



Equality Impact Analysis Full Tool with Guidance

Overview

This Tool has been produced to help you analyse the likelihood of impacts on the protected characteristics – including where people are represented in more than one – with regard to your new or proposed policy, strategy, function, project or activity. It has been updated to reflect the new public sector equality duty and should be used for decisions from 6th April 2011 onwards. It is designed to help you analyse decisions of high relevance to equality, and/or of high public interest.

General points

1. 'Due regard' means the regard that is appropriate in all the circumstances. In the case of controversial matters such as service closures or reductions, considerable thought will need to be given the equalities aspects.
2. Wherever appropriate, and in all cases likely to be controversial, the outcome of the EIA needs to be summarised in the Cabinet/Cabinet Member report (section 08 of this tool) and equalities issues dealt with and cross referenced as appropriate within the report.
3. Equalities duties are fertile ground for litigation and a failure to deal with them properly can result in considerable delay, expense and reputational damage.
4. Where dealing with obvious equalities issues e.g. changing services to disabled people/children, take care not to lose sight of other less obvious issues for other protected groups.

Timing, and sources of help

Case law has established that having due regard means analysing the impact, and using this to inform decisions, thus demonstrating a conscious approach and state of mind ([2008] EWHC 3158 (Admin), [here](#)). It has also established that due regard cannot be demonstrated after the decision has been taken. Your EIA should be considered at the outset and throughout the development of your proposal, through to the recommendation for decision. It should demonstrably inform, and be made available when the decision that is recommended. This tool contains guidance, and you can also access guidance from the EHRC [here](#). If you are analysing the impact of a budgetary decision, you can find EHRC guidance [here](#). Advice and guidance can be accessed from the Opportunities Manager: PEIA@lbhf.gov.uk or ext 3430.

Full Equality Impact Analysis Tool

Overall Information	Details of Full Equality Impact Analysis	
Financial Year and Quarter	2012/13, Q4	
Name and details of policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme	South Fulham Riverside Supplementary Planning Document ('SFR SPD'). A new policy which has been consulted on with the public twice. The aim of the SPD is to set a framework for redevelopment in the designated area, which is in Sand's End Ward in the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.	
Lead Officers	Name: Carly Fry Position: Opportunities Manager Email: PEIA@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No: 020 8753 3430	Name: Jackie Simkins Position: Special Projects Officer (Planning) Email: jackie.simkins@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No: 020 8753 3460
Date of completion of final EIA	20/12/2012	

Section 02	Scoping of Full EIA
Plan for completion	Timing: November and December 2011, February 2012 and December 2012. Resources: Officer time, data and information as given at Section 03 of this EQIA Lead Officers: Carly Fry and Jackie Simkins
What is the policy, strategy, function, project, activity, or programme looking to achieve?	<p>Analyse the impact of the policy on the protected characteristics (including where people / groups may be in more than one protected characteristic). You should use this to determine whether the policy will have a positive/neutral/negative impact and whether it is of low/medium/high relevance to equality.</p> <p>You should also use this section when your policy may not be relevant to one or more protected characteristics. If this applies, case law has established that you must give your reasoning. It is not sufficient to state 'N/A' without saying why.</p> <p>Information: Protected characteristics and PSED The public sector equality duty (PSED) states that in the exercise of our functions, we must have due regard to the need to:</p>

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

Having due regard for advancing equality involves:

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people; and
- Encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low

The Act states that meeting different needs involves taking steps to take account of disabled people's disabilities. It describes fostering good relations as tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between people from different groups. It states that compliance with the duty may involve treating some people more favourably than others.

EQIA of Draft SPD for second round of consultation

Given in more detail in Chapter 2: Introduction, the draft SPD sets out LB Hammersmith & Fulham's vision for the redevelopment of the South Fulham Riverside. This is one of five regeneration areas identified in the adopted Core Strategy (2011) where a comprehensive approach to regeneration will take place guiding growth and change in the area.

The SFR SPD has been produced in order to identify the potential opportunities for regeneration within the area of the borough formerly designated as the Carnwath Road employment zone until September 2007, together with former employment zone land to the east of Wandsworth Bridge Road, along Townmead Road. It should be read in conjunction with the saved policies under the Unitary Development Plan (as amended in 2007 and 2011), The Submission Development Management DPD (July 2012), the London Plan (2011), the Core Strategy (2011) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents and Supplementary Guidance on Thames Strategy: Kew to Chelsea.

This EQIA looks at the following chapters and their relevance to, and impact on, the relevant protected characteristics:

- Chapter 8: Housing Strategy
- Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy
- Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study
- Chapter 11: Transport Interventions
- Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

Other chapters in the draft SPD provide an overview and context, and so only the chapters above are analysed here. For completeness, a summary of Chapters 7, 13 and 14 is given here:

Chapter 7: Area Planning Framework and Land Use Strategy

This chapter sets out the key principles for land use in the area. It is likely to be of relevance to protected groups such as Age and Disability, in terms of its vision for accessible design. It is potentially of relevance to all protected groups where issues such as creating employment, more housing, public green space, improvements to transport, schools and health. However, the detail of these issues are discussed elsewhere in the document (e.g. Chapter 8: Housing Strategy or Chapter 10: Urban Design Strategy, as examples) and so this Chapter is not further analysed below.

