

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The **Equality Act 2010** places a '**General Duty**' on all public bodies to have '**due regard**' to the need to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advancing equality of opportunity for those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them
- Fostering good relations between those with 'protected characteristics' and those without them.

This is known as the **Public Sector Equality Duty**.

In addition the Council complies with the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act 2013.

Stage 1 – Screening

Please complete the equalities screening form. If screening identifies that your proposal is likely to impact on protected characteristics, please proceed to stage 2 and complete a full Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).

Stage 2 – Full Equality Impact Assessment

An EqIA provides evidence for meeting the Council's commitment to equality and the responsibilities under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

When an EqIA has been undertaken, it should be submitted as an attachment/appendix to the final decision making report. This is so the decision maker (e.g. Cabinet, Committee, senior leader) can use the EqIA to help inform their final decision. The EqIA once submitted will become a public document, published alongside the minutes and record of the decision.

Please read the Council's Equality Impact Assessment Guidance before beginning the EqIA process.

1. Responsibility for the Equality Impact Assessment

Name of proposal	Cranwood Business Plan (Haringey Development Vehicle Cabinet Report July 2018)
Service area	Housing, Regeneration, and Planning
Officer completing assessment	Hugh Smith
Equalities/ HR Advisor	Hugh Smith
Cabinet meeting date (if applicable)	July 2018
Director/Assistant Director	Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing and Growth

2. Summary of the proposal

Please outline in no more than 3 paragraphs

- *The proposal which is being assessed*
- *The key stakeholders who may be affected by the policy or proposal*
- *The decision-making route being taken*

The proposal being assessed is the decision not to proceed with the establishment of the Haringey Development Vehicle (HDV). The July 2017 Cabinet decision to establish the HDV approved, among other documents, the 'Cranwood Business Plan' (CBP). While the July 2017 Cabinet made no decision whatsoever on the future of Cranwood, it was envisaged that its redevelopment could be taken forward through the HDV – subject entirely to statutory consultation, further equality impact assessments, future Cabinet decision(s) and ultimately, full Council authorisation for making the relevant application to the Secretary of State for consent to dispose of the land. The CBP set out the key parameters, deliverables, proposals and processes for the regeneration of the Cranwood site through the HDV. This would have involved rehousing 6 Homes for Haringey tenants and either purchasing the 2 free holder properties, or offering resident owners housing options related to shared equity or shared ownership, in order to build significantly more homes with 50% affordable properties. By no longer proceeding with the HDV, the regeneration of Cranwood in accordance with the CBP is similarly no longer an option. This Equalities Impact Assessment assesses the impact not implementing the CBP.

The key stakeholders who may be affected by the plans for Cranwood are Council tenants and resident (or any non-resident) Freeholders.

The decision on the HDV and therefore on the CBP is being taken by Cabinet in July 2018.

3. What data will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of service users and/or staff?

Identify the main sources of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative, that supports your analysis. Please include any gaps and how you will address these

This could include, for example, data on the Council's workforce, equalities profile of service users, recent surveys, research, results of relevant consultations, Haringey Borough Profile, Haringey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and any other sources of relevant information, local, regional or national. For restructures, please complete the restructure EqIA which is available on the HR pages.

Protected group	Service users	Staff
Sex	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011)▪ Tenant and Leaseholder demographic information	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Haringey JSNA 	
Gender Reassignment	We do not hold this data. The Equality and Human Rights Commission have published a national estimate.	N/A
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) ▪ Tenant and Leaseholder demographic information ▪ Haringey JSNA 	N/A
Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) ▪ Tenant and Leaseholder demographic information ▪ Haringey JSNA ▪ Home Office data regarding hate crime 	N/A
Race & Ethnicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) ▪ Tenant and Leaseholder demographic information ▪ Haringey JSNA ▪ Home Office data regarding hate crime 	N/A
Sexual Orientation	ONS Annual Population Data 2016	N/A
Religion or Belief (or No Belief)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) ▪ Haringey JSNA ▪ Home Office data regarding hate crime 	N/A
Pregnancy & Maternity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) 	N/A
Marriage and Civil Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward profile data (Census 2011) 	N/A

Outline the key findings of your data analysis. Which groups are disproportionately affected by the proposal? How does this compare with the impact on wider service users and/or the borough's demographic profile? Have any inequalities been

identified?

