



**Appendix J
Equality Impact Assessment
for the
Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy
for Islington**

by S Reid, D Allen, S Bygrave, A Davies

**UPR/T/042/05
Clients Project Reference Number**

UNPUBLISHED PROJECT REPORT

Appendix J

Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
ISLINGTON COUNCIL’S SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY.....	2
THE EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS.....	4
THE GROUPS TARGETED BY AN EQIA.....	5
THE NATURE OF IMPACTS UPON EQUALITY TARGET GROUPS.....	5
SPACES OF FLOW IN ISLINGTON	6
<i>Ethnoscapes</i>	6
<i>Finanscapes</i>	7
<i>Mobility</i>	7
ISLINGTON CONTEXT	9
UNEMPLOYMENT IN ISLINGTON.....	9
LIVING ENVIRONMENT	9
GENDER	11
AGE	11
ETHNICITY	12
DISABILITY	13
SEXUALITY.....	13
FAITH	14
KEY FACTS FROM SECTION 2.....	15
EQUALITY TARGET GROUP DISTRIBUTION	15
CLUSTER IDENTIFICATION.....	16
PERCENTAGE AGED OVER 65 YEARS	18
PERCENTAGE OF YOUNGER PEOPLE AGED 16 – 25 YEARS	19
PERCENTAGE UNDER 16 YEARS.....	19
FEMALES.....	20
<i>Percentage of females</i>	20
RELIGION.....	21
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as Buddhist</i>	21
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu</i>	21
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as Jewish</i>	22
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as Muslim</i>	22
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as Sikh</i>	23
<i>Percentage of people stating religion as ‘Other religion’</i>	23
<i>Total percentage of ethnic faith groups</i>	23
ETHNIC ORIGIN	24
<i>Percentage of Asian or Asian British people</i>	24
<i>Percentage of Black or Black British people</i>	24
<i>Percentage of Chinese or other ethnic people</i>	25
<i>Percentage of mixed race people</i>	25

<i>Percentage of white people</i>	25
<i>Percentage of Black or ethnic minority groups</i>	25
HEALTH	26
<i>Percentage of people living with a long term illness</i>	26
<i>Percentage total Disability Living Allowance Claimants</i>	26
<i>Male life expectancy</i>	27
KEY FACTS FROM SECTION 3	28
EQUALITY TARGET GROUP CURRENT OPPORTUNITIES TO USE	
TRANSPORT	30
DEFINING TRANSPORT PROVISION.....	30
DEFINING TRIP GENERATORS.....	31
TRANSPORT PROVISION	38
TRIP GENERATORS	39
COMMUNITY ACCESS RATINGS.....	40
SUMMARY OF EQUALITY TARGET GROUP PROVISION	40
EQUALITY TARGET GROUPS IDENTIFIED FOR TRANSPORT PROVISION, TRIP GENERATORS AND COMMUNITY ACCESS RATING	41
TRANSPORT AND LAND USE	43
SUMMARY	44
KEY FACTS FROM SECTION 4	47
EQUALITY TARGET GROUP CONCERNS	49
WOMEN	49
<i>Safety</i>	49
OLDER PEOPLE	50
<i>Accessibility</i>	50
<i>Safety</i>	50
PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY	50
<i>Road quality and surfaces</i>	50
<i>Obstructions and street clutter</i>	51
<i>Lighting</i>	51
<i>Signage</i>	51
<i>Home Zones</i>	51
CHILDREN AND YOUNGER PEOPLE	51
<i>Noise</i>	51
<i>Exercise and safety</i>	52
ETHNICITY	52
<i>Language</i>	52
SEXUALITY	53
<i>Public Transport</i>	53
ACCESSIBLE TRANSPORT	53
STREETS FOR PEOPLE CONSULTATION 2004.....	53
KEY FACTS FROM SECTION 5	54
SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT OF TRANSPORT PROPOSALS ON EQUALITY TARGET GROUPS	55
PROPOSALS LINKED TO EQUALITY TARGET GROUPS.....	56
OPPORTUNITIES MISSED.....	56
<i>Opportunities missed in improving the Highways Infrastructure</i>	56
<i>Opportunities missed by walking routes</i>	56
IMPACTS SUMMARISED BY GROUP	58

<i>Impacts on Women</i>	58
<i>Impacts on Minority Ethnic groups</i>	58
<i>Impacts on Children and Younger people</i>	59
<i>Impacts on Older people</i>	59
<i>Impacts on people with a disability</i>	59
<i>Impacts on Lesbians, Gay men, Bisexual and Transgender people</i>	60
<i>Impacts on Faith groups</i>	60
MONITORING THESE IMPACTS	60
CONCLUSION	64
<i>Recommendations</i>	64
REFERENCES	65

List of Tables

Table J1.1: EqIA stages	5
Table J2.1: Gender Breakdown.....	11
Table J2.2: Age groups in Islington	12
Table J2.3: Ethnic Groups in Islington, 2001	12
Table J2.4: Difficulties Affecting Ability to Travel Amongst Islington Residents	13
Table J2.5: People living in a same sex couple.....	14
Table J2.6: Religious attachment of Islington residents	15
Table J3.1: Equality Target Groups – London borough of Islington.....	29
Table J4.1: Scoring categories	33
Table J4.2: Transport provision and trip generators (Classifications).....	36
Table J4.3: Transport provision and trip generators (Scores).....	36
Table J4.4: Total Community Access rating scores for each ward	37
Table J4.5: Transport provision	42
Table J4.6: Trip generators	43
Table J4.7: Community access rating	43
Table J6.1: Suggested monitoring of the Draft Consultation Sustainable Transport Strategy proposals.....	62

List of Figures

Figure J1.1: Wards within Islington.....	3
Figure J2.1: Living environment deprivation scores across Islington.....	10
Figure J2.2: Age Profile of Islington.....	12
Figure J3.1: Ward names within Islington.....	18
Figure J3.2: Percentage of older people (>65) in Wards of Islington.....	19
Figure J3.3: Percentage of children (<16) in Wards of Islington.....	20
Figure J3.4: Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu in Wards of Islington	22
Figure J3.5: Percentage of ethnic minority faiths in Wards of Islington (including: Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and other religions)	24

Figure J3.6: Percentage of black and minority ethnic people in Wards of Islington..... 26

Figure J3.7: Percentage of total disability living allowance claimants in wards of Islington..... 27

Figure J4.1: Traffic Congestion on Islington’s main roads..... 34

Figure J4.2: Accident Severity in Wards of Islington 35

Figure J4.3: Community Access ratings by ward..... 38

Figure J4.4: Public Transport Accessibility Levels..... 46

Figure J4.5: Ground Floor Land Use 47

Figure J6.1: Community Access rating map with proposed walking routes..... 57

Executive Summary

TRL was commissioned to carry out the following Equality Impact Assessment for the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy for Islington.

The study aims to assess and record the likely equality impacts of the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy for Islington. It establishes the current context of Islington in terms of economic and social factors and the living environment. It describes the distribution of people from the groups deemed most likely to experience inequalities (the Equality Target Groups). The study found that significant numbers of members of Equality Target Groups are resident in Islington and that their spatial distribution is not uniform, resulting in identifiable concentrations of people from Equality Target Groups at ward level. When compared with current accessibility in the borough it was found that some concentrations of groups have more opportunities than others to move through and within the borough to access amenities.

Many concerns and needs of the Equality Target Groups were identified from previous research and direct consultation with people from the borough and helped build up a healthy baseline of the needs and current experience of the groups deemed most likely to experience inequalities.

The analysis of the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy identified generic benefits to people in Equality Target Groups as well as specific benefits to particular groups. These included various positive impacts such as the enhancement of the personal security of women, improvements to children's safety that may reduce the number of child casualties, the dismantling of accessibility barriers that exclude older and disabled people and new signage creating possible benefits to non-English readers from the race or faith strands.

While **no serious negative impacts were found**, two potential negative impacts were identified in proposals regarding Home Zones (i.e. that removing dropped kerbs could create hazards to the visually impaired) and Freight (i.e. that any increase in freight movement in Islington could increase noise, air and vibration pollution). Mitigation was suggested and monitoring was recommended to measure the effectiveness of various schemes.

Some missed opportunities were identified where improvements to the highway infrastructure and development of walking routes were deemed to have missed joining up or serving particular concentrations of people from the Equality Target Groups.

1.0 Introduction

Islington Council's Sustainable Transport Strategy

- 1.1 The Sustainable Transport Strategy (STS) for Islington has been written for four main purposes:
- to document Islington Council's transport strategy for the next ten years, 2006 to 2016, for Islington's residents, businesses, transport partners and other stakeholders
 - to fulfil the Mayor's requirement for Islington Council to develop a local implementation plan
 - to contribute towards the council's new planning policy, the Local Development Framework (LDF), which is being developed alongside the transport strategy and will replace the existing Unitary Development Plan (UDP) towards the end of 2007 or early in 2008
 - to be used as a strategic tool by council officers to assist longer-term programming and co-ordination of transport improvements
- 1.2 The strategy's vision is derived from Islington Council's overall "One Islington" vision, which is to make Islington:
- a greener place to live
 - a place where people of all backgrounds are able to realise their full potential
 - a borough of safe, empowered communities
- 1.3 Building on the One Islington vision, the objectives of this sustainable transport strategy are to make Islington's transport system:
- Safe
 - Accessible
 - Green
 - Efficient
 - Secure
 - Attractive
- 1.4 The strategy is a very comprehensive compilation of transport information, containing
- Islington's socio-economic/demographic and transport contexts (chapters 1 and 2)
 - strategic transport policies (chapter 3)
 - proposals for specific transport topic areas (chapter 4)
 - the funding implications of the strategy (chapter 5)
 - a "core capacity statement" summarising the council's capacity to deliver the proposed programme (chapter 6)
 - targets and performance indicators that will be used to monitor implementation of the strategy (chapter 7)
 - and a number of additional chapters and appendices to present further detail and to assist specific individuals and groups to find

the information most likely to be of interest to them

- 1.5 This Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a part of the council's statutory requirement to develop a Local Implementation Plan. Readers seeking more detail or further background should read this plan in conjunction with the broader strategy.

Figure J1.1: Wards within Islington



- 1.6 This section gives a brief introduction to Equality Impact Assessment:
- 1.7 An Equality Impact Assessment is a relatively new process. It is intended to ensure that projects and policies do not adversely affect the members of socially excluded or vulnerable groups.

- 1.8 The use of EqIA can assist in ensuring that statutory duties under the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) and Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) are discharged. EqIA can also support policy commitments to provide inclusive services and reduce social exclusion.
- 1.9 In the London context, the Mayor's Transport Strategy sets out ten key priorities, of which several are directly related to equality and inclusion:
- supporting local transport initiatives, including improved access to town centres and regeneration areas, walking and cycling schemes, Safer Routes to School, road safety improvements, better maintenance of roads and bridges, and improved co-ordination of street works;
 - improving the accessibility of London's transport system so that everyone, regardless of disability, can enjoy the benefits of living in, working in and visiting the Capital, thus improving social inclusion;
 - bringing forward new integration initiatives to: provide integrated, simple and affordable public transport fares; improve key interchanges; enhance safety and security across all means of travel; ensure taxis and private hire vehicles are improved and fully incorporated into London's transport system; and provide much better information and waiting environment.

The Equality Impact Assessment process

- 1.10 An EqIA *focuses on assessing and recording the likely equality impacts of a strategy, policy, business plan or project. There is a focus on assessing the impact on certain groups of people known as Equality Target Groups (ETGs). It involves anticipating the consequences of policies and projects on these groups and making sure that, as far as possible, any negative consequences are eliminated or minimised and opportunities for promoting equality are maximised.*ⁱ
- 1.11 The main output of the EqIA process is an EqIA statement in which the likely significant impacts upon the people in an ETG are described. The EqIA of Islington's Sustainable Transport Strategy involves 5 stages (see table J1.1 below).