Chapter 13: Environmental Strategy

This chapter sets out the aims regarding reducing and mitigating the local causes of climate change. Much of this chapter is statutory provision, or requires building solutions to protect people against weather. As such, this chapter will have an overall benefit to all groups but not to any specific group.

Chapter 14: Delivery and Implementation Strategy

This Chapter sets out how delivery and implementation of the policy aims would work, and as such it is the detail of the aims of the draft SFR SPD that is of relevance to protected groups. The Council will continue to consult with the public and to be mindful of issues that are raised.

Age	<p>Analysis of impact on age including due regard to PSED (above).</p> <p>The age profile for Sands End ward very closely mirrors that of the borough. Those under 18 are not currently protected under the Equality Act 2010 in terms of age and so impacts on children are covered under Children’s Rights (below)</p> <p><u>Chapter 8: Housing Strategy</u></p>
-----	--

This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to various age groups. For example, the intermediate housing is expected to cover a range of intermediate housing products including shared equity, key worker, discounted market sale/rent and shared ownership and be affordable to a range of household incomes. The diverse range of delivery methods for housing as given here will help younger people who may have less capital than middle age groups due to being in the workplace for less time, for example. This, balanced with market housing which is open to all age groups, will help to promote equality of opportunity between younger and older people. As set out in the SFR SPD, any application will be expected to provide a range of unit sizes within the market housing provision and special consideration should be given to the provision of family units (3 bedrooms or more). This will help couples with children.

As per strategic policy H4 (Core Strategy 2011), all new housing should be built to lifetime homes standards, with a minimum of 10% of those units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users. This also has other benefits for those with small children as such units are more accessible for people with buggies and pushchairs. This will benefit new residents who may develop an age-related mobility impairment later on in their lives, which means that they require accessible housing. This may be of benefit to those in the ward who reported that their health was not good (8.25%) and possibly also to those who reported that they had a limiting long-term illness (14.76%) during the 2001 census count.

This chapter requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor's minimum standards. It also requires new communal children's play space will normally be provided in new residential development that requires family accommodation. Children's play space should be accessible and cater for younger, older, and disabled children. As such, this will have an indirect positive benefit for parents.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9.

This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter is of medium relevance to older people and to children (see:

Children's Rights) as they are more likely to have age-related mobility impairments (older people) or to find physical barriers (e.g. large steps) difficult to navigate (children).

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. Parsons Green and Putney Bridge do not however have step free access. Imperial Wharf is within the SFRRRA and given it only opened in 2009 this does have step free access. Improvements are not proposed to Parsons Green or Putney Bridge, (e.g. step-free access and so on), which would usually have a positive impact on older people with age-related mobility impairments. Imperial Wharf is accessible and Fulham Broadway underground station which can be reached via a bus or walking is also step free. In terms of the river service all piers are wheelchair accessible, most riverboats are accessible, and most new riverboats have dedicated wheelchair spaces. As such, the relevance to Age will be low, since although the extra capacity would have a positive impact on all age groups, there are no specific, further improvements or elements of further relevance to Age.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new homes in the SFRRRA. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) which would have a positive impact on people of all ages and those with small children, as these would provide places to meet and to socialise. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Any planning application submitted on a SFR site would have to be assessed against these formulas in order to ascertain the anticipated increase in the nursery, primary and secondary school numbers and seek suitable financial contributions in order to create the capacity for this additional demand and as such any potential negative impact on various age groups should be mitigated. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods : Play and

		<p>Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of SPD), which will benefit those with children, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will benefit all age groups. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, giving reassurance to all age groups however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of medium relevance to all age groups, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning application.</p>
	Disability	<p>Analysis of impact on disability including due regard to PSED (above).</p> <p>4.93% of residents in H&F identified as permanently sick/disabled (2001 Census). In Sands End, 8.25% reported that their health was not good and 14.76 said they had a limiting long-term illness (2001 Census). However, this does not directly correspond to a disability as is defined by the Equality Act 2010, as the question in the census did not ask respondents if they were registered disabled.</p> <p><u>Chapter 8: Housing Strategy</u></p> <p>This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to disabled people. For example, the intermediate housing is expected to cover a range of intermediate housing products including shared equity, key worker, discounted market sale/rent and shared ownership and be affordable to a range of household incomes. This will also help those disabled people who may be in different types of work due to their disability. This, balanced with market housing which is also open to disabled people, will help to promote equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled people.</p> <p>As per strategic policy H4 (Core Strategy 2011), all new housing should be built to lifetime homes standards, with a minimum of 10% of those units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users. This will benefit new residents who may be disabled or develop a disability.</p>

This chapter requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor's minimum standards. Children's play space will normally be provided and should be accessible and cater for disabled children. As such, this will have a positive impact on disabled children.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9.

This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter is of high relevance to disabled people as it requires consideration of disabled people's needs at the outset of any new proposals and designs. This will be positive and promote equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled people by promoting and requiring equal access.

