

Local Development Framework  
London Borough of Newham



## **Equalities and the Local Development Framework in Newham**

February 2011

For further information please refer to the Council's website: [www.newham.gov.uk](http://www.newham.gov.uk)

Alternatively, contact Spatial Planning and Regeneration Policy on 0208 430 2639

or email [ldf@newham.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@newham.gov.uk).

# Equalities and the Local Development Framework in Newham: February 2011

Introduction .....	4
Purpose .....	4
What is the Local Development Framework (LDF) ? .....	4
How has this work been undertaken? .....	4
A 'live' document.....	5
Structure of the document .....	5
Newham's Approach to Equality and Community Cohesion .....	5
Building Common Ground - developing our shared aims and interests ....	6
Mixing Communities - encouraging contact between people from different backgrounds .....	7
Promoting Fairness- avoiding jealousy, suspicion and prejudice.....	8
Engagement Undertaken .....	8
Prevalence and distribution of equalities groups in Newham .....	10
Newham's diversity .....	10
Equalities groups within Newham – spatial patterns and overlaps. ....	12
<i>Ethnic groups, recently arrived migrants and asylum seekers</i> .....	12
<i>People of Faith</i> .....	13
<i>Disabled People and Carers</i> .....	13
<i>Older people</i> .....	14
<i>Younger people</i> .....	14
<i>Women, including lone parents, and those who take on the majority of childcare and home-making</i> .....	14
<i>LGBT people</i> .....	15
Issues and Aspirations Relevant to Spatial Planning in Newham by Equalities Group.....	15
Deprivation, Regeneration and Equalities Groups .....	15
Older People, Disabled People and their Carers .....	16
Ethnic groups, (other than gypsy travellers) recently arrived migrants and asylum seekers.....	17
Gypsy-Travellers.....	19
People of faith.....	19
Younger People .....	21
Women including lone parents and those that take on the majority of child-care and home-making.....	22
LGBT people.....	23
Conclusions and Action Points.....	23
Conclusions and the policy formulation checklist.....	23
Action Points – Core Strategy Proposed Submission Stage.....	25
References .....	27

Appendix 1: Summary Checklist for consideration through the LDF to ensure equality of opportunity, social and environmental justice and social inclusion and cohesion – as applied at the Core Strategy Choices stage (policy directions/scoping) .....28

Appendix 2: Summary Checklist for consideration through the LDF to ensure equality of opportunity, social and environmental justice and social inclusion and cohesion – as applied at Proposed Submission Stage (draft policies).....34

## ***Introduction***

### **Purpose**

This paper is intended firstly, to set out the information and understanding we have gathered regarding equalities groups<sup>1</sup> in Newham and their particular needs, issues and aspirations that we need to be aware of in the process of equalities impact assessment of spatial planning strategies and policies. As such, it is intended to be of relevance not only for the Core Strategy, but also other Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents which together comprise the Local Development Framework (LDF). This understanding is carried through into a checklist against which policy directions, options, and draft policies can be assessed. This has been and will continue to be applied as the LDF develops, which conclusions and action points amended accordingly, and the relevant matrix added as a new appendix. This second aspect to the paper is what is more typically understood as an Equalities Impact Assessment, though is in effect a summary part of it.

### **What is the Local Development Framework (LDF) ?**

The Local Development Framework is, together with the London Plan, the borough's statutory Development Plan, by which it directs the location and nature of investment in the area. This occurs mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission, but also by the Plan helping to influence wider investment decisions. The objective of the LDF is to direct this investment to to best effect, maximising the positive social, environmental and economic impacts of development for the benefit for the community as a whole.

### **How has this work been undertaken?**

The process of information-gathering and assessment has occurred concurrently with a wider process of issues and options scoping and evidence base generation, both prior to, and subsequently alongside, the development of policies, commencing May 2010. This work has been undertaken by the LDF (Spatial Planning and Regeneration Team) in close liaison with colleagues in Corporate Policy and Research, drawing on a process of continuous engagement with stakeholders, including local residents

---

<sup>1</sup> Equalities groups are those covered by legislation concerned to prevent discrimination and promote equality of opportunity on grounds of gender, age, race/ethnicity, faith, sexual orientation, disability and caring responsibilities, and socio-economic background. They therefore conventionally comprise the following [and any combination – inequality is often experienced on multiple grounds]:

- Older and younger people and their carers
- People of different faiths
- People of different, (particularly minority) ethnic backgrounds, including gypsy-travellers
- Lesbian, Gay, Trans-sexual and Transgender people
- People with disabilities and their carers
- Women
- Less affluent socio-demographic groups.

themselves. It has also been published for consultation during the recent Choices consultation on the Core Strategy) as an appendix to the Sustainability Appraisal) and will be published again for consultation, as updated, alongside the Proposed Submission Draft of the Core Strategy.

### **A 'live' document**

This document is however, not an end-point, and we will continue to re-visit the equalities evidence base as engagement and other research continues, updating and widening our understanding. This is particularly relevant as we work within a wider corporate research, consultation and engagement context to avoid consultation fatigue and make best use of resources. The document will also be added to as the LDF evolves, and hence as the spatial planning approach to equalities becomes more comprehensively based on a series of documents that have been formulated through an 'equalities aware' process. It will provide evidence of this process at appropriate points, and comment on the evolving picture in the conclusion.

### **Structure of the document**

The paper firstly sets out the corporate approach to equalities, which provides the context to this work. It then details the engagement undertaken with equalities groups or representatives of them, both directly in connection with the LDF, and indirectly through events and exercises with wider corporate purposes. Our understanding of the prevalence, overlap and spatial distribution of such groups (both through residence and their day-to-day activities) in Newham is then set out. From this, it is possible to draw out an understanding of how development in particular areas, and the borough as a whole needs to be sensitive to the needs and aspirations of equalities groups. Lastly, the particular needs and aspirations of such groups that we have identified both through engagement and other resources<sup>2</sup> as relevant to spatial planning, are highlighted, whilst reflecting on the commonalities between them, and those expressed by the wider population.

The conclusion presents a structured way of approaching equalities issues in the LDF going forward, enabling a proactive and focused approach to equalities impact assessment. It also reports on the application of the 'checklist' derived to the development of policies in the Core Strategy, and resultant action points.

### ***Newham's Approach to Equality and Community Cohesion***

Newham's approach to Equality and Diversity is about ensuring all of our residents are able to take full advantage of opportunities and fulfil their potential. The Council's values, policies and services are designed to ensure we both meet our legal duties but are also actively working to eliminate inequality and continue to ensure a community where individuals are valued

---

<sup>2</sup> Notably the Mayor of London's SPG Equality and Diversity in Planning; see also the references section at the end of the paper.

for their differences while having a strong sense of belonging to Newham as a place. This is underpinned by a clear commitment to:

- Treating individuals equally and respectfully.
- Using research to establish where there is disadvantage and ensure we understand and tackle its causes
- Eliminating unfair discrimination based on age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, belief and class (socio-economic status).
- Ensuring everyone has the opportunity to fully participate in community engagement and decision making.
- Building the capacity of individuals to realise their aspirations.
- Valuing diversity as a community leader, an employer and a service provider.

### **Building Common Ground - developing our shared aims and interests**

Newham's population is made up of residents from many different backgrounds and cultures which makes the borough a unique, vibrant and interesting place to be. We strongly believe in celebrating the richness of the borough's diversity, as it is important to celebrate our differences as well as our similarities. However, we also believe that diversity can only be truly appreciated if people from different backgrounds come together, whether it be through events, activities or accessing public or community services, in order that individuals can understand and appreciate differences.

The Council has a key role to play in providing community leadership and ensuring that every resident and visitor to the borough feels welcome and part of the community. We recognise that it is important that alongside diversity there exist certain norms and shared goals. A common civic identity that is recognised by everybody, irrespective of their background is key to ensuring a strong sense of community cohesion and a feeling of belonging to both our local neighbourhood and Newham as a place. That is why we believe it is important for us to encourage the development of the things we have in common.