Table J1.1: EqlA stages

	EqlA Stage	What is involved
‘Initial screen’	Stage 1	Baseline data gathering: defining the scope (the Equality Target Groups), identifying how people in the ETGs are distributed, identifying the recorded concerns of people in the ETGs and identifying the exposure of people in the ETGs to current / proposed transport schemes
	Stage 2	Consideration of the impacts of the STS proposals upon people in the ETGs
Full Impact Assessment	Stage 3	More detailed assessment of significant impacts identified
	Stage 4	Production of the final EqlA statement with suggested mitigation
Post-Statement	Stage 5	Monitor the significant Equality impacts of implementing the STS

- 1.12 This report describes the results of Stage 1 and 2 as applied to Islington’s Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy.

The groups targeted by an EqlA

- 1.13 The EqlA process has a defined scope of interest; the Equality Target Groups (ETGs) as set out by the Greater London Authority (2003).
- 1.14 The Equality Target Groups are:
- Women
 - Black and minority ethnic people
 - Children and young people
 - Older people
 - Disabled people
 - Lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender people
 - People from different faiths

The nature of impacts upon Equality Target Groups

- 1.15 Transport for London (TfL) identifies two possible impacts in its guidance:
1. A **negative or adverse impact** where the impact could disadvantage one Equality Target Group, or some Equality Target Groups. This disadvantage may be differential, where the negative or adverse impact on one particular group of individuals or one equality target group is likely to be greater

than on another. It should be noted that some negative or adverse impacts may be intended. The EqIA provides an opportunity to assess this.

2. *An impact that will have a **positive impact** on an equality target group, or some equality target groups, or improve equal opportunities and /or relationships between groups. This positive impact may be differential, where the positive impact on one particular group of individuals or one equality target group is likely to be greater than on another.ⁱⁱ*

1.16 There are two further criteria that this report will assess proposals against:

3. An impact that will have a **neutral impact** upon people in a ETG, or several Equality Target Groups. This impact will neither disadvantage a people in a group nor enhance or improve a groups opportunities or relations. This may be because people from a certain ETG are present in the area but are not deemed to be in a cluster (see cluster identification below).
4. An **opportunity missed** regarding people in a ETG, this is when a proposal may miss an opportunity to improve conditions for excluded groups. Examples may include failure to upgrade bus stops to support wheelchair accessible buses or concentration of streetscape enhancement projects in more prosperous parts of the borough.

1.17 Impact assessment will be proposal driven, detailing how a proposal may create problems, solve problems or fail to address problems.¹

Spaces of flow in Islington

1.18 One way of understanding the complex overlapping identities, cultures and economies in Islington is through the spaces of flow created within the borough. These spaces or –scapes may be an easier way of understanding the complex make-up of the borough.² While these -scapes are formed by people, they also influence, connect and exclude people.

Ethnoscapes

1.19 The ethnoscapes that form and reform in the borough are not only dependent upon global flows of people but flows of information, media, ideology and commodities that add to and forge new ethnic identities.

¹ For more information on the proposals of Islington’s Sustainable Transport Strategy see Chapter 4 of the Strategy.

² Using the idea of -scapes may help form an understanding of the “complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing centre-periphery models (even those that might account for multiple centres and peripheries)” (Appadurai, 1990).

This results, not only, in difference between recognised ethnic groups such as Asian British or Jewish communities, but also between those who have different levels of access to these flows (dependent upon factors such as age, education, finance, mobility or interest). These overlapping, intertwining flows create more and more complex ethnic identities that embrace or reject different sexualities, belief systems and ideas about (dis) ability.

- 1.20 Islington then, holds ethnoscapas that have strong connections to the major religious belief systems including Islam (with over 8% stating their religion as Muslim ⁱⁱⁱ), small strands of Buddhist, Hindu and Jewish (all just over 1%) and even smaller numbers associating with the Sikh religion (0.34%) and any other religion (0.41%). While 54% of people identify with Christianity, the level of connection with these ideologies or communities is likely to vary.
- 1.21 The overlapping nature of the ETG categories is evident when racial identities are examined. It is likely that some people identifying as Muslim also identify as Asian / Asian British (5.39% of Islington's population) or mixed race (4.11%) categories. Global flow is hugely evident in Islington with only 56% of people identifying as White British. There are also important distributions of Black / Black British people (11.86%) and Chinese or other ethnic groups (3.28%) in the borough.

Finanscapes

- 1.22 The flow of money and resources through the borough is not only “deeply disconnected and profoundly unpredictable”^{iv} but is also interwoven and channelled with the ethnoscapas already discussed. Large amounts of wealth enters and leaves the borough everyday as 112,000 commute into Islington to work and 53,000 leave the borough to travel to work (source 2001 Census). This in part contributes to the great mixture of approximated social grades of people within the borough. With over 58% of the population falling within the social grades A, B (higher and intermediate managerial / administrative / professional) or C1 (Supervisory; clerical; junior managerial / administrative / professional). 22% fall into categories C2 (Skilled manual workers) and D (semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers) and 19% in the lowest category of E (On state benefit; unemployed or lowest grade workers ^v).

Mobility

- 1.23 Within these -scapes are the various transport networks that further connect, disconnect and mix the different flows of people and resource within the borough.
- 1.24 Therefore, although Islington's residents and visitors occupy a relatively limited land area, there are a significant number of communities that exist in the borough.

- 1.25 This report should contribute toward the realisation of many targets in Islington’s Environment and Conservation Equality Action Plan. A report on the Equality Action Plan highlighted the need to create “baseline data to support the monitoring of the targets included in the plan”^{vi}, sections 2,3,4 and 5 of this report should begin to provide a such a resource.
- 1.26 The remainder of this report will consider the Consultation Draft of Islington’s Sustainable Transport Strategy in relation to those communities that have been identified as Equality Target Groups. It consists of the following sections:

Section 2 – Islington Context

Section 3 – Equality Target Group distribution

Section 4 – Equality Target Group current opportunities to use transport

Section 5 – Equality Target Group Concerns

Section 6 – Summary of the Impact of Transport Proposals on Equality Target Groups

2.0 Islington Context

- 2.1 The London borough of Islington lies north of the City of London and shares borders with Haringey, Hackney and Camden. The borough has a surface area of 1,487 hectares, making it the third smallest local authority in the UK. Islington is the 8th most deprived local authority in the country, and many of the wards in the borough are amongst the most deprived in London. Areas of deprivation often border areas of great wealth due to the higher than average level of social housing in the borough. It has approximately 86,000 dwellings and a population of nearly 179,000. Population growth within the borough has increased over the past three years with an additional 2,500 residents compared to an increase of 4,000 residents between 1991 and 2001. In consequence, Islington is now one of the London boroughs with the highest growth rates and concentrations of people per hectare^{vii}.

Unemployment in Islington

- 2.2 In Islington 5.8% of people are unemployed and 56.6% are employed. Unemployment rates vary with age and sex. On the whole rates tend to be lower amongst women than men. Unemployment rates tend to be higher in Inner London, than Outer London. Compared to the London average (4.9%), the overall unemployment rate (claimant-based) in Islington (7.6%) is substantially higher; and this holds for both men and women. Islington has the highest unemployment rate of all the five boroughs in the north central London sector.
- 2.3 Unemployment rates show disparities across different age groups. They are consistently higher across all age groups in Islington compared to Greater London. The rate is highest among 16-24 year olds, and significantly higher in 16-19 year olds. The unemployment rate is lower for women than men of all age groups.


Living Environment

- 2.4 Nationally Index of Multiple Deprivation³ data is collected relating to living environment. This includes components for a number of key

³ The Index of multiple deprivation for England (IMD 2004) was used by the Islington Primary Care Trust in their report *Health in Islington 2003/2004*. It has been recently updated from the IMD 2000, and incorporates new measures. The seven domains of the IMD 2004 are Income deprivation, Employment deprivation, Health and Disability, Education, Skills and Training, Barriers to Housing and services, Crime and Living Environment deprivation. The IMD 2004 is designed to measure, on a small area level, the main factors of multiple deprivation. Underlying this idea is the assumption that deprivation has distinct dimensions within a given area, and these dimensions can be measured separately. This study utilised the Index for Living Environment deprivation.

areas relating to the transport environment, including public spaces and road casualties^{viii}.

Figure J2.1: Living environment deprivation scores across Islington



Source: Islington Primary Care Trust (2005)

- 2.5 Islington falls into the two lowest quintiles for living environment deprivation ranked nationally; substantially more areas are in the lowest quintile.
- 2.6 Figure J2.1 (above) maps Living Environment deprivation ranked according to levels within Islington. Again there is extreme variation within wards for areas that are the least and worst deprived. Clerkenwell, Highbury East, and Highbury West contain the most people living in the worst quintile of living environment deprivation in Islington. However they also contain substantial numbers who live in the least deprived quintile. Caledonian and Hillrise have the largest

number of areas that fall into the least deprived 20%.

- 2.7 The following describes the breakdown of different groups of people within the borough of Islington, namely gender, age, ethnic groups, disability groups, sexuality and faith.

Gender

- 2.8 There are marginally more women than men in Islington. The key difference is in the 60+ age group. Table J2.1 illustrates the gender breakdown of Islington and London. In the London context, Islington is fairly typical.

Table J2.1: Gender Breakdown

	Islington		London	
	Persons	%	Persons	%
Male	84,229	47.9	3,468,816	48.4
Female	91,568	52.1	3,703,220	51.6
Total	175,787	100.0	7,172,036	100.0

Source: 2001 Census

- 2.9 Men and women very often have different transport patterns and needs. They have different levels of access to private transport, different patterns of commuting and employment, different child-care and lifestyle requirements, and other family responsibilities. Passenger surveys reveal differences in men's and women's attitudes to and experience of public transport travel. To improve the quality of transport in Islington, the council needs to take into consideration the distinctive concerns, preferences and priorities that women hold when it comes to transport; this includes safety and security issues such as travel at night.


Age

- 2.10 Islington has a young population, especially in terms of the 17 – 25 age group which only spans 8 years but makes up 14% of the total population. Similarly the 0 – 16 age group forms almost one fifth of the population (see Table 2.2 below). Older people are more of a minority with only 14% of the population over 60 years old. Therefore 47% of the population of Islington are within one of the three age specified ETGs either children, young people or older people.

Table J2.2: Age groups in Islington

Age Group	Number in borough	Percentage of borough
Children (0 - 16)	34115	19%
Younger people (17-25)	24808	14%
Aged 26 - 59 years	92742	53%
Older people (60+)	24132	14%

Source: 2001 Census

Figure J2.2: Age Profile of Islington

Source: 2001 Census

Ethnicity

- 2.11 The proportion of Islington residents that belong to an ethnic minority is relatively high compared to the national average, yet below average for greater London and only two thirds that for inner London. Table J2.3 sets out the number of people in each ethnic group in Islington.

Table J2.3: Ethnic Groups in Islington, 2001

Ethnicity	Count	%
White British	99,784	57
White (Irish and other)	32,680	19
Black or Black British	20,856	12
Asian or Asian British	9,484	5
Mixed	7,234	4
Chinese or other ethnic group	5,759	3
All people	175,797	100

Source: 2001 Census

- 2.12 While 43% of Islington’s population classify themselves as non White-British, a smaller figure of 24% classify themselves as Non-white (neither White- British, White-Irish or White - other). Almost a quarter of Islington’s population fall into the Equality Target Group for Race.