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. Parsons Green and Putney Bridge do not however have step free access. Imperial Wharf is within the SFRRRA and given it only opened in 2009 this does have step free access. Improvements are not proposed to Parsons Green or Putney Bridge, (e.g. step-free access and so on), which would usually have a positive impact on disabled people. Imperial Wharf is accessible and Fulham Broadway underground station which can be reached via a bus or walking is also step free. In terms of the river service all piers are wheelchair accessible, most riverboats are accessible, and most new riverboats have dedicated wheelchair spaces. As such, the relevance to Disability will be low, since although the extra capacity would have a positive impact on all disabled people (e.g. more bus

connections as buses are accessible), there are no specific, further improvements or elements of further relevance to Disability.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new homes in the SFRRRA. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of the SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) of which the café would be of most relevance to disabled people, with the playground requiring an assessment of disabled people's needs, and the area for ball games of more use to some disabled people than others (e.g. this may not be of relevance to those who cannot partake in such activity. All would provide places to meet and to socialise, thereby increasing opportunities for disabled people to participate in public life. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of the SPD), which will benefit those with children, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will benefit disabled people whose specific needs will be taken into account. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, giving reassurance to all age groups however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of high relevance to disabled people, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning application.

Gender
reassignment

Analysis of impact on gender reassignment including due regard to PSED (above).

Research relating to LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) population estimates notes that:

In 2005, the Department for Trade and Industry published a figure of 6% as the percentage of LGBT people in the general population as part of its research in relation to new equalities legislation. The number of LGBT people in London is thought to be anywhere between 6% and 10% of the total population, increased by

		<p><i>disproportionate levels of migration. This equates to an urban population of between 450,000 and 750,000 people.</i></p> <p>[Kairos in Soho: p27, 2007]</p> <p>This estimate does include other groups (LBG).</p> <p>None of the chapters has, so far, emerged as relevant to this protected characteristic. However, people who are protected here may find improvements to housing (lifetime homes), transport, urban design, and social infrastructure of a small indirect benefit in that they (and all other policies) collectively seek to improve the area and make it safer, more attractive, and greener.</p>																										
	Marriage and Civil Partnership	<p>Analysis of impact on marriage and civil partnership including due regard to PSED (above).</p> <p>The draft SPD is not seeking to provide a service for married people or civil partners, and so no Chapters are relevant to this protected characteristic</p>																										
	Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Analysis of impact on pregnancy and maternity including due regard to PSED (above).</p> <p>Live Births by Usual Area of Residence 2010</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="750 874 1823 1059"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="9">Age of mother at birth</th> </tr> <tr> <th>All ages</th> <th>Under 18</th> <th>Under 20</th> <th>20-24</th> <th>25-29</th> <th>30-34</th> <th>35-39</th> <th>40-44</th> <th>45+</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2,773</td> <td>18</td> <td>69</td> <td>300</td> <td>521</td> <td>964</td> <td>740</td> <td>165</td> <td>14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Chapter 8: Housing Strategy</u></p> <p>This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to women who are pregnant or breastfeeding. For example, the intermediate housing is expected to cover a range of intermediate housing products including shared equity, key worker, discounted market sale/rent and shared ownership and be affordable to a range of household incomes. The diverse range of delivery methods will help women who may have less capital than other groups for periods of time due to maternity leave payments, though this will vary from individual to individual. As set out in the SPD, any application will be expected to provide a range of unit sizes within the market housing provision and special consideration should be given to the provision of family units (3 bedrooms or more)., will also</p>	Age of mother at birth									All ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+	2,773	18	69	300	521	964	740	165
Age of mother at birth																												
All ages	Under 18	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+																				
2,773	18	69	300	521	964	740	165	14																				

benefit women with infants.

As per strategic policy H4 (Core Strategy 2011), all new housing should be built to lifetime homes standards, with a minimum of 10% of those units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users. This will benefit pregnant women with reduced mobility in the latter stages of pregnancy, as well as those with infants and small children as such units are more accessible for people with buggies and pushchairs.

This chapter requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor's minimum standards. It also requires new communal children's play space will normally be provided in new residential development that requires family accommodation. Children's play space should be accessible and cater for younger, older, and disabled children. As such, this will have an indirect positive benefit on women with this protected characteristic as this will serve as a place to meet other women with small infants and children who may or may not have a disability.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9. This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter is of medium relevance to pregnant women and those with small infants, as it seeks to facilitate ease of access in the urban environment and remove physical barriers.

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. Parsons Green

and Putney Bridge do not however have step free access. Imperial Wharf is within the SFRRRA and given it only opened in 2009 this does have step free access. Improvements are not proposed to Parsons Green or Putney Bridge, (e.g. step-free access and so on), which would usually have a positive impact on pregnant women with reduced mobility, as well as those women who have small infants. Imperial Wharf is accessible and Fulham Broadway underground station which can be reached via a bus or walking is also step free. In terms of the river service all piers are wheelchair accessible, most riverboats are accessible. As such, the relevance to Pregnancy and Maternity will be low, since although the extra capacity would have a positive impact on women protected here, there are no specific, further improvements or elements of further relevance to those women.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new homes in the SFRRRA. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of the SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) which would have a positive impact on pregnant women and those with small infants, as these would provide places to meet and to socialise. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Any planning application submitted on a SFR site would have to be assessed against these formulas in order to ascertain the anticipated increase in the nursery, primary and secondary school numbers and seek suitable financial contributions in order to create the capacity for this additional demand and as such any potential indirect negative impact on women with small children should be mitigated. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of SPD), which will benefit pregnant women and those with small infants, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will also benefit this group. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, giving reassurance to women protected here however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of relevance to all women with this protected characteristic, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning

application.

