

Consultation Response

January 2010



Response to the *London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London*

About Race on the Agenda

Race on the Agenda (ROTA) is one of Britain's leading social policy think-tanks focusing on issues that affect Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) communities. Originally set up in 1984, ROTA aims to increase the capacity of BAME organisations and strengthen the voice of BAME communities through increased civic engagement and participation in society.

ROTA's Articles of Association state that the charity is set up "to work towards the elimination of racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity, human rights and good relations between persons of different groups".

For historical and demographic reasons, our work prioritises London, but our activities and a number of our projects have national and international significance. To this end we work in close partnership with our membership and others interested in race equality, human rights and the promotion of good relations.

Our presence in London is enhanced by the regional network MiNet.

MiNet is the London focused BAME network of networks, which joined ROTA in 2002 to strengthen the voice for London's BAME third sector in the development of regional policy.

ROTA definition of BAME and approach to race equality

ROTA works on social policy issues that have an impact on race equality and BAME communities. ROTA's definition of 'race' encompasses all the protected characteristics under equality legislation including:

- colour
- nationality
- ethnic or national origin

We use the term BAME to refer to all groups who are discriminated against on the aforementioned grounds. This definition includes but is not exclusive to people of African, Asian, Caribbean, European and Eastern European, Irish, Greek, Turkish, Jewish, Roma and South East Asian decent as well as refugees and asylum seekers.

Methodology for this response

ROTA's policy work is evidence based in the sense that everything we do is informed by the views and real life experiences of BAME communities and the organisations that are set up to serve them. We collect evidence through:

- Action **Research** (qualitative and quantitative surveys)
- Events, consultations and conferences, including with the Just Space Network of third sector organisations
- The ROTA based network of **MiNet**

This response is based on previous consultations and research ROTA has undertaken with BAME communities and our partners.

The draft replacement London Plan 2009

The London Plan is the regional spatial strategy for London. It is developed by the Mayors Office and must be considered in decisions by London boroughs over the development of the physical environment of London. It will influence the Local Development Frameworks that individual boroughs will write and will act as material evidence in planning decisions when assessing new developments for their necessity, meeting environmental concerns and encouraging the social and economic growth of London.

The draft replacement London Plan 2009 presented in this consultation is a replacement of the London Plan 2008. This is because there have been several amendments and additions to the 2008 plan since the new administration took office. Considering the changes it was considered a more sensible, efficient and inclusive approach to review the entire plan and present a rewritten version. The replacement plan covers the period 2011 to 2031 and is linked with a joint consultation of the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, Mayor's Health Inequalities Strategy and the Mayors Transport Plan for London. It is one of the core strategies that will shape the design and development of London for the next two decades.

This response focuses on the general approach of the strategy and priorities identified by BAME communities in London. Therefore this response will be limited to the main chapters which have reference to these priorities and link with the other consultations being undertaken. That is Chapter 1, Context and Strategy that feeds in the assumptions behind the plan; Chapter 3, London's People; Chapter 4 London's Economy; and Chapter 8 Implementation, Monitoring and Review that oversees the replacement plan.

ROTA Recommendations to the Mayor of London

Chapter 1: Context and strategy

- Include in the Mayor's vision and objectives of the London plan an explicit objective to address the substantive inequality faced by BAME communities and other equality groups in London. The BAME population in London is very significant with the 2001 Census indicating 28.1% of person being from

a non white background and 40.3% from a non British white background¹. This should include as part of this objective the requirement for planners and developers to consider inequality at each juncture in their work by ensuring a good evidence base, working with BAME and other third sector equality organisations. This will meet the Mayor's obligations under the GLA Act 1999 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 and the Single Equality Bill currently going through parliament.

- Information should be included for different issues faced by equality groups in relation to the socio-economic areas the Plan covers. This could be presented in an equalities section with sub-sections covering each equalities 'strand' in turn. Such a format would reflect recent developments in the equalities and human rights landscape, including the establishment of the Equality and Human Rights Commission and the Single Equality Bill. It should clarify what the role of the London Plan, and planners and developers themselves is in addressing inequality, while acting as an accessible reference guide on equalities issues for consideration in planning.
- The Examination In Public (EIP) should have a dedicated day to address whether the London Plan will satisfactorily meet the equality obligations on the GLA and London Boroughs, particularly in meeting the needs of the most excluded and disadvantaged groups including Gypsy and Travellers, Asylum Seekers and Refugees and Young People.

Chapter 3: London's People

- ROTA recommends the inclusion of a sentence under paragraph 3.81 and in the implementation plan about the particular barriers faced by BAME communities in engaging in local democratic structures and processes, including Local Authorities, Local Area Agreements, Local Strategic Partnerships and planning departments as a way of encourages local statutory bodies to address these barriers.
- Policy 3.1 should be rephrased as
"The Mayor is committed to ensuring equal life for all Londoners. Meeting the needs and expanding opportunities for all Londoners, with a focus on the particular needs of excluded groups and communities – is key to tackling the huge issues of inequality across London. The provision of social infrastructure is an important part of meeting this commitment".

Health inequalities

- ROTA strongly encourages the draft replacement London Plan 2009 retain and build on the priority given to health in the current London Plan 2008 in

¹ Source: Table UV09 2001 Census, *Office for National Statistics*, © <http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/LeadTableView.do?a=3&b=276743&c=London&d=13&e=16&g=325264&i=1001x1003x1004&m=0&r=1&s=1263209520031&enc=1&dsFamilyId=87>

order to help tackle the continuing and unacceptable incidence of health inequalities in London.

- The Mayor's Office should refer to ROTA's response to the consultation on the Mayor's Strategy Health Inequalities² for more information about the health inequalities experienced by London's BAME communities and use that response to inform the London Plan.
- Due to the health inequalities faced by BAME communities, including in terms of accessing appropriate community, primary and acute healthcare, planners should ensure that provisions for the development of healthcare services have given special consideration to the needs of BAME communities and that targeted and specific action is needed to ensure improved health outcomes for BAME communities.
- This policy should make greater links to the Mayor's Health Inequalities Strategies to ensure planners are more fully aware of what their obligations are under the latter strategy and that addressing health inequalities is central to their work.
- Some of the barriers faced by BAME communities in accessing health services can in part be addressed through commissioning BAME organisations to deliver health services or to act as links between BAME communities and mainstream services. The Plan should enable some awareness among planners and developers of these issues and ensure community health and third sector facilities are integrated.
- The Mayor should encourage his local partners, in particular local authorities and PCTs, to recognise the wider social impact of BAME organisations and support their engagement in all aspects of the development of health services. In doing this the draft replacement London Plan 2009 should draw a link with work highlighted in *Partnership in Public Services: An action plan for third sector involvement*³. This states that the government will "promote the use of social clauses in championing in the social value of the third sector can create and enable innovative approaches to grow".

