

RBKC Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

EqIAs evidence that you have considered the impact or potential impact on groups in our community who share protected characteristics. These are characteristics that are protected against discrimination by the Equality Act 2010. We are required by law under the Public Sector Equality duty (PSED) which is contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act and requires public authorities to have due regard to several equality considerations when exercising their functions.

When do I need to complete an EqIA? You need to complete an EqIA when:

- Planning or developing new services including business services, policies, strategies, practices and plans
- Reviewing, amending or substantially changing existing services, policies, strategies, practices and plans
- Considering a change management process or organisational review, particularly those that could involve relocating staff or rationalisation of posts
- Reviewing or introducing forms, leaflets, guidance, codes of practice such as changes to how residents access services
- When considering and developing a tender document for procurement of services

Who should complete an EqIA?

The person completing the EqIA should have detailed knowledge of the proposal or project. They should be able to identify the impact on those with protected characteristics be they residents, workforce, visitors or others. They should also have knowledge or access to any consultations and where relevant, have knowledge of the area of the Borough that is impacted. The ownership and responsibility for an EqIA lies at Head of Service level and above, however, managers and staff play a key role in the assessment process as they will be involved in implementing the necessary actions identified and integrating equalities into planning. As a rule, any work that needs a decision e.g. Lead Member decision or Leadership Team should be signed off by the Executive Director. Anything that is not going through a formal decision-making process can be signed off by Head of service.

At what point do I need to complete an EqIA?

You need to complete an EqIA at the very beginning when considering your proposal and therefore before a decision is taken.

Please note an EqIA is a live document which means it must be regularly reviewed and updated considering new evidence or information.

It is important to consider equalities issues at every stage of the process. You may not have all the data you need at the beginning, or you may not have finalised what your project will look like. However, an EqIA is there to help guide your thinking on how your work might affect different groups in our community and support your planning and consultation work.

Where can I get support to complete an EqIA?

There are resources available on the SharePoint site, including example EqIAs. You can also get support from the EqIA Champion in your Team/Directorate, see the SharePoint site for details. You can email any queries to the EqIA inbox eqia@rbkc.gov.uk. Finally further support is available for strategic and crosscutting EqIAs from Mandeep Kaur Bains (mandeep.kaurbains@rbkc.gov.uk) in the Corporate Strategy Team. If your EqIA focuses on workforce changes or development, then contact Charlene Nkum (Charlene.nkum@rbkc.gov.uk) or Lee Sykes (lee.sykes@rbkc.gov.uk) in HR.

SECTION 1: Programme details

<p>Name of the policy, project, service, or strategy being assessed</p>	<p>Acquisition of Princess Beatrice House</p>
<p>Give a brief overview of your works aims and objectives</p>	<p>The Council is looking to acquire Princess Beatrice House which is situated in Earls Court/West Brompton within the Redcliffe ward. The building is owned by Look Ahead.</p> <p>There is a significant demand for supported housing from residents, with two key supported housing services having been de-commissioned in the borough since 2023 and an increasing demand for homelessness assistance from single people within the Borough.</p> <p>The provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House would increase supply to meet the demand and needs of vulnerable residents, reduce the need to accommodate residents in costly temporary accommodation or housing which is not as suitable for their needs, positively impact on homelessness prevention, and increase the provision of accessible housing in the borough.</p> <p>In owning the freehold, the Council will have full flexibility related to its future use and, as necessary and appropriate, can justify investing any capital required to ensure the provision of good quality supported housing in the borough.</p> <p>The Council has considered five options in relation to this potential acquisition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acquire the property and remodel as supported housing – recommended option 2. Acquire the property and remodel as temporary accommodation – not recommended 3. Acquire the property and remodel for other Council uses – not recommended 4. Acquire the property, demolish the existing structure and rebuild – recommended for further exploration should Option 1 not proceed 5. Do not acquire the property – not recommended <p>The recommended option is to purchase the property and refurbish and remodel it to provide modern, fit-for-purpose studio accommodation, continuing its use as supported housing for the homeless.</p> <p>Option 1 is the recommended option as ensures the provision of the essential supported housing need in this location whilst achieving cost savings for the Council when compared to either a third-party acquiring or the Council having to provide this</p>