Our approach to maintaining a strong sense of community cohesion is therefore built on an approach which ensures:

- **We celebrate diversity through encouraging people from different backgrounds to come together at events or activity which are open to everyone in the community, rather than the Council providing activity for single groups.** We do this because it is only through people from different backgrounds sharing different experiences and cultures that we truly have a diverse community. The alternative is a place made up of many different groups and different communities with a danger that they do not mix and lead separate lives. Separation and ignorance of others can lead to people judging each other on only one aspect of their

identity rather than for who they are and for them being part of the wider community of Newham.

- **An approach to service provision and community capacity building which underpins this - with a clear focus on ensuring services are not provided to a single section of the community but are accessible and open to everyone.** This is key to ensuring a sense of fairness and encouraging people from different backgrounds to come together. When services are provided to only one part of the community this can lead, rightly or wrongly, to suspicion, jealousy and a perceived sense of unfairness where others are seen to receive more or better services. In taking a mainstream approach to service provision we recognise that sometimes people and certain groups within the community face barriers which prevent them accessing services or facilities. In these circumstances the Council has a duty to ensure we remove these barriers.
- **An shared aspiration across all Newham residents for greater prosperity.** Newham is one of the most deprived boroughs in the country and all residents irrespective of age, race or faith want greater prosperity for themselves and their children. As well as overseeing the physical regeneration of the borough, we want to encourage a social regeneration in which residents feel a stronger sense of belonging to Newham. Our calendar of cultural and sporting events is a key part of this strategy, and is the largest council run programme of events in the country. The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games represent a golden opportunity to further encourage people to get involved in their community through sport, volunteering and other activities.
- **A community built on a common language.** In order to be part of the community and to build relationships with different people, everyone must be able to communicate effectively. We believe it is essential that everyone can speak English. We provide translation services so that nobody is barred from accessing services, but we believe the long term emphasis must be on encouraging and assisting people to learn English. If we do not encourage individuals to learn English this can lead in the long term to increased isolation from the rest of the community, a reliance on a single section of the community for social interaction and a inefficient use of public resource. Above all, an individual who cannot engage with the rest of the community misses out on the opportunity to appreciate different cultures and access events and services which improve their long term quality of life, for example, opportunities to gain new skills and confidence to access jobs and training.

### **Mixing Communities - encouraging contact between people from different backgrounds**

Cohesion requires regular communication between people from different backgrounds. This helps build relationships, develop a common sense of purpose and dispel myths and suspicion. We are committed to doing

everything possible to build mixed communities and to enable the people of Newham to build strong relationships with other members of the community. We believe that in the interests of cohesion, our neighbourhoods must be mixed by class, ethnicity and tenure. Our housing policy aims to create sustainable, mixed communities that reflect the diversity of the borough as a whole.

In addition to mixed housing, there are other important areas which provide opportunities for contact between communities. Employment is essential to community cohesion. Work brings people into contact with others from different backgrounds, providing the opportunity to dispel ignorance and build relationships. Accordingly, we have made tackling worklessness a priority.

Our sporting and cultural events also provide occasions for people to meet others different from themselves. Events such as the Under the Stars festival, which every year attracts around 40,000 people to enjoy a wide variety of music, and which are aimed at the whole community.

### **Promoting Fairness- avoiding jealousy, suspicion and prejudice**

In order for community cohesion to exist there must be a sense that everyone is treated fairly and has equal access to public services. We are determined to avoid jealousy, suspicion and prejudice, and we are committed to even-handedness and transparency in the provision of all of our services. That is why we have a system which allocates housing, as far as is possible, based on waiting time. This 'first come, first served' principle is clear, fair and challenges perceptions of favouritism that undermine community cohesion.

### ***Engagement Undertaken***

The following is a summary of the LDF Equalities Groups Engagement Log, which records engagement activities drawn upon because they can be interrogated by equality group, or contribute some understanding as regards the lives of such groups in Newham. Whilst in general a mainstreaming approach has been followed, with engagement activities designed and monitored to ensure that they incorporate a range of views from residents from all walks of life, these have been supplemented with some specific engagement with those groups that are 'typically under-represented' in mainstream consultation. This can also help to give us a more clearly articulated steer as to specific issues faced by particular equalities groups, rather than them being subsumed by the majority view (although the latter is of no less importance).

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Which Equalities Group covered?</b>	<b>LDF or other consultation?</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Survey facilitated by external company for the LDA	2005	Gypsy-travellers	Olympic site planning	Survey of gypsy-travellers living on site within the Olympic Park



<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Which Equalities Group covered?</b>	<b>LDF or other consultation?</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Focus Group on AAP Vision and Objectives	September 2008	Young People (under 18)	LDF consultation	
Postcard questionnaires at the Newham Show re issues and spatial preferences	July 2009	Ethnicity, Age, Gender	LDF consultation	Very small sample
Evidence Base Studies' Surveys	September-November 2009	Ethnicity, faith, disability, age	LDF research on shopping habits, business needs/views and housing need	Consumer survey sample size 1000, housing need survey 1800.
Visioning workshops	January 2010	Disabled people and carers, faith groups, young people (14-18)	LDF consultation	Via LSP reps invited as strategic stakeholders and Youth Council meeting
Evidence Base Discussion Event	February 2010	Disabled people; all - via people that work with Newham's demographically diverse population.	LDF consultation	Via umbrella groups invited as specialist stakeholders, and other stakeholders working in the borough.
Corporate Focus Groups on issues in Newham and the future (SCS/SES link)	January 2010-August 2010	With disabled people, carers, older people, young adults, LGBT people, people with families, with a mix of faith, ethnicity, income, geographic and age groups as appropriate; plus deaf people, housed Irish travellers, housed Roma, children in care, the Youth Council and BAME groups.	Corporate consultation	
Corporate Surveys – Liveability, Place, Annual Residents' , Young People's	2009-10	Some information provided by age and ethnic group. Also a separate Young People's Survey of secondary school children.	Corporate consultation	

Activity	Date(s)	Which Equalities Group covered?	LDF or other consultation?	Notes
Meetings with representative/ umbrella Groups	October 2009- August 2010 (and ongoing)	Gypsy Travellers; Minority Ethnic Groups; LGBT people; 3 <sup>rd</sup> sector faith etc groups;	LDF consultation, SES consultation	As contact is established, we aim to encourage participation in mainstream stakeholder events
Youth Council Meeting and activities related to EDS/LDF	July 2010	Young People	LDF/EDS/Stratford Masterplan	
Stakeholder workshop on draft EDS/potential Core Strategy Choices	July 2010	Disabled people; all - via people that work with Newham's demographically diverse population.	Joint LDF/EDS consultation	Via umbrella groups/specialist charities invited as specialist stakeholders, and other stakeholders working in the borough.
Stakeholder workshop on Choices for the Core Strategy	November 2010	People of faith; ethnicity; all all - via people that work with Newham's demographically diverse population.	LDF consultation	Via umbrella groups invited as specialist stakeholders, and other stakeholders working in the borough.

## ***Prevalence and distribution of equalities groups in Newham***

### **Newham's diversity**

Newham, in common with many inner London authorities is a visibly (and audibly) diverse and young borough, which in relation to equalities groups means that<sup>3</sup>:

- Varied ethnic groups are more prominent than elsewhere in England, and even than in many parts of London. At the last census people of a non-white British background accounted for around two thirds of the population, and indications are that this has increased since, particularly with recent waves of immigration from European Accession countries, as reflected in GLA modelling<sup>4</sup>. The Annual Pupil Leaving Census in 2009 found that nearly 200 different languages were spoken by school pupils at home, and 71% of children were from families where English was not the preferred language spoken at home.
- Christian and Muslim faith groups are the most prominent, (55% and 23% of the population respectively) but Christianity is less commonly practised than elsewhere, and Islam more so; Hindus and Sikhs are also present in

<sup>3</sup> Census and ONS data accessed from ONS (Neighbourhood Statistics Online), GLA data accessed from Newham INFO (Newham statistical portal) and data.london.gov.uk .

<sup>4</sup> GLA data estimates that in 2010, Newham's white population is 28.8% of its total population. Source: 2009 Ethnic Group Projections - SHLAA

relatively high numbers (8% and 1.5% respectively). However people with no faith also equate to 11% of the population<sup>5</sup>. Differences between the latest figures and the 2001 census figures suggest that Christian and Hindu groups may be increasing in prominence in the borough relative to Muslims and Sikhs.