Race

Analysis of impact on race including due regard to PSED (above).

The breakdown of race groups in the Ward is as follows:

Ethnic Group 2001: % total population	Ward	LBHF
White	79.88	77.83
White: British	62.26	58.04
White: Irish	3.65	4.83
White: Other White	13.97	14.95
Mixed	3.93	3.81
Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	1.54	1.22
Mixed: White and Black African	0.70	0.63
Mixed: White and Asian	0.73	0.97
Mixed: Other Mixed	0.96	1.00
Asian or Asian British	3.25	4.44
Asian or Asian British: Indian	1.21	1.65
Asian or Asian British: Pakistani	0.70	1.04
Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi	0.72	0.61
Asian or Asian British: Other Asian	0.62	1.14
Black or Black British	10.14	11.13
Black or Black British: Caribbean	4.35	5.16
Black or Black British: African	4.76	4.88
Black or Black British: Other Black	1.03	1.08
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group	2.80	2.79
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Chinese	0.91	0.79
Chinese or Other Ethnic Group: Other Ethnic Group	1.89	2.00

(Census 2001: Table UV09P)

Chapter 8: Housing Strategy

This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to different race groups. This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to various age groups. For example, the intermediate housing is

expected to cover a range of intermediate housing products including shared equity, key worker, discounted market sale/rent and shared ownership and be affordable to a range of household incomes. The diverse range of delivery methods for housing as given here will help people of different race groups who may have less capital than other groups due to economic factors, for example. This, balanced with market housing which is open to all race groups, will help to promote equality of opportunity. As set out in the SPD, any application will be expected to provide a range of unit sizes within the market housing provision and special consideration should be given to the provision of family units (3 bedrooms or more), this will help people of all race groups who need family size units. The breakdown of race groups (aged 16-74) by employment in the Ward is as follows:

	Total	Total White	White Irish	Black	Asian	Chinese	Mixed	Other
LBHF		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Economically active	69.4	72.1	56.5	59.9	53.9	62.0	60.7	59.0
Economically inactive	30.6	27.9	43.5	40.1	46.2	38.1	39.4	41.0

(Table A10 of Appx 2 of Census 2001: Economic Activity of People Aged 16-74 by Ethnic Group)

This may give an indication that some groups who are less economically active than others would be less likely to access market housing. However, there will be other race groups who will benefit from the provision of market housing. As such the mix of housing proposed by the SPD is of high relevance to race and will be positive for all groups.

As per strategic policy H4 (Core Strategy 2011), all new housing should be built to lifetime homes standards, with a minimum of 10% of those units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users. This chapter also requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor’s minimum standards. It also requires new communal children’s play space will normally be provided in new residential development that requires family accommodation. Neither is directly related to race but will have a small positive effect.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9. This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to

be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter is of low relevance to race and will have a small positive impact on all race groups

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. The accessibility issues are given under Age, Disability, Pregnancy and Maternity, and Sex, and there is no evidence to suggest that these are race-specific. As such, this Chapter will have a low relevance to race, and the extra capacity will be positive for all race groups.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new homes in the SFRRRA. None of the proposals has merged as of specific benefit to any race group thus far. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of the SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) which would have a positive impact on people of all race groups, as these would provide places to meet and to socialise. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods : Play and Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of SPD), which will benefit those with children, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will benefit all race groups. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, giving reassurance to all race groups however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the

changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of relevance to all race groups, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning application.

Religion/belief (including non-belief)

Analysis of impact on religion including due regard to PSED (above).

The breakdown for groups in this Ward is as follows:

	Ward	LBHF
Christian	67.18%	63.65%
Buddhist	0.78%	0.77%
Hindu	0.67%	1.09%
Jewish	0.83%	0.79%
Muslim	5.71%	6.85%
Sikh	0.15%	0.19%
Any other religion	0.39%	0.43%
No religion	15.97%	17.64%
Religion not stated	8.31%	8.59%

(Census, 2001. Table KS07. Data may not be representative as responding to the Census question relating to religion was voluntary)

The ward is broadly in line with the borough, although there are some differences. There is a slightly higher proportion of Christians in the ward as compared to the borough (+3.53%), a lower proportion Muslims (-1.14), as well as of people with no religion (-1.67). There are some other differences but none is stark. The SPD will not be wholly relevant to this protected characteristic, however, people who are protected here may find improvements to housing (lifetime homes), transport, community facilities, and urban design of a small indirect benefit in that they (and all other policies) collectively seek to improve the area and make it safer, more attractive, and greener.

Sex

Analysis of impact on sex

Ward and borough data for gender is as follows:

	Ward	Borough
All males count	4,538	83,700
All males %	46.67%	49.6%
All females count	5,185	84,900
All females %	53.33%	50.4%

(Ward data – Census 2001. Table UV03. All comparative data – Revised Mid Year Estimates 2008)

There is a disparity between numbers of men and women for this Ward. There are more women than men (+2.93%) as compared to the borough profile. This may be explained by the difference in life expectancy for men and for women:

Life expectancy for men and women:

	Male Life Expectancy in Years	Female Life Expectancy in Years
H&F	78.1	84.3

(London Health Observatory, 2009)

This may also be explained by the proportions of lone parents households with dependant children, which is this ward is 10.32% as compared to 8.36% for the borough: a difference of +1.96%. With reference to gender, 91% of single parent households of all age groups are headed by women, of whom only 16% are in full-time employment in the borough (2001 census).