	<p>accommodation via temporary accommodation. This is supported by effectively utilising available GLA grant.</p> <p>Option 2 is not recommended as it is not financially viable given the lower available grant position and income if the property was bought and remodelled as temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Option 3 is not recommended as the continuation of a supported housing service from this location is strongly supported, and the planning and grant viability cases for changing use would be challenging and incur unnecessary risk.</p> <p>Option 4 is recommended for further exploration post-acquisition if for some unforeseen reason, Option 1 is prevented from coming forward. At present, however, the Council's view is that financial, planning and site constraints will likely prevent this from being as viable as the recommended option (Option 1). The recommended option remains a viable base case for acquisition in any event.</p> <p>Option 5 is not recommended as the Council will have less security of supply – potentially losing control of a site that has been critical in meeting its supported housing requirements – and also incur higher costs, either by renting the site from a third party, which is likely to be at higher cost, or having to source additional temporary accommodation.</p> <p>We are completing an EQIA in relation to this potential acquisition and use of Princess Beatrice House.</p>
Name of person completing this EqIA	James Hermida, Housing Policy and Strategy Manager
Name of Director	Kojo Sarpong, Director of Housing Needs
Team	Housing Policy and Strategy Team
Directorate	Housing Needs, Housing and Social Investment
Contact Email	James.hermida@rbkc.gov.uk
Where is this EqIA stored. (This is to ensure colleagues can pick this up in your absence.)	Housing Policy and Strategy Team SharePoint site
Is this EqIA accompanying a report that is going through a formal decision process? If so which meeting, is it going to for decision?	Yes – this is a Key Decision which is due to be taken by the Leadership Team in January 2025

SECTION 2: EqIA Screening – Do you need to complete a full EqIA?

Please complete the checklist below, including impact to help determine if a full EqIA is necessary.

Please see table in Section 3 for a breakdown of the protected characteristics

Question	Answer (Yes, No, Unclear)	Impact (Positive, Negative or Neutral)
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect men, women or those who identify as non-binary?	Y	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of a particular race or ethnicity? This includes refugees, asylum seekers, migrants and gypsies and travellers.	Y	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people with a disability? Consider physical and learning disabilities and mental health conditions.	Y	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of certain sexual orientations?	N	
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different age groups? Consider children and elderly populations.	Y	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those undergoing or intending to undergo the process of gender reassignment?	N	
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those due to pregnancy or maternity? The Equality Act protects women people from discrimination from when you become pregnant until your right to maternity leave ends and you return to work. If you do not have the right to maternity leave this is 2 weeks after the child is born.	N	
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect those who are married or in a civil partnership?	N	
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people of different faiths and beliefs?	N	
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people on low incomes or living in poverty?	Y	Positive
Does your programme have the potential to disproportionately affect people living in the most deprived areas of RBKC?	Y	Positive

Think about North Kensington, in particular Golborne, Notting Dale, Dalgarno and those living on the Worlds End Estate. There is further detail in Section 3 below in the socioeconomic and geographical box.		
---	--	--

If you have assessed the impact to any of the above questions to be Negative, Neutral or Unclear, then you will need to complete Sections 3, 4 and 5. If you have assessed all the necessary impacts as Positive, explain the rational for this in the box below and then go to Section 5.

Please use this box to outline how residents are positively impacted. Include the following information:

- Data on services users or people potential impacted
- Consultation information with service users and how this has evidenced a positive impact
- Explain if your proposal takes steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups, where these are different from the needs of other people; and encourages people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low

It is important to note that Look Ahead is selling Princess Beatrice House with vacant possession. This means that all residents will be decanted from the building before any sale is completed, regardless of who the buyer is. It is therefore necessary for residents to vacate the building, regardless of whether the Council acquires it and what it may be used for in the future.

Further, even if the Council acquires the building and uses it for supported housing, it will take some time for the building to be redesigned to provide 66 self-contained studios, including several wheelchair accessible units. In addition, it will take some time to tender and commission a new supported housing service to be provided in the building.

