

# Equalities Analysis in Lambeth

Proposal Title \*

Stopping Up of Leake Street Footway for Elizabeth House Development

Author

Rachel Sandbrook

Please provide name of lead author and/or those within project team who may be required to contribute to this assessment

Who will sign off the assessment?

Michael Munnelly

Please indicate who will be involved in approving this assessment. This will need to be signed off by the Director

Q1a. What is changing?

A new development, Elizabeth House, is proposed to be built, sited adjacent to York Road to the west, Waterloo Station to the east, Cab Road to the north and Leake Street to the south. Planning permission for the development has been granted (19/01477/EIAFUL).

The proposed development footprint extends onto land currently maintained by Lambeth Highways on the north side of Leake Street, thereby narrowing this footway (to a minimum dimension of 2.8m) and necessitating the stopping up of a strip of Lambeth Highways-maintained land to enable this land to be taken up by the proposed building.

What is the most significant or key change taking place? Can you indicate the type of change in your response (e.g. policy/decision/strategy/ service/procedural/ geographic/procurement etc.) so it is clear what is being equalities assessed? Why is this change happening? What do you aim to achieve? Can you clearly indicate what decision-makers are being asked to take a decision on?

Read more

Q1b. Who will be involved in approving this decision?

Michael Munnelly, AD for Infrastructure, Capital Delivery, Public Realm

Who else will be involved in signing-off this decision?

Read more

## Q2a. What do we know about the people who will be impacted by this change?

According to the 2011 Census there are 303,086 residents in the borough.

### **Age**

The 3 recognised age groups are as follows:

0-15 (children) - 54,786 (18.1%), 16-64 (working age) - 225, 113 (74.3%); 65+ (older people) - 23,187 (1.6%)

### **Disability and health**

About 37,000 (12%) of people in Lambeth say their day-to-day activities are limited by a long-term illness (7%) or disability (5%).

The 2011 Census recorded that 12,690 (4%) of residents were in receipt of Disability Living Allowance (DLA).

When rating their health, 52.9% of residents rated their health as 'very good' with 1.17% rating it as 'very bad'. Both of these figures are less than the national average.

### **Gender Reassignment**

No data

### **Pregnancy and maternity**

No data

### **Race/ethnicity**

In May 2017, 60% of Lambeth's population (3 in 5) described their ethnicity as other than white British. 24% are Black with almost half of these, (11%) Black African.

White and white other (40%), African (18%), Caribbean (8%), Other Black (5%), Asian (7%), Mixed (8%), Other 3%

### **Religion or belief**

In 2011 63.3% of the population said that they had a religion. The religious makeup was as follows:

Christian (53.1%), No religion (27.3%), Muslim (7.1%), Hindu (1%), Buddhist (1%), Jewish (0.4%), Sikh (0.1%), Agnostic (0.1%), Other 9.9%

### **Gender**

Of the 303,086 residents in 2011 there were 150,921 (49.8%) males and 152,165 (50.2%) females in the borough.

### **Sexual Orientation**

In response to the 2005 Lambeth Residents' Survey 3% of respondents identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual. By 2013 this figure had increased to 4% but is believed that this is likely to be an under representation.

## **Socio-economic**

The 2011 Census recorded 130,017 households in Lambeth. Around 65% live in rented accommodation and 33% own their own home. Over 70% live in flats, either purpose built or converted house. Just over 10% of households live in detached or semi-detached houses.

According to the GLA the average household income for Lambeth between 2000-2013 is similar to those for the whole of London which is consistently higher than the UK as a whole.

Over 45% of residents are educated to degree level, although 14% of residents have no education (both comparable to inner London boroughs and London as a whole). Employment levels in Lambeth are high (79.2%), higher than both the London and national averages of 71.8% and 72.4% respectively.

According to the latest Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) of 2015, Lambeth is the 8th most deprived borough in London and 22nd most deprived in England.

42.2% of households have car or van availability. Average cars per household is 0.5.

## **Language**

Over 150 languages are spoken in the borough although the majority of people in Lambeth as of 2011 speak English. The main languages are:

English (79.7%), Portuguese (3.4%), Spanish, (2.5%), Polish (2.2%), French (1.8%), Italian (1.1%), Somali (0.8%), Arabic (0.5%), German (0.5%), Tigrinya (0.4%), Other (7.1%).

What does your information tell you about the people who will be affected by this change? Are protected groups impacted? What information do you hold on the protected characteristics of the people affected by the change? (Age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race/ethnicity, religion or belief, gender, sexual orientation, health, socio-economic, language) Are there any gaps or missing information?

Read more



## Q2b. How will they be impacted by the change?

### **Universal Impacts**

The reduction of the footway width was the subject of detailed discussion during the planning process. The proposed footway width was agreed with both Highways and Transport Planning Officers. Any perceived negative impact from the loss of public circulation space was deemed to be outweighed by the overall positive impacts of the proposed development. The impacts on the transport network overall were deemed acceptable, as outlined in paragraph 17.42 in the 19/01477/EIAFUL: Elizabeth House – 39 York Road – SE1 7NQ Lambeth Planning Applications Committee Report, presented to the Lambeth Planning Applications Committee on 15th October 2019.