Social infrastructure

- The Mayor's Office should include Supplementary Planning Guidance to inform the London plan developing diverse social infrastructure to facilitate services to BAME communities, including:
 - How to assess social infrastructure needs in diverse communities to ensure the 'hardest to reach' are considered.
 - How to ensure facilities are accessible to all sections of the community.

² ROTA response to the London Health Inequalities Strategy, ROTA 2010

³ Office for the Third Sector, *Partnership in Public Services: An action plan for third sector involvement*, 2006

- How to involve all sections of third sector, particularly those representing diverse communities such as the BAME third sector.

Schools

- Planning decisions should ensure that in developing educational facilities consideration is given to the inequalities BAME people face in terms of educational experience and outcomes, for example, by ensuring that there are provisions for the disproportionate number of BAME young people that are excluded from school, that facilities are available for supplementary schools, single sex or religious facilities as required, ensuring further educational facilities have in place positive action measures to address any disadvantage.

Chapter 4: London's Economy

- Where the plan contains a focus on economic growth on certain sectors (financial/cultural) then higher proportion of resources must be focused on addressing inequalities for communities who cannot access those sectors to achieve substantive equality. This will develop capacity in the workforce, build resilience into the London economy and access a hitherto underused resource of skills while generating spending power to further stimulate local economies
- The provision of cultural and arts activity and spaces in new developments to facilitate diverse cultural industries and activities is encouraged under the London Plan guidance and should take account of the differing resource capacity of different communities in informing these decisions.

Chapter 8: Implementation, Monitoring and Review

- The Mayors Office should outline how equality impacts will be assessed in the AMR and what feedback mechanism there will be to ensure that the findings of these impacts will go on to inform the further development of planning strategy in London to benefit BAME communities.
- ROTA recommends that in the Key Performance Indicators there should be, at a minimum, an ethnicity cross section of indicators 6, 7, 11, 12, and 13 to identify whether all ethnic groups are achieving the same progress against the performance indicators across the fundamental areas of disadvantage facing BAME communities.
- ROTA recommends that the GLA to reword KPI 11 to be the '*elimination of the gap in unemployment rates between BAME and White populations*' rather than merely a '*reduction*'. This will embed the commitment of the Mayors Office to the achievement of substantive equality within a generation.
- In the implementation plan the BAME third sector needs to be referenced and described alongside, but separately from, the generic third sector

because of the distinctive and vital role it could play in supporting the Mayor to meet the equalities related aims outlined in the Plan and other policy documents. Additionally a definition of social infrastructure which includes the VCS and the BAME third sector separately should be included in the policy statements to ensure the Mayor's commitments are backed up.

Equality Impact Assessment

- ROTA asks the Mayors Office to inform us and the wider community what information has been used to evidence the benefits of the London Plan 2009, the issues facing BAME communities and those disadvantaged by discrimination and exclusion.
- ROTA believes the Equality Impact Assessment conducted on the draft replacement London Plan 2009 is inadequate to meet the requirements under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 and Section 33 of the GLA Act 1999. The Mayors Office should, as part of and additional to this consultation, do a thorough assessment of the impact of the proposed draft replacement London Plan 2009 on different equality groups and alter the plan as necessary to ensure equality for all of London's diverse communities.
- The Examination in Public (EIP) should have a dedicated day to address whether the Integrated Impact Assessment adequately meets the needs of the London Plan and all legal requirements effectively. This should include contributions from interested parties identified within this consultation process.

ROTA Response to London Plan 2009

General points

While the range of GLA initiatives, including policy and programmes in areas such as housing and employment have had some impact, London's BAME communities continue to face persistent inequalities. The following facts and figures, including from the Commission for Racial Equality's' last report⁴, demonstrates this:

- BAME young people are more likely to suffer from mental health problems and are disproportionately more likely to be found within the social care system.
- Young black or mixed race men are more likely than others to be prosecuted and convicted.
- BAME people are over represented in the criminal justice system making up 25% of the male prison population.
- BAME people represent 2.4% of all directors in FTSE 100 companies.
- Anecdotal evidence suggests that ethnic minority businesses find it more difficult to gain opportunities to tender for contracts and are under-represented in both public and private sector supply chains.

⁴ *A lot done, a lot to do: Our vision for an integrated Britain*, Commission for Racial Equality (2007)

- Of the 214 people currently elected to the London Assembly, Welsh Assembly and the Scottish Parliament, only two belong to an ethnic minority and only 4.1% of local councillors come from an ethnic minority background.
- In the 2005 general election, voter turnout was 47% for ethnic minority voters compared with 61% among the population as a whole.
- 67% of BAME people live in the 88 most deprived wards in England.
- London children with a very high risk of living in poverty include those from Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups (69 per cent) those from Black ethnic groups (51 per cent)⁵
- In London, pupils of Chinese and Indian origin perform well above average at school with over 70% of Chinese and 65% of Indian 15+ year olds achieving five or more A – C grade GCSEs, compared with 48% of white children⁶.
- In 2006, the unemployment rate for Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) Londoners averaged 13 percent whereas the unemployment rate for White Londoners was 5%⁷
- In London in 2007/08 Black people were over 4 times more likely to be stopped and searched than White people under Section 1 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE)⁸.
- Black people are over three times more likely to be arrested than white people. In 2007/08 Black Londoners experienced proportionally 3 times more arrests than White Londoners⁹.

This disadvantage speaks to the level of exclusion among BAME communities that must be considered by any strategic approach by the Mayor's Office. These differences result from exclusion, systematic inequality and discrimination. Addressing these differences requires consideration and a focused effort in the replacement plan.