Chapter 8: Housing Strategy

This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to men and women. For example, the intermediate housing is expected to cover a range of intermediate housing products including shared equity, key worker, discounted market sale/rent and shared ownership and be affordable to a range of household incomes. The diverse range of delivery methods for housing as given here will help women proportionately more, who may be in lower paid jobs as compared to men. The gender pay gap is at just under 10% (ONS, Nov 2011). This, balanced with market housing which is open to all age groups, will help to promote equality of opportunity between younger and older

people. As set out in the SPD, any application will be expected to provide a range of unit sizes within the market housing provision and special consideration should be given to the provision of family units (3 bedrooms or more). This will help men and women.

As per strategic policy H4 (Core Strategy 2011), all new housing should be built to lifetime homes standards, with a minimum of 10% of those units to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users. This also has other benefits for those with small children as such units are more accessible for people with buggies and pushchairs. This will benefit men and women with small children.

This chapter requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor's minimum standards. It also requires new communal children's play space will normally be provided in new residential development that requires family accommodation. Children's play space should be accessible and cater for younger, older, and disabled children. As such, this will have an indirect positive benefit for parents.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9. This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter is of medium relevance to parents with small children, as it seeks to facilitate ease of access in the urban environment and remove physical barriers.

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. Parsons Green

and Putney Bridge do not however have step free access. Imperial Wharf is within the SFRRRA and given it only opened in 2009 this does have step free access. Improvements are not proposed to Parsons Green or Putney Bridge, (e.g. step-free access and so on), which would usually have a positive impact on parents with small children in buggies and pushchairs. Imperial Wharf is accessible and Fulham Broadway underground station which can be reached via a bus or walking is also step free. In terms of the river service all piers are wheelchair accessible, most riverboats are accessible. As such, the relevance to men and women will be low, since although the extra capacity would have a positive impact on all, there are no further specific elements of relevance to Sex.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new homes in the SFRRRA. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) which would have a positive impact on parents, as these would provide places to meet and to socialise. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Any planning application submitted for a SFR site would have to be assessed against these formulas in order to ascertain the anticipated increase in the nursery, primary and secondary school numbers and seek suitable financial contributions in order to create the capacity for this additional demand and as such any potential indirect negative impact on male and female parents should be mitigated. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods : Play and Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of SPD), which will benefit those with children, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will benefit parents. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, giving reassurance to men and women however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of relevance to Sex, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning application.

	Sexual Orientation	<p>Analysis of impact on sexual orientation</p> <p>Research relating to LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) population estimates notes that:</p> <p><i>In 2005, the Department for Trade and Industry published a figure of 6% as the percentage of LGBT people in the general population as part of its research in relation to new equalities legislation. The number of LGBT people in London is thought to be anywhere between 6% and 10% of the total population, increased by disproportionate levels of migration. This equates to an urban population of between 450,000 and 750,000 people.</i></p> <p>[Kairos in Soho: p27, 2007]</p> <p>This estimate does include other groups (Transgender).</p> <p>None of the chapters has, so far, emerged as relevant to this protected characteristic. However, people who are protected here may find improvements to housing (lifetime homes), transport, urban design, and social infrastructure of a small indirect benefit in that they (and all other policies) collectively seek to improve the area and make it safer, more attractive, and greener.</p>
<p>Human Rights and Children's Rights</p> <p>Will it affect Human Rights, as defined by the Human Rights Act 1998? No: none of the chapters within the SFR SPD is expected to have an impact on Human Rights.</p> <p>Will it affect Children's Rights, as defined by the UNCRC (1992)? Yes: see below</p> <p><u>Chapter 8: Housing Strategy</u> This chapter contains several aims that are relevant to children, both directly and indirectly. As set out in the SFR SPD, any application will be expected to provide a range of unit sizes within the market housing provision and special consideration should be given to the provision of family units (3 bedrooms or more). This will help younger people with children to be housed in suitable accommodation, and this will indirectly benefit children who will have</p>		

more space to grow. This chapter requires amenity space as per current UDP and proposed DM DPD, and the Mayor's minimum standards. It also requires new communal children's play space will normally be provided in new residential development that requires family accommodation. Children's play space should be accessible and cater for younger, older, and disabled children. As such, this will have a direct positive impact on children. In this regard, this Chapter supports Children's Rights to survival and development, to leisure, and upholds the rights of disabled children.

Chapter 9: Urban Design Strategy

This chapter aims to facilitate high quality design, a connected waterfront, and a high level of connectivity and permeability. It also refers to the provision of play spaces, which this EqIA deals with under Chapter 8: Housing Strategy and there is nothing additional to analyse in this regard for Chapter 9. This chapter requires that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all, with all proposals having regard to the Council's Access For All SPD. In this regard, this chapter supports children in general, and upholds the rights of disabled children by removing physical barriers in the urban environment.

Chapter 10: Development Capacity Study

The purpose of this chapter is to use a 3D model to test the spatial capacity of the area to see if it can accommodate different options regarding housing and employment growth. Given that these are directly linked with Chapters 8 and 9, and will depend on other factors such as the transport study, equality impacts are given elsewhere in this EqIA.