Therefore, the Council's decision as to whether to acquire Princess Beatrice House, and its potential use in the future, has not resulted in the residents being decanted from Princess Beatrice House – rather, it is Look Ahead's decision to sell the building with vacant possession which has caused residents to be moved elsewhere.

The Council has worked with Look Ahead and partner organisations to move residents to alternative accommodation in a planned way. Of the 53 residents decanted from Princess Beatrice House by 21 November 2024, 10 (19%) moved to the private rented sector, 24 (45%) to other supported housing, seven (13%) to social housing, one (2%) to rehab, seven (13%) were evicted, and four (8%) moved to temporary accommodation. There were nine residents whose stay at Princess Beatrice House was extended for a short period to enable them to secure move-on options.

If the Council does not acquire Princess Beatrice House to use as supported housing, the provision of 68 bedspaces for vulnerable residents with support needs will be lost in the long-term. Therefore, acquiring the building for this use would provide a supported housing service which may otherwise not exist.

Should the Council not acquire this building to provide self-contained supported housing and housing related support for 66 vulnerable residents, this may result in a significant number of residents becoming homeless, experiencing other negative outcomes (detailed further below) and residing in alternative housing, which is not as suitable for their needs, including temporary accommodation out of borough.

Consultation with previous residents of Princess Beatrice House has been conducted through annual surveys and interviews. The feedback from residents was that they appreciated the support they received from the support staff, especially support around budgeting, accessing training and health services. In addition, they shared concerns about the state of the building and the need for repairs and refurbishment – all residents supported refurbishment of the building.

There will be consultation when commissioning a new housing support service, which will potentially include internal and external stakeholders, such as supported housing residents, supported housing providers, health and adult social care, via meetings and surveys to gather feedback.

As part of this EQIA, we have considered the protected characteristics of residents on the Council's Housing Register who have been awarded independent living points to enable them to move on from supported housing to permanent social housing. The points are ordinarily awarded where a person in supported housing has vulnerabilities and needs that mean they would find it very difficult to manage a private rented tenancy and stay independent – although the points can also be awarded to residents in a 'working hostel'.

Whilst this does not include residents in supported housing who do not qualify for this priority – because they are assessed as being suitable for private rented accommodation – it provides an indication of the residents in supported housing who have different protected characteristics, including residents who previously resided at Princess Beatrice House.

Age

2021 census: The average age of residents in Kensington and Chelsea is 40.45 years, making it the fourth oldest population in London.

The age breakdown of our population is:

4 years and under	4.3%	25-34 years	17.5 %
5-9 years	4.4%	35-49 years	21.2 %
10-15 years	5.4%	50-64 years	20.5%
16-19 years	3.8%	65-74 years	7.9%
20-24 years	8.5%	75-84 years	4.8%
		85 years and over	1.7%

9% of people with independent living points are aged 60+ and 55% of residents are aged under 25. As such, young people are disproportionately represented amongst this group of residents compared to the general population of the borough. Therefore, if Princess Beatrice House is acquired to use as supported housing for vulnerable residents, this will likely positively impact younger people, as well as a relatively significant amount of older people, who would otherwise not have this accommodation based service available to them.

Disability

2021 census: 12.8% of residents in the borough said they had a long-term condition or disability that limited their life in some way.

19% of residents with independent living points stated that they had a disability; 64% did not answer; and 17% said that they had no disability. Therefore, people with a disability are slightly overrepresented in this group of residents compared to the general population of the borough – although it is likely that many of the residents who did not answer this question do in fact have a

disability, as supported housing is provided to vulnerable residents, many of whom will have a mental or physical health related disability.

In addition, Princes Beatrice House will include the provision of several wheelchair accessible flats (likely to be between six and nine) – the number will be dependent on further assessment and surveys.

Consequently, the provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House will have a positive impact on this protected characteristic group – particularly people who have mental health issues (who often meet the criteria for supported housing) and residents requiring a wheelchair accessible home (as there is a significant shortage of these types of properties within social housing, supported housing, private rented housing and temporary accommodation stock).

Race

2021 Census: The broad ethnic breakdown of the borough's population is White at 70.6%; Asian, Asian British at 11.8%; Black, Black British at 7.9%; Mixed or multiple ethnicities at 6.6%; and Other at 9.9%.

