median average rose from  $\pounds 35,303$  to  $\pounds 41,149$  (17%).

Figure 16 shows the percentage of houses in poverty across the borough identified in the Enfield Poverty & Equality Commission report 2020.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Enfield Borough profile 2022





Source: Enfield Poverty & Equality Commission report 2020

TfL research shows that low-income Londoners also tend to travel less frequently than Londoners overall – 2.2 trips per weekday on average compared to 2.4 among all Londoners. Among this group, a greater proportion of journeys are completed for the purposes of shopping and personal business: 31 per cent for Londoners with household income of less than £20,000 compared with 22 per cent all Londoners (in line with 31 per cent and 22 per cent observed in 2013/14)<sup>11</sup>.

Regarding cycling, TfL research found that BAME groups are distanced from cycling due to a lack of culturally accessible facilities or provision, including low levels of bicycle ownership, limited places to store or clean a bike, and having to carry a bike up several flights of stairs. Furthermore, 57 per cent of ethnic minority groups are excluded from participation by poverty. For those on a very low income, the cost of a bike may be a significant barrier to cycling<sup>12</sup>

Londoners in lower income households are the most likely equality group to use the bus at least weekly; seven in 10 Londoners in households with an annual income of less than £20,000 do so (69 per cent).

These combine factors suggest more of the community will likely use public transport or walk than drive in Enfield.

The third stage of the feasibility study considered criteria such as the percentage

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> <u>https://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf</u>
<sup>12</sup> <u>http://content.tfl.gov.uk/barriers-to-cycling-for-ethnic-minorities-and-deprived-groups-summary.pdf</u>



of households in poverty and the traffic level within the vicinity of the 15 schools which aimed to ensure that the implementation of School Streets would not disproportionately affect communities already facing socio-economic challenges.

Those who are socio-economically disadvantaged are more likely to use buses (where walking forms the start/end of the trip) and walk than those on higher incomes. As such the timed road closures are likely to disproportionately benefit them as they are more likely to feel safer walking on the roads during timed closures due to improved road safety localised air quality. Based on EPIC report, deprived areas above 40% EPIC got a higher score in order to promote active travel in the most deprived areas and ensuring a fair assessment for the entire borough.

Families who are socio-economically disadvantaged are more likely to benefit from schemes which facilitate modal shift and improve conditions for walking particularly, as they are less likely to drive. As such they are likely to disproportionately benefit from School Streets schemes.

#### Mitigating actions to be taken.

- There is often poor awareness of local walking and cycling schemes amongst those who rarely walk, cycle, or travel outside their immediate area, particularly in those who do not speak English at all, or it is not their first language.
- Consultation and engagement communications should aim to ensure that these groups are reached, for example by offering materials in appropriate languages and or engaging through relevant community organisations.
- The School Street website and supporting communications where possible will include the promotion of cycling and active travel to the whole community and how it can be made accessible to everyone.



# Section 4 – Monitoring and review

How do you intend to monitor and review the effects of this proposal?

Who will be responsible for assessing the effects of this proposal?

- 1. Traffic surveys are commissioned to understand the level of traffic, so that this can be benchmarked and checked during the operation of the scheme.
- 2. Schools participating in the STARS (Sustainable, travel, active, responsible, safe) programme, a Transport for London accredited road safety programme will allow us to track and monitor how children travel to school and how involved in behaviour change the school is.

An objective of a STARS accredited school with a school street is to achieve and maintain gold status, which equates to 90% of pupils travelling actively.

STARS activities have a significant impact on increasing the number of families using sustainable and active travel.

Schools also internally promote walking and cycling events to encourage active travel. This is monitored and rewarded by the school.

The information gained from the monitoring activities above should be examined to determine whether they provide additional insights into any disproportionate impacts (either positive or negative) on particular groups. If so, then this EqIA should be updated, and mitigation measures considered if appropriate.



# Section 5 – Action plan for mitigating actions

Any actions that are already completed should be captured in the equality analysis section above. Any actions that will be implemented once the decision has been made should be captured here.

Identified Issue	Action Required/Comments	Lead officer	Timescale /By When	Costs	Review Date/ Comments
Age	Exemptions in place for all residents within the affected roads Engagement to focus on all residents the School Street zone or impacted by the proposed one ways School Streets, particularly the elderly who may be less likely to have access to the online engagement materials, in these cases residents can call attend the Parking Shop. Instructions to access alternative means of application will be included in written communications issued to residents Consider the incorporation of School Streets within school travel planning objectives.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	Advice/liaison from school travel plan officer (if appropriate)
Disability	Design of School Streets will need to incorporate the requirements of disabled people, facilitating access to level footways.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	General design advice from highways design officer



Disability	Exemptions systems are in place for blue badge holding residents and those requiring special access to the school to mitigate negative impact.	Penny Swan	Post-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	General exemptions developed pre- scheme implementation with feedback from school's post- implementation
Religion and Belief	No religious institutions have been found that will be impacted by the changes.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	If any centres or issues emerged, this could be managed as they arose should any situations changed.
Pregnancy & Maternity / sex	The scheme's design should look to avoid reducing comfort levels on footways, whilst maintaining full access to existing dropped kerbs, to enable full access to those pushing prams/strollers. Monitor and review any feedback received from pregnant women and mothers of young children during the consultation and evaluation processes.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	General design advice from highways design officer
Sex	Ensure sufficient engagement covers the concerns of women, and particularly the impact of poor road safety during the school run, and impact of measures on footways.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	Engagement should feed into scheme design principles
Race/ Socio- economic	Ensure that all consultation and engagement communications aim to include people whose first language is not English, for example by offering	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within	Engagement should be translated into



deprivation	materials in appropriate languages and or engaging through relevant community organisations.			scheme budget)	required languages
Socio- economic deprivation	The School Streets website and supporting communications where possible will include the promotion of cycling and active travel to the whole community and how it can be made accessible to everyone.	Penny Swan	Pre-scheme implementation	Time (included within scheme budget)	Engagement should be translated into required languages