Explain how you will overcome this within the proposal.

Further information on how to do data analysis can be found in the guidance.

This section will cover two areas of:

1. Demographics
2. Wider socio-economic data

1. Demographics

The current site of Cranwood contains a disused care home and a terrace of 8 houses comprising 6 Council homes and 2 freeholders – all are currently occupied. We are not able to publish equality data of the 8 households that are impacted by this decision because the low number of residents mean that they are easily identifiable.

In order to establish if there are any inequalities as a result of this decision, we have undertaken a brief analysis of the population of Muswell Hill as the new development would have been based there. We are aware that the demographics of the area do not necessarily reflect the 8 households impacted by this decision and this has been taken into account in our analysis.

A) Sex¹

Female	51.7%
Male	48.3%

The gender split in Muswell Hill roughly reflects the wider population and we envisage that both female and males will be living in the 8 households on the Cranwood site. It is possible that women might experience additional inequalities due to the fact that women are more likely to take on parenting and caring responsibilities, including lone parent households headed by women. In the 2011 Census, there was 219 lone parent households, in which 203 (93%) were headed by a woman and 16 (7%) by men.

B) Gender reassignment

We do not hold data on the number of people who are seeking, receiving or have received gender reassignment surgery, and there is not national data collected for this protected characteristic. The Equality and Human Rights Commission estimate that there is between 300,000-500,000 transgender people in the UK². We will need to consider the inequalities and discrimination experienced for this protected group. For the purposes of this EqIA, we will use the inclusive term Trans* in order to represent the spectrum of transgender and gender variance.

¹ Census 2011

² <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/trans-inequalities-reviewed/introduction-review>

C) Age³

Ward	All ages	0-19	%	20-64	%	65+	%
Alexandra	11795	3048	25.8%	7575	64.2%	1172	9.9%
Bounds Green	13725	3115	22.7%	9341	68.1%	1269	9.2%
Bruce Grove	14483	4086	28.2%	9183	63.4%	1214	8.4%
Crouch End	12395	2274	18.3%	9013	72.7%	1108	8.9%
Fortis Green	12488	3151	25.2%	7965	63.8%	1372	11.0%
Harringay	13272	2363	17.8%	9909	74.7%	1000	7.5%
Highgate	11632	2101	18.1%	8175	70.3%	1356	11.7%
Hornsey	12659	2777	21.9%	8845	69.9%	1037	8.2%
Muswell Hill	10784	2337	21.7%	7143	66.2%	1304	12.1%
Noel Park	13939	3369	24.2%	9391	67.4%	1179	8.5%
Northumberland Park	14429	4726	32.8%	8565	59.4%	1138	7.9%
St Ann's	14638	3248	22.2%	10149	69.3%	1241	8.5%
Seven Sisters	15968	5068	31.7%	9730	60.9%	1170	7.3%
Stroud Green	11758	2298	19.5%	8653	73.6%	807	6.9%
Tottenham Green	14580	3710	25.4%	9675	66.4%	1195	8.2%
Tottenham Hale	15064	4508	29.9%	9384	62.3%	1172	7.8%
West Green	13372	3246	24.3%	8854	66.2%	1272	9.5%
White Hart Lane	13431	4532	33.7%	7769	57.8%	1130	8.4%
Woodside	14514	3417	23.5%	9864	68.0%	1233	8.5%

Muswell Hill has one of the lowest 0-19 age groups in the borough and the highest proportion of 65+ year olds. We assume that there will be a disproportionate amount of older people living in the 8 households. However, we are aware that some of the residents may be younger and have younger families.