A more detailed breakdown is:

Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian	2.1%
Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African	0.9%
Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2.1%
Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other	2.4%
Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British	32.7%
Black African	4.8%	White Irish	2.0%
Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.1%
Black Other	0.8%	White Roma	0.7%
		White Other	28.3%
		Other Arab	4.5%
		Other ethnicities	5.4%

28% of residents with independent living points stated that they were from an ethnic minority background; 60% of people did not answer the question; and 12% said they were White British. The percentage of people who said they were White British was less than the general population of the borough, 33% of whom said they were White British.

Therefore, the provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House will likely have a positive impact on people from different ethnic backgrounds, who would otherwise have to look for alternative suitable housing.

Sex

2021 Census: Female 53.2% and Male 46.8%.

Of those residents with independent living points, 40% are women and 60% are men. Men are therefore disproportionately overrepresented amongst supported housing residents compared with the general population of the borough. Therefore, the provision of supported housing will likely have a positive impact on men.

In addition, it is possible that princess Beatrice House could be a mixed-sex service, depending on the demand for this, which would also have a positive impact on women.

People on low incomes or living in poverty

People residing in supported housing are vulnerable and often have some of the most complex needs in terms of mental health, social exclusion, substance misuse and offending behaviour – and a significant number of residents in supported housing will be on a low income (often welfare benefits) and living in poverty.

It is likely that if Princess Beatrice House is not available as supported housing, some of the residents who would have otherwise been accommodated there, will be able to access alternative supported housing to meet their needs. However, there will likely be a significant number of residents who are unable to access alternative supported housing because it is not available in time to prevent or relieve their homelessness.

It is likely that many such residents would experience less positive counter-factual outcomes in comparison to the provision of supported housing. This could include homelessness and accommodation which is not as suitable for their needs, and would likely equate to a significant number of residents over time.

The Council commissions 453 supporting housing units in the borough. Analysis of supported housing in the borough from Homeless Link estimates that 576 units of supported housing is required in the long-term, which is 123 units more than the Council currently commissions. In addition, Homeless Link surveyed supported housing residents in the borough. This revealed that 72% would likely experience poorer outcomes if the supported housing option was removed. Homeless Link estimated that the counter-factual for such residents would be: 4% to prison; 14% to psychiatric care; 43% to Council temporary accommodation; 2% to post-18 foster care; 1% to a refuge; 7% to a registered care home; 19% rough sleeping; and 10% to non-commissioned supported housing.

This analysis from Homeless Link highlights the important role that supported housing plays in meeting the housing needs of vulnerable residents in the borough.

Consequently, it is expected that the provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House would positively impact residents on low incomes and/or living in poverty – especially because supported housing residents are particularly vulnerable and a significant number of people would likely experience poorer outcomes if supported housing was not available for them.

People living in the most deprived areas of RBKC

There is a polarised picture of deprivation in Kensington and Chelsea, with some very high levels of deprivation in the north, and most westerly and southerly parts of the borough, and relatively low levels of deprivation elsewhere. Deprivation levels in Kensington and Chelsea are predominantly

driven by factors relating to employment, low household income, the living environment, crime, and access to housing and services.

Housing is a challenging issue for Kensington and Chelsea in terms of deprivation – according to the Census 2021 data, 22% of households in the borough are deprived in the housing dimension, compared to 18% in London. Barriers to housing and services include the physical/geographical and financial accessibility of housing and services in the borough.

The provision of this service would have a positive impact in terms of addressing housing related deprivation in Kensington and Chelsea, as it is situated in the borough and will therefore promote the physical/geographical accessibility of housing; and rents will be covered by Housing Benefit which will promote the financial accessibility of housing.

Princess Beatrice House is in the Redcliffe ward of the borough – it is one of the most westerly parts of the borough with a relative degree of deprivation. Moreover, vulnerable residents from across the whole borough, including in the most deprived wards such as Golborne, Notting Dale and Dalgarno, and those living on the World's End Estate, will be able to access supported housing at Princess Beatrice House. Ordinarily, residents must have a significant local connection to the borough in terms of residence to be able to access supported housing.