Chapter 11: Transport Interventions

This Chapter sets out the potential development scenarios and improvements to transport. The improvements to transport are mainly given in terms of capacity and the balance with the amenity of the area. Fulham Broadway has lift access between the platform and the street. Parsons Green and Putney Bridge do not however have step free access. Imperial Wharf is within the SFRRRA and given it only opened in 2009 this does have step free access. Improvements are not proposed to Parsons Green or Putney Bridge, (e.g. step-free access and so on), which would usually have a positive impact on children who may not find the built environment as easy to navigate as adults. Imperial Wharf is accessible and Fulham Broadway underground station which can be reached via a bus or walking is also step free. In terms of the river service all piers are wheelchair accessible, most riverboats are accessible, and most new riverboats have dedicated wheelchair spaces. As such, this Chapter would not specifically engage Children's Rights, since although the extra capacity would have a positive impact on children; there are no specific elements of further relevance to them.

Chapter 12: Social Infrastructure

This Chapter deals with the increase in social and community infrastructure required to support growth in new

homes in the SFRRRA. The first round of consultation identified uses for public space (12.2 of SPD: café, playground and areas for ball games) which would have a positive impact on children, as these would provide places to meet and to socialise, and to exercise, upholding their right to development. These would of course be subject to planning applications and so on. In terms of education and providing capacity to cope with the increase in numbers of children, child yield formulas will be used. Any planning application submitted for a SFR site would have to be assessed against these formulas in order to ascertain the anticipated increase in the nursery, primary and secondary school numbers and seek suitable financial contributions in order to create the capacity for this additional demand and as such any potential negative impact on children should be mitigated. Further, the Mayor's SPG Shaping Neighbourhoods : Play and Informal recreation 2012 will be used to determine levels of play space required (12.6 of SPD), which will benefit children, and other relevant policy (e.g. London Plan Policy 7.18 as given at 12.5 of the SPD) will be used to determine public space requirements, which will benefit all children, including disabled children. Again this will depend on planning applications that may be presented to the Council for consideration. The Chapter also assesses and notes that the new Primary Care Centre should be able to accommodate the additional GP/district nurses that are required alongside growth in the area, upholding children's health rights however the position will need to be regularly reviewed in relation to population projections to ensure local facilities can still accommodate the growth. Further, the Chapter is mindful of the changes in service provision (library and children's centre at 12.7 of the SPD) and is flexible and refers to CF1 of the Core Strategy which can respond to any future needs. As such, proposals for social infrastructure are of relevance to all children, considering their best interests, with outcomes expected to be positive and dependent on any related planning application.

Section 03	Analysis of relevant data and/or undertake research
Documents and data reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SFR SPD ▪ Borough profile 2010 ▪ Census data 2001 ▪ Ward Profile: Sands End Ward ▪ Live Births by Area of Residence 2010. From table 2a: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-222793 ▪ London Health Observatory, 2009 ▪ Office for National Statistics (ONS) <i>Gender pay gap falls below 10 per cent in 2011</i> http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/mro/news-release/annual-survey-of-hours-and-earnings-2011/ashe-2011-nr.html (23 November 2011), (accessed 09 December 2011) ▪ Kairos in Soho, <i>London's LGBT Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Project</i>, 2007

New research	No new research, although this final revised version of the SFR SPD has already been informed by two rounds of public consultation as well as feedback from two workshops facilitated by the Princes Foundation.
---------------------	--

Section 04	Undertake and analyse consultation
Consultation	<p>The first draft of The South Fulham Riverside SPD April 2011 went through a full public consultation exercise for six weeks during April/May 2011. A total of 119 responses were received. A schedule of comments received and the response to these comments including any changes required to the revised SPD are available on LBHF's website. The Consultation Summary Report and Statement of Consultation outline the method and outcome of the consultation including analysis of consultation responses. Summarised below are responses most likely to have relevance regarding equality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was doubt expressed whether a continuous river walkway could be achieved due the safeguarded wharves 2. There was concern that the proposed expansion of the Wandsworth Bridge/Townmead and Carnwath Road junction could worsen the pedestrian environment. 3. Concern was expressed that the proposals for the new library to be located at Hurlingham & Chelsea School was not in a central enough location to serve the whole community. Concern that a new library at Hurlingham & Chelsea School due to its location would discriminate against older and disabled people. 4. Chelsea Academy in RBKC would be unlikely to receive any children from LBHF therefore all future growth in school places should be accommodated within LBHF. 5. Concern was expressed regarding adhering to space standards in the Housing Design Guide (2009) for non grant funded residential units. 6. London Plan requires 10% of homes need to be adaptable to rather than designed to meet wheelchair standards 7. Objection to further development as existing infrastructure cannot accommodate it. 8. Objection that new areas of public space would be maintained by private developers who may lose interest and place restrictions on their operation. 9. Would expect all pedestrian routes to be accessible and inclusive. 10. There was concern that there were no proposals for step free access at underground stations. <p>The second draft of The South Fulham Riverside SPD went through a public consultation exercise for 6 weeks between March – May 2012. A total of 83 responses were received .The Consultation Summary Report and Statement of Consultation outline the method and outcome of the consultation including analysis of consultation responses. Summarised below are responses most likely to have relevance regarding equality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern regarding the closure of the Sands End Community Centre and its relocation of services to