The London Plan is a key document in bringing cohesion to disparate strategies affecting these inequalities. Its role in addressing these inequalities should be more greatly emphasised throughout the document.

We also acknowledge that there is often tension between the type of growth projected by the plan and efforts to address inequality. Too often, where there is such growth, it is the quality of life of those already on the margins who suffer. As the socio-economic framework for a world city, with high levels of wealth and inequality, we feel the Plan should be far more innovative and ambitious in its attempts to address this tension.

There is presumption throughout the plan that achieving formal equality (processes

⁵ *Child Poverty in London: Income and Labour Market Indicators: Summary of Findings*, Data Management and Analysis Group, GLA, June 2006

⁶ *Health in London 2004: Focus on London's Black and minority ethnic communities: Summary*, London Health Observatory, <http://www.lho.org.uk/viewResource.aspx?id=8812>

⁷ *Social Exclusion Update, Unemployment rates by ethnicity: 2007 Update*, Data Management and Analysis Group, GLA, September 2007

⁸ *Statistics on Race and The Criminal Justice System: A Ministry of Justice Publication under section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 199*, Ministry of Justice, April 2009, p35

⁹ *Ibid*, p77

that treat everybody the same) will achieve the aims of addressing inequality. Formal equality, which treats everyone equally, even in unequal situations, risks exacerbating inequality. Substantive equality recognises that entitlements, opportunities and access are not equally distributed throughout the community and there may be barriers to service provision resulting in unequal outcomes for particular groups. It acknowledges that where service delivery agencies tailor their services to the needs of the majority group, other people with different needs may miss out on essential services. It encourages positive action to address and correct these situational imbalances, as with gender, race and disability duties. In relation to gender equality, for example, to ensure equality, plans must take account of differences between different ethnic groups to avoid ethnicity-related outcomes that are unfair. Substantive equality recognises that women and men may need to be treated differently in order to benefit equally and will help ensure equality of outcomes. ROTA believes that without a specific design toward substantive equality there will be a significant loss of opportunity in the plan.

The plan should include specific measures aimed at those who experience inequality based on their ethnicity and informed by their experiences as well as a good evidence base. The London Plan does not provide enough information about the inequalities faced by different groups and is not currently well informed enough by evidence on inequality and groups that experience it. In its current form it will not enable planners to plan in a way that adequately addresses inequality.

Chapter 1: Context and Strategy

The London Plan, as the spatial development strategy for London, relies on a set of assumed patterns of population change. In the first chapter of the Plan these assumed patterns of population change have set premises about the BAME community which predict significant growth. On the basis of significant net in migration from overseas and natural growth, the BAME community is predicted to grow and contribute 40% of population growth in the capital by 2031. In fact the plan recognises that BAME communities will form the majority of the population in 8 boroughs by 2028. Brent and Newham are already over 50% BAME population with Harrow, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets, Ealing, Hounslow, and Croydon joining them during the period of the Plan. Therefore it is necessary to recognise the place of BAME communities in the future development of London.

It is a fair and accurate representation of the situation in the Draft Replacement Plan that deprivation is concentrated among BAME communities. It is important that the Mayors Office delivers against its obligations under section 33 of the GLA Act 1999 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 which recognises the accurate identification of need of all of London's communities. Recognising the particular social and economic disadvantage that is facing many of London's BAME communities is necessary to accurately reflect their needs in the London Plan.

The geographical focus of the most deprived areas is identified in the plan, and it is recognised that there is a considerable BAME population in those areas.

We are pleased that there is recognition of the diversity of the London population in the Mayors London Plan and the identified 6 objectives for London¹⁰. It is disappointing that this recognition is not extended to acknowledging the specific inequalities faced by many of these diverse communities. Objective one identifies the generic *'huge issue of tackling inequality among Londoners'* but does not identify the dynamics of inequality based on ethnicity. Considering the recognition of the role of BAME communities as a growing and significant part of the working age population in the future the GLA needs to facilitate equal access to the labour market for the economic benefit of London. To this end it is necessary to make clear that the plan will aim to meet the requirements of sec 33 of the GLA Act 1999 to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and promotion of good race relations¹¹. ROTA believes that a specific strategic objective should look to address the substantive inequality and disadvantage faced by BAME communities and other equality groups.

Chapter 3: London People

In order to meet the objective of *"ensuring equal life chances for all"* the concept and language of substantive equality, rather than formal equality needs to be incorporated within Policy 3.1. The way Policy 3.1 is currently worded may result in de facto discrimination by failing to encourage planning that adequately meets the needs of all individuals and groups of people. It is unlikely to effect the structural, social and cultural changes necessary to correct past and current forms and effects of discrimination against equality groups. We recommend it should be rephrased as *'The Mayor is committed to ensuring equal life for all Londoners. Meeting the needs and expanding opportunities for all Londoners, with a focus on the particular needs of excluded groups and communities – is key to tackling the huge issues of inequality across London. The provision of social infrastructure is an important part of meeting this commitment'*.

Similarly, point 'E' needs to be worded more strongly to 'require', rather than 'suggest', that boroughs consider the cultural, social and religious needs of such groups in order to help ensure compliance with equalities legislation.

In work towards 'equal life chances for all, the plan should include targets relating to the specific inequalities faced by BAME groups. This is further expanded upon in the response to chapter 8. Additionally affirmative actions should be included, for example, to require specific consideration of the inequalities faced by BAME groups in all new developments. Such measures should be considered 'temporary' and discontinued once equality for BAME groups in the areas covered by the Plan have been achieved.

As well as referring planners to the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment', Policy 3.1 should refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance about Equalities and Diversity, which was produced in 2007 after consultation with experts on equalities and diversity issues.

¹⁰ *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London*, Greater London Authority, October 2009, page 27

¹¹ Part II, Section 30, Greater London Authority Act 1999, Stationery Office, Houses of Parliament

We are concerned by the lack of reference to this guidance in the new Plan, which appears to demonstrate lack of commitment to equality and diversity issues. There should be a statement that Policy 3.1 should be considered a cross cutting policy throughout the plan, and could form the basis of the strategic objective that ROTA has already referred to under context and strategy.