If Princess Beatrice House is not acquired to use as supported housing, vulnerable residents from the most deprived parts of the borough will have to find alternative housing arrangements – and a significant number may experience poorer outcomes than if they had resided in specialist supported housing at Princess Beatrice House. Consequently, the provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House will have a positive impact on people living in the most deprived areas of the borough.

Other groups

The provision of supported housing at Princess Beatrice House will have a positive impact on other groups who will lose this specialist housing provision in the borough in the long-term if the Council does not acquire the building to use as supported housing. This includes the following:

- Care leavers who are often placed in supported housing as their semi-independent living accommodation pending their rehousing to permanent social housing in the future
- Rough sleepers who often require supported housing to help them move away from a life on the streets and develop the independent living skills needed to move on to settled housing
- Domestic abuse survivors who may need the provision of supported housing to help them stabilise and prepare to live independently following traumatic experiences
- People with mental health issues who often reside in specialist supported housing to help develop their independent living skills before moving on to a permanent home
- People with substance misuse issues who often benefit from supported housing to access the housing related and other support they need to live more independently in the future
- People with an offending background who need support to successfully live an offending-free life in the community.

Council Plan

Acquiring Princess Beatrice House for supported housing will contribute towards some of the commitments in the Council Plan and its Action Plan:

- Becoming the best Council for a borough that is greener, safer and fairer
- Prioritise safety in our approach to managing, maintaining and allocating Council homes, while working with registered providers, temporary accommodation providers, and private sector landlords to drive the highest possible standards (safer)
- Be a good landlord, investing in and maintaining our social housing and targeting more services in areas like health and employment support to people in social housing or on the housing register (fairer)
- Prevent homelessness and rough sleeping wherever we can (fairer)
- Ensure that residents who most need our support, including those who live in social housing and temporary accommodation, feel the full benefit of our services and investment (fairer)
- Lead the transition to net zero by making council-owned buildings like our homes and estates, schools, and offices energy efficient (greener).

In addition, it will contribute towards the related cross-Council change activity in prioritising the impact on the safety and wellbeing of our residents when we make decisions about spending and being a good landlord by investing in more support for residents.

SECTION 3: Assessing the Impact

Please use this section to assess the impact of the programme on those with protected characteristics. Please answer the following questions in your assessment for each characteristic.

- 1. How many people currently use the service? Or who and how many people will be affected by the policy or strategy?** We have provided data from the latest census on the population of RBKC for each protected characteristic. Additional Census data can also be accessed from the RBKC Census Dashboard. Please add data about your service users/populations in the relevant boxes.
- 2. What consultation have you completed to gather feedback from service users? Or what other relevant data have you gathered to support your work?** Include the findings in each relevant group.
For more information on consultation please refer to the [12 principles of good governance and consultation in the Constitution](#). You can also speak with the Consultations Team for further advice.
- 3. How will you ensure that the policy, project, service, or strategy will be accessible to all groups? and how will you address or breakdown any barriers to achieving this.** Explain if your proposal takes steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups, where these are different from the needs of other people; and encourages people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low?
- 4. How is this group impacted and determine whether the proposed activity will have a positive, neutral or negative impact.**
- 5. If the impact is negative, what mitigations will you put in place to reduce the impact?**
- 6. If the impact is positive, what actions have you taken to achieve a positive impact?**

Protected characteristic	Analysis	Impact (Positive, Negative or Neutral)																								
Age	<p>2021 census: The average age of residents in Kensington and Chelsea is 40.45 years, making it the fourth oldest population in London.</p> <p>The age breakdown of our population is:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="319 495 1173 759"> <tr> <td>4 years and under</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>25-34 years</td> <td>17.5 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-9 years</td> <td>4.4%</td> <td>35-49 years</td> <td>21.2 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10-15 years</td> <td>5.4%</td> <td>50-64 years</td> <td>20.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16-19 years</td> <td>3.8%</td> <td>65-74 years</td> <td>7.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-24 years</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>75-84 years</td> <td>4.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>85 years and over</td> <td>1.7%</td> </tr> </table> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p> <p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>4. Analysis of impact:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	4 years and under	4.3%	25-34 years	17.5 %	5-9 years	4.4%	35-49 years	21.2 %	10-15 years	5.4%	50-64 years	20.5%	16-19 years	3.8%	65-74 years	7.9%	20-24 years	8.5%	75-84 years	4.8%			85 years and over	1.7%	
4 years and under	4.3%	25-34 years	17.5 %																							
5-9 years	4.4%	35-49 years	21.2 %																							
10-15 years	5.4%	50-64 years	20.5%																							
16-19 years	3.8%	65-74 years	7.9%																							
20-24 years	8.5%	75-84 years	4.8%																							
		85 years and over	1.7%																							
Disability	<p>2021 census: 12.8% of residents in the borough said they had a long-term condition or disability that limited their life in some way. LGA Data from the academic year 21/22 highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,379 young people have Special Educational Needs in RBKC. • 746 have a statement of Special Educational Need or an Education and Health Plan. • 62 children in the Borough have a disability in schools. <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p> <p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>4. Analysis of impact:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>																									