	<p>Hurlingham and Chelsea School as it is not centrally located. Improvements are required to youth club provision in the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Concern regarding the onerous restrictions on the use of Imperial Wharf Park that means it does not serve the local community. 3. Concern that from Chelsea Harbour it is hard for cyclists to access the riverside walk, also better cycle paths and better signage especially at Wandsworth Bridge should be sought. 4. Requests that affordable housing and mixed communities to be prioritised. 5. Request that the nature of housing typologies should be left to the developer to consider in response to the market. 6. Would like it to be clear that the council is not limiting new homes to an additional 2,200. 7. The regeneration area has inadequate open space, as well as new space in the east of the area there should also be additional space at the Wandsworth Bridge location. 8. Children's play space should not be available to the wider public but specific to the scheme. 9. The SPD underplays how connectivity could be improved with the wider Lots Road /Kings Road area. 10. Concern that high rise new build developments do not attract local households or families with children 11. Seating on the public realm/river walkway should be designed to accommodate the elderly and disabled. 12. Concern that the proposed density will impact adversely on the infrastructure of the area, especially traffic 13. H&F Disability Forum welcome the improvements to the 424 and 391 buses that will make a real difference to disabled people. 14. Important to make Wandsworth Bridge more acceptable to pedestrians. 15. RBKC also has concerns regarding the proposed location of education and health facilities which they consider relatively distant from sites in the east of the regeneration close to the boundary with RBKC. 16. There is concern that if there was growth in the area of 4,000 additional homes that this could necessitate the provision of new health facilities.
Analysis	<p><u>First Round of Consultation</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objective remains in the SPD to have a continuous riverside walk from Broomhouse Dock to Chelsea Harbour. Currently cyclists and pedestrians have to leave the river walk where the safeguarded wharves are located and rejoin it further down. When safeguarded wharves come up for redevelopment at planning application stage the option to continue the path will be considered however where not possible it will be important to ensure a accessible and inclusive alternative is provided. This will benefit all groups but

- specifically the elderly and disabled.
2. The expansion of the junction at Wandsworth Bridge/Townmead and Carnwath Roads is essential to accommodate the growth in homes and jobs in the area. The proposed improvement to the junction will provide formal pedestrian crossing facilities which should benefit all equality groups but especially the elderly and disabled
 3. The decision to close the Sands End Community Centre and re-provide the facilities in various locations was a decision taken prior to the draft SPD and a dedicated Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken as part of the Cabinet approval process.
 4. The SPD has taken into account that the admissions policy to Chelsea Academy in RBKC will restrict access from children in LBHF. The SPD has considered child yield linked to the anticipated growth in new homes to predict the impact this will have on school numbers to ensure adequate capacity is in place to accommodate this increase within LBHF and not impact negatively on any groups.
 5. The London Plan (2011) includes minimum space standards for all new housing in Policy 3.5 which has been emphasised in the SPD and will benefit all equality groups.
 6. The SPD has been updated to reflect strategic policy H4 in the Core Strategy that all new housing should be built to “Lifetime Homes” standards with 10% to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents that are wheelchair users.
 7. Concern has been expressed that the existing infrastructure in area cannot accommodate the anticipated growth in the SPD which could adversely affect all equality groups. The SPD however fully considers existing provision, identifies gaps and proposes new infrastructure to accommodate the proposed growth in homes and jobs. Chapter 11 identifies required transport interventions and chapter 12 considers social infrastructure. Chapter 14 outlines the outcome from the Delivery Infrastructure Funding (DIF) Study which lists the required infrastructure items and the mechanism to collect contributions.
 8. Concern has been raised regarding the intention in the SPD that new areas of public open space would be maintained by private developers. The concern is that developers may lose interest and place restrictions on their operation. When planning applications are submitted conditions will be attached to approvals that relate to detailed design, maintenance and opening hours etc.
 9. The SPD already makes it clear in section 9.8 that all buildings, streets and public spaces should be designed to be inclusive and accessible for all and all proposals should have regard to the Council’s “Access for All” SPD. It is important that this is considered in more detail at planning application stage. This will benefit all equality groups but specifically the elderly and disabled.
 10. As regards step free access at underground stations it is detailed in the text above that Fulham Broadway and Imperial Wharf have step free access but Putney Bridge and Parsons Green do not. There are no

proposals in the SPD to fund this as there are other transport and infrastructure funding priorities.