We welcome the fact that in paragraph 3.6 the plan encourages all Londoners, especially those who have not previously done so, to engage in strategy and local decision-making. There is a need for recognition of the barriers that some groups face in engaging, which is usually both a cause and effect of inequality and exclusion and provisions to address exclusion. This response makes a more detailed point about this under-representation and how the Mayor's policy could be developed to address this later.

Housing

ROTA has provided a detailed response¹² to *London Housing Strategy: draft for public consultation* (May 2009). This forms the basis of our concerns around the housing of BAME communities. It is necessary to recognise the specific situations faced by a variety of BAME communities, particularly around the invisibility of homelessness and the problems of overcrowding for certain BAME communities. This is aggravated by the interceding economic and social exclusion that can place increased complications in housing of BAME communities. These issues are covered in details in the ROTA response to the Housing Strategy and won't be repeated here. We ask that in the coordination of the provisions of the draft replacement London Plan and London Housing Strategy that the interceding concerns raised by ROTA and The Race Equality Foundation are considered and built into the response to housing issues.

Health inequalities

BAME communities currently face unequal treatment and outcomes in terms of health, with different communities facing different socio-economic health determinants, different risk factors, different illnesses, different barriers to accessing health care¹³. For example:

- Certain health issues are only experienced by or disproportionately affect specific communities, for example there are higher rates of coronary disease among Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups, hypertension among African Caribbean groups, diabetes among South Asian and African Caribbean groups, and a growing rate of prostate cancer among BAME men.
- There are certain social issues that impact on the health of small groups, who are not being supported. Measures should be included in the Strategy to address such gaps. ROTA's Female Voices in Violence project has identified significant unmet health needs for many young BAME women who are victims of violence as a result of being gang associated.

¹² *Joint Response to the Mayor of London's 'London Housing Strategy 2009*, ROTA & Race Equality Foundation, 2009

¹³ *ROTA response to the London Health Inequalities Strategy*, ROTA 2010

For reasons outlined above, we feel the London Plan needs to consider these specific health inequalities in more detail and include provisions to address them within Policy 3.2.

The existing London Plan reflects a stronger commitment to improving health and reducing inequalities and contains a sound policy framework to facilitate progress in this direction.

Social Infrastructure

Essential to meeting health needs of BAME communities, and the social exclusion that feeds health inequalities, is good and effective social infrastructure. We are pleased by the emphasis placed on developing social infrastructure and with the Mayor's intention to work closely with London boroughs and PCTs to identify the current and future social infrastructure needs of London's neighbourhoods. We feel that Policy 3.17 needs to be developed further in order to ensure it enables the development of social infrastructure that will be of benefit to all of London's diverse communities.

Under Point F of this policy it is essential that the BAME third sector is adequately engaged in the development of this further guidance on social infrastructure requirements at the local, sub-regional and London wide level and ROTA would welcome the opportunity to be involved as this is a key area of our expertise. It should include sections that support planners and developers in understanding BAME communities and should be linked to the Guidance on Equality and Diversity¹⁴.

Engagement

When considering the need for BAME communities to be engaged in Boroughs and Local Strategic Partnerships in paragraph 3.81, it is worth noting that BAME communities are under-represented in local structures and processes, as both a cause and a consequence of the inequalities they face. This is despite the considerable investment over recent years aimed at giving local communities more influence over the decisions that affect them, which has not adequately benefited BAME communities as evidenced by much of ROTA's work, for example:

- ROTA's research projects, 'Building Bridges Project' and 'Female Voices in Violence', which look at the impact of serious youth violence, gangs and serious group offending on BAME communities and have reported the under-engagement of BAME organisations in the development of gang crime and youth violence policies.
- ROTA's 2007 report '*Developing the Mayor's Health Inequality Strategy for London: Stakeholder Engagement on Race Equality. Event report*' which found that BAME communities were not fully engaged in the development of in health policy affecting them.

¹⁴ *Planning for Equality and Diversity in London: Supplementary Planning Guidance to the London Plan*, Greater London Authority, October 2007

- The BEAM-EM/ROTA mental health event in October 2009 which found that BAME organisations are still often excluded from forums responsible for the shaping local health services.

Others¹⁵ have evidenced the under-representation of BAME communities in local democratic structures and processes. Additionally, ROTA has also generated anecdotal evidence that engagement of BAME organisations in Local Involvement Networks (LINKs) is patchy across the boroughs.

This is adding to the increasingly challenging environment facing BAME third sector organisations. They are being disproportionately impacted on by the recession¹⁶ and the move from grant making to commissioning, which is favouring large and more resilient mainstream third sector organisations. In addition, the sector has been faced by its own specific challenges, particularly:

- Government's cohesion policies¹⁷
- The uncertainty of the continuity of support from Capacitybuilders for regional BAME networks under the Regional Infrastructure Programme. These networks are main sources of infrastructure support for the BAME third sector and the removal of this funding would be very damaging.
- The continued and persistent inequality faced by BAME people.

ROTA is deeply concerned that the significant challenges faced by the BAME third sector will act as a barrier to the type of engagement needed in order to make this strategy truly successful. This is not considered in the Equality Impact Assessment either.

Service Delivery

We are very pleased by the recognition of the key role the voluntary and community sector (VCS) in supporting communities and addressing inequalities (for example, the voluntary and community sector has an essential role in tackling health inequalities at the local level, particular in promoting and supporting community involvement (paragraph 3.11). This recognition should be headlined within the policy proposals.

It has been well documented by ROTA¹⁸ and others¹⁹ that BAME organisations have a unique and vital role to play in supporting marginalised BAME communities and addressing inequalities, by:

¹⁵ For example, 'Voice 4 Change England (2007) *Bridge the Gap: What is known about the BME Third Sector in England*. Final report & appendices. Abridged version', which reviews a wide range of existing literature about the BAME sector, reports the under-representation of BAME communities in the development of policy that affects them at many levels and in many areas; Kalathil (2009), NHS Bradford and Airedale/UCLAN, (2009) reports Service users and carers from BME communities are not as involved as they would like to be in commissioning and service development processes and decision making.

