

Step 1: Clarifying Aims

Q1. Outline the aims/objectives/scope of this piece of work

Route 648 has been reviewed in advance of its contract being re-tendered. The review has been done in accordance with the MTS, TfL Business plan; TfL Bus Strategy (2019); Service Planning Guidelines and other requirements relevant to bus services.

Summary of proposals and rationale for change

It is proposed to withdraw route 648 subject to consultation.

Rationale: Route 648 operates 2 trips per day in the morning and 2 trips in the afternoon between Romford and Cranham. The purpose of the route is primarily to provide direct access to Coopers Company and Coborn school as well as provide additional capacity on route 248 between Romford and Upminster.

Analysis of the most recent data shows around 20 trips per day to/from the stops closest to the school. 17 of these are in the morning. The 648 provides space for 110 passengers in both the morning and the afternoon. Consequently, there is excess capacity. Since trips to the school are primarily in the morning, it suggests students are using an alternative way to route 648 travel in the afternoon.

Across the route as a whole there are 200 trips per day. The majority of these trips can be made on route 248 or 346 without incurring capacity issues on those routes. The remaining trips can be made by using route 248 and interchanging onto route 346 (or vice versa).

The current contract cost of the route is £170,639 per annum. Fares cover approximately 2% of that cost. It is considered that resource can be better utilised elsewhere on the