The reduction in footway width on the north side of Leake Street gives reduced space for pedestrian circulation by comparison with the current configuration. The impacts of this are explored in detail in WSP; Elizabeth House Transport Assessment; April 2019, which formed a part of the 19/01477/EIAFUL planning submission. The design of the new Elizabeth House introduces new public circulation routes across and through the site. With this better site permeability, pedestrian flow analysis undertaken as part of the planning submission shows that the overall number of pedestrians using this part of Leake Street will fall as a result of the proposed development. Overall, with these reduced pedestrian flows and allowing for the proposed reduced footway width, the Pedestrian Comfort Level (PCL) analysis shows a PCL of A+ on Leake Street's reduced narrowed northern footway. A PCL of A+ indicates that

the pedestrian environment is very comfortable, with plenty of space for people to walk at the speed and route that they choose. It is noted that the proposed footway will have a minimum width of 2.8m, which remains well in excess of the 2.0m that the Highways and Transport Planning teams would generally look to achieve as an absolute minimum in relation to highways alterations resulting from new development. On this basis, the proposed stopping-up and its impact on the footway width is deemed acceptable.

### **Age**

Noting the projected pedestrian flow levels on the footway, including during peak times of day, the proposed minimum footway width is deemed to be sufficient to enable comfortable passage, including for buggies, wheelchairs and users who may be less steady on their feet.

### **Disability and health**

As above, noting the projected pedestrian flow levels on the footway, including during peak times of day, the proposed minimum footway width is deemed to be sufficient to enable comfortable passage, including for buggies, wheelchairs and users who may be less steady on their feet.

### **Gender Reassignment**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Pregnancy and maternity**

As above, noting the projected pedestrian flow levels on the footway, including during peak times of day, the proposed minimum footway width is deemed to be sufficient to enable comfortable passage, including for buggies, wheelchairs and users who may be less steady on their feet.

### **Race/ethnicity**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Religion or belief**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Gender**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Sexual Orientation**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Socio-economic**

No specific impact anticipated.

### **Language**

Alternative formats of any documentation used in any consultations will be made available upon request (such as audible copies for blind people) as well as being made available in different languages. In all documentation produced to date, we have sought to use Plain English and avoid jargon as much as possible.

Would you assess the impact as positive, adverse, neutral? Do you have any uncertainty about the impact of your proposal? Is there a likelihood that some people will more impacted than others? Can you describe the ways in which they will be affected? How might this change affect our 'general duty'?

Read more



### Q3a. How do you plan to promote and deliver any positive impacts of the proposal?

The proposal enables the implementation of the Elizabeth House development in accordance with planning permission 19/01477/EIAFUL. The proposal to maximise the building's footprint area by reducing the existing Leake Street northern footway width will have had a positive impact on the overall viability of the development.

In the 19/01477/EIAFUL: Elizabeth House – 39 York Road – SE1 7NQ Lambeth Planning Applications Committee Report, presented to the Lambeth Planning Applications Committee on 15th October 2019, the following key benefits of the development to the London Borough of Lambeth are outlined:

- Reshaping of the public realm (through high quality design) by providing a new square in front of Victory Arch, a covered square along York Road, a new pedestrian route parallel to Waterloo Station and a promenade connecting the building to the station concourse.
- An important contribution to the supply of office space in the borough and the strategic aims of the Opportunity Area. (146,170m<sup>2</sup> GIA of high quality office floorspace, £33.27m of subsidy towards discounted workspace memberships)
- 8,900m<sup>2</sup> of high quality retail, commercial and leisure space
- Estimated 11,095 new jobs (9,715 fulltime equivalent)

How might the principles of fairness, equality of opportunity and positive relationships be further promoted as a consequence of this proposal? How do you propose to measure your positive outcomes and the benefits outlined to find out if these have been achieved?

Read more



### Q3b How do you plan to address and mitigate any negative impacts of the proposal?

The following steps have been taken to mitigate the negative impacts of the proposal:

- Development layout provides improved permeability for pedestrians through the site, reducing the overall pedestrian flows on the northern Leake Street footway.
- Footway has been increased in width from original proposal discussed during pre-app process. Service lift doors have been pushed back, with splay each side for visibility.

We will also seek to ensure that the developer implements the following:

- Any existing street furniture, including utilities cabinets, to be removed from the footway to ensure no obstacles to pedestrian flows

What impact has this evidence had on what you are proposing? What can you do differently that might lessen the impact on people within the timeframes i.e. development-implementation? Who can help you to develop these solutions?

Read More



**Q4. How will you review/evaluate your proposal, mitigating actions and/or benefits? Who will be responsible for this?**

The Development Related Works team will undertake site visits as part of their contractual arrangement with the developer. As part of these site visits, activity on the carriageway and footway will be observed once the alterations have been made to verify that the scheme is functioning appropriately and as anticipated.

Who will you be accountable to for the above actions/outcome? How will those responsible know these actions have worked? What performance indicators will you use to demonstrate this? Are there any other forms of evidence you can use to support this assessment of their effectiveness?

Read more



**Section to be completed by Sponsor/Director/Head of Service**

Outcome of equality impact assessment

- No adverse impact, no change required
- Low adverse impact, minor adjustment required
- Significant adverse impact, further action required
- Significant impact identified unable to mitigate fully
- Unlawful in/direct discrimination, stop and rethink

Read more



Comments from Sponsor/Director/Head of Service

Submit for approval

Submit for approval

When you are ready for the assesment to be reviewed by your Director, please select 'Submit for Approval' from the drop down. (Or select Resubmit if requesting approval after a rejection)

Executive Approval

Pending

For Directors: Please use the drop down to Approve or Reject the Assessment. (You will need to click 'Edit Item' at the top of the form to do this)

Attachments

Close