- Newham bucks the general trend of ageing populations - older people form a much smaller, and declining proportion of the population than elsewhere (latest estimates are that over 65s account for 7.5% of the population<sup>6</sup>). Conversely, those under 25 account for around 37% of the population<sup>7</sup>.
- Gender is roughly balanced, as might be expected, except among older people due to the longer life expectancy of women; GLA modelling also suggests that the proportion of females in the population is slowly increasing<sup>8</sup>. However, lone parents by the last census were recorded at distinctively high levels compared to elsewhere in London and England as a whole, as were people who were full-time home-makers and carers (in both cases, known to be predominantly women).
- Though information about sexuality is hard to come by, census data about people living in same-sex couples points to a relatively small LGBT population (around 580 people, or 0.3% of the over 16 population). This is borne-out by more recent ONS data on civil partnerships, which shows much lower rates than other Inner London authorities (around 50 instead of several hundred annually). Modelled results of a recent household survey suggest that there are around 750 households in Newham (0.7%)<sup>9</sup>.
- Disabilities, long-term limiting illnesses and, associated carers, are present at relatively high levels in the borough. At the last census (2001) roughly one in 5 residents were found to be suffering from a limiting long term illness or disability and more than 1 in 3 households in Newham had at least one person with a limiting long term illness. More recent statistics are that around 26% of Newham's households had at least one person with limiting health problems, mainly mobility problems<sup>10</sup>, whilst around 5% of the population are in receipt of Disability Allowance<sup>11</sup>, 3% were blue badge holders with mobility problems<sup>12</sup>, and 0.5% are registered blind<sup>13</sup>.
- There are relatively high levels of people in routine and semi-routine occupations and relatively low levels of people in higher managerial and professional occupations (according to the 2001 census). Newham is considered the 6<sup>th</sup> most deprived local area in England when assessed by

---

<sup>5</sup> All figures modelled from Newham Housing Market Assessment Household Survey, 2009

<sup>6</sup> 2009 GLA Ethnic Group Projections for 2010 - SHLAA. The 2001 Census stated that over 65s represented 8.7% of the population

<sup>7</sup> Source: 2009 Ethnic Group Projections for 2010 - Low

<sup>8</sup> GLA Ethnic Group Projections 2009, suggest that in 2010 the male to female ratio was 49:51 and that by 2027 this will be 48:52

<sup>9</sup> 2009 Housing Market Assessment Household Survey

<sup>10</sup> 2009 Housing Market Assessment Household Survey

<sup>11</sup> 2009 ONS figures, using 2008 GLA low population projections for 2009

<sup>12</sup> 2007 Social Services Performance Team figures, using 2008 GLA low population estimates for 2007

<sup>13</sup> 2006 Social Services Performance Team figures, using 2008 GLA low population estimates for 2006

the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007, particularly on the grounds of income and the extent of deprivation.

### **Equalities groups within Newham – spatial patterns and overlaps.**

The following section looks at each equalities group (and some sub-groups) in more detail, considering spatial patterns in their use of variation in their places of residence, and other uses of space and overlaps in group membership where possible<sup>14</sup>. It should be noted that deprivation and socio-economic equality is tackled as a borough-wide over-arching/cross-cutting issue in the main discussion section.

#### *Ethnic groups, recently arrived migrants and asylum seekers*

Recent household survey data<sup>15</sup> modelled as part of the LDF technical evidence base suggests that the most ethnically-mixed community forum areas (with a fairly even mix of ethnic groups) are Plaistow, Green St and East Ham, though East Ham is a focus for Asian groups, especially Indians, and Plaistow is a slight focus for people of Bangladeshi origin. In turn, Manor Park has the largest non-white population, followed by East Ham whilst Royal Docks is the most 'white' area, closely followed by Beckton, Canning Town-Custom House, and Stratford-West Ham, though a significant proportion of this population is non-white British, particularly in Stratford-West Ham. Asian populations are most focused in East Ham and Manor Park (though Manor Park is more of a focus for Pakistani communities, East Ham Indian and 'other'). Black-African and Black Caribbean people are most concentrated in Forest Gate and Canning Town, though Black Africans are also a relatively significant component of the population in Stratford-West Ham, Beckton and Royal Docks. Royal Docks has the highest Chinese population.

This largely corresponds to data from a survey of town centre businesses, (2009)<sup>16</sup> which showed that the highest levels of black, Asian and minority ethnic group workforce composition were in Green St, East Beckton and East Ham town centres, with the highest levels of businesses only employing white people seen in Canning Town and Forest Gate town centres. Forest Gate would be the anomaly here – given the community forum area has one of the lower white populations, but this may reflect the smaller nature of the centre compared to the extent of the community forum area.

In turn, information about the shopping patterns of different ethnic groups from a 2009 consumer survey<sup>17</sup> shows similarly that Green Street is an important shopping destination for Asian people and Chinese people, though for people of Indian origin East Ham, East Beckton and Forest Gate are also significant destinations, and for Chinese people, East Beckton. Black Caribbean people

---

<sup>14</sup> This section will be updated as new data becomes available. Not all data is available at lower than borough spatial levels (i.e. ward, lower super output area, community forum area etc).

<sup>15</sup> Undertaken as part of Newham Housing Market Assessment

<sup>16</sup> Undertaken as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study

<sup>17</sup> Undertaken as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study

are significant customers at Stratford and Forest Gate, whilst Black African people are more prominent users of East Beckton and Stratford. Green St is the only centre where people of white ethnicity are not the largest group of shoppers. Canning Town, Stratford and East Beckton are most dominated by white shoppers, with the second largest ethnic groups in these locations being Indian (Canning Town, East Beckton) and Black African (Stratford). Likewise key locations for ethnic shopping (food) are Green St, East Ham and Forest Gate plus local centres at Manor Park, Plaistow High Street, Abbey Arms, Greengate, North Woolwich and shops at Maryland. Stratford is also important for specialist ethnic non-food products.

Newham also has a small gypsy-traveller population living on a site in Stratford, (around 15 households) with an additional 2 communities of gypsy-travellers living in housed accommodation known to the Council's Education Service. The recent Housing Market Assessment household survey (2009) found only 1 family in its sample of households in Newham, suggesting numbers are lower than elsewhere in London, or at least very focused in where they live.

#### *People of Faith*

From the more up to date ethnicity data discussed above, plus local knowledge it is also possible to surmise that Islamic, Hindu and Sikh people are more likely to be focused in the centre of the borough from Plaistow through Green St to East Ham and Manor Park. Christian groups are likely to be more focused in Forest Gate, Stratford-West Ham, Canning Town-Custom House, Royal Docks and Beckton. This is largely supported by data from Aston Mansfield (2006) on the distribution of religious meeting places at that time. This found that whilst Christian meeting places were most numerous and reasonably equally spread throughout the borough, (presumably reflecting historic patterns) Muslim meeting places were clustered in the north and east of the borough (East Ham, Manor Park and Green Street, and to a lesser extent, Stratford and Plaistow), while Hindu meeting places were to be found in mainly in Green Street then East Ham, Stratford and Manor Park.

#### *Disabled People and Carers*

It can generally be assumed that carers and disabled people and/or those with a limiting long term illness will be co-located. At the last census, the Canning Town area had the highest proportion of the population reporting limiting long term illness, while Beckton has the lowest, whilst of permanently sick and disabled people were relatively evenly distributed across the borough, with slightly higher levels in the South West.

More recent data on claimant counts however, (Incapacity Benefit, August 2009) suggests that there are more disabled people not only in Canning Town and Custom House, (where disability is still more prominent than elsewhere in the borough) but also parts of Stratford and West Ham and much of the Royal Docks and Beckton community forum areas. Further high counts are found in pockets (individual lower super output areas) in Forest Gate, Green St and Manor Park. In contrast, the 2009 Housing Market Assessment Household

Survey found that the community forum areas with most people with life-limiting health problems were East Ham, Canning Town and Custom House and Plaistow. Overall the conclusion to be drawn appears to be that disabled people and carers are widely distributed across the borough, though Canning Town and Custom House is probably the area where more of the population have consistently been affected by disabilities.