³ Census 2011

D) Disability⁴

The following information was obtained in the 2011 Census where people reported limitations on day-to-day activities as a result of a disability or disabilities:

	Muswell Hill	Haringey	London	England and Wales
Day-to-day activity limited a lot	4.8%	6.8%	6.7%	8.3%
Day-to-day activity limited a little	6.2%	7.2%	7.4%	9.3%
Day-to-day activity not limited	89.0%	86.0%	85.8%	82.4%
Day-to-day activity limited a lot: Age 16-64	2.2%	3.8%	3.4%	3.6%
Day-to-day activity limited a little: Age 16-64	3.2%	4.6%	4.2%	4.6%
Day-to-day activity not limited: Age 16-64	64.6%	62.4%	61.5%	56.5%

While this does not necessarily reflect the composition of households impacted by the Cranwood business plan, based on this information, Muswell Hill has the 4th highest percentage of people who do not have a limiting long term physical or mental health condition in Haringey.

E) Race and Ethnicity

	Muswell Hill	Haringey	London	England
White; English/Welsh/Scottish/N.Irish/British	64.8%	34.68%	44.89%	79.75%
White Irish	2.8%	2.75%	2.15%	0.98%
White; Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.0%	0.15%	0.10%	0.10%
White; White Other	16.1%	22.97%	12.65%	4.58%
Mixed; White and Black Caribbean	1.1%	1.90%	1.46%	0.78%
Mixed; White and Black African	0.6%	1.02%	0.80%	0.30%
Mixed; White and	2.0%	1.47%	1.21%	0.63%

⁴ Census 2011

Asian				
Mixed; Other mixed	1.6%	2.10%	1.45%	0.53%
Asian/Asian British; Indian	1.5%	2.33%	6.64%	2.62%
Asian/Asian British; Pakistani	0.3%	0.75%	2.74%	2.10%
Asian/Asian British; Bangladeshi	0.3%	1.73%	2.72%	8.23%
Asian/Asian British; Chinese	0.8%	1.47%	1.52%	0.72%
Asian/Asian British; Other Asian	1.4%	3.19%	4.88%	1.55%
Black African	1.8%	9.04%	7.02%	1.8%
Black Caribbean	2.3%	7.10%	4.22%	1.1%
Black Other	0.5%	2.63%	2.08%	0.52%
Other Ethnic group; Arab	0.4%	0.87%	1.30%	0.42%
Other Ethnic group; Any Other Ethnic	1.7%	3.85%	2.14%	0.62%

Muswell Hill has significantly less non British White communities compared to the rest of Haringey and London. However, there are more BAME communities compared to England. We can therefore assume it is likely that there will be some households that will be from BAME backgrounds.

The Cranwood development would have the potential to rehouse some families from Northumberland Park, were the HDV to be taken forward. Therefore, some of the benefits would have been felt by individuals and families not currently located in Muswell Hill. This would have allowed the opportunity for different communities to live in the same area, and therefore fostered good relations between different protected groups.

F) Sexual Orientation

We do not hold ward or borough level data on sexual orientation, and it is not collected nationally. However, the ONS estimates that 3.7% of Haringey's population are lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB), which is the 15th largest LGB community in the country⁵. We will need to ensure that the inequalities and discrimination experienced by LGB people are considered throughout this EqIA.

G) Religion and Faith⁶

	<i>Muswell Hill</i>	<i>Haringey</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>England and Wales</i>
Christian	39.5%	45.0%	48.5%	59.3%
Buddhist	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%	0.4%

⁵<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/articles/subnationalsexualidentityestimates/uk2013to2015#introduction>

⁶ Census, 2011

Hindu	0.7%	1.8%	5.0%	1.5%
Jewish	5.3%	3.0%	1.8%	0.5%
Muslim	3.0%	14.2%	12.4%	4.8%
Sikh	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	0.8%
Other	0.9%	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
No religion	40.0%	25.2%	20.7%	25.1%
Not stated	9.4%	8.9%	8.5%	7.2%

Muswell Hill has the highest proportion of people with no religion and below local, regional and national average of Christians. There is a significant Jewish community compared to the borough and national average. This may not necessarily reflect the religion and beliefs of the households impacted by the CBP.