Disability

- 2.13 Table J2.4 indicates that the highest proportion of Islington residents have difficulty walking (7.1%) while 1.8% have difficulty seeing, overall 12.9% register some kind of disability.

Table J2.4: Difficulties Affecting Ability to Travel Amongst Islington Residents

Difficulty Affecting Ability to Travel	Percentage
Difficulty walking	7.1%
Difficulty hearing	1.8%
Difficulty seeing	0.7%
Difficulty understanding	1.0%
Difficulty other	1.8%
Uses a wheelchair	0.5%
Total	12.9%

Source: London Area Transport Survey

- 2.14 Almost 18% of people in Islington assess themselves as having ‘a limiting long-term illness, health problem or disability which limits their daily activities or the work they can do, including problems that are due to old age’. This is slightly below the average for England and Wales (18.23%) and more than the average for Inner London (15.64%).^{ix}

Sexuality

- 2.15 Compared to the other Inner London boroughs, Islington has the second highest proportion of people registered as living in a same sex couple (see Table 2.5 below). Inner London has a higher proportion of people living in a same sex couple than the rest of London (London as a whole only has 0.34%) which is almost twice the proportion of the average for all England (0.20%^x). Other quantitative information regarding sexuality is difficult to obtain, but it is clear that people from the ETGs identified as Lesbians, gay men and bisexual people have an important presence in the borough.

Table J2.5: People living in a same sex couple

Inner London borough	All People Aged 16 and over in Households	Living in a same-sex couple	%
Camden	156036	1046	0.67
City of London	6230	72	1.16
Hackney	153787	1028	0.67
Hammersmith and Fulham	136066	568	0.42
Haringey	169817	952	0.56
Islington	140058	1180	0.84
Kensington and Chelsea	130702	522	0.40
Lambeth	212110	1716	0.81
Lewisham	194011	1070	0.55
Newham	178396	584	0.33
Southwark	189890	1230	0.65
Tower Hamlets	149108	1004	0.67
Wandsworth	213559	1134	0.53
Westminster	150738	890	0.59

Source: 2001 Census

- 2.16 Recorded homophobic crime in Islington is a third more than the average for the entire Metropolitan Police area (0.22% of total crimes committed in Islington are homophobic while only 0.14% are homophobic in London as a whole (Feb 2004 to Feb 2005)^{xi}). Lesbians, Gay men, Bisexual and Transgender people are more at risk in Islington than several other London boroughs as almost 6% of the homophobic crimes committed in the whole of London occurred in Islington (evenly distributed across all 33 boroughs the figure should be closer to 3%). This may have a bearing on any proposals that intend to increase street security or provide night transport.

Faith

- 2.17 While the most popular religious attachment in Islington is Christianity (54% of the population identify this as their faith, see Table J2.6) Islington has one of the lowest rankings for this faith in England and Wales. There is an important presence of various other faith groups in the borough, 8% of the population are Muslim while Buddhist, Hindu and Jewish people all make up around 1% of the population respectively. Those identifying as having no religion (24% of Islington residents) is very high for both London and England and Wales, similarly those not stating their religion make up a substantial proportion (10% of Islington residents).

Table J2.6: Religious attachment of Islington residents

Religion (all people)	Value	Eng & Wales	Regional
		Rank/376 (proportion)	Rank/33 (proportion)
Christian	95305	363	22
Buddhist	1840	9	9
Hindu	1751	58	29
Jewish	1846	22	12
Muslim	14259	26	14
Sikh	590	73	19
Other	719	52	20
No religion	41691	11	2
Religion not stated	17796	5	4

Source: 2001 Census

Key facts from Section 2

- 2.18 To summarise, the key facts from section 2 include:
- 47% of the population of Islington are in an age specified ETG (children, younger people or older people).
 - Almost a quarter of Islington's population fall into the ETG group for race.
 - Almost 18% of people in Islington assess themselves as having 'a limiting long-term illness' (including disability).
 - Recorded homophobic crime in Islington is a third more than the average for the entire Metropolitan Police area.
 - Over 10% of Islington's residents state their religion as either Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh or 'other religion'.

3.0 Equality Target Group distribution

- 3.1 The following indicators have been selected from National Census 2001 classifications as Equality Target Groups (groups that are potentially vulnerable to social exclusion):

Age

- Percentage aged over 65 years
- Percentage of younger people aged 16 – 25 years
- Percentage under 16 years

Females

- Percentage females

Religion

- Percentage of people stating religion as Buddhist
- Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu
- Percentage of people stating religion as Jewish
- Percentage of people stating religion as Muslim
- Percentage of people stating religion as Sikh
- Percentage of people stating religion as ‘Other religion’
- Total percentage of ethnic faith groups

Ethnic origin

- Percentage of Asian or Asian British people
- Percentage of Black or Black British people
- Percentage of Chinese or other ethnic people
- Percentage of mixed race people
- Percentage of white people
- Percentage of Black or ethnic minority groups

Health

- Percentage of people living with a long term illness
- Percentage total Disability Living Allowance Claimants
- Male life expectancy (*taken from Islington Primary Care Trust – Heath in Islington 2003-2004*)

3.2 Data for each of the Equality Target Groups have been extracted from the National Census 2001 for each of the wards within the London borough of Islington. This data shows the percentage of each ward's population that is in a given Equality Target Group. The following methodology has been used to produce thresholds within the data in order to identify wards within the London borough of Islington that have particular clusters of the Equality Target Groups.

Cluster identification

3.3 In order to identify substantial groups of people from any of the ETGs, wards were classified as having ‘clusters’ of people from ETGs, ‘some presence’ of people or ‘no concentration’⁴. For each Equality Target Group the threshold for identifying a cluster or no concentration of Equality Target Group people has been identified (see Table J3.1). The threshold is the level at which the concentration of a particular group is pronounced.


⁴ To aid identification of clusters of people from Equality Target Groups, a system of cluster identification was employed. If a ward contained over 20% more people from an ETG than the average for all wards then it was deemed to have a cluster of that group. Likewise if a ward had 20% less people from an ETG than the average for all wards then it was deemed to have ‘no real concentration’ of people in any one ETG. If a ward fell between 20% above average and 20% below it was deemed that there was a presence of people from the ETG in the ward but not to a significant extent.

- 3.4 Thresholds have been identified for wards in which there are significantly less or more people of a particular equality group compared to the average across all wards.⁵
- 3.5 The distribution of ward populations for each Equality Target Group has been mapped using a GIS (Geographical Information System). A shaded map has been used to provide an indication of the spread of Equality Target Groups across the borough as a whole.
- 3.6 The following text provides an outline of the spread of each Equality Target Group across the borough at a ward level. Where appropriate, references to the GIS mapping are made to provide a visual indication of the spread of a given group. Figure 3.1 below provides a reference point to the locations of the wards within Islington.

⁵ The average for each Equality Target Group shown in Table J3.1 was created by finding the ‘mean’ average from all the ward averages. This ensures that ‘clusters’ and ‘no concentrations’ are identified on a standard that is relative only to Islington and are not measured against London-wide or national levels.

Figure J3.1: Ward names within Islington**Percentage aged over 65 years**

- 3.7 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that is aged over 65 years, the data extracted from the National Census (see Table J3.1) indicates that the wards of **Bunhill**, **Canonbury** and **Junction** have particular concentration of this age group. The wards of **Hillrise** and **Tollington** appear to have no notable concentrations (see Figure J3.2).

Figure J3.2: Percentage of older people (>65) in Wards of Islington

Percentage of younger people aged 16 – 25 years


- 3.8 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that is aged between 16 – 25 years, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the ward of **Holloway** has particular concentration of this age group. The wards of **Canonbury** and **Highbury East** appear to have no notable concentrations.

Percentage under 16 years

- 3.9 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that is aged under 16 years, the data extracted from the National Census indicates

that none of the wards reach either threshold ('cluster' or 'no concentration') this suggests that this age group are relatively evenly spread across the borough (See Figure J3.3).

Figure J3.3: Percentage of children (<16) in Wards of Islington



Females

Percentage of females

- 3.10 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that is female, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that none of the wards reach either threshold ('cluster' or 'no concentration') this suggests that this group are relatively evenly spread across the borough.

Religion


Percentage of people stating religion as Buddhist

- 3.11 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states their religion as Buddhist, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the ward of **Barnsbury** has particular concentration of this group. The ward of **Canonbury** appears to have no notable concentrations.

Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu

- 3.12 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states their religion as Hindu, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Bunhill, Finsbury Park, Junction** and **Tollington** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Barnsbury, Canonbury, Mildmay** and **St. George's** appear to have no notable concentrations (see figure 3.4).

Figure J3.4: Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu in Wards of Islington



Percentage of people stating religion as Jewish

- 3.13 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states their religion as Jewish, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Highbury East, Hillrise, Junction** and **St. Georges** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Caledonian, Canonbury, Finsbury Park, Holloway, Mildmay** and **Tollington** appear to have no notable concentrations (see Table J3.1).

Percentage of people stating religion as Muslim

- 3.14 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states

their religion as Muslim, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Bunhill, Caledonian, Finsbury Park** and **Junction** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Canonbury, Clerkenwell, Junction** and **St. George's** appear to have no notable concentrations.

Percentage of people stating religion as Sikh

- 3.15 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states their religion as Sikh, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Bunhill, Clerkenwell** and **Highbury East** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Caledonian, Canonbury, Hillrise, Holloway, St. George's** and **St. Mary's** appear to have no notable concentrations.


Percentage of people stating religion as 'Other religion'

- 3.16 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that states their religion as 'Other', the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Junction** and **St. George's** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Highbury East, Holloway** and **St. Peter's** appear to have no notable concentrations.

Total percentage of ethnic faith groups

- 3.17 In terms of the total percentage of ethnic faith groups in individual wards, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the ward of **Finsbury Park** has a particular concentration of this group. The ward of **Canonbury** appears to have no notable concentrations (see Figure J3.5).

Figure J3.5: Percentage of ethnic minority faiths in Wards of Islington (including: Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and other religions)



Ethnic Origin

Percentage of Asian or Asian British people

- 3.18 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are Asian or Asian British, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Finsbury Park**, **Highbury West** and **Hillrise** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Canonbury**, **Junction**, **St. George's** and **St. Peter's** appear to have no notable concentrations (see Table J3.1 below).

Percentage of Black or Black British people

- 3.19 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are Black or Black British, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Finsbury Park, Mildmay** and **Tollington** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Barnsbury, Clerkenwell, Highbury East, St. Mary's** and **St. Peter's** appear to have no notable concentrations.

Percentage of Chinese or other ethnic people

- 3.20 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are Chinese or 'Other ethnic people', the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Caledonian, Clerkenwell, Finsbury Park** and **Holloway** have particular concentrations of this group. The wards of **Canonbury, Highbury East, Hillrise** and **Mildmay** appear to have no notable concentrations.

Percentage of mixed race people

- 3.21 In terms of the total percentage of ward populations that are of mixed race, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the wards of **Hillrise** and **Tollington** have particular concentrations of this group. The ward of **St. Peter's** appears to have no notable concentrations.


Percentage of white people

- 3.22 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are white, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that none of the wards reach either threshold, this suggests that this group are relatively evenly spread across the borough.

Percentage of Black or ethnic minority groups

- 3.23 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are Black or ethnic minority groups, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the ward of **Tollington** has a particular concentration of this group. The wards of **Canonbury, Highbury East** and **St. Peter's** appear to have no notable concentrations (see Figure J3.6).

Figure J3.6: Percentage of black and minority ethnic people in Wards of Islington



3.24 Health


Percentage of people living with a long term illness

3.25 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are living with a long term illness, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that none of the wards reach either threshold, this suggests that this group are relatively evenly spread across the borough (see Table J3.1).