¹⁶ MiNet, *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. London: ROTA, July 2009

¹⁷ *Annex D: Single Group Funding in Our Shared Future Commission for Integration and Cohesion Final Report*, Commission for Integration and Cohesion, 2007

- Bridging the gap between BAME communities and generic services
- Providing services to meet needs that mainstream providers are either unaware of or do not have the expertise to address
- Empowering BAME communities and supporting their engagement in decision-making that affects them
- Representing BAME communities and informing policy development
- Tackling the wider socio-economic determinants of ill-health
- Advocating on behalf of people suffering discrimination
- Engaging otherwise isolated communities and acting as bridges to other communities, and therefore in strengthening cohesion.

Whilst this is welcome the BAME led third sector delivering services is consistently under resourced and missing out on support services, even though the most essential services to those most in need are among the BAME client groups being serviced by these organisations. The disproportionately high level of need among client groups of BAME third sector, versus the disproportionately low receipt of support and resources means that the gaps in services meeting the need of disadvantaged BAME communities is under distinct pressure²⁰. As such to address the significant needs of BAME communities, and in meeting the need of community empowerment, resources and engagement should be encouraged with BAME communities through the BAME third sector.

ROTA's FVV project, for example, has found that the majority of girls and young women that have been victimised as a result of their gang association are unlikely to take up generic health services and those of Haven and Rape Crisis Centres as they do not believe in confidentiality and are of the opinion that, as their experiences are gang-related, they will be reported to the police²¹. There is a vital role for specialist BAME women's organisations to play here in both bringing such young women to generic services, and in supporting the services to develop the expertise needed to appropriately respond to the complex needs of these young women.

A national study²² found that a significant proportion of BAME organisations are already doing work around the health of their communities (14% of BAME organisations provide health services, including mental health. Other main services provided include: advocacy and advice on, for example, immigration, legal issues, equal opportunities and anti-racism (17%); welfare and income support services (11%); housing and accommodation services (11%); and

¹⁸ For example see 'Nea, B. & Cox, D. (2008) *Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equalities sectors*. HEAR. (HEAR is a London regional network that was hosted by ROTA at the time this report was produced).

¹⁹ For example see 'Perry, J. & El-Hassan, A. A., Hact (2008) *More responsive public services. A guide to commissioning for refugee community organisations*. JRF;

²⁰ MiNet, *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*, London, ROTA, July 2009

²¹ Forthcoming Full Report due for release February 2010. see website for project details <http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV.aspx>

²² Chouhan, K., Lusane, C., (2004) *Black Voluntary and Community Sector funding: its impact on civic engagement and capacity building*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

school-related education (11%). As it has been estimated²³ that there are 5,000 BAME organisations in London, there is huge potential for the Mayor of London to meet its objectives in relation to the health of BAME communities by working more supportively and in closer partnership with the BAME third sector

ROTA welcomes Policy 3.18 that: "*The Mayor will support provision of high quality healthcare provision appropriate for a growing and changing population, particularly in areas of under provision or where there are particular healthcare needs.*"

ROTA's considerable work²⁴ on health has found that BAME communities continue to face significant barriers in accessing high quality health and social care services, even in areas where the provision is considered to be sufficient or better, and often do not attempt to access services until they have reached crises points. ROTA's response to the consultation on the Mayor's Health Inequalities has elaborated on the issues BAME communities often face in accessing health services in detail and we recommend the GLA consider this response in developing this section of the London Plan. Planners need to ensure those developing health services give these issues explicit consideration.

Point 'E' under this policy, as mentioned earlier regarding other policies, covers BAME communities facing barriers in influencing service development related to health as well as other areas which needs to be considered and addressed by the Mayor through this and other policies.

Healthcare provision should not be seen as an isolated phenomenon but as a result of a failure to mainstream a culture of equality and human rights in public authorities and beyond. Furthermore, it should not be separated from the phenomenon of institutional racism.

There is a need for a greater proportion of investment in health to be focused on primary care, preventative and community-based services (as opposed to acute services) than in recent years, with those services being made more accessible to BAME communities. Focusing investment in this way is likely to result in cost-savings as fewer BAME people will end up in more expensive acute services.

Schools

Further to these issues and informing Policy 3.19 London's BAME communities also face a range of inequalities in terms of educational experience and outcome, which are outlined below and which need to be addressed within this Plan.

²³ MiNet survey of the BAME Third Sector in 2008, unpublished

²⁴ For example ROTA's 2007 and 2009 consultations with London's BAME third sector on health; ROTA's work in relation to *Equal Life Chances for All*; an event held by ROTA in partnership with BEAM-EM in October about mental health within BAME communities; ROTA's Female Voices in Violence project, including our response to the Mayor's 2009 consultation on 'The Way Forward: A Call for Action to End Violence Against Women'; ROTA (2007), Cox D & Gavrielides T. *The visible and hidden dimensions of London's homelessness: A Black, Asian and minority ethnic account*; as well as ROTA's in-house expertise on health.

At present, African Caribbean, mixed white and black Caribbean, Irish Traveller and Roma Gypsy children have, on average, attainment rates below the national average. Furthermore, Black Caribbean, Mixed Black Caribbean and White, and Black Other children are all more likely to be permanently excluded from mainstream education, and for reasons that their white peers may not be excluded for²⁵. Black Caribbean and Black African children are more likely to be placed in lower tiered classes and be entered into lower-tiered examination papers. The state of competition in the education system has produced schools considered to be 'failing' allowing for wealthier parents to move into areas with schools at the top of league tables, and others left with schools that could not compete.

The success or failure of schools has also determined their funding and compounded disadvantage. The difficulties that many BAME families have in navigating and understanding the British education system, the impact that poverty had on their ability to travel outside of the borough, means that they often struggle to compete with other families. This is particularly acute for refugee families or newer/emerging communities who lack even community/local support/awareness to guide their decisions.

All of the above has been confirmed by research conducted by ROTA over the past two decades. Our seminal book, *Inclusive Schools, Inclusive Society*²⁶ highlighted all of the concerns noted above as barriers to an inclusive education system, which offered equal chances to all BAME groups. It is concerning that 10 years on from its publication, both a recent ROTA consultation of London's BAME sector, and a ROTA workshop held at the sixth London Schools and the Black Child Conference, raised persistent concerns regarding unequal access, experience and outcomes for some BAME communities in London.