H) Pregnancy and Maternity

As stated in the age category, 5.9% of Muswell Hill is between the ages of 0-4 years old, compared to the Haringey average of 7.1% and London average 7.2%. In addition to this, 28.2% of Muswell Hill have dependent children, compared to 31.4% in Haringey and 30.9% London average. From this, we can infer that it is likely that there may be fewer households which fall under the pregnancy and maternity protected characteristic.

I) Marriage and Civil Partnership Status

In Muswell Hill, there were 1,551 married couples (41.4% of the population – 3rd highest in Haringey)) at the time of the 2011 Census (before equal marriage was introduced). There were 67 (0.8% of the population – 2nd highest in Haringey) in a civil partnership. All couples in a civil partnership will be treated equally with married couples.

2. Wider socio-economic data

The development will allow opportunities to tackle wider inequalities in the borough, as outlined below:

1. **Community Pride and Housing**

The Council's Housing Strategy in October 2016 outlines the issues in regards to housing demand and supply in the borough. The strategy can be found here:

<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=118&MIId=7846&Ver=4>

The EqIA for the Housing Strategy found that there were a range of inequalities in housing across Haringey, including:

- Female lone parents vulnerable to homelessness
- Disabled people and supported housing needs
- Black households are more vulnerable to homelessness and are less likely to engage with shared ownership schemes
- LGBT young people are more vulnerable to homelessness.

This business plan intended to address these inequalities by providing 50% affordable housing, with the potential to rehouse individuals and families from Northumberland Park. A range of bedrooms sizes would have been provided in order to meet the differentiated demand for housing.

The current mixture of tenure in Muswell Hill includes the following:

<i>(Census 2011)</i>	<i>Muswell Hill</i>	<i>Haringey</i>	<i>London</i>	<i>England</i>
% Households Owned – 2011	58.5%	38.8%	48.2%	63.5%
% Households Social Rented – 2011	9.4%	26.7%	24.1%	17.6%
% Households Private Rented – 2011	30.5%	31.5%	25.1%	16.7%

The business plan adopted a tenure blind design policy ensuring there was not a differentiation in quality and design. The development would have provided communal outdoor space for all residents to use which would have provided an opportunity to foster good relations with different protected groups. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that this will not occur through the CBP.

In order to provide this housing, there would have been an impact on the 6 Homes for Haringey residents and the 2 freeholders through the rehousing process. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that this possibly negative impact will not occur through the CBP.

The overall offer to tenants and leaseholders

The HDV offer to secure tenants and owners whose properties are demolished by the regeneration was based on statutory requirements and recent case law and set out below:

- Secure council tenants would have been offered rehousing, and a statutory Home Loss and Disturbance payments;
- Resident Leaseholders and Freeholders would have been offered a financial package that would have comprised the market value for their homes, a Home Loss payment and a statutory disturbance payment. Those wishing to return to the site would instead have been offered the option of a fully owned new home as detailed below;
- Non-resident Leaseholders and Freeholders would have been offered the market value for their homes, a Home Loss payment and a statutory Disturbance payment. They would also have been offered a prioritised opportunity to buy in an early phase of the regeneration.

Furthermore, the HDV would have acted in accordance with all relevant council strategy and policy except where a departure from that policy were agreed in the business plan following consultation with residents.

A transparent allocation process for all rehousing would have taken account of needs and preferences. The HDV would have issued a schedule of properties to be allocated to eligible households who would have been given an opportunity to select their unit.

This Business Plan includes an offer to Resident Leaseholders and Freeholders that would have provided them with an opportunity to own an equity share in an Intermediate Affordable home within a Category 1 property that formed part of the HDV's target 40%

Affordable Housing provision.