Percentage total Disability Living Allowance Claimants

- 3.26 In terms of the percentage of individual ward populations that are Disability Living Allowance claimants, the data extracted from the National Census indicates that the ward of **Holloway** has a particular concentration of this group. The ward of **Bunhill** appears to have no notable concentrations (see Figure J3.7).

Figure J3.7: Percentage of total disability living allowance claimants in wards of Islington



Male life expectancy

- 3.27 For Male Life Expectancy a classification of High, Medium or Low has been used where High is 74.1 – 74.8 years, Medium is 72.1 – 74.1 years and Low is 69.4 – 72.1 years. The wards of **Bunhill**, **Holloway**, **Junction** and **Tollington** have the lowest male life expectancy whilst the highest life expectancy is in the wards of **Barnsbury**, **Clerkenwell**,

Highbury East, Highbury West, Hillrise and Mildmay.

- 3.28 Table J3.1 below shows the data that has been extracted for the Equality Target Groups. This table has been coloured coded to show where there are particularly high or low numbers of Equality Target Groups in the individual wards.
- 3.29 It is clear from Table 3.1 that some wards have more concentrations of people from ETGs than others. Finsbury Park has 5 clusters of people from ETGs including 3 from ethnic groups and 2 from faith groups. Junction has 3 clusters of people from faith groups and a cluster of people over 65 years old. Similarly Bunhill has 3 clusters of people from faith groups and a cluster of people over 65 years old. At the same time there are several wards that have significantly less people from ETGs. Canonbury ward has no concentrations of people from 8 different ETGs including 2 ethnic groups, 5 faith groups and a distinctive lack of younger people (aged 16 – 25), however the ward has a cluster of older people. Highbury East, St Georges and St Peters all have no real concentrations of people from 4 ETGs.
- 3.30 These wards in particular should be monitored to ensure that the Consultation Draft STS is equally benefiting ETGs along with other sectors of the community in Islington.

Key facts from Section 3

- 3.31 To summarise, the key facts from section 3 include:
- Females, children and people living with a limiting long term illness are relatively evenly spread across the borough.
 - Finsbury Park, Junction and Bunhill wards all have more than three clusters of people from ETGs.
 - Canonbury, Highbury East, St Georges and St Peters are wards that have ‘no real concentrations’ of people from many ETGs.

Table J3.1: Equality Target Groups – London borough of Islington

	Percentage of females	Percentage under 16	Percentage of younger people aged 16 - 25	Percentage over 65	Percentage of people stating religion as: Buddhist	Percentage of people stating religion as: Hindu	Percentage of people stating religion as: Jewish	Percentage of people stating religion as: Muslim	Percentage of people stating religion as: Sikh	Percentage of people stating religion as: Other religions	Percentage of Asian or Asian British people	Percentage of Black or Black British people	Percentage of Chinese people and other ethnic people	Percentage of people of mixed race
Barnsbury	52.2	18.5	13.7	9.56	1.25	0.65	0.99	8.44	0.32	0.39	5.84	8.97	3.51	3.27
Bunhill	50.5	16.85	15.8	13.04	1.01	1.24	0.97	9.74	0.42	0.39	6.32	10.17	3.68	3.73
Caledonian	48.7	17.91	16.3	10.83	1.5	0.87	0.74	10.1	0.25	0.36	7.37	12.37	5.12	3.34
Canonbury	52.9	20.03	11.8	12.4	0.84	0.52	0.81	5.99	0.13	0.35	2.54	11.11	2.15	3.55
Clerkenwell	52.0	14.67	19	11.16	1.17	0.93	0.92	6.02	0.65	0.37	5.48	8.36	4.03	3.33
Finsbury Park	51.8	19.55	18.1	8.35	1	1.21	0.75	11.79	0.28	0.5	7.06	17.76	4.21	4.79
Highbury East	51.5	18.47	11.9	10.62	0.85	0.77	1.71	6.64	0.74	0.32	4.7	8.99	2.1	3.63
Highbury West	51.8	19.37	15.6	8.36	0.97	1.02	0.9	9.62	0.29	0.4	7.7	12.28	3.65	4.1
Hillrise	53.3	21.25	14.8	7.81	0.82	1.17	1.35	7.66	0.25	0.35	7.8	13.6	2.2	5.45
Holloway	52.9	17.12	19.2	10.78	1.22	1.59	0.78	7.61	0.26	0.27	4.94	12.03	4.25	4.08
Junction	54.1	16.25	15.3	12.4	0.98	1.34	1.48	6.09	0.36	0.62	4.25	11.08	3.23	4.12
Mildmay	52.6	19.28	14.1	9.68	0.74	0.54	0.73	10.22	0.36	0.41	4.89	14.28	2.4	5.17
St George's	53.0	17.91	13.8	10.39	1.15	0.72	1.78	5.78	0.24	0.75	3.74	12.03	3	4.08
St Mary's	52.3	17.04	13.8	10.33	1.22	1.1	1.23	7.11	0.16	0.36	5.4	9.03	2.8	3.93
St Peter's	50.7	18.63	13.1	11.55	0.85	0.91	1.04	6.61	0.31	0.31	4.01	8.77	3.02	3.1
Tollington	53.1	19.7	15.9	7.82	1.16	1.24	0.71	9.08	0.39	0.37	6.49	16.28	2.83	5.55
Average	52.08	18.28	15.14	10.32	1.05	0.99	1.06	8.03	0.34	0.41	5.53	11.69	3.26	4.08
Cluster threshold	62.50	21.94	18.17	12.38	1.25	1.19	1.27	9.64	0.41	0.49	6.64	14.03	3.91	4.89
No concentration threshold	41.67	14.63	12.11	8.25	0.84	0.79	0.84	6.43	0.27	0.33	4.43	9.36	2.61	3.26

Key:

	Identified groups within wards 20% above the average
	Identified groups within wards 20% below the average

4.0 **Equality Target Group current opportunities to use transport**

- 4.1 While the aim of all transport provision is to serve the general public and further society, there are sometimes unforeseen or secondary negative impacts that transport provision can create. For instance the improvement of highway infrastructures has many positive outcomes such as enhancing accessibility, aiding economic development or reducing road casualties, but at the same time such provision can increase noise and air pollution, sever communities or blight the landscape. The distribution of such schemes can also create negative impacts or intensify barriers and exclusions, for instance the alteration of bus routes can further reduce people's options for getting to work or reaching amenities when the routes miss out key communities. This raises the issue of equity against the level of absolute provision.
- 4.2 In order to provide an indication of the current access opportunities for the Equality Target Group's identified in Section 3, a range of transport indicators have been used. The indicators reflect traditional transport provision such as the distribution of underground and National Rail stations but also consider other transport related factors such as congestion and trip generators such as schools. The transport indicators (transport provisions and trip generators) used are listed as follows:

Defining Transport provision

- 4.3 Any facilities, routes or measurements that indicate provision for people to move around and through the borough, including:
- Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs)
 - Tube station locations
 - National rail station
 - Strategic traffic routes
 - Road congestion ^{xii}
 - Road casualty clusters ^{xiii}
 - Bus route density
 - London Cycle Network routes
 - Walking routes
- 4.4 It should be noted that another important consideration is the impact of air quality in relation to transport provision and the Equality Target Groups; this will be subject to further research.
- 4.5 This EqIA also relates people from Equality Target Groups to the location of key trip generators within Islington. Access to such trip generators is a basic requirement for all people. The trip generators examined in this assessment are as follows:

Defining Trip generators

- 4.6 Any amenities, organisations, services or places that people need or want to access, including:
- Hospitals
 - Distribution of doctors surgeries
 - Primary schools
 - Secondary schools
 - Parks and open spaces
- 4.7 Where possible, the rating of community access has been based upon the factors addressing access within the Social Exclusion Unit Report: ‘Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion’ (2003). The report draws upon access to local services and activities which can be problematic for people:
- Access to work
 - Access to learning
 - Access to healthcare
 - Access to food shops
 - Access to social, cultural and sporting activities
- 4.8 Alongside this, the report identifies the impact of traffic on deprived communities. This Equality Impact Assessment for Islington has applied existing data to assess access opportunities by focussing upon access for people from Equality Target Groups to hospitals, doctors surgeries, primary schools, secondary schools, parks and open spaces. Further work will be undertaken to relate people from ETG’s to other key access opportunities such as food shops. This accessibility assessment will provide a full evaluation of community access to necessary services.
- 4.9
- Car Ownership per average household**
 Car ownership in the borough was also considered alongside other transport provision, but was not used in constructing the scores for Transport Provision or Community Access Rating.

The average for most wards in Islington (around 0.5) is over half the average for England and Wales (1.1). However some wards had even fewer cars per household, **Bunhill** only had 0.38 and **Holloway** had 0.45. At the same time **Highbury East** (0.61) and **Hillrise** (0.59) had much higher averages.
- 4.10 In addition, although no classifications have been carried out, identifications have been made on the distribution of other possible trip generators within the borough such as universities, cinemas and theatres where information has been provided.
- 4.11 Each transport related indicator has been roughly classified for the

purpose of this study based upon a visual appraisal of maps and the manual identification of clusters and distributions. The classification of each transport indicator varies depending upon the context of that indicator. For example, the presence of a secondary school in a ward is indicated by 'Yes' or 'No' whereas the distribution of doctors surgeries across wards indicated by 'Good' or 'Sparse'. These classifications are shown in Table J4.3.⁶

- 4.12 A further classification has then been carried out to provide a **comparable** figure that represents the level of transport provision for each ward within the borough. For each transport indicator, each classification has been translated into a score in the range of 0 and 1; this is shown in the following table (Table J4.1).

⁶ A more detailed assessment of the location of transport provision should be carried out. The classifications are based upon the presence of a particular factor in each ward; it should be noted that this does not reflect the specific location of that factor within the ward and the proportion of the population that it can realistically serve. For example, in some instances the location of a transport interchange or trip generator may be close to the boundary between wards and therefore may only serve a small number of the population within the given ward overall but conversely provide a service to a neighbouring ward.

Similarly, it should be considered that transport provision and trip generators are likely to provide services for people outside of the borough and as such the number of people requiring transport into Islington should be considered.

The issue of scaling should also be noted, for example it may be unreasonable to expect a small ward (in terms of geographical area and low population) to have a high number of primary schools. In relation to the previous statement, further investigation into the location of primary schools, and access to them, in relation to the population that they serve should be considered.

Table J4.1: Scoring categories

Transport indicator	Score		
	0	0.5	1
Public Transport Accessibility Levels	Low	Medium	High
Tube station	None in ward	1 in ward	+1 in ward
National Rail station	None in ward	1 in ward	+1 in ward
Strategic traffic routes	Local roads only	Main distributor present in ward	Strategic traffic route present in ward
Road congestion	High	-	Low
Road casualty clusters	High level of clusters present	-	Low level of clusters
Bus route density	Low	Medium	High
London Cycle Network	None	1 present / boundary	+1 present
Walking routes	None in ward	Boundary	Present / bisects ward
Hospitals	None in ward	-	1+ in ward
Distribution of doctors surgeries	Sparse	-	Good
Primary schools	1 –2 in ward	3	4+ in ward
Secondary school.	None in ward		1+ in ward
Parks and open spaces	None in ward		1+ in ward

- 4.13 It should be noted that these indicators are intended to provide a rough representation only and that further investigation into the more specific details of each indicator may be necessary at a later date. Where this is the case and indication of further exploration will be provided in the text.
- 4.14 The scores given to each transport indicator and trip generator are shown in Tables J4.2 and J4.3. In order to investigate the access opportunities for Equality Target Groups to use transport, various grouping of the Target Groups will be compared to the level of transport provision and trip generators in each ward. Table J4.4 then summarises the total scores that each ward gained as a result of being subjected to the scoring table above.
- 4.15 For reference purposes, Figures J4.1 and J4.2 below illustrate the distribution of pedestrian casualties and traffic congestion within the

borough.