The problem with this is that while all of these groups currently face below average attainment at GCSE level they do so for different reasons. Asides from low attainment Black Caribbean boys, and to a lesser extent Gypsy and Traveller children, are also affected by the tiering system, exclusions and access to systems which are link directly to the treatment of their communities. This is not the same for White working class boys, and it is the poverty/class in their case, and not their ethnicity, which links to this outcome for working class boys. Therefore any intervention put in place to impact their performance would be different to support required for Black or Gypsy and Traveller young people. Furthermore, once we extend concerns to issues around exclusion and tiering, instead of focusing completely on attainment, the role played by service providers is questioned rather than simply what the communities in question do.

We make recommendations below as to how the London Plan might be developed to address some of these inequalities.

Gypsy and Travellers

²⁵ Department of Children Family and Schools, *Ethnicity and Education: the evidence on minority ethnic pupils aged 5-16*, Research Topic Paper, July 2006

²⁶ R. Richardson 7 A Wood, *Inclusive Schools, Inclusive society: race and identity on the agenda*, ROTA, Trentham Books, 1999

ROTA welcomes the specific recognition of the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in terms of housing and provision of pitches. It is welcomed that this has been specifically identified in the Plan to identify more sites to provide secure housing conditions for this group. The Plan must recognise that since the Housing Act 2004 it has taken four years to complete the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment before discussions with London boroughs on identifying sites and developing them. The Mayors Office has chosen a median figure of 538 pitches per annum instead of the top end of the assessments over 800 pitches. The choice for this median figure does not take into account the potential for underestimation of population that are based in bricks and mortar housing, and as such ROTA believes is an underestimate of need and inadequate.

The immediate need of the growing Gypsy and Traveller population must not be neglected in pursuit of a sustainable planning strategy and the GLA must ensure boroughs fulfil their responsibilities to meet urgent need. Given the delays so far in gaining an adequate assessment, and the historical level of extreme discrimination faced by these communities ROTA believes that the commitments of London boroughs needs to be stronger and with stricter timelines. This must be enforced by the Authority through the strategic overview of the London Plan and this part should be strengthened.

We urge the GLA and Mayor's office to take into consideration the response by the London and Gypsy and Traveller Unit which covers these details and issues in more depth.

Chapter 4: London's Economy

ROTA recognises that the Mayor's Office must take the lead in tackling the challenges of the current economic situation and ensuring London remains a world class city. This chapter of the London Plan deals with the requirements of the different sectors of the economy and their workplace requirements. It complements the draft Mayor's Economic Development Strategy which MiNet, the London regional network of BAME groups, has made a response and which will be referred to in this response.

One consistent problem with the plan is a failure to seek to achieve substantive equality as opposed to formal equality and therefore address the entrenched disadvantage faced by many BAME communities. Part of the key indicators, and the aims of the London Plan, are to address the specific employment gap between BAME groups and the White population, and tackle general inequalities. Economic growth and inequality intercedes with and across these inequalities so must be an essential part of delivering against these objectives. It must be recognised that the facilitation of economic growth will benefit communities but that it has also failed to address the economic and social disadvantage faced by many BAME communities. In advancing London's economic development the disadvantage of some communities cannot be entrenched further by embedding the assumptions behind formal equality that all will benefit equally.

In Policy 4.2 the focus of activity is to ensure office space and specialist provision to encourage the 'world city' vision of London is positive but fails to recognise that

the sectors of activity this most encourages are generally exclusionary of BAME communities and equality groups. As a result this focus, while generating economic growth at a faster rate, will not tackle entrenched disadvantage and inequality except as a cascade effect of consumption, with less growth for those communities. As has been seen after repeated recessions have been followed by rounds of economic restructurings which have particularly impacted on London's BAME community. This is likely to enlarge the gap between communities and fail to meet objectives of the Mayor's strategic vision

There needs to be more emphasis on the dynamism and vibrancy that London offers. The marketing as a business centre should also be emphasise a partnership that reflects all communities and equality groups. This will work towards encouraging the movement of economic opportunities from the promotion of cultural sectors and activities, and the promotion of services centred on diverse cultural and social activities. Policy 4.4 gives emphasis to the use of tourist driven economic growth. But this should take into account the wide range of other tourist opportunities to London other than the traditional tourist sites, including managed familial visit for the diverse communities and the wide range of cultural events throughout the year. This is a significant economic growth area that is not being facilitated at present.

The need to take advantage and support the dynamism and vibrancy of London needs to be firmly recognised in Policy 4.6 in supporting arts culture and entertainment. The importance of premises and temporary use of space must not be limited to certain areas. The promotional and development of cultural quarters needs to recognise the differential level of communities wealth across London and how this can affect BAME communities ability to develop these opportunities. There is a real need to take account of this differential in the distribution of resources, and the provision of opportunities through proactive planning and consents for groups with more limited resources. This will ensure that the entire range of London's diversity supports this development.

It is important that the London Plan, linked with the Economic Development Strategy, encourages small and independent shops as a fundamental part of the retail sector (Policy 4.9). This is essential to encourage greater levels of self employment among BAME communities through their preferred method of developing small and medium enterprises (SME)²⁷. Ultimately this is linked to the development of adequate social infrastructure to develop the skills among communities to support London's growth sectors and how this can encourage BAME communities be drawn into these sectors where there is considerable under representation.

It is disappointing that there is no mention of the diverse communities of London to encourage new and merging sectors, where the international and diverse cultural base of London provides a hotbed of opportunity to innovate, develop new markets and recognition, as well as use underused resources and skills, particularly in

²⁷ MiNet, *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*, London, ROTA, July 2009 & *MiNet's Response to the Mayors Economic Development Strategy*, MiNet 2010.

multi-lingual, cultural and socially driven businesses²⁸. While focusing on university centred areas for developing opportunities for new industries in Policy 4.10, there should be wide ranging consideration of these opportunities across London, and particularly in those areas of regeneration where home grown commercial enterprises can provide a greater multiplier effect of money spent to benefit excluded communities. This would give a greater level of support to achieve the substantive equality of tackling the economic disadvantage experienced by many BAME communities.