Second Round of Consultation

1. The decision to close the Sands End Community Centre and re-provide the facilities in various locations was a decision taken prior to the draft SPD and a dedicated Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken as part of the Cabinet approval process. The process was started in the Delivery and Infrastructure Funding (DIF) Study (background paper to the SPD) regarding the anticipated infrastructure required linked to the anticipated growth in new homes. This position will be regularly reviewed to ensure adequate services are in place and available linked to actual growth.
2. The guidance in the SPD makes it clear that new areas of public open space will need to improve on the standards provided at Imperial Park.
3. There are proposals in the SPD for a step change in the walking and cycling environment both within and to/from the regeneration area and ensuring improved legibility and connections.
4. This SPD does not create new policy but provides more detailed guidance to support the objectives in the Core Strategy. A key principle in Chapter 8 relates to Core Strategy Policy H2 that requires 40% of residential units on sites with the capacity for 10 or more self contained units should be affordable subject to viability and in accordance with strategic policy H2. In addition Core Strategy policy H2 aims to achieve more mixed and balanced communities and to reduce social and economic polarisation by improving the mix of affordable housing in the borough.
5. The Core Strategy has a strategic objective that relates to the need to increase the supply and choice of housing, with particular emphasis on the need for family sized housing. Rather than relying on the developer to choose the nature of housing typologies in response to the market the SPD expects to see a mix of unit sizes, with a significant quantum of larger family units.
6. The strategic policy for South Fulham Riverside regeneration area in the Core Strategy refers to a “target of 2,200 additional dwellings”. The SPD has however considered the implications of up to circa 4,000 homes potentially coming forward in the plan period. The council is not limiting new homes to an additional 2,200.
7. The SPD has thoroughly considered existing access to open space and promotes areas where new open space could be provided to address these deficiencies.
8. It is important that all children in the regeneration area have access to play space. In order to ensure this the provision of children’s play space will be determined using the Mayor of London’s “Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG 2012.
9. As regards how connectivity could be improved within the wider Lots Road /Kings Road area this has already been considered in the SPD and a potential connection to Lots Road is indicted in Figure 9.25.

- Connectivity and Permeability. Also 9.7.3 refers to this potential new link.
10. Concern has been expressed that high rise new build developments do not attract local households or families with children. The guidance regarding building height in the Chapter 9 of the SPD however is only identifying two key focal points that could accommodate increased massing and height.
 11. The guidance in the SPD requires that all public spaces are designed be inclusive and accessible for all and that proposals should have regard to the Council's "Access for All" SPD which will be superseded by the Planning Guidance SPD in 2013. This will ensure the public realm/river walkway are designed to accommodate the elderly and disabled.
 12. The SPD and DIF Study have fully considered potential growth in the regeneration area in excess of that proposed in the Core Strategy to ensure that it will not impact adversely on the infrastructure of the area, especially traffic
 13. The Council and TfL will continue to work closely to agree on the form and timescale of bus service enhancements in the regeneration area. Specific changes to existing bus services or the introduction of new services will be subject to specific consultation that will be carried out by London Buses.
 14. Securing additional capacity and appropriate pedestrian crossing facilities at Wandsworth Bridge junction is a principle objective of the proposed highway interventions which make Wandsworth Bridge more acceptable to pedestrians.
 15. The DIF has considered all infrastructure needs linked to the growth in new homes and given an indication of when these facilities will need to be provided to support the new population. It will also be necessary to consider the proposed location of facilities linked to growth in new homes.
 16. The SPD makes it clear that health provision required to serve the area will need to be kept under review to ensure facilities are adequate to serve the growing population.

Section 05	Analysis of impact and outcomes
Analysis	Overall the objectives and key principles of the South Fulham Riverside SPD are unlikely to have any negative impact on the protected characteristics, and in general the key principles of the SPD will have a positive impact of differing levels on the protected characteristics (except where they are non-applicable).

Section 06	Reducing any adverse impacts
-------------------	-------------------------------------

Outcome of Analysis	<p>This EIA has not found any evidence of unlawful discrimination and in the main, equality issues have, as set out in this EIA, been captured and responded to appropriately, with some being of more relevance to some protected groups than others.</p> <p>Any planning application submitted in the SFR area would have to be assessed against child yield formulas in order to ascertain the anticipated increase in the nursery, primary and secondary school numbers and seek suitable financial contributions in order to create the capacity for this additional demand and as such any potential negative impact on children, various age groups, and male and female parents should be mitigated.</p> <p>The DIF Study considered growth predictions in the Core Strategy and linked this to an assessment of infrastructure required to support this growth. Periodically the actual growth will need to be assessed and more detailed assessment made of the required infrastructure to ensure cover is adequate and action taken if this is not the case. This is important to avoid any negative impact on protected groups.</p>
----------------------------	---

Section 07	Action Plan					
Action Plan	Issue identified	Action (s) to be taken	When	Lead officer	Expected outcome	Date added to business/service plan
	Potential increase in school children due to development	Child yield formula to be used to assess any application that comes in to the Council	At the time any application might come in	South Team	Financial contribution from developer in order to mitigate as set out at 12.3 of the SFR SPD	This will become adopted policy as date of adoption of the SFR SPD
	Increase in demand for health services	Regularly review the growth in new homes to ensure adequate health provision is provided.	At regular six monthly intervals.	Planning Regeneration Team	Review Section 106 contributions to ensure adequate health provision is provided.	This will become adopted policy as date of adoption of the SFR SPD

	Increase in demand for community facilities.	Regularly review the growth in new homes to ensure adequate community facilities are provided.	At regular six monthly intervals.	Planning Regeneration Team	Review Section 106 contributions to ensure adequate community facilities are provided.	This will become adopted policy as date of adoption of the SFR SPD
--	--	--	-----------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--

Section 08	Agreement, publication and monitoring					
Chief Officer sign-off	Name: Juliemma McLoughlin Position: Head of Planning Regeneration Email: juliemma.mcloughlin@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No: Tel: 020 8753 3565 (direct line)					
Key Decision Report	Confirmation that key equalities issues found here have been included: Yes					
Opportunities Manager for advice and guidance only	Name: Carly Fry Position: Opportunities Manager Date advice / guidance given: 22 February 2012 Email: PEIA@lbhf.gov.uk Telephone No: 020 8753 3430					