Figure J4.1: Traffic Congestion on Islington's main roads




Figure J4.2: Accident Severity in Wards of Islington




Table J4.2: Transport provision and trip generators (Classifications)


Ward	Average No cars per household	Public Transport Accessibility Levels	Tube station	National Rail Station	Road Congestion	Road Casualty Clusters	Strategic traffic routes	Bus route density	London cycle network cycle routes	Walking routes	Hospitals	Distribution of doctors surgeries	Primary Schools	Secondary School
Barnsbury	0.54	High	-	-	High	✓	Local	High	✓✓	Bisects	-	Sparse	3	✓
Bunhill	0.38	High	✓	✓	Low	✓	Strategic	High	✓	None	✓	Sparse	3	✓
Caledonian	0.5	High	-	✓	Low	-	Strategic	High	✓	Bisects	-	Good	5	-
Canonbury	0.54	Medium	-	-	High	-	Strategic	Low	✓✓	Bisects	-	Good	1	-
Clerkenwell	0.46	High	✓	✓	High	✓	Strategic	High	✓✓✓	Boundary	-	Good	3	-
Finsbury Park	0.46	High	✓	✓	High	✓	Main	High	✓	None	-	Good	4	-
Highbury East	0.61	Medium	-	-	Low	-	Main	Medium	Boundary	None	-	Sparse	2	✓
Highbury West	0.56	Medium	✓	✓	Low	-	Main	Low	0	Bisects	-	Sparse	3	-
Hillrise	0.59	Low	-	-	High	-	Main	Medium	✓	Boundary	-	Good	2	✓
Holloway	0.45	Medium	✓✓	-	Low	-	Strategic	High	Boundary	None	-	Sparse	2	-
Junction	0.48	High	✓	✓	High	✓	Strategic	High	✓	None	✓	Sparse	3	✓
Mildmay	0.5	Low	-	✓	Low	-	Main	High	0	Bisects	-	Sparse	3	✓
St George's	0.55	Low	✓	-	Low	-	Main	Low	✓	None	-	Sparse	2	✓
St Mary's	0.51	Medium	✓	✓✓	Low	✓	Strategic	High	Boundary	Boundary	-	Sparse	4	-
St Peter's	0.51	Medium	✓	-	Low	-	Strategic	Low	✓✓	Bisects	-	Good	3	-
Tollington	0.49	Low	-	✓	Low	-	Main	Medium	0	Bisects	-	Sparse	2	✓

Table J4.3: Transport provision and trip generators (Scores)

Ward	Public Transport Accessibility Levels	Tube station	National Rail Station	Road Congestion	Road Casualty Clusters	Strategic traffic routes	Bus route density	London cycle network cycle routes	Walking routes	Hospitals	Distribution of doctors surgeries	Primary Schools	Secondary School	Parks and Open Spaces
Barnsbury	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
Bunhill	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
Caledonian	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Canonbury	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Clerkenwell	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Finsbury Park	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Highbury East	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Highbury West	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.0
Hillrise	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
Holloway	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Junction	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0
Mildmay	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.0
St George's	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
St Mary's	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
St Peter's	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Tollington	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0

Table J4.4: Total Community Access rating scores for each ward

Ward	Transport provision total	Trip generator total	Community Access rating
Caledonian	7	3	10
Bunhill	5.5	3.5	9
Junction	4.5	3.5	8
St Peter's	6	1.5	7.5
Clerkenwell	5.5	1.5	7
St Mary's	6	1	7
Barnsbury	4	2.5	6.5
Highbury West	5	1.5	6.5
Mildmay	5	1.5	6.5
Canonbury	4	2	6
Finsbury Park	4	2	6
Highbury East	4	2	6
Hillrise	3	3	6
Holloway	6	0	6
St George's	3.5	1	4.5
Tollington	3.5	1	4.5
Average	4.8	1.9	6.7

Figure J4.3: Community Access ratings by ward

Transport provision

- 4.16 In terms of the total score for transport provision, the wards with the highest scores (indicating a good level of overall access opportunities) are Caledonian, Holloway, St. Mary's and St. Peters. The wards with the lowest score are Hillrise, St. George's and Tollington.
- 4.17 **Caledonian** (the highest score for transport provision) has high public transport accessibility levels, a National rail station, low congestion, a strategic road and cycle and walking routes are present. It also appears to have a high density of bus routes. In terms of Equality Target Groups, Caledonian has clusters of people stating their religion

as Muslim and ‘Chinese and Other ethnic’ people and a high level of male life expectancy, which could be considered an important factor.

- 4.18 Holloway has particular clusters of ‘Chinese and Other ethnic’ people, younger people (aged 16-25 years) and disability allowance claimants. There is a low level of male life expectancy. St. Mary’s and St Peter’s have no clusters of Equality Target Groups.
- 4.19 **Hillrise** (the lowest score for transport provision) has no stations, a low level of public transport accessibility, main traffic routes, and a medium bus route density. However, there is evidence of sparse, or boundary based, walking and cycling routes in the ward. In terms of Equality Target Groups, Hillrise has clusters of people stating their religion as Jewish, Asian or Asian British people and people of mixed race.
- 4.20 St. George’s has clusters of people stating their religion as Jewish and ‘Other’ religion. Tollington has clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu, Black or Black British people and people of mixed race. There is an overall cluster of Black or ethnic minority groups.
- 4.21 Overall for transport provision it appears that there are particular clusters of ‘Chinese and Other ethnic’ people, younger people (aged 16-25 years) and disability allowance claimants in wards with a good level of transport provision. However, in general there appear to be few clusters of Equality Target Groups in the wards with high scores. In general, those wards with poor scores have particular clusters of particular ethnic minorities and religions.
- 4.22 In assessing the impact of the STS, particularly for those proposals where locations are not specified, those wards featuring concentrations of ETGs and low levels of current provision should receive an equitable proportion of scheme resources.

Trip generators

- 4.23 In terms of the total score for trip generators (places that people are likely to want access to); the wards with the highest scores are Bunhill, Junction, Caledonian and Hillrise. The wards with the lowest scores are Holloway, Tollington, St. Mary’s and St. George’s.
- 4.24 **It should be noted that Caledonian had a favourable score in terms of transport provision and had clusters of Muslims and ‘Chinese and Other ethnic’ people. However, Hillrise scored poorly in terms of transport provision with evidence of clusters of people stating their religion as Jewish, Asian or Asian British people and people of mixed race.**
- 4.25 Bunhill had an above average score for transport provision (5.5) and has clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu, Muslim and Sikh. There is also evidence of clusters of over 65 year olds. There is a low

level of male life expectancy.

- 4.26 Junction has a slightly below average score for transport provision (4.5) and has clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu, Jewish and ‘Other’. There is also evidence of clusters of over 65 year olds.
- 4.27 **It should be noted that Holloway and St. Mary’s had favourable scores in term of transport provision with particular clusters of ‘Chinese and Other ethnic’ people, younger people (aged 16-25 years) and disability allowance claimants in Holloway. Tollington and St. George’s had poor scores for transport provision and have evidence of clusters of people from ethnic minorities.**
- 4.28 Overall, Holloway and St. Mary’s had a low level of trip generators but a good level of transport provision. Tollington and St. George’s similarly have a low level of trip generators but also have an indication of poor transport provision indicating that Tollington and St. George’s residents may be particularly prone to difficulties in accessibility.⁷
- 4.29 The wards with the highest score for trip generators all have a reasonable level of transport provision. These wards, have a low number clusters overall but there is evidence of particular clusters of over 65 year olds and various religious backgrounds.
- 4.30 In addition, Interactive Islington indicates that there are a number of university buildings on the border between Highbury East and West and Holloway. These are likely to impact upon the number and type of trips undertaken to this area. There is also evidence of university buildings in Bunhill.

Community Access ratings

- 4.31 The score for Community access ratings (based on transport provision and access to trip generators) is a cumulative score that reflects the level of transport provision and trip generators. The wards with the highest score are Caledonian, Bunhill and Junction.

The wards with the lowest scores are St. George’s and Tollington.

Summary of Equality Target Group provision

- 4.32 By looking across the borough as a whole, the average score for transport provision, trip generators and the community access ratings can be compared to the occurrence of clusters for each Equality Target Group.

⁷ It should be noted that St. Mary’s appears to have a number of cinemas and theatre’s, these have not been included in this analysis but are likely to impact upon the number of trips undertaken to St. Mary’s ward.

- 4.33 Three clusters of over 65 year olds were identified across the borough in the wards of Bunhill, Canonbury and Junction. In terms of transport provision, Bunhill has an above average score whilst the remaining two have below average scores. All three wards have above average scores for trip generators and overall all wards have above average scores for Community access rating to use transport.
- 4.34 No clusters were found in terms of females, under 16 year olds and people living with long term illnesses suggesting that these groups are evenly spread across the borough.
- 4.35 Although several clusters of individual faith groups have been identified, only one cluster of the cumulative indicator 'ethnic faith groups' has been found in Finsbury Park. The ward of Finsbury Park has below average scores for transport provision and overall opportunities compared to other wards in the borough. The score for trip generators is slightly above average. Despite having a tube and rail station, this ward has high road congestion, clusters of road casualties and no walking routes. However, there is evidence of a London Cycle Network route in this ward, main distributor roads and a good bus route density. This ward has high public transport accessibility.
- 4.36 Several clusters of individual ethnic minorities have been identified, however one overall cluster of Black or ethnic minority groups has been found in Tollington. Tollington has below average scores in terms of trip generators, transport provision and overall Community access rating.
- 4.37 One cluster of young people (aged 16-25 years) has been identified in Holloway; a single cluster of disability living allowance claimants has also been identified in this ward. Holloway has an above average score for transport provision and below average for trip generators.
- 4.38 Four clusters of low male life expectancy have been identified in the wards of Hillrise, Mildmay, St. George's and Tollington. Tollington and St. George's have below average scores for all three scoring categories whereas Hillrise has an above average score for trip generators Mildmay has an above average score for transport provision.

Equality Target Groups identified for Transport Provision, Trip Generators and Community access rating

- 4.39 The following tables provide an overview of the clusters of Equality Target Groups identified for Transport Provision, Trip Generators and Community access rating. Each cluster has been colour coded to indicate whether the ward it is in has scored above or below average in the scoring framework outlined above.



4.40 The Equality Target Groups have been numbered as follows:

1. Percentage aged over 65 years
2. Percentage of younger people aged 16 – 25 years
3. Percentage under 16 years
4. Percentage females
5. Percentage of people stating religion as Buddhist
6. Percentage of people stating religion as Hindu
7. Percentage of people stating religion as Jewish
8. Percentage of people stating religion as Muslim
9. Percentage of people stating religion as Sikh
10. Percentage of people stating religion as ‘Other religion’
11. Total percentage of ethnic faith groups
12. Percentage of Asian or Asian British people
13. Percentage of Black or Black British people
14. Percentage of Chinese or other ethnic people
15. Percentage of mixed race people
16. Percentage of white people
17. Percentage of Black or ethnic minority groups
18. Percentage of people living with a long term illness
19. Percentage total Disability Living Allowance Claimants
20. Male life expectancy

Table J4.5: Transport provision

TRANSPORT PROVISION - AVERAGE SCORE = 4.8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Barnsbury				Below average																Below average
Bunhill	Above average				Below average		Above average	Above average												
Caledonian							Above average						Above average							
Canonbury	Below average																			
Clerkenwell								Above average						Above average						Above average
Finsbury Park					Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average	Below average						
Highbury East						Below average		Below average												Below average
Highbury West											Above average									Above average
Hillrise						Below average					Below average			Below average						
Holloway													Above average					Above average	Above average	
Junction	Below average				Below average	Below average			Below average											
Mildmay							Above average					Above average								Below average
St George's						Below average			Below average											Below average
St Mary's																				
St Peter's																				
Tollington					Below average							Below average	Below average	Below average						

4.41 In terms of transport provision, the table above shows that the majority of clusters are in wards that have a below average score. In this instance, Finsbury Park, Junction and Tollington have the most clusters of Equality Target Groups.