To do this will require a connected economy, and it is encouraging that the Mayor's office considers this a priority in Policy 4.12, but again there is no mention of the different levels of access that different communities experience to new communications technology.

The draft replacement London Plan focuses on using Local Strategic Partnerships and the LDA to facilitate increased employment opportunities and increase participation of those most distant from the labour market. Recognising the more entrenched levels of unemployment and worklessness within BAME communities is welcome but the overall strategic actions assume that the formal equality will achieve the lessening of the gap between disadvantaged groups than evidence suggests. As the MiNet response to the draft Economic Development Strategy identifies²⁹, unemployed people are twice as likely to experience poverty as the average person³⁰ and that it those communities which are already deprived who are suffering most: one can understand how there is a role for the GLA and London's BAME third sector to play. Especially when considering London's BAME population are disproportionately overrepresented in these communities. This is even more important when research has clearly stressed that unemployment rates for people from minority ethnic groups rises faster than average unemployment during recessions³¹. Additionally, Richard Berthoud's study leads him to predict, for example, that the proportion of Bangladeshi's and Pakistani's will rise by nearly seven per cent, concerning when 47 per cent are already unemployed. This is a pattern which has been repeated in past recessions³² with ethnic minority unemployment rising faster than white unemployment.

Chapter 8: Implementation, Monitoring and Review

Planning decisions are incredibly important decisions with long term implications for communities. The London Plan will give strategic direction to the policies that shape these decisions at a regional and London borough level. As a result the

²⁸ MiNet, *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*, London, ROTA, July 2009 & *MiNet's Response to the Mayors Economic Development Strategy*, 2010 & *Joint Discussion Group with MiNet and London Funders*, City Hall, 17th November 2009, http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/MiNet_NewsRecession.aspx

²⁹ *Joint Discussion Group with MiNet and London Funders*, City Hall, 17th November 2009

³⁰ Smith, N. & Middleton, S. (2007). *A review of poverty dynamics research in the UK*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

³¹ Berthold, R (2009). Patterns of non-employment, and of disadvantage, in a recession, ISER Working Paper No, 2009-23

³² Smith, D. (1977). *Unemployment and Ethnic Minorities*, PEP
Jones, T (1993) *Britain's Ethnic Minorities*, Policy Fiscal Studies

consideration that will be given to the London Plan, the influence it has, how much weight it should have in planning decisions are essential questions for the strategy to address. It is of considerable concern to ROTA that the replacement London Plan has less than 10 pages covering the methods for implementation of the Plan, compared to the 30 pages of detail in the London Plan 2008. While size of documents can be a limit to their use by the general public, the information does not clearly outline the priorities of the strategy and how planning decisions should use the plan in enough detail. As a result the relevance of the document to the general public or communities in general is hard to decipher. This will undermine its use in informing individuals and communities and using the document.

Key to the implementation will be the ongoing adjustment to the plan to take into account the changes that occur to communities and to keep the strategic overview appropriate to meeting communities' needs. Key to this is the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) that will identify any emerging trends or developments that need to be considered. It is key that the issues facing BAME communities and anything effecting equality is included in the process of producing and reacting to the AMR's. ROTA would like further information on what level of equality impact assessment is included in the AMR to further inform the development of the London Plan and assess its impact? Considering the flaws identified later in the Equalities Impact Assessment of the London Plan it is essential that this is improved and the AMR is an area in which to engage this process and improve the London Plans responsiveness to equality.

It is disappointing that under Policy 8.2 tackling inequality and entrenched disadvantage are not identified as important under Point E *Planning Obligations*. This is a particular issue for London with its extensive diversity and continuing entrenched inequality. ROTA recognises that this is a continuation of the provisions in the London Plan 2008. Under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act there is considerable discretion for local authorities to meet conditions based on their own priorities³³. As with the wider London Plan, the lack of placing equalities as a strategic objective fails to provide for any achievement of the substantive required by disadvantaged BAME communities. It is highly disappointing that the Mayor's Office has not included this as a priority for London boroughs to consider when negotiating and working with developers.

Monitoring

ROTA recognises the importance of ongoing monitoring and review of policies for a policy lasting from 2011-2031. It is of considerable importance that the needs and issues facing BAME communities are taken into account. Key Performance Indicators are essential to driving activities to achieve the strategic vision of the London Plan. Whilst pleased that there is recognition of the employment disadvantage that is faced by BAME communities, and ROTA is pleased this is recognised in the KPI 11, we have very significant concerns that this is the only area where specific disadvantage faced by ethnic minorities is identified or built into performance measures. Considering the interdependence of employment and

³³ Part IV, Section 106, Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Stationery Office, House of Commons.

economic development with education and housing outcomes and community infrastructure, to have measures addressing disadvantage and inequality for BAME communities only recognised in employment is treating a symptom without addressing any of the causes.

Key performance indicators 6, 7, 12 and 13 all also have an impact on the disproportionate economic and social disadvantage faced by BAME communities, from poorer health outcomes and less working age adults in employment to educational underachievement. These areas are interdependent and feed into the social and economic disadvantage that underpins ethnic inequality in London.

Firstly there should be an ethnicity cross section of the performance indicators to identify whether all ethnic groups are achieving the same progress against the performance indicators. This would help to assess and measure the inequalities if existent, and inform future policy development within boroughs over the lifetime of the plan, meeting the requirements of the Race Relations Amendment Act General Duty to monitor policies for adverse impact. This would also provide ongoing and strong evidence to support meeting obligations under section 33 of the GLA Act 1999 and the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000.

Secondly considering the length of the London Plan, in place until 2031, it is disappointing that where the disadvantage faced by BAME communities is overtly recognised (KPI11) that the target is merely to *'reduce the gap in unemployment rates between BAME groups and white population....'* The London Plan covers a period of policy development and economic activity of 20 years, a generation in demographic terms and considerably longer lived than most modern policies will be. To not aspire to the elimination of such a gap in life outcomes between the BAME groups and the White population within a generation indicates an acceptance of this disadvantage which is unjustified. ROTA does not consider that a mere reduction over a generation is constitutive of showing 'due regard' as considered under equalities obligations of the law. Over the next generation it should be the governing authorities desire to eliminate this fundamental inequality and this should be a driving force of policy making and the authorities activities.