<p>Gender reassignment</p>	<p>The 2021 census captured this information those aged 16 and above. Approximately 90% of our residents stated that their sex is the same as it was at birth. Nearly 9% of residents did not answer the question. The remaining identified themselves as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.2% said that their sex is different to that registered at birth • 0.1% identify as Trans woman • 0.1% as Trans man • Less than 0.1% identify as non-binary • 0.1% identify as other <p>1.Data on service users/those affected: 2. Consultation outcomes for this group: 3. Accessibility and Inclusion: 4. Analysis of impact: 5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	
<p>Marriage and Civil Partnership</p>	<p>2021 Census data shows 49.24% of residents are single. Nearly 35% of residents are married to someone of the opposite sex and 0.5% are married to someone of the same sex. The remaining 0.15% of our residents are in a civil partnership with someone of the opposite sex and 0.39% are in a civil partnership with someone of the same sex.</p> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected: 2. Consultation outcomes for this group: 3. Accessibility and Inclusion: 4. Analysis of impact: 5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	
<p>Pregnancy and maternity</p>	<p>The 2019 JSNA showed there were 1,612 births in the borough. It also showed an estimated 335 cases perinatal mental illness.</p> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected: 2. Consultation outcomes for this group: 3. Accessibility and Inclusion: 4. Analysis of impact:</p>	

	5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:																																													
Race	<p>2021 Census: The broad ethnic breakdown of the borough's population is White at 70.6%; Asian, Asian British at 11.8%; Black, Black British at 7.9%; Mixed or multiple ethnicities at 6.6%; and Other at 9.9%.</p> <p>A more detailed breakdown is:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Asian Bangladeshi</td> <td>1%</td> <td>Mixed White and Asian</td> <td>2.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Chinese</td> <td>2.7%</td> <td>Mixed White and Black African</td> <td>0.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Indian</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td> <td>2.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Pakistani</td> <td>0.9%</td> <td>Mixed Other</td> <td>2.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian Other</td> <td>5%</td> <td>White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British</td> <td>32.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black African</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td>White Irish</td> <td>2.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Caribbean</td> <td>2.3%</td> <td>White Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td> <td>0.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black Other</td> <td>0.8%</td> <td>White Roma</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>White Other</td> <td>28.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Other Arab</td> <td>4.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Other ethnicities</td> <td>5.4%</td> </tr> </table> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p> <p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>4. Analysis of impact:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian	2.1%	Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African	0.9%	Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2.1%	Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other	2.4%	Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British	32.7%	Black African	4.8%	White Irish	2.0%	Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.1%	Black Other	0.8%	White Roma	0.7%			White Other	28.3%			Other Arab	4.5%			Other ethnicities	5.4%	
Asian Bangladeshi	1%	Mixed White and Asian	2.1%																																											
Asian Chinese	2.7%	Mixed White and Black African	0.9%																																											
Asian Indian	2.2%	Mixed White and Black Caribbean	2.1%																																											
Asian Pakistani	0.9%	Mixed Other	2.4%																																											
Asian Other	5%	White English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish British	32.7%																																											
Black African	4.8%	White Irish	2.0%																																											
Black Caribbean	2.3%	White Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0.1%																																											
Black Other	0.8%	White Roma	0.7%																																											
		White Other	28.3%																																											
		Other Arab	4.5%																																											
		Other ethnicities	5.4%																																											
Religion/belief	<p>A breakdown of religious groups in RBKC from the 2021 census are:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Buddhist</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Jewish</td> <td>1.9%</td> <td>Other</td> <td>0.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Christian</td> <td>48.4%</td> <td>Muslim</td> <td>11.8%</td> <td>No religion</td> <td>24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hindu</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>Sikh</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>did not answer</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </table> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p>	Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other	0.7%	Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion	24.8%	Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer	10%																											
Buddhist	1.1%	Jewish	1.9%	Other	0.7%																																									
Christian	48.4%	Muslim	11.8%	No religion	24.8%																																									
Hindu	1.1%	Sikh	0.2%	did not answer	10%																																									