Table J4.6: Trip generators

TRIP GENERATORS AVERAGE SCORE 1.9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Barnsbury				█																█
Bunhill	█				█		█	█												
Caledonian							█						█							
Canonbury	█																			
Clerkenwell								█					█							█
Finsbury Park					█		█			█	█	█	█							
Highbury East						█		█												█
Highbury West											█									█
Hillrise						█					█			█						
Holloway													█					█	█	
Junction	█				█	█				█										
Mildmay							█						█							█
St George's						█			█											█
St Mary's																				
St Peter's																				
Tollington					█							█		█		█				

4.42 In terms of trip generators, the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have an above average score. This may suggest that in wards such as Barnsbury, Finsbury Park, Canonbury, Finsbury Park, Canonbury, Highbury East, Hillrise and Junction there is a high number of trip generators that are not supported by access opportunities.

Table J4.7: Community access rating

EXPOSURE TO TRANSPORT AVERAGE SCORE 6.7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Barnsbury				█																█
Bunhill	█				█		█	█												
Caledonian							█						█							
Canonbury	█																			
Clerkenwell								█					█							█
Finsbury Park					█		█			█	█	█	█							
Highbury East						█		█												█
Highbury West											█									█
Hillrise						█					█			█						
Holloway													█					█	█	
Junction	█				█	█				█										
Mildmay							█						█							█
St George's						█			█											█
St Mary's																				
St Peter's																				
Tollington					█							█		█		█				

4.43 In terms of Community access rating (transport provision + trip generators), the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have a below average score.

Transport and land use

4.44 As stated previously, it is important to consider the likelihood of people

coming from outside of Islington to access the facilities within it, such as National Rail stations, education and employment. The following maps outline the public transport accessibility, road congestion, and use maps produced by the London borough of Islington. They can be visually compared to provide a basic assessment of whether there are gaps in transport provision to places where people are most likely to go.

- 4.45 The blue circles on the maps in Figures J4.4 and J4.5 indicate particular concentrations of employment as ground floor land use. These concentrations have been overlaid onto the Public Transport Accessibility map. This shows that in the areas around the boundary between Caledonian and Holloway wards and also in Junction, there appears to be a low level of public transport accessibility but grouping of employment.⁸

Summary

- 4.46 In terms of transport provision, the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have a **below average score**. In this instance, Finsbury Park, Junction and Tollington have the **most clusters of Equality Target Groups** in comparison to other wards in the borough.
- 4.47 **Finsbury Park** has clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu and Muslim, this ward has a concentration in terms of the total percentage of ethnic faith groups overall. Finsbury Park also has clusters of Asian or Asian British people, Black or Black British People and Chinese and Other Ethnic People. Although these groups have access to a National Rail station, tube station and a high density of bus routes (high Public Transport Accessibility Levels), there is high level of road congestion and evidence of clusters of road casualties. Main distributor roads are present in the ward but there appears to be no immediate access to the strategic road network. There is one London Cycle Network Route in the ward and no strategic walking routes.
- 4.48 **Junction** has clusters of over 65 year olds and people stating their religion as Hindu, Jewish and 'Other'. Although these groups have access to a National Rail station, tube station and a high density of bus routes (high Public Transport Accessibility Levels), there is high level of road congestion and evidence of clusters of road casualties. There appears to be immediate access to the strategic road network. There is one London Cycle Network Route in the ward and no strategic walking routes.
- 4.49 **Tollington** has clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu. This

⁸ Further investigation into the assertions made by this rough comparison should be made in order to assess the correlation between Equality Target Groups and access opportunities (Community access rating).

ward also has clusters of Black or Black British people and people of mixed race. There is a concentration in term of the total percentage of Black or Ethnic Minority Groups overall. These groups have access to a National Rail station but not a tube station and there is a medium density of bus routes in the ward. This ward has low Public Transport Accessibility Levels. However, there appears to be a low level of road congestion and little evidence of clusters of road casualties. There are no London Cycle Network routes or strategic walking routes evident in the ward.⁹

- 4.50 In terms of trip generators, the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have an above average score. These are Barnsbury, Bunhill, Finsbury Park, Canonbury, Highbury East, Hillrise and Junction. All of the aforementioned wards, excluding Bunhill, scored below average for transport provision. This suggests that there are a high number of trip generators that are not supported by access opportunities.
- 4.51 The remaining wards scored below average in terms of trip generators: **Clerkenwell, Holloway, Mildmay, St. George's, St Mary's, St. Peter's** and **Tollington**. These wards, in general, do not appear to have any parks or open spaces, no secondary school and a sparse distribution of doctors surgeries. The Equality Target Groups in these wards are varied and there do not appear to be any patterns. Mildmay and Tollington have clusters of Black or Black British people whilst Clerkenwell and Holloway have clusters of Chinese or Other Ethnic People. St. Mary's and St. Peter's have no Equality Target Group clusters.
- 4.52 In terms of Community Access rating (a cumulative indication of transport provision and trip generators), the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have a below average score. The ward with the highest number of 'below average' clusters is **Finsbury Park**, followed by **Tollington**.
- 4.53 The Equality Target Group clusters and transport provision characteristics of **Finsbury Park** and **Tollington** have been outlined above. In terms of trip generators, Finsbury Park has no hospital, no secondary school and no parks or open spaces. However, there is a good distribution of doctors surgeries and primary schools. Tollington has no hospital, a sparse distribution of doctors surgeries, two primary schools and no parks or open spaces. However, there is a secondary school in this ward.

⁹ These wards are three out of four wards that have clusters of people stating their religion as Hindu.

Figure J4.4: Public Transport Accessibility Levels





Figure J4.5: Ground Floor Land Use**Key facts from Section 4**

- 4.65 To summarise, the key facts from section 4 include:
- Hillrise, St Georges and Tollington wards all gained low scores for transport provision indicating a lack of access to public transport, walking, cycling and strategic routes and possible experience of congestion and heavy traffic casualties.
 - Holloway, St Georges and Tollington wards all gained a low score for trip generators indicating that they have very few

amenities such as hospitals, doctors surgeries, schools, parks and open spaces.

- St Georges and Tollington wards scored very low Community Access ratings and are considerably below the other wards indicating that they have few opportunities to access local amenities or travel to ones further away.

5.0 Equality Target Group Concerns

- 5.1 Section 4 has described in detail the relationships between transport provision and trip generators to the distribution of people in Equality Target Groups in Islington. As has been outlined above, in terms of transport provision, the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have a below average score. In terms of trip generators, the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have an above average score. These are Barnsbury, Bunhill, Finsbury Park, Canonbury, Highbury East, Hillrise and Junction.
- 5.2 From this assessment, it is suggested that there are a high number of trip generators that are not supported by access opportunities. In terms of Community access rating (a cumulative indication of transport provision and trip generators), the majority of clusters of Equality Target Groups are in wards that have a below average score.
- 5.3 This section outlines the theoretical underpinning of overcoming the transport barriers for people from Equality Target Groups, followed by the identified concerns of these groups in Islington.
- 5.4 It highlights the links between the theoretical needs of people from the Equality Target Groups and the relevant proposals set out in Chapter 4 of Islington’s Sustainable Transport Strategy.

Women

Safety

- 5.5 *[In regards to improving safety] the improvement of lighting was identified by 44 (49% of these respondents), particularly at bus and train stations (with specific mention of suburban stations), bus shelters, walkways and car parks.*^{xiv}
- 5.6 Lighting has particular relevance when considering the improvement of the borough’s street lights (including STS proposal HI5). The visual appearance of the streetscape has also been identified as a possible area that could enhance safety for female transport users:
- 5.7 *Several respondents pointed to the need to incorporate safety issues into planning and design, for example :
“the principles of crime prevention through environmental design need to be promoted to architects, planners, builders, etc. For example, this would avoid wherever possible the use of underpasses, improve lighting levels, remove recesses, etc all of which affect the feeling of safety and security”.*^{xv}
- 5.8 This has particular relevance regarding any enhancement of the

streetscape (including STS proposal HI4).

Older people

Accessibility

- 5.9 It has been identified that older people (>65 years) have specific accessibility needs.
- 5.10 *Amongst the largest barriers to mobility are physical difficulties associated with walking and accessing public transport. Common concerns include:*
- *Poor condition of pavements;*
 - *Inadequate crossing facilities;*
 - *Boarding/alighting buses and trains; and*
 - *Steps at railway stations.* ^{xvi}
- 5.11 Accessibility has particular relevance when considering the maintenance and up-keep of Islingtons road network and the enhancement of streetscapes (including STS proposals HI1, HI2, HI3 and W4).

Safety

- 5.12 A key recommendation for improving safety for older people has been identified as providing:
- Well-lit facilities to take account of failing eyesight, with guidelines relating to this for local authorities and operators. ^{xvii}
- 5.13 This has particular relevance when considering the improvement of street lighting (including STS proposal HI5).

People with a disability

Road quality and surfaces

- 5.14 *Uneven surfaces, gaps between paving slabs etc whether within or outside buildings can cause problems for people using sticks and crutches, visually impaired cane users and wheelchair users.* ^{xviii}
- 5.15 Surface quality has particular relevance when considering the maintenance and up-keep Islingtons road network and the enhancement of streetscapes (including STS proposals HI1, HI2 and W4).

Obstructions and street clutter

- 5.16 Department for Transport guidelines for Inclusive Mobility (2002) highlight reducing street clutter as an important step toward creating more inclusive environments. The use and positioning of Guardrails, seating, ramps, steps and street furniture is imperative in creating accessible streetscapes:
...there are many other sometimes temporary obstructions that can cause problems for disabled people, particularly those with visual impairments.^{xix}

Lighting

- 5.17 *People with visual impairments require clarity from a lighting system. Reflection, glare, shadows and large variations in lighting levels generate visual confusion and, in some cases, discomfort.*^{xx}
- 5.18 This has particular relevance when considering the improvement of street lighting (including STS proposal HI5).

Signage

- 5.19 Good quality signage is important to certain disabled people:
It is particularly important to take account of the needs of visually impaired and hard of hearing people and to make information as simple and easily understood as possible.^{xxi}
- 5.20 Alongside this, there is a need to ensure the correct type of tactile information is provided.

Home Zones

- 5.21 *There are clearly big benefits to wheelchair users (and others who have difficulty with steps) in that they will be able to cross the road anywhere. However, if we weigh this advantage against the disadvantages for visually impaired people it would seem more appropriate to maintain raised pavements and to have more effective use of dropped kerbs. For visually impaired people, the home zone strips out all the useful parts of the street environment and replaces them with obstacles and dangers that could result in injuries or fear which keep people inside their homes.*^{xxii}
- 5.22 This has particular relevance when considering the piloting of home zones (including STS proposal TR2).

Children and Younger people

Noise

- 5.23 The World Health Organisation (2001) advises that noise levels inside

a classroom should not exceed 35 decibels and 55 decibels in the playground. It is likely that this is true of all learning environments and so may apply to nurseries all the way up to universities. This has particular relevance when considering any schemes that may decrease traffic and noise pollution (including STS proposal W4 and EN2).