Interestingly however, the 2009 Town Centre Business Survey showed that disabled people were less commonly employed in Canning Town and Forest Gate, with higher levels of workforce representation in East Beckton and Stratford, suggesting disabled people in Canning Town and Custom House may have more difficulty accessing the labour market locally.

### *Older people*

According to the latest GLA modelled population estimates<sup>18</sup>, higher proportions of older people are found in Plaistow, Green Street and East Ham. There are more older people amongst the white population and Black Caribbean population<sup>19</sup>. In addition, the 2001 census reported a correlation between age and disability/limiting long term illness, a pattern that continues to be found by recent household survey work<sup>20</sup>.

### *Younger people*

According to the latest GLA modelled population estimates<sup>21</sup>, higher proportions of under-15 year olds are found in East Ham, Manor Park and Canning Town and Custom House, whilst higher proportions of 15-24 year olds are found in Beckton, Canning Town and Custom House, Forest Gate and Green Street. Combined, Canning Town and Custom House, Green Street, Manor Park, East Ham and Stratford and West Ham have the highest levels of people aged 0-24. There are more younger people amongst Newham's BAME populations than the white population<sup>22</sup>.

### *Women, including lone parents, and those who take on the majority of childcare and home-making*

According to the latest GLA modelled population estimates<sup>23</sup>, higher proportions of women live in Canning Town and Custom House, and Stratford and West Ham. These also suggest that there are greater numbers of females amongst Black and Chinese populations<sup>24</sup>. According to the 2001 census, lone parents were present at highest levels in Canning Town and Custom House, and Beckton, and then Plaistow, West Ham, Royal Docks and Little Ilford.

---

<sup>18</sup> GLA 2008 low projections for 2010

<sup>19</sup> 2008 Round Ethnic Group Projections for 2010 - Low

<sup>20</sup> 2009 Housing Market Survey

<sup>21</sup> GLA 2008 low projections for 2010

<sup>22</sup> 2008 Round Ethnic Group Projections for 2010 - Low

<sup>23</sup> GLA 2008 low projections for 2010

<sup>24</sup> 2008 Round Ethnic Group Projections for 2010 - Low

Around 47% of town centre businesses surveyed in 2009 (Town Centre Business Survey) had more than 50% female staff; this was higher in Green St, Stratford, and East Beckton (the latter probably skewed by the large supermarket).

### *LGBT people*

There is no data available on the spatial distribution of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and transsexual people in the borough, and there are no obvious places of congregation of such groups equivalent to those elsewhere in London. However, it is important to recognise that the actual extent of the LGBT population is likely to be larger than recorded by the census co-habitation and civil partnership data, not least because people are more likely in some ethnic and faith groups prominent in Newham to hide their sexuality from friends and family.

## ***Issues and Aspirations Relevant to Spatial Planning in Newham by Equalities Group***

### **Deprivation, Regeneration and Equalities Groups**

Given the high levels of deprivation in Newham, and the well-established fact that many people who fall within one or more equalities group suffer from multiple deprivation due to a complex web of causal factors (MoL, 2007) impact on socio-economic inequality and deprivation is discussed here first as an over-arching issue.

In response, on the one hand, it is reasonable to expect that everyone will benefit to some extent from area-based improvements to job opportunities, environmental quality, housing choice and quality, crime prevention, community facilities etc. This is the Newham-wide 'regeneration' that the Council and its partners wish to achieve through spatial planning, addressing reinforcing spirals of decline to help to achieve 'convergence' with the rest of London. A wide 'catch-all' mechanism of this type is the well-established justification for area-based regeneration interventions as opposed to individualised interventions in deprivation that can get overly complex to administer. Indeed, to a large extent, engagement with different equalities groups suggests their main concerns are shared with the wider population: crime, grime, anti-social behaviour, jobs for local people, affordable housing and family housing and convenient and good quality facilities, although priorities may vary from group to group.

Conversely, multiple deprivation as experienced by equalities groups means that we need to take extra care to ensure people are not further disadvantaged through planning and development, and if possible, to tackle through carefully directed spatial investment particular barriers to opportunity that they face. This will partly be done through appropriate social, economic and environmental impact assessment. Whilst ostensibly, this is at the heart of the British planning system of nationalised development rights which seeks

to ensure that development occurs 'for the public good' weighing up costs and benefits, it is well known that some impacts/effects can be unevenly distributed socially and geographically. This is variously described by concepts such as environmental injustice, the failure of 'trickle down' and social exclusion and injustice. As such, sustainability appraisal, the key policy testing tool here, needs to be undertaken in the knowledge of these potentially distinctive or uneven impacts. The other concern will be to ensure that particular needs, where appropriate within the context of community cohesion, can be met (directly or indirectly) and aspirations addressed.

Therefore the two foci of the remainder of this section are the specific or priority needs and aspirations of, plus potential distinctive or uneven impacts on, particular equalities groups. This analysis is concluded by identifying the key equalities challenges for the LDF, and with a summary table which lists checkpoints relating to particular themes that need to be reflected in the Core Strategy, and subsequent LDF documents to meet equalities obligations.

Firstly however, a brief consideration of environmental injustice in Newham is appropriate given its relation to multiple deprivation and hence relevance to all marginalised equalities groups through this link (as discussed above) rather than groups-specific mechanisms.

#### *Environmental Injustice in Newham*

Newham as a whole suffers from a London-wide environmental injustice effect, whereby in being historically outside the more restrictive city boundaries, it became the disproportionately-favoured location for dirty, malodorous and noisy industry and infrastructure. In turn, this has meant historically that Newham has been a less desirable location within London, with cheaper land and rent, attracting poorer residents who are in turn less likely to complain about such land uses, despite being affected by them. As such, more deprived groups are likely to suffer more from environmental and health impacts.

Within Newham, this situation particularly applies to populations living in proximity to the sewerage works in the East, the airport to the South, and remnants of 'dirty industry' along the Lower Lea Valley in the West. The spatial response therefore must be to consider carefully whether any new housing is justified in close proximity to these sites, and in turn, whether any further development of this type should be allowed in these locations. Equally, particular attention to mitigation of existing impacts should be considered.

#### **Older People, Disabled People and their Carers**

Focus groups<sup>25</sup> have shown considerable overlap in the particular spatial concerns of these groups: crime, fear of crime, anti-social behaviour, the availability of specialist and generally good quality housing, good quality (safe, accessible, with adequate parking) public realm and buildings, healthier lifestyles, and conveniently-located facilities and services that people know

---

<sup>25</sup> As described in the engagement section



about, including opportunities for socialising (some clustering of specialist housing may help with this, and make it more peaceful). Related to this, the Housing Market Assessment Household Survey (2009) found about 4% of households (58% of those with special housing requirements) were in inappropriate housing in relation to a health condition of one or more of their members, primarily due to mobility-related issues. Recent corporate surveys<sup>26</sup> have also shown that disabled people are also more concerned about the economic downturn, particularly rising food and fuel costs, and are less satisfied with local services than others in Newham.

This corresponds to what the literature suggests we need to be sensitive to in relation to these groups, further pointing out the value of quality public realm and open space in enhancing people's mental health and well-being, and improving legibility, particularly for those with learning disabilities.

Quality, inclusive housing that is more energy efficient, more accessible and visible community infrastructure, improvements to the public realm and town centres, and increased job opportunities including support for intermediary mechanisms such as Workplace, will all be relevant development-linked responses here.

### **Ethnic groups, (other than gypsy travellers) recently arrived migrants and asylum seekers**

Newham is unusual in the extent of its non-white British population, and relatively high levels of community cohesion reported. As such, Black and Asian people, as well as white British people tend to be well represented in mainstream consultation events, including focus groups and surveys that are deliberately recruited to on a stratified basis. As a result, we can largely assume that the priorities expressed through these – namely crime and anti-social behaviour, public-realm environmental improvements, affordable and family housing and improved job opportunities are also those that would make most difference to Black and Asian groups as well as the white-British population.