We are unable to publish specific equality data on these households because of data protection reasons, however we know that there were potential negative impacts for different protected characteristics. This includes:

- **Sex** - Women are more likely to take on child caring responsibilities so rehousing may have impacted in terms of accessing current childcare provision, and could have impacted on ability to work.
- **Gender Reassignment** – We do not have data on this protected group.
- **Age (0-19 year olds)** – Rehousing may have caused disruption to education and childcare.
- **Age (65+)** - There may have been negative impacts regarding single older people with caring networks in the local area if they were rehoused away from the local area
- **Disability - Physical and sensory impairments:** Rehousing would have needed to consider needs for adaptations for households with members with disabilities
- **Disability - Mental health:** Rehousing may have exacerbated mental health issues, such as anxiety and depression.
- **Disability - Learning disabilities:** Being rehoused to a new part of the borough could have resulted in additional inequalities being created
- **Race and Ethnicity:** It is likely that there is disproportionate representation of BAME communities within the 6 tenants and 2 freeholders. If they were rehoused away from the local area, this could have reduced links with local cultural communities.
- **Sexual Orientation:** We do not hold data at the national, borough or ward levels. However, we are aware there is a significant LGB population in Haringey compared to other places in England and there are a high level of civil partnerships compared to the rest of the borough in Muswell Hill. Same sex couples, regardless of marital status, would have been treated the same as a heterosexual couple in the rehousing process
- **Religion and Faith:** There is a relatively large Jewish community in Muswell Hill as well as people declaring no faith. All residents affected may have been rehoused away from the local area, which for those of faith could have impacted on the places of worship they attend.
- **Pregnancy and maternity:** Rehousing could have affected the needs of pregnant woman or women with young children to attend maternity health services.
- **Marriage and Civil Partnership Status:** Any civil partnered couple impacted by this decision will be treated the same as if they were married

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that these potential negative impacts on those with protected characteristics will not occur through the CBP.

2. Safe and Clean

While crime rates are low in Muswell Hill⁷ there is still the potential of the fear of crime, especially for those vulnerable to hate crime and other crimes related to protected groups.

The 'Secure by Design' principle of the development would have allowed those groups to feel safer and allow all residents of the development to feel part of a safer community and would have helped foster good relations between different protected groups. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that this will not occur through the CBP.

4. a) How will consultation and/or engagement inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of residents, service users and/or staff?

Please outline which groups you may target and how you will have targeted them

Further information on consultation is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

No consultation or engagement is due to take place.

4. b) Outline the key findings of your consultation / engagement activities once completed, particularly in terms of how this relates to groups that share the protected characteristics

Explain how will the consultation's findings will shape and inform your proposal and the decision making process, and any modifications made?

The Council would have undertaken consultation with all residents and other interested parties, including S105 consultation, if the HDV were to proceed. This consultation has not taken place to date and so there are no findings from consultation or engagement activities.

5. What is the likely impact of the proposal on groups of service users and/or staff that share the protected characteristics?

Please explain the likely differential impact on each of the 9 equality strands, whether positive or negative. Where it is anticipated there will be no impact from the proposal, please outline the evidence that supports this conclusion.

Further information on assessing impact on different groups is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

1. Sex

The Cranwood business plan would have had a number of positive impacts for particular protected characteristics, including sex. This includes more housing to meet demand, including affordable housing. This could have particularly benefited female led single parent households who are vulnerable to homelessness. In addition, the new development would have provided a safe community, which would have benefited women.

However, in order to achieve this, there would have been some short term negative impacts for the six households who would have been required to have been rehoused.

⁷ <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/ward-profiles-and-atlas>

Women are more likely to take on child caring responsibilities so rehousing may have impacted in terms of accessing current childcare provision, and could have impacted on ability to work.

Older people were more likely to have been impacted by this because they are less likely to get a mortgage if they are retired or close to retirement. Moreover, this is likely to have had a greater impact on older women as they have a greater life expectancy than men. The Council would have offered alternative options to help freeholders and leaseholders in these circumstances through the offer for tenants, leaseholders and freeholders.

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that positive and negative impacts identified here will not occur through the CBP.

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

2. Gender reassignment

We do not hold data at a ward or borough level.

The development would have made the local area feel safer, which would have benefited trans* people who are vulnerable to transphobic hate crime. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that this will not occur through the CBP.

We do not envisage that there would have been a disproportionate impact on the gender reassignment protected group in regards to the rehousing process.