Exercise and safety

- 5.24 *Establishing activity from an early age and throughout childhood makes an important contribution to healthy growth and development. In conjunction with diet, regular activity is essential in maintaining the energy balance as well as developing physical literacy, social skills and creative and emotional intelligence, such as positive self-esteem and peer relationships. However, three out of ten boys and four out of ten girls are still insufficiently active to benefit their health and all recent studies show that obesity is increasingly prevalent among children. For example, 16.6% of boys and 16.7% of girls are now obese.*^{xxiii}
- 5.25 This has particular relevance to schemes that increase the activity and exercise of children (including STS proposal LS1).

Ethnicity

Language

- 5.26 Language can be a serious barrier to people from certain groups:
- At present, there is inadequate understanding by service providers of the transport needs of minority ethnic and faith communities. A consequence of this is that initiatives to promote services are frequently ineffective in reaching some communities and do not produce the expected results. A key reason appears to be that organisations fail to establish satisfactory communications with these groups.*
- 5.27 *"The Chinese community don't understand the way they set out the timetables. Also, the hospital has signs in Chinese - why can't the same be done at bus and tram stops especially around Chinatown?" (Members of the Manchester Chinese Community).*^{xxiv}
- 5.28 *Among women aged 45 to 64, those of Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Chinese origin are least likely to be proficient in English – only 4% of Bangladeshi women, 28% of Pakistani women and 47% of Chinese women are proficient.*^{xxv}
- 5.29 This has particular significance when considering street signage (including STS proposal H18).

Sexuality

Public Transport

- 5.30 A study of homophobic crime against the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender community (LGBT) in Birmingham found that the fourth most likely place for homophobic crime to take place was on public transport with 6% taking place in taxis.^{xxvi}
- 5.31 This has particular relevance to any schemes that enhance security on and around public transport (including proposal TX1 and TX2).

Accessible Transport

- 5.32 *In general, those who already use public transport are quite well informed about the routes they habitually use. However, in some areas there is a need for better co-ordinated information so that users are aware of alternatives and of the possibilities of visiting hitherto unvisited destinations.*^{xxvii}
- 5.33 This has particular relevance when considering Accessible Transport services (including STS proposals AC3, AC4 and AC5).
- 5.34 The section below describes consultation undertaken with such groups within Islington.

Streets for People Consultation 2004

- 5.35 The Environment and Conservation ‘Best Value Review for People Friendly Streets’ (Islington, Final Report, 2004) describes equalities and environmental assessments. These assessments were carried out during the Interim Challenge phase of the review.
- 5.36 The document states that equalities for those delivering services are largely addressed through the objectives and actions in the Environment and Conservation Department Equality Action Plan 2004/05.
- 5.37 Improvements in equalities for customers have been identified through consultation workshops with hard to reach community groups. The following groups were consulted in December 2003 and January 2004:
- Islington Child Parliament
 - (Listen Up) – Youth Forum Group
 - Islington Carers Forum
 - Islington Somali Community
 - St Luke’s Centre for Older People
 - Islington Age Concern
 - Parents and Toddler Group – Copenhagen Sure Start Centre
 - Parent Toddler Group Hillside Community Centre
 - Disability Action Islington

- 5.38 In addition, the report states that the following groups were invited to take part but declined:
- Islington Bangladeshi Association
 - London Asian Caribbean Centre
 - Indo/Pakistan Cultural Centre
 - Islington Chinese Association
 - Eritrean Community
 - London Friend (Gay and Lesbian Group)
- 5.39 It found that “these groups share many of the same concerns with the population as a whole” (Islington, Final Report, 2004). Issues such as badly maintained streets and the problem of litterbags can act as severe barriers to particular groups such as the mobility impaired or older groups. It should be noted that the equality issues raised by hard to reach groups that are common to the population as a whole include:
- Accessibility issues
 - Safety
 - Personal security
- 5.40 Of particular significance to more vulnerable groups, but not to the population as a whole is:
- The effect of badly managed construction sites which can be dangerous to less mobile pedestrians
 - Illegally parked cars which can reduce sight lines (reference is made to the CPZ priorities within the STS)
 - The use of street as a social space particularly for young people (reference is made to Home Zones and environmental enhancement schemes within the STS)
- 5.41 Reference is made to Appendix 4 in the ‘Best Value Review for People Friendly Streets’ (Islington, 2004) which provides actions to improve the pedestrian environment for hard to reach groups. Actions include:
- Setting up a Mobility Forum - the council has initiated an independently chaired mobility forum and is currently seeking a facilitator
 - Conducting mobility audits - the council carries out walking and mobility audits for all major council traffic schemes
 - Increasing the number of pedestrian crossings with provision for disabled people - all borough pedestrian crossings provide at least the minimum facilities for disabled people

Key Facts from Section 5

- 5.42 To summarise, the key facts from section 5 include:
- Women see lighting and streetscapes as key in improving safety.
 - Older and disabled people find badly maintained and designed footways and streetscapes a particular barrier to their

- movement.
- Homezones present a serious hazard to visually impaired people.
- Children’s and younger peoples learning is disturbed by high levels of traffic noise.
- Exercise such as walking and cycling is key in improving children’s health.
- Non-english speaking people should be provided for in some way by transport information (including signage).
- The street is an important social space for young people in Islington.
- Future consultation with people from ETGs in Islington will required as the STS proposals are designed and implemented.

6.0 **Summary of the Impact of Transport Proposals on Equality Target Groups**

- 6.1 This section aims to build upon the assessment in Section 4 by examining the proposals contained within the STS in relation to each Equality Target Group.

Proposals

- 6.2 This section looks at the STS proposals¹⁰ in these topic areas:

- A. Highways Infrastructure (HI)
- B. Bridges and Structures (BR)
- C. Traffic Calming in Residential Areas (TR)
- D. Local Safety Schemes (LS)
- E. Safer Routes to School (SR)
- F. School Travel Plans (ST)
- G. Road Safety Education and Training (RS)
- H. Travel Awareness (TA)
- I. Accessibility (AC)
- J. Walking (W)
- K. Cycling (C)
- L. Bus (B)
- M. Rail and Underground (RU)
- N. Parking (P)
- O. Environment (EN)
- P. Freight (F)
- Q. Powered Two-Wheelers (TW)
- R. Taxis and Private Hire (TX)
- S. Water (WT)

- 6.3 It also looks at the Parking Plan for Islington 2004 – 2005, which includes some of the relevant STS proposals and more detailed Parking plans.

¹⁰ Proposals are general statements of the council’s aims in each transport area.

Proposals linked to Equality Target Groups

- 6.4 A detailed consideration of the effects of these proposals was undertaken for every proposal in the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy. This Section summarises the key relationships identified between proposals and Equality Target Groups.

Opportunities missed

- 6.5 Where the locations of proposals were available it was possible to identify some potential missed opportunities (mostly in a spatial sense) by these schemes.


Opportunities missed in improving the Highways Infrastructure

- 6.6 Improvements to the Highways Infrastructure are generally based upon the roads that need the most attention, not the roads nearest the most people from ETGs. However this assessment aims to address any missed opportunities towards people from ETGs contained in the STS.
- 6.7 With this in mind there seems to be an unequal distribution of road improvements in proposal HI1. Nearly all the identified clusters of people from ETGs have at least one principle road being returned to a good state of repair near them. However the clusters of Jewish people and people of other religions in St Georges ward have no principle roads being returned to a good state of repair near them. At the same time clusters of Older people, Hindu people, Muslim people and Sikh people in Bunhill ward have 4 principle roads being developed near them. Similar situations are evident in Clerkenwell and Canonbury (which only has one ETG cluster but is positively impacted by 4 roads).
- 6.8 Looking at impact distribution by group, Older people and Sikh people will both have three times the number of positive impacts than number of clusters. People of other religions only have one positive impact between two clusters.
- 6.9 The ward with no highways improvements (St Georges) has two clusters of people from ETGs and gained the lowest Community Access rating (Table J4.4) in the baseline assessment, people from the ETGs in this ward would have benefited from highways improvements. At the same time Tollington ward (which shares the lowest Community Access rating) contains three clusters of people from ETGs and only has two road improvements near it.

Opportunities missed by walking routes

- 6.10 The two walking routes named in STS proposal W4 (and shown in blue in Figure J6.1 below) could be key in connecting people from ETGs who live in wards with low community access ratings (Table J4.4).

Figure J6.1: Community Access rating map with proposed walking routes



- 6.11 The creation of the **North Islington walking route** creates a link between St Georges (which has one of the lowest community access ratings) and Junction which contains a good proportion of trip generators. This scheme will benefit and further connect the residents of St Georges, (which has two clusters of people from ETGs) and missed out on any highways improvements.
- 6.12 A potential opportunity was missed by not running part of the walking route through Tollington, which has the lowest community access rating, contains clusters of people from three ETGs and has only two road improvements near it. Future development of walking schemes should consider running routes through this area.

- 6.13 The enhancement of **New River Walk** connects 6 wards together including Mildmay (which contains three clusters of people from ETGs, has a below average community access rating and only has two highways improvements).
- 6.14 Both of these walking routes failed to connect **Hillrise**, the northern most ward which scored the lowest for transport provision (see Table J4.4) and has three clusters of people from ETGs and only one highways improvement.

Impacts summarised by Group

- 6.15 Improvements to accessibility are likely to benefit members of ETGs generically as part of the general population of residents and visitors in Islington. It was identified that all groups could be negatively impacted by any increase in vibration, noise and air pollution resulting from proposal F2, if a balance between business needs and residents concerns is not created.
- 6.16 It was suggested that these could be **mitigated** by ensuring representatives from these groups are consulted and included in the Freight Quality Partnership. To ensure that these impacts do not occur it was suggested that the council monitor the impact of these measures upon people from these groups (especially children) in terms of experience of vibration, noise, pollutants and visual intrusion (using noise complaints, air quality levels and group consultation). At the same time the council should monitor the inclusion of representatives from these groups in the Freight Quality Partnership.
- 6.17 However, some effects have been identified that are specific to people in particular ETGs and these are described below.

Impacts on Women

- 6.18 Where the streetscape is enhanced (in proposal H14) or lighting is improved (proposal H15), personal security may increase and women will benefit from this. They will also benefit from the proposals that enhance their access to green travel modes (including proposals AC1 – AC4, W1 – W4 and C1 – C5) as less women have driving licences.
- 6.19 There were no negative impacts identified for women.

Impacts on Minority Ethnic groups

- 6.20 People within minority ethnic groups who cannot read English will benefit from any standardisation of street signage (proposal H18) that aids non-English readers (such as pictograms).
- 6.21 There were no negative impacts identified for minority ethnic groups.

Impacts on Children and Younger people

- 6.22 Children will benefit from the safety schemes that reduce the likelihood of child casualties (including proposals TR1, TR2, LS1, SR, AC2 and RS1). Mandatory school ‘keep clear’ markings provided in the Parking Plan may also cut child casualties.
- 6.23 Safety information (RS1) will contribute to this as long as information is provided in relevant formats.
- 6.24 Children will also benefit from the schemes that encourage increased activity and exercise (including proposals ST1 and C1).
- 6.25 It was clear that children and younger people will benefit from schemes that include noise and emissions reduction (including proposals W4, EN2 and F1) provided that noise and pollution is actually reduced by these schemes. Proposal F2 was actually identified as creating possible negative impacts upon children should it increase noise, air and vibration levels and specific mitigation and monitoring set out (see above).
- 6.26 There were no other negative impacts identified for children and younger people.

Impacts on Older people

- 6.27 Many older people have particular problems with bad quality surfaces and streetscapes and will benefit from the improvement of footways, carriageways, the reduction of street clutter and debris and the enhancement of the streetscape in proposals HI1 to HI4.
- 6.28 They will also be positively impacted by proposals that address barriers in transportation including proposal B2 and proposal RU2 if it addresses the problem of overcrowding.
- 6.29 Older people will benefit from the allowances in Visitor Parking given in the Parking Plan. Such measures may enhance their access options and quality of life.