Nonetheless, recent consumer survey work referred to above<sup>27</sup> highlights the importance of specialist ethnic retail provision in many of the borough's town and local centres and elsewhere, and that all town centres are clearly well-used by ethnic groups. Indeed, such shops and services are commonly places of social interaction as well as meeting specific consumer needs.. Many black, Asian and people from minority ethnic backgrounds are highly prominent business-owners and workers<sup>28</sup>, particularly in/of smaller shops

---

<sup>26</sup> The Liveability Survey 2009, Newham Annual Residents' Survey 2009. The latter found that 24% of disabled residents rated the local shopping facilities in Newham as 'poor' – compared to 15% of Newham residents overall; equivalent figures for parking services were 43% cf. 36%, and for policing were 25% cf. 18%.

<sup>27</sup> 2009, as part of the Retail and Town Centre Study

<sup>28</sup> ONS Population Survey 2009 found that of over 16 year olds employed as sales and consumer staff, 86% are from BAME groups.

and services, though in some cases, recent enforcement work suggests employment conditions are poor (notably in hot food takeaways). This indicates that future changes to these centres and other shops need careful consideration in relation to potential impacts on BAME groups, seeking to maintain an adequate range of affordable, smaller shop units and where appropriate, market stalls.

We are also however aware from recent corporate survey work<sup>29</sup> that Black and mixed race people are more concerned about the economic downturn than other ethnic groups, particularly the costs of food and fuel. Similarly, the Housing Market Assessment Household Survey (2009) identified that BAME people (particularly Asians) were more likely to be found in overcrowded households, and are more likely to be living in housing in a poor condition, or otherwise be unsuitably housed than the white British population. Indeed, ONS statistics<sup>30</sup> further report lower rates of employment, and higher rates of unemployment amongst BAME groups in Newham as compared to the borough average, and fewer are in management and professional positions than those from a white ethnic background<sup>31</sup>. This fits with the wider literature that refers to the need to pay particular attention to the need to address discrimination in the job market, and issues of multiple deprivation discussed above, whilst also promoting community cohesion. As such employment interventions such as Workplace are likely to be particularly important, as well as overall increasing job opportunities and promoting general community cohesion and integration to break down barriers. Providing more quality, affordable and family-sized housing that reduces fuel and other running costs will also be relevant spatial interventions.

Concerns about jobs and housing may in turn link to higher levels of stress and other mental health problems which are more common in BAME groups<sup>32</sup>. People working with such groups<sup>33</sup> have suggested that open space, and natural green space may be particularly important to bring relief to such conditions.

In addition, development control colleagues and the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector infrastructure workshop indicated the demand for community spaces from small, often minority-community groups, affected both by the lack of affordable new space and by access to more exclusive community facilities. This suggests the importance of continuing to facilitate multiple use and flexible re-use of premises, as discussed further below in relation to places of worship.

Lastly, in relation to recently-arrived migrants and asylum seekers, issues of temporary and affordable housing, access to healthcare and cheap transport

---

<sup>29</sup> Liveability Survey, 2009

<sup>30</sup> ONS, Annual Population Survey, June 2009 found that the employment rate for all working age residents in Newham is 56%, but for BAME residents is 49%; likewise the unemployment rate for over 16 year olds overall is 13.7%, but for BAME residents is 17.5%.

<sup>31</sup> ONS, Annual Population Survey, June 2009 found that of over 16 year olds employed in managerial and professional posts, only 36% were from a BAME background.

<sup>32</sup> NHS Newham/ LB Newham 2009 – Black (25.3%) and Asian (23.4%) women are particularly affected, as compared to white women (19.2%) or men in general (13.6%).

<sup>33</sup> See engagement schedule above

are reported in the literature to be particularly acute. It is also possible to envisage that informal social opportunities in public spaces and awareness of community facilities will also be important to this group.

## **Gypsy-Travellers**

Engagement with site-based gypsy travellers and those that work with them<sup>34</sup> raises the key concern that their current site is unfit for purpose, and their understanding that they have a high-level commitment (by the Mayor of London and OLPLC, plus the Mayor of Newham) that they will be able to move back onto a site within the Olympic Park boundary. Inadequacies relate to lack of privacy, safety and security, lack of space (both amenity and for parking etc), poor quality amenities and public realm, and poor management and maintenance. More generally, they express the desires to live in the Stratford vicinity where they have local connections, and in common with other groups, away from environmentally intrusive land uses such as landfill sites, pylons and busy roads, with some seclusion due to fear of intimidation and aggression, but within easy access of key facilities, including shops, education and health facilities. We are also advised that sites generally work best when planned in conjunction with neighbouring development, rather than being shoe-horned in afterwards, and that there is additional latent demand for pitches, due to a number of households currently being housed rather than provided with pitches.

Housed gypsy-travellers engaged with<sup>35</sup> are generally more satisfied with Newham, with particular value placed on its connectivity and facilities. There was particular ambition expressed for younger people, and a desire to have a site of their own, due to a certain amount of intolerance shown to them, and feelings of isolation. Accepting that this was difficult in London, housing close to each other was seen to be a reasonable alternative.

More broadly, the literature advises us of the extreme discrimination faced by gypsy-travellers, and the high levels of exclusion and deprivation they experience, both socially and in terms of employment and income. Problems of illegal encampments and frequent moves as injunctions are served due to inadequate pitch provision, lack of legal transit sites, and difficulties in purchasing and getting planning permission for sites themselves include disruption to health care, employment and schooling, as well as associated stress. Many gypsy-travellers also end up living on sites with extreme exposure to environmental risk, such as air and noise pollution, landfill hazards and flooding, with further associated health implications.

## **People of faith**

Engagement with faith groups and umbrella third sector organisations that work with faith groups suggests that whilst some traditional places of worship and other potential worship space is under-used (such as some smaller independent community centres) quite a lot of Newham's faith infrastructure is

---

<sup>34</sup> See engagement work referenced above

<sup>35</sup> Focus group, summer 2010 – engagement work referenced above.

at capacity. They report that many groups are already sharing worship space to the extent that it may be limiting their frequency of worship, linked community activities and so on. This is also evident by our contact with faith groups through the development control process, which sees a steady flow of applications for new worship and associated community facilities, often in inappropriate locations where loss of employment space would be involved, and access by means other than private car would be less convenient. Equally, it is clear that many faith groups in London travel some distance to worship – faith communities are not necessarily geographically-constrained as they once were, and congregations can be very large. However, we also know that some spaces (e.g. schools, traditional church buildings, some community centres not in council ownership) could be more intensively used by the community, including particular faith groups.

In line with the corporate community cohesion and sustainable communities approach, this suggests the need for a continued emphasis on multi-use, flexible facilities/spaces in accessible locations, (applied to both new and existing facilities/spaces) and facilitation of inter-faith/inter-congregation working to make co-ownership, -use and -development possible to meet local needs. This is particularly relevant given the diversity of faith (and non-faith) groups in Newham, and that the use of worship space tends to be highly cyclical, with peaks and troughs according to worship cycles and religious calendars. Facilitating access to places of worship elsewhere through improved cross-boundary connectivity may also be important, together with clear guidance to proponents of new, perhaps larger facilities as to where and in what form they are likely to be acceptable, where they address local needs. Again, in line with the corporate cohesion and sustainable communities approach, this will be about ensuring that such facilities are integrated (through their design and functioning/management) into the urban fabric, with minimal impact on residential amenity or employment potential, and easy access by non-car means.

The literature also draws our attention to the fact that some groups, perhaps because of their distinctive clothing or other aspects of appearance may live in fear of intimidation and crime due to religious intolerance. Indeed, bullying, primarily due to appearance is still found to be an issue by many young people (c. one fifth) according to the latest corporate survey<sup>36</sup>. This highlights the continued need to promote integration and cohesion, not least through opportunities for informal social contact, and discouraging segregated or specialist facilities and housing. Similarly, distinctive appearances and practices may mean that some faith groups are more likely to suffer from employment discrimination, finding it difficult to access jobs, suggesting the importance of increases in job opportunities and support to access them, as well as affordable housing. Indeed, the 2009 Housing Market Assessment Household Survey suggests that Muslims in particular were more dependent than other groups on social rent and intermediate housing.

---

<sup>36</sup> Young People's Survey 2010; crime is also the top issue of concern reported in 18-34 year olds in Newham Annual Residents' Survey 2009.

Faith is also a factor in some people having larger families due to religious practices. . This is borne out by the 2009 Housing Market Assessment Household Survey which found Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs were more likely to be living in overcrowded conditions. Home-based worship is also a growing trend to be aware of amongst Pentecostal and Charismatic churches, Muslim women and Hindus, although this is partly a response to inadequate formal faith infrastructure (GLA, 2008). Lastly, access to specialist shops and services may also be important to some groups (e.g. Halal butchers and takeaways in Newham).

## **Younger People**

Younger people in Newham express<sup>37</sup> concerns both about the need for better facilities for themselves (including open spaces such as the Greenway) and wider issues that affect them and their families such as the need for more and better employment opportunities, affordable housing, family-sized housing, easier parking, health facilities, local facilities rather than everything being concentrated in areas such as the Olympic Park, clean streets, and the general need to make the area somewhere to be proud of, where people feel safe and un-intimidated. Crime, the availability of jobs and issues relating to promoting community cohesion are the top 3 issues facing Newham,<sup>38</sup> . This corresponds with official ONS data which shows that younger people are more likely to be on Jobseekers Allowance than older people<sup>39</sup>.

Longer term, engagement work has also indicated that there was also some concern that they would be priced out, or crowded out by change, but also ambition to continue into higher education and professions. They also indicated that compared with other groups they are more aware of, and concerned about, sustainability and climate change, and enthusiastic proponents of choice, contemporary design and innovative solutions such as mobile facilities, high quality design to allow less compatible neighbours to reside side by side, and re-use of buildings. These issues and concerns translate into the relevance of designing inclusive public spaces for informal interaction, support for employment intermediaries such as Workplace, as well as new affordable family housing, more and better job opportunities, reviews of infrastructure provision and overall better, more secure and environmentally-sensitive design.

Recent survey work<sup>40</sup> also highlights the importance of healthy urban planning, centred around food access, and access to active recreational opportunities. Many young people surveyed were found to eat takeaways at least once a week, and to eat fresh fruit and vegetables once a week or less (50% and 43% respectively). Indeed, a recent focus group with the Youth Council found that they wanted to see fewer takeaways targeting children in

---

<sup>37</sup> See engagement work referenced above

<sup>38</sup> Young People's Survey, 2010

<sup>39</sup> 6.7% of 18-24 years olds are claiming Job Seekers' Allowance, compared to 3.6% of 50+ year olds. (Office of National Statistics, 2007).

<sup>40</sup> Young People's Survey, 2010

the vicinity of their schools and homes<sup>41</sup>. The survey work also found that lack of free time and appropriately timed sessions, together with lack of local facilities were a key reason for not undertaking more physical activity, and most facilities on a 'wish list' related to this (including ice skating/ice hockey, extreme sports facilities, outdoor gym, BMX and skateparks, goal posts etc).

Beyond this, the literature advises sensitivity to the need for safe independent travel, open spaces that are not excessively managed to enable imaginative play, better air quality and environments that help to reduce obesity, and sufficient affordable childcare. It also reminds us that child poverty is a significant issue in London.

### **Women including lone parents and those that take on the majority of child-care and home-making**

On the basis of the limited amount of information we have as to distinct gender-based priorities and preferences<sup>42</sup>, women engaged with in Newham generally seem more conscious of and concerned about family-oriented issues, including the availability of family housing, affordable housing, and opportunities for themselves and their children - social, educational and employment-based. As with other groups, they were also concerned about crime and anti-social behaviour.

Importantly, official ONS statistics<sup>43</sup> indicate that women in Newham are more likely than the London average to be economically inactive, and when in employment, to work fewer hours than men. This suggests that family life is likely to be a greater focus for them, but also that women may be excluded from the labour market for various reasons, and more likely to be living in households with lower incomes. Black and Asian women also suffer disproportionately from mental health issues<sup>44</sup>. Along these lines, the literature draws our attention to the significance in most women's lives of good, safe public transport, walking and cycling; access to natural green space and good quality housing; clusters of good quality local services; affordable childcare facilities; and opportunities for informal interaction with others to socialise outside the house, particularly for women who are the main carers and home-makers. Likewise, women may also benefit from targeted support to access job opportunities and training.

---

<sup>41</sup> See engagement work referenced above.

<sup>42</sup> As per engagement activities discussed above

<sup>43</sup> 48% of women in Newham are economically inactive, as opposed to 32% in London as a whole. Only 11.3% of female Newham residents work more than 45 hours a week compared to 30.2% for male residents. Almost half of working female residents in Newham (48%) work between 10 and 34 hours a week.

Source, Office for National Statistics, Annual Population Survey, 2009, Office for National Statistics, Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2009.

<sup>44</sup> NHS Newham/LB Newham (2009): NHS national psychiatric morbidity survey work shows that Black (25.3%) and Asian (23.4%) women are particularly affected, as compared to white women (19.2%) or men in general (13.6%).

## **LGBT people**

A recent focus group found that LGBT people did not have any specific concerns relating to the expression of sexuality in Newham, although they welcomed an overt presence and acknowledgement of their community as part of the wider community events. Some homophobia was reported, but this was frequently indistinguishable from other hate crime and other threatening behaviour from certain groups, and as with many people, this affects feelings of safety in certain areas/parks. Promotion of community safety and community cohesion were therefore an area of importance highlighted.

Backing up what action group and service providers had told us about patterns of service access, LGBT people were largely happy to access more specialist services and social facilities in other boroughs, notably Waltham Forest and Tower Hamlets, and may choose to do so due to concerns about being 'outed' in their own community. This suggests good cross-borough connections to the north and west may be particularly important to this group.

Evidence from the Housing Market Assessment Household Survey (2009) also found that in contrast to what the literature advises may be the case, LGBT people in Newham were more affluent, and more likely to occupy market housing. This may suggest that they are less in need of other development-related responses of the types discussed above than other equalities groups, such as clusters of affordable, and sheltered housing. However, action group workers suggest this is still a 'hidden' issue, particularly amongst younger people whose acute housing need is complicated by their fear of being 'outed' – and that the survey may not have uncovered this as it relies on people being happy to discuss their sexuality.

## ***Conclusions and Action Points***

### **Conclusions and the policy formulation checklist**

Newham is an obviously diverse borough, not only in the variety of faces that can be seen here, the languages that can be heard, the cooking smells smelt, but also in terms of its cultural landscape, which includes a diversity of places of worship, shops and services. In many respects therefore, planning and development can be seen to respond well to diversity already. Recent economic migration from Eastern Europe for instance are already reflected in shops and social spaces. However, in reality, diversity represents an ongoing management challenge within the urban environment and within planning as part of this. Failure to explicitly acknowledge it, and the less obvious associated potential equalities issues, would be to risk the disintegration of social cohesion, disruption of the opportunities for people to achieve their potential, and the ability to make Newham a better place.

Generally we can see that in response to an explicit acknowledgement of the need to manage diversity and an analysis of the potential equalities issues by equality group, the key spatial interventions in addition to regeneration that are indicated are of 4 types:

1. Regulatory – to prevent disproportionate harm; [Red]

2. Provision, or enablement of provision for specific needs where appropriate within a cohesion agenda; [Yellow]
3. Provision for mechanisms to access mainstream opportunities; [Blue] and
4. Priorities within general themes that will particularly benefit equalities groups as well as the wider population [Green].

These relate to the various legislative duties which seek to manage distributional effects (uneven outcomes), prevent discrimination and ensure equality of opportunity, social inclusion and cohesion.