Implementation

It is disappointing that the implementation plan has no mention of BAME communities or the BAME third sector. This is particularly important as under the Social Infrastructure section there is a clear statement of the third sector intended involvement in developing *'skills, training, services and community empowerment'*³⁴. As covered under service delivery earlier in this response, the BAME third sector has an essential role in delivering appropriate and accessible services and meeting the unmet needs of BAME communities. This is not recognised as part of the implementation plan, or the distinct role and benefits of the BAME third sector among the wider third sector (or voluntary and community sector as referred to in the Plan). The specific role of the BAME third sector needs

³⁴ *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London*, Greater London Authority, October 2009, page 210

to be overtly stated as part of the implementation plan to inform future strategy and actions of the GLA.

There is considerable experience that without incentives and monitoring there is limited proactive engagement with BAME communities by statutory authorities. As such it is essential that the GLA takes a lead and provides both a leading example and policy drivers to ensure engagement with the Third Sector to meet the needs of London's social infrastructure is representative of sub sectors of the Third Sector according to the needs addressed. This means that the level of disadvantage experienced by BAME communities is represented by an increased level of BAME third sector involvement in this part of the implementation. This means increasing the relative resources to adequately meet the needs of the disadvantaged.

Equality Impact Assessment

Key to informing the London Plan's promotion of equality is the equality impact assessment. This is required under the Race Relations Amendment Act 2000 General and Specific Duties in relation to BAME groups and is a proven method in the process of showing 'due regard' to equalities under section 33 of the GLA Act 1999. It is a requirement to assess what the impact of policies will be on different ethnic groups, if there is any difference in that impact, and to change policies where that impact is assessed as being detrimental or less than equal for certain groups compared to others. It is key in identifying the difference in outcomes for different groups and to mitigate that disadvantage.

An equality impact assessment for the London Plan should gather information, both quantitative and qualitative to inform an understanding of what the impact will be on different groups from the proposals. This should then be further substantiated with consultation with the affected communities, in this case the BAME community, to identify the experience of those groups. The proposals should be assessed in light of this information; threats and potential inequality identified; if there is any overriding policy that has to be prioritised, and the proposals changed or action plans put in place to mitigate any adverse effects.

ROTA welcomes that the equality impact assessment for the London Plan acknowledges *The Scoping Reports* sixteen objectives contains equalities. We are pleased that the changing makeup of the London population and its particularly diverse nature is also recognised³⁵. *The Scoping Report* identifies that there is concentrated poverty, deprivation and lower health outcomes for BAME communities.

It is also encouraging that tackling deprivation and poverty is a priority of the London Plan. While recognising that equalities has been mentioned by the Mayor the equality impact assessment has very little in terms of evidence, analysis or planning for the specific inequalities or differential impacts that will be faced by

³⁵ It is predicted that 8 boroughs will be majority BAME by 2031, Redbridge, Harrow, Tower Hamlets, Ealing, Hounslow and Croydon additional to BRENT and Newham which are majority BAME already London Plan. *The London Plan: Spatial development Strategy For Greater London*, Greater London Authority, October 2009, page 15-16

BAME communities in London and the effects of the London Plan. The statements in the assessment are generic and rely on positive outcomes being equally shared across groups.

This assumption rests on the continued economic and skills growth within London, and that this growth would at best be shared equally across ethnic groups. The achievement of substantive equality relies significantly more on taking into consideration the different positions of different ethnic groups and how this will allow access to the benefits from the hoped for growth. There are no clear indications of any work to take account of these different positions, within the equality impact assessment.

Equally the equality impact assessment, and the London Plan more generally assumes that there will be continued economic growth, and similar levels of skills and learning development among London's population. With the recent economic turmoil in the financial markets and knock on recession in the western world and the UK, these assumptions seem weaker and less reliable and the equality impact assessment, and subsequent London Plan, needs to develop contingency plans should these assumptions turn out to be false.

It is a significant concern of ROTA that the equality impact assessment at no point presents any evidence of what the impact would be on BAME communities or different ethnic groups. This is a fundamental underpinning of an impact assessments benefits and usefulness. As there is no evidential underpinning the subsequent conclusions made by the equality impact assessment lose considerable veracity in how they have influenced or altered the development of the London plan.

There is no information in the impact assessment on the nature, level and groups consulted as part of the process. This is a fundamental part of informing any impact assessment and understanding and ensuring that the conclusions reached are legitimate and will be supported by the communities and individuals considered. There is no methodology described, events or reports indicating the feedback and views that have been presented to the GLA as part of this impact assessment process. ROTA asks the Mayors Office to provide a full breakdown of the consultation undertaken as part of the impact assessment, and how this has influenced the final draft of the replacement London Plan 2009.

The equality impact assessment is a poor analysis with minimal input by BAME communities or assessment of actual impacts of proposed policies. There is no evidence that it was a consideration in the development of the Draft Replacement London Plan or that there has been any changes to the plan based on the extensive research and data available indicating significant disadvantage and inequality faced by BAME communities. As such ROTA does not believe that this impact assessment is compliant with the specific duties of the Race Relations Act 2000 general duty or applicable specific duties.

One issue that is cross cutting of all the specific points made in the London Plan and impact assessment is consideration of the intersectional social and economic disadvantage faced by groups with protected characteristics. BAME communities

have significantly lower incomes, rates of employment and educational achievement once class has been controlled for. As a result the different social and economic position of certain communities directly speaks to, contributes and conflates the unequal outcomes experienced. This is a fundamental issue that needs to be considered across the actions of the London Plan, but also in addressing inequality needs to be addressed as part of a wide range of actions. ROTA believes that tackling this issue should be a founding principle to address ethnic inequality in the London Plan.

© 2010 Race on the Agenda

targeting social policy

An organisation investing in sustainable future
Printed on Greencoat Offset – 100% recycled fibre, Totally Chlorine Free (TCF). bio-degradable and NAPM recycled certification

Race on the Agenda

Waterloo Business Centre
117 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8UL, UK

t: +44 (0) 20 7902 1177

e: rota@rota.org.uk

Registered Charity: 1064975

Company Limited by Guarantee: 3425664

www.rota.org.uk