There were no negative impacts identified for older people.

Impacts on people with a disability

- 6.30 Many disabled people have particular problems with bad quality surfaces and streetscapes and will benefit from the improvement of footways, carriageways, the reduction of street clutter and debris and the enhancement of the streetscape in proposals HI1 to HI4. Similarly the almost borough-wide footway parking ban will reduce hazards to disabled, visually impaired and older people. People with visual

impairments will benefit from improved lighting (HI5).

- 6.31 Disabled people will directly benefit from the proposal AC1 which aims to engage with the disabled community to identify the barriers to independent mobility.
- 6.32 Many disabled people will benefit from the Blue Badge concessions, the 50% discount on Visitor Parking vouchers and the doubled number of 'hours' available. Such measures provided in the Parking Plan may increase their accessibility options and quality of life.
- 6.33 Home zones can prove difficult for certain visually impaired users to navigate and there may be a negative impact if this is not accounted for in the home zones proposal TR2. Suggested **mitigation** included taking into account the needs of the visually impaired user and providing detailed technical design alterations that will ensure the safety of these users including the use of colour contrast for assisting navigation (MACS, 2004). It was also suggested that these schemes should be monitored to ensure that disabled casualties do not increase and no disabled people are further excluded due to this scheme.

Impacts on Lesbians, Gay men, Bisexual and Transgender people

- 6.34 Lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender people who use public transport will benefit from increased security for these services especially in regard improved security in taxi provision outlined in proposals TX1 and TX2.
- 6.35 Lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgender people often share the concerns of the general population regarding many of the proposals and are likely to be impacted in similar ways.
- 6.36 There were no negative impacts identified for people in this group.

Impacts on Faith groups

- 6.37 People within faith groups who cannot read English will benefit from any standardisation of street signage (proposal HI8) that aids non-English readers (such as pictograms).
- 6.38 People from faith groups will benefit from the provision of appropriate levels of paid short stay parking around places of worship (Parking Plan 2004 - 2005). Consultation of these groups is advised as well as the consideration of encouraging travel plans for these organisations.
- 6.39 There were no negative impacts identified for people in faith groups.

Monitoring these impacts

- 6.40 The monitoring recommended for some of the specific key impacts is

shown in Table J6.1 below.

Table J6.1: Suggested monitoring of the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy proposals

Proposal	Location of implementation	Monitoring
Proposal HI8	Locations not yet released	Monitor whether people from non-English speaking groups can use standardised sign system.
Proposal TR2	Locations not yet released	Monitor these schemes to ensure that disabled casualties do not increase and no disabled people are further excluded due to this scheme (using STATS 19 data and consultation with disabled users of the home zone schemes).
Proposal RS1	Locations not yet released	Monitor child casualty rates among children receiving road safety education. Monitor the effectiveness of communication of this information to the children targeted.
Proposal W1	Locations not yet released	Monitor the effect this scheme has upon child and younger peoples exercise levels
Proposal W2	North Islington Walking Route	Monitor levels of children walking to school at the primary schools on Eburne Road and Hornsey Road via this route.
		Monitor levels of younger people walking to the Colleges on Blackstock Road and Parkhurst Road and the University of London via this route.
	New River Walk	Monitor the levels of children walking to school at Highbury New Park, Cross Street, Gloucester Way and Duncan Street, the special school on Gerrard Road and the secondary schools on Petherton Road, via this route.
		Monitor the levels of younger people walking to the College on St John Street and the City University via this route.
Proposal W4	Streets For People - EC1 New Deal	Monitor Noise levels at the 4 Primary schools in this area
		Monitor Noise levels at the City University
	Streets For People - Caledonian Park	Monitor Noise levels at Primary school on Brewer Road

Proposal	Location of implementation	Monitoring
Proposal W4	Town Centres - Angel Town Centre	Monitor Noise levels at Primary school on White Lion Street
		Monitor Noise levels at College on St Johns Street
	Town Centres - Highbury Corner	Monitor Noise levels at the 3 Primary schools in the area
		Monitor Noise levels at the College / University on Holloway Road
	Town Centres - Nags Head	Monitor Noise levels at the Primary school Eburne Road
		Monitor Noise levels at the College on the corner of Holloway and Parkhurst Road
	Town Centres - Archway	Monitor Noise levels at the primary school on Bedcar Road and the special school on the corner of Glebach Road and Holloway Road
		Monitor Noise levels at the College on the corner of Holloway and Parkhurst Road
A1 Borough	Monitor Noise levels at the schools along the A1	
	Monitor Noise levels at the Colleges and universities along the A1	
Proposal C1	Locations not yet released	Monitor the effect this scheme has upon child and younger peoples exercise levels
Proposal C2	Locations not yet released	Monitor the effect this scheme has upon child and younger peoples exercise levels
Proposal C5	Locations not yet released	Monitor the effect this scheme has upon child and younger peoples cycle casualty levels
Proposal F2	Throughout the borough	Monitor the impact of these measures upon people from these groups (especially children) in terms of experience of vibration, noise, pollutants and visual intrusion (using noise complaints, air quality levels and group consultation). Monitor the inclusion of representatives from these groups in the Freight Quality Partnership.
Proposal TW1	Throughout the borough	Monitor whether safety and accessibility has actually been balanced against the effects of nuisance behaviour (using indicators such as casualty reports, noise complaints and anti-social behaviour complaints)

Conclusion

- 6.41 In conclusion this study has identified that significant numbers of members of Equality Target Groups are resident in Islington and that their spatial distribution is not uniform, resulting in identifiable concentrations of people from ETGs at ward level. The analysis of the Consultation Draft Sustainable Transport Strategy has identified generic benefits to people from ETGs as well as specific benefits to particular groups.
- 6.42 Two potential negative impacts were identified by the EqlA. Proposal F2 (involving improvement in delivery arrangements) was identified as having the potential to negatively impact every group (especially children) if a balance between business needs and residents concerns is not created. Proposal TR2 (involving the establishment of homezones) was also identified as having potentially negative impacts on visually impaired users navigation. Mitigation was suggested for both potential impacts. Future monitoring was also suggested for these proposals as well as several others to measure the success of any positive impacts (see Table J6.2).
- 6.43 **However no serious negative impacts resulting from the STS have been identified.**
- 6.44 The level of development of the STS strategy means that it is not currently possible to identify the location of implementation of many of the proposed measures and therefore to determine conclusively that there are uneven distributions of funding and resources relative to people from ETGs. Further investigation of these distributions will be completed for the final STS.
- 6.45 It is recommended that the implementation of the strategy be monitored against the baseline of data assembled by this project and the satisfaction of users.

Recommendations

- 6.46 Where baseline information is missing or modelled (such as the London noise map) it is suggested that actual data is collected to form a baseline for future modelling. In the case of noise at schools (Table J6.1), noise levels within classrooms should also be sampled.^{xxviii}
- 6.47 It is suggested that the implementation(s) of each proposal should undergo an EqlA. This will ensure that any details that are currently missing or yet to be finalised will be taken into account with regard to people from ETGs in the borough and will allow for more focus.
- 6.48 Consultation of people from all the ETGs should continue, with more

effort to understand the concerns of every party. Respondents concerns (including a satisfaction rating) could be collected from people from each ETG at intervals before and after the implementation of each scheme from the STS.

References

-
- i Transport for London (June 2004) *Equality Impact Assessments - How to do them*
 - ii Transport for London (June 2004) *Equality Impact Assessments - How to do them*
 - iii National Office of Statistics (2001) UK Census 2001
 - iv Arjun Appadurai (1990) Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy in *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7. p.295 - 310
 - v National Office of Statistics (2001) UK Census 2001
 - vi London borough of Islington Environment and Conservation Department (2004) *Equality Action Planning in Environment and Conservation*
 - vii Entec UK Limited (2004) *London borough of Islington State of the Environment Report* – yet to be published
 - viii Islington Primary Care Trust (2005) *Health in Islington 2003/2004*
 - ix National Office of Statistics (2001) UK Census 2001
 - x National Office of Statistics (2001) UK Census 2001
 - xi Metropolitan Police (2005) *Latest Crime figures for Islington*
 - xii Traffic congestion on Islington’s main roads, Transport for London – (December 2001 – March 2004, AM Peak 07:00-10:00)
 - xiii TRAFFMAP: AccsMap, 01.12.2001 – 30.11-2004
 - xiv Scottish Executive (2000) *Women and Transport: Moving forward*
 - xv Scottish Executive (2000) *Women and Transport: Moving forward*
 - xvi Department for Transport (1999) *Older people: Their transport needs and requirements - Main report*
 - xvii Department for Transport (1999) *Older people: Their transport needs and requirements - Main report*
 - xviii Department for Transport (2002) *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best practice on access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*
 - xix Department for Transport (2002) *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best practice on access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*
 - xx Department for Transport (2002) *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best practice on access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*

-
- xxi Department for Transport (2002) *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best practice on access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*
 - xxii Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (2004) *Home Zones Guidance Consultation*
 - xxiii Department of Health (March 2005) *Choosing activity: a physical activity action plan*
 - xxiv Department for Transport (no date) *Public Transport Needs of Minority Ethnic and Faith Communities Guidance Pack*
 - xxv Commission for Racial Equality (1999) *Ethnic Minorities in Britain Factsheet*
 - xxvi The Birmingham Police Forum for the Gay community (2002) *A Matter of Trust – Recommendations from the Pink Shield Project*
 - xxvii Department for Transport (no date) *Public Transport Needs of Minority Ethnic and Faith Communities Guidance Pack*
 - xxviii World Health Organisation (2001) *Fact sheet N°258 Occupational and community noise*

Bibliography

Arjun Appadurai (1990) Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy in *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7. p.295 - 310

The Birmingham Police Forum for the Gay community (2002) *A Matter of Trust – Recommendations from the Pink Shield Project* - http://www.birmingham-csp.org.uk/b_audit/pdf/pdf_02/pink_rec.pdf

Commission for Racial Equality (1999) *Ethnic Minorities in Britain Factsheet*

DEFRA (2005) London Noise Map - <http://www.londonnoisemap.com>

Department for Transport (1999) *Older people: Their transport needs and requirements - Main report*

Department for Transport (2000) *Women and public transport: The checklist*

Department for Transport (2002) *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best practice on access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*

Department for Transport (no date) *Public Transport Needs of Minority Ethnic and Faith Communities Guidance Pack*

Department for Transport (no date) *Social exclusion and the provision of public transport - Main report*

Department of Health (March 2005) *Choosing activity: a physical activity action plan*

Entec UK Limited (2004) *London borough of Islington State of the Environment Report* – yet to be published

Greater London Authority (2003) *Equality Impact Assessments - How to do them*

Health Development Agency (2005) *Making the case: Improving health through transport* - www.publichealth.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=503416

Islington Primary Care Trust (2005) *Health in Islington 2003/2004*

London Area Transport Survey (2001)

London borough of Islington Environment and Conservation Department (2004) *Equality Action Planning in Environment and Conservation*

Metropolitan Police (2005) *Latest Crime figures for Islington*

Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (2004) *Home Zones Guidance Consultation* – <http://www.macs-mobility.org/docs/consult/response/homezones/>

National Office of Statistics (2001) UK Census 2001

Scottish Executive (2000) *Women and Transport: Moving forward*

Social Exclusion Unit (2003) *Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion*

Transport for London (June 2004) *Equality Impact Assessments - How to do them*

Transport for London (2003) *Mayor of London Transport Strategy*

World Health Organisation (2001) *Fact sheet N°258 Occupational and community noise* - <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs258/en/>