	<p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>4. Analysis of impact:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	
Sex	<p>2021 Census: Female 53.2% and Male 46.8%.</p> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p> <p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>4. Analysis of impact:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	
Sexual Orientation	<p>2021 census information on sexual orientation is only captured for people aged 16 and above. Approximately 85% identify as Heterosexual, nearly 3% identify as Gay or Lesbian, 1.3% as Bisexual and 0.3% as other, the remaining 10.4% did not answer this question.</p> <p>1.Data on service users/those affected:</p> <p>2. Consultation outcomes for this group:</p> <p>3. Accessibility and Inclusion:</p> <p>5/6. Mitigations for negative impact/actions taken for positive impact:</p>	
<p>In addition to the nine protected characteristics, where relevant we ask that you also think about the socio-economic and geographical considerations of our residents. Some data has been included below for your reference.</p>		
Socio-economic and Geographical	<p>A recent report on data from the Index of Multiple Deprivation for 2019 showed that a high concentration of the most deprived Lower Super Output Areas being found in the Golborne, Notting Dale and Dalgarno wards.</p> <p>North Kensington also has higher numbers of people on low incomes, who are unemployed or who have no qualifications than</p>	

	<p>the rest of the borough and has a higher proportion of social housing. There are also pockets of low income, higher unemployment, and lower skills levels in parts of the south and west of the borough, again in areas where there are greater proportions of social housing.</p> <p>According to recent ONS data RBKC continues to have the highest life expectancy in the country, however this varies between the north and the south, between people from different ethnic minorities, and between homeowners, private renters, and those in social housing.</p> <p>ONS data also shows that life expectancy in the borough can vary significantly by different wards. There are larger gaps between the least and most deprived wards, these are as much as 14.8 years for males and 11.9 years for females. Females in Notting Dale live on average 15 years less than their neighbours in Holland Ward.</p> <p>The 2021 census data on general health of our residents shows that 58% of all residents, reported being in 'very good' health, 29.6 reported 'good' health, 10.1% reported 'fair health', 3.7% reported 'bad health' and 1.1% of residents reported 'very bad' health. However, these figures vary greatly across the Borough. Campden residents had the highest proportion reporting 'very good' health, 67.4% and Dalgarno in the north of the Borough had the lowest, 48.5%.</p>	
Other Groups	Please consider groups that may be affected by your work, such as Grenfell Bereaved and Survivors, Carers and Members of the Armed Forces etc.	

SECTION 4: Action Plan

Have you identified the need to reduce or remove any negative impacts, conduct work with those from protected groups to participate where their participation is disproportionately low, or fill any data gaps? If so, complete the Action Plan below to show the work that is planned.

None identified

Issue identified	Planned Action	Lead Officer and Timeframe
------------------	----------------	----------------------------

SECTION 5: Sign-off

Director/ Head of Service Name	Altin Smajli, Head of Housing Strategy, Health & Allocations (Housing Needs)
Contact Email	Altin.smajli@rbkc.gov.uk
Date of sign off	2 January 2025

Review

It is important to consider equalities issues at every stage of the process. Remember an EqIA is a live document which means it must be regularly reviewed and updated considering new evidence or information, for example, have you now completed your consultation or has there been news on funding. Please ask your Director or Head of Service to sign-off at every review stage. You can have as many reviews as are appropriate for your work.

Date of 1 st Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	
Date of 2 nd Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	
Date of 3 rd Review	
Name of Reviewer	
Director signature	