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

3. Age

The Cranwood business plan would have had a number of positive impacts for particular protected characteristics, including different age groups. This includes more housing to meet demand, including helping meet the needs of older people housing and people who need different bedroom sizes for families with children. In addition, the new development would have provided a safe community, which would have benefited children and young people as well as older people who experience inequalities. It would have provided opportunities through shared communal open spaces to foster good relations with different age groups.

However, in order to achieve this, there would have been some short term negative impacts for the six households who would have been required to have been rehoused and the two freeholders. Although we are unable to publish equality data on these households because of data protection reasons, there are some potential negative impacts for different age groups.

Consideration would have been needed for children and young people to minimise disruption to education and childcare facilities they may attend.

In regards to older people, the rehousing process would have attempted to meet the needs

for adaptations for age related disabilities. Consideration would have been needed regarding older people without caring networks in order to minimise the risk of social isolation. In addition to this, if any of the freeholders are near retirement or have retired, there could have been negative implications in regards to obtaining a mortgage in the nearby area.

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that positive and negative impacts identified here will not occur through the CBP.

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

4. Disability

The Cranwood business plan would have had a number of positive impacts for particular protected characteristics, including disability. This includes more housing to meet demand, such as adaptations for disabled residents to help them live independent lives. In addition, the new development would have provided a safer community, which would have benefited disabled people.

Consideration would have been needed in the rehousing process to prevent increasing inequalities for disabled people. The following issues would have needed to have been addressed on a case-by-case basis through the Housing Needs Assessment of the eight households impacted.

- **Physical and sensory impairments:** Any rehousing process would have needed to ensure that reasonable adjustments and adaptations are provided to prevent further barriers through the rehousing process
- **Mental health:** Consideration would have been needed to mitigate any further inequalities or exasperation of mental health issues, such as anxiety and depression.
- **Learning disabilities:** People with learning disabilities within the development site would have benefited from being rehoused close-by as familiarity is helpful for people with particular learning disabilities. Being rehoused to a new part of the borough could have resulted in additional inequalities being created and reduced independent living.

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that positive and negative impacts identified here will not occur through the CBP.

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

5. Race and ethnicity

The Cranwood business plan would have had a number of positive impacts for particular protected characteristics, including race and ethnicity. As established in the Housing Strategy, particular BAME communities are more likely to use and need social and affordable housing. The Cranwood business plan would have helped deliver this. In addition, the new development would have provided a healthier and safer community,

which would have benefited different BAME communities as they are more likely to experience health inequalities and be victims of crime, including hate crime. In addition, the new development would have helped foster good relations between different ethnic groups.

However, in order to achieve this, there would have been some short term negative impacts for the six households who would have been required to have been rehoused as well as the two freeholders. Although we are unable to publish equality data on these households ethnicity because of data protection reasons, it is likely that BAME communities are disproportionately represented in the tenant population, despite it being an area with a comparatively large British White population.

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that positive and negative impacts identified here will not occur through the CBP.

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

6. Sexual orientation

We do not hold data at a ward or borough level and therefore cannot determine if this decision would have disproportionately impacted on this protected group. The development would have made the local area feel safer, which would have benefited lesbian, gay and bisexual people who are vulnerable to homophobic and biphobic hate crime. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that this will not occur through the CBP.

We do not envisage that there would have been a disproportionate impact on the sexual orientation protected group in regards to the rehousing process.

Any same sex couple impacted by the decision, regardless of marital, cohabitation or civil partnership status, would have been treated the same as a heterosexual couple in the rehousing process.

Positive		Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

7. Religion or belief (or no belief)

The Cranwood business plan would have had a number of positive impacts for particular protected characteristics, including religion or belief. The new development would have provided a safer environment, which would have benefited different religious communities as they are more likely to experience religious hate crime, in particular Anti-Semitism and Islamophobic hate crime. There is a comparatively large population in Muswell Hill who identify as Jewish and therefore would have benefited particularly from the improved safety created by the business plan. In addition, the new development would have helped foster good relations between different religious groups.