From the analysis above, a series of checkpoints has been distilled for the LDF, to be applied in the formulation of policy and guidance. These can be seen in the matrix used in Appendix 1, with the colour coding linking back to the type of intervention above as indicated. [In some cases categories overlap; where this is the case the text is one colour and the shading the other, with the shading being the more significant]

In general, all equalities groups, along with the wider population should benefit from the interventions suggested, and many are easy to incorporate into a planning system that already embraces them for other reasons. Nonetheless, a number of challenges can be anticipated, notably:

- a. Balancing the desire for exclusive facilities for faith reasons, with the widely accepted view that community cohesion is best fostered through different groups coming into contact with each other on a daily, informal basis, rather than allowing for complete segregation (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007).
- b. Promoting environmental justice in the context of well-established patterns of land-use, such that there is the need for retrospective mitigation and it usually makes sense to place further similar uses in the same, generally relatively low-populated area, rather than spread the impact further.
- c. Responding to changing diversity – Newham’s population is ever-changing, and though we may aim to make it more stable, its historic associations and place in London, together with wider cultural and demographic patterns mean that equalities issues now, may not be those of the future.

As with many decisions in planning, a balancing of conflicting objectives will be required, with due consideration of appropriate mitigation and in some cases, the need to step back and work to find alternative solutions – by altering the mainstream, sub-regional working and so on. In relation to problem (a), mitigation is provided for within the checkpoint that relates to faith infrastructure and in checkpoint 2 in the table; whilst cross-boundary solutions are suggested by checkpoint 3. In relation to problem (b), mitigation fallbacks are represented in checkpoints 1, 11 and 18 in the table, and cross-boundary alternatives by checkpoint 3. Thus, whilst in theory some checkpoints have more serious consequences if not responded to, in many cases these checkpoints rely on each other to achieve the best outcomes, particularly in the context of wider planning objectives that also need to be achieved.



Equally, in response to challenge (c) regarding changing diversity, an overriding consideration must be the need to plan for flexibility. Significantly, this will include considerations of ownership as well as adaptability, a key lesson that has been learnt from past experiences of asset transfer In Newham, which have seen the keys to important community facilities being held by people and organisations that are no longer involved in its social and community life. Fortunately this is an external test (of 'soundness') that the LDF must pass before it is adopted, so it will be reviewed as a matter of course. Monitoring and review will also be important however.

### **Action Points – Core Strategy Proposed Submission Stage**

Having applied the checklist at the 'Choices' (options stage) of the document, which demonstrated we were on track to address equalities issues as scoped, (see Appendix 1) the next step was to apply the checklist to actual policies and site allocations (see Appendix 2, as labelled). This again demonstrates a that we are addressing the issues identified, within the scope of the Core Strategy, to help to achieve positive outcomes for equalities groups within a community cohesion context.

However, some further action points are identified where checkpoints are not fully covered, and in light of the points b and c above. These are categorised by type.

#### 1. Issues to be addressed by subsequent Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and guidance:

- Further requirements in relation to environmental impact assessment, as per checkpoint 1.
- Further guidance in relation to inclusive access design as per checkpoint 2.
- Further guidance on provision/suitable sites for specialist housing need as per checkpoint 13.
- Disabled parking – is partly covered by the London Plan, but will also need to be considered through the borough-wide parking strategy [currently under preparation] which subsequent DPDs will reflect.

#### 2. Monitoring – through the Annual Monitoring Report, which keeps policies under review, identifying areas where modification is required. Key indicators include:

- Environmental health complaints re economic activity
- Satisfaction with the area/need for improvements (Liveability Survey which is interrogable by equalities group)
- Cross-boundary connectivity improvements secured.
- Crime and fear of crime rates
- Provision of community infrastructure
- Access to community infrastructure
- Meanwhile uses in place
- Public realm investment projects
- Walking and cycling rates
- Employment and activity rates

- Improvements to housing quality (Building for Life assessments) including environmental performance (SAP performance, BREEAM/Code for Sustainable Homes levels achieved)
- Funding/outputs of employment and training intermediaries
- Delivery of affordable housing, family housing and specialist housing including gypsy-traveller pitches
- Physical activity rates and key health statistics
- Location of housing and infrastructure investment
- Provision of a variety of business unit sizes

### 3. Ongoing engagement

- With all equalities groups through the Council's mainstream research programme, particularly regarding housing and infrastructure needs, but also to help to review issues and needs as presently scoped, including issues that are less easily monitored by standard indicators e.g. visibility of community facilities, management of change.
- This will also help give more nuanced interpretations of monitoring work by equalities group, where this is not available in the statistical source.

## **References**

In addition to the engagement work and statistical sources referenced above, the following documents have been consulted:

Aston Mansfield (2006) *Newham Directory of Religious Groups 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*  
Aston Mansfield: London

CABE (2008) *Inclusion by Design* available at:  
<http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/inclusion-by-design> [accessed October 2009]

Commission on Integration and Cohesion (2007) *Our Shared Future* available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/jun/14/communities.raceintheuk> [accessed June 2010]

Greater London Authority GLA (2007) *The State of London's Children Report* available at <http://static.london.gov.uk/gla/publications/children.jsp> [accessed October 2009]

Greater London Authority GLA (2008) *Responding to the needs of faith communities: places of worship* available at:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/archive/gla/publications/planning.jsp> [accessed June 2010]

Mayor of London MoL (2007) SPG – Planning for Equality and Diversity in London available at:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/archive/mayor/strategies/sds/spg-planning-for-diversity.jsp> [accessed June 2009]

NHS Newham/LB Newham (2009) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2009* available at:  
<http://www.newham.gov.uk/HealthAndSocialCare/JointStrategicNeedsAssessment.htm>

ODPM (2005) *Diversity and Equality in Planning – A Good Practice Guide* available at:  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/diversityequality> [accessed June 2009]

**Appendix 1: Summary Checklist for consideration through the LDF to ensure equality of opportunity, social and environmental justice and social inclusion and cohesion – as applied at the Core Strategy Choices stage (policy directions/scoping) .**

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
1. A more robust approach to environmental impact, with greater attention to community engagement, cumulative, health and distributional effects and more stringent mitigation and separation of uses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Particular attention needed in South, West and East of borough. Further compensation (especially for already existing impacts) at point 18.	SCC SP H J SS	Checked – scoping provides for; strategic sites schedule acknowledges environmental constraints to further residential development in relevant areas, as well as to airport expansion. General policy direction is to promote cleaner, greener industry and higher quality design.
2. Provision for truly public spaces/public realm (including adequate management/maintenance) and inclusive facilities	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		SP I	Checked - a key component of design quality and efficient infrastructure planning as per successful places and

<sup>45</sup> SP = Successful Places, SCC = Sustainability and Climate Change, H = Homes, J= Jobs, I = Infrastructure, SS = Strategic Sites

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
3. Improvements to cross-boundary connectivity				+			+		SP I	Checked – objectives and policy scoping provide for in design and infrastructure terms.
4. Designing out, [or re-designing to reduce] crime and fear of crime	+	+	+	+	+	+			SP SS I	Checked – a key component of design quality, as scoping in Successful Places objectives and policy directions.
5. Clear guidance on where and how new faith infrastructure is likely to be acceptable to meet local needs, whilst also facilitating the multi-use of new and existing community infrastructure or other appropriate spaces, co-development/ownership and an understanding of the logic of a community-cohesion approach, to ensure exclusive spaces are minimised.		+		+				Particular need for a new mosque in Beckton.	I SS	Checked – within the scope of infrastructure policies and objectives, and sites identified as suitable for community use.
6. Accessibility-based approach to	+	+	+		+	+			I	Checked – a key

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
infrastructure planning, ensuring all types of housing have good infrastructure access (including to green space) or at least good low cost transport connections									SP H SCC SS	component of infrastructure, successful places and sustainability objectives and policy scoping, with clear consideration in relation to proposed areas of housing growth.
7. Promotion of clustering and multi-use of community infrastructure facilities, including flexible re-use of otherwise redundant spaces	+	+		+	+	+			I J SCC SP	Checked – a key component of efficient infrastructure planning as reflected by policy scoping and objectives, and successful places and sustainability objectives.
8. Support for low cost transport modes	+	+	+	+	+	+			SCC SP I	Checked – a key component of successful places, infrastructure and sustainability objectives and policy scoping
9. Increasing and diversifying job opportunities, both in absolute terms and through local labour agreements	+	+	+	+	+	+			J SS	Checked – within jobs policy scoping and objectives .
10. Child/day care provision/enablerment	+	+	+	+	+	+			I J	Checked – within scope of infrastructure policies, though will depend on

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
11. Higher environmental and quality (especially space) standards in housing	+	+			+	+		Important mitigation for legacy of environmental injustice	SCC SP H	Checked – a key component of housing, sustainability and successful place objectives and policy scoping.
12. Support for training and employment intermediaries	+	+	+	+	+	+			J I	Checked – within scope of homes and jobs objective and policy scoping and community infrastructure policy scoping
13. Provision for affordable housing and specialist housing needs, (including non-conventional housing and family housing) within genuinely mixed communities, securing as much mainstreaming of adaptations as possible. Some clustering of specialist housing for certain groups may be appropriate.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		H SS	Checked – a key component of housing objectives and policy scoping
14. Ensuring that publicly-accessible facilities are visible and obvious	+	+							SP I	Checked – within scope of design policies within

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
	within the urban context									
15. Application of principles of healthy urban planning focused on healthy lifestyles	+				+				SP I	Checked – objectives and policy scoping responds to the healthy urban planning agenda under Successful Places (SP2) and Infrastructure themes.
16. Acknowledgement of the importance of particular locations for specialist ethnic shopping and services in planning and managing change in these locations		+		+					SP I S	Checked – Successful Places and Community Infrastructure policy scoping and strategic sites makes reference to
17. Provision for appropriate levels of disabled persons' parking	+								I, SCC	This is dealt with by London Plan parking standards. Will also be considered at a borough-level in subsequent LDF documents once the borough-wide parking strategy is in place.
18. Consideration of targeting investment in housing and infrastructure improvements in most deprived areas	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	'Compensates' or helps retrospectively mitigate for legacy of	I SS H	Checked – whilst a matter for infrastructure and housing providers, major regeneration schemes are underway and planned in



Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme in which should be picked up <sup>45</sup>	CHECK CHOICES STAGE
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
19.Acknowledgement of the importance of smaller shops as places of business, employment and social interaction for BAME groups in planning change that affects these.		+							I SP J	Some potential conflict in the stricter stance proposed against takeaways, but other proposals e.g. protection for isolated shops/local shopping parades, and homes and jobs objective should compensate.

**Appendix 2: Summary Checklist for consideration through the LDF to ensure equality of opportunity, social and environmental justice and social inclusion and cohesion – as applied at Proposed Submission Stage (draft policies).**

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme <sup>46</sup>	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
1. A more robust approach to environmental impact, with greater attention to community engagement, cumulative, health and distributional effects and more stringent mitigation and separation of uses	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Particular attention needed in South, West and East of borough. Further compensation (especially for already existing impacts) at point 18.	SCC SP J S I	Checked – spatial policies reflect environmental constraints to further residential development in relevant areas, as well as to airport expansion. General policy direction is to promote cleaner, greener industry (J1) and higher quality design and housing standards. This includes securing effective mixed use/management of bad neighbour uses (SP1, SP2, SP3, H1).  More detailed

<sup>46</sup> SP = Successful Places, SCC = Sustainability and Climate Change, H = Homes, J= Jobs, I = Infrastructure, S = Spatial Policies

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
										requirements for environmental impact to be set out in DCPM.
2. Provision for truly public spaces/public realm (including adequate management/maintenance) and inclusive facilities	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		SP I	Checked - a key component of design quality reflected in policy SP3, SP6 and INF8  Further guidance may be appropriate (e.g. in the form of an SPD).
3. Improvements to cross-boundary connectivity				+			+		SP I S	Checked – covered by spatial policies, which identify key connections, infrastructure policies which identify key schemes and principles (INF1, INF2) and design policies' emphasis on connectivity (SP1, SP3).
4. Designing out, [or re-designing to reduce] crime and fear of crime	+	+	+	+	+	+			SP	Checked – a key component of design quality, as acknowledged in SP1, SP3 and SP6.  Further guidance may be

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
										helpful as part of a design SPD.
5. Clear guidance on where and how new faith infrastructure is likely to be acceptable to meet local needs, whilst also facilitating the multi-use of new and existing community infrastructure or other appropriate spaces, co-development/ownership and an understanding of the logic of a community-cohesion approach, to ensure exclusive spaces are minimised.		+		+				Particular need for a new mosque in Beckton.	I	Checked – policy INF8 sets out a clear spatial strategy for community infrastructure including faith facilities.  Should monitor whether this is effective through appropriate engagement and review of planning applications.
6. Accessibility-based approach to infrastructure planning, ensuring all types of housing have good infrastructure access (including to green space) or at least good low cost transport connections	+	+	+		+	+			I SP S	Checked – a key component of infrastructure and successful places objectives reflected in policies SP1, SP3, INF5, INF8, INF6 and spatial policies relating to proposed areas of housing growth.
7. Promotion of clustering and multi-use of community infrastructure	+	+		+	+	+			I SCC	Checked – a key component of efficient

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy- travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home- makers	LBGT people			
	facilities, including flexible re-use of otherwise redundant spaces									
8. Support for low cost transport modes	+	+	+	+	+	+		SCC SP I	Checked – a key component of successful places, and infrastructure objectives as reflected in policies SP3, SP6, SP7 and INF1 and INF2	
9. Increasing and diversifying job opportunities, both in absolute terms and through local labour agreements	+	+	+	+	+	+		J S	Checked – within jobs (J1, J2, J3) and spatial policies which are aligned with the Economic Development Strategy to help enable its objectives.	
10. Child/day care provision/enablement	+	+	+	+	+	+		I J	Checked – encouraged by policy J3, and also covered by INF8, though implementation will depend on provider demand to some extent.	

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
	11. Higher environmental and quality (especially space) standards in housing	+	+			+	+			
12. Support for training and employment intermediaries	+	+	+	+	+	+			J I	Checked – acknowledged in jobs policy J3 and INF9.
13. Provision for affordable housing and specialist housing needs, (including non-conventional housing and family housing) within genuinely mixed communities, securing as much mainstreaming of adaptations as possible. Some clustering of specialist housing for certain groups may be appropriate.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		H S	Checked – a key component of housing objectives reflected in policies H1, H2, H3 and H4.  Delivery against these policies will however need to be monitored to ensure needs of particular groups are met.  It may be appropriate to provide extra guidance in subsidiary documents for particular forms of housing need e.g. gypsy traveller

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
										pitches
14. Ensuring that publicly-accessible facilities are visible and obvious within the urban context	+	+							SP I	Checked – through encouraging location of community facilities within town and local centres (INF8) and design policy that requires attention to legibility (SP3).
15. Application of principles of healthy urban planning focused on healthy lifestyles (HIA is covered by checkpoint 1)	+				+				SP I	Checked – objectives reflect healthy urban planning agenda, reflected in policy SP2 as well as SP3, and INF2 and INF5.
16. Acknowledgement of the importance of particular locations for specialist ethnic shopping and services in planning and managing change in these locations		+		+					SP I S	Checked –reflected in design policies SP3, SP5; retail policy INF5 and associated spatial policies.
17. Provision for appropriate levels of disabled persons' parking	+								I, SCC SP	Will need to be carefully reflected within policies in response sustainable transport objectives.
18. Consideration of targeting	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	'Compensates'	SP	Checked – whilst a matter

Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LGBT people			
	investment in housing and infrastructure improvements in most deprived areas									
19.Acknowledgement of the importance of smaller shops as places of business, employment and social interaction for BAME groups in planning change that affects these.		+						I SP S	Some potential conflict in the stricter stance proposed against takeaways (SP6, SP2) but other proposals e.g. protection for isolated shops/local shopping parades,(INF5) and promotion of a variety of unit sizes in town and local centres, (SP6) and reference to the importance of independent and specialist shops in	



Check Point	Equalities Groups Particularly Relevant To (as discussed above) [NB In many cases all groups in fact will benefit]							Notes	Theme 46	CHECK Proposed Submission Stage
	Older people, disabled people, carers	BAME people & recently arrived migrants	Gypsy-travellers	People of Faith	Young People	Women, incl. lone parents/F T home-makers	LBGT people			
										town centre visions (spatial policies) should compensate.