Negative impacts may have occurred if households were rehoused away from the area and were then less able to practice their religion, but most households would have been rehoused in the immediate area.

The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that these positive and negative impacts will not occur through the CBP.

Positive	X	Negative	X	Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	
----------	---	----------	---	----------------	--	----------------	--

8. Pregnancy and maternity

In addition to the positive and negative aspects identified under the 'Sex' protected characteristic, consideration would have been needed to ensure women who are pregnant or have given birth in the six months prior to any rehousing were able to access appropriate maternity services as well as housing. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that these impacts will not occur through the CBP.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact		Unknown Impact	X
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	--	----------------	---

9. Marriage and Civil Partnership

We are unable to publish data on the marital and civil partnership status of the eight households affected by the decision. In any rehousing, a couple in a civil partnership would have been treated in the same way as a couple in a marriage, which would have been identified through the Housing Needs Assessment.

Positive		Negative		Neutral impact	X	Unknown Impact	
----------	--	----------	--	----------------	---	----------------	--

10. Groups that cross two or more equality strands e.g. young black women

We are unable to publish equality data for data protection reasons, as outlined above. However, we expect that there would have been a range of intersectionary issues, particularly related to age, sex, ethnicity and disability. The process of rehousing would have adopted a case-by-case approach using the Housing Needs Assessment to ensure that further inequalities are not recreated. The decision not to proceed with the HDV means that the benefits and negative impacts associated with the CBP will not occur through the delivery of the plan.

Outline the overall impact of the policy for the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- Could the proposal result in any direct/indirect discrimination for any group that shares the protected characteristics?
- Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity between groups who share a protected characteristic and those who do not?

This includes:

- a) Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons protected under the Equality Act
 - b) Take steps to meet the needs of persons protected under the Equality Act that are different from the needs of other groups
 - c) Encourage persons protected under the Equality Act to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
- Will the proposal help to foster good relations between groups who share a protected characteristic and those who do not?

The decision not to proceed with the HDV will not have a direct positive or negative impact on individuals or groups with protected characteristics relative to current circumstances. Rather, the decision not to proceed represents the removal of an option for achieving certain objectives rather than a change in those objectives.

As set out above, to the extent that implementation of the CBP would have had a positive impact on those with protected characteristics, those benefits will no longer materialise (or at least until such time as the Council pursues alternative options to meet its objectives). On the other hand, by not proceeding with the HDV, the Council is also avoiding the negative impacts associated with implementing the CBP on those with protected characteristics.

6. a) What changes if any do you plan to make to your proposal as a result of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Further information on responding to identified impacts is contained within accompanying EqIA guidance

Outcome	Y/N
No major change to the proposal: the EqIA demonstrates the proposal is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. <u>If you have found any inequalities or negative impacts that you are unable to mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below why you are unable to mitigate them.</u>	
Adjust the proposal: the EqIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the proposal to remove barriers or better promote equality. Clearly <u>set out below</u> the key adjustments you plan to make to the policy. If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below	Y
Stop and remove the proposal: the proposal shows actual or potential avoidable adverse impacts on different protected characteristics. The decision maker must not make this decision.	

6 b) Summarise the specific actions you plan to take to remove or mitigate any actual or potential negative impact and to further the aims of the Equality Duty

Impact and which protected characteristics are impacted?	Action	Lead officer	Timescale
Withdrawal of the HDV as the means of achieving corporate	Pursue alternative options to achieve corporate objectives	Director of Housing, Regeneration,	2018/19

objectives (which, if continued, would have impacted on all protected characteristics)		and Planning	
--	--	--------------	--

Please outline any areas you have identified where negative impacts will happen as a result of the proposal but it is not possible to mitigate them. Please provide a complete and honest justification on why it is not possible to mitigate them.

N/A

6 c) Summarise the measures you intend to put in place to monitor the equalities impact of the proposal as it is implemented:

N/A

7. Authorisation

EqlA approved by	Date
------------------	------

8. Publication

Please ensure the completed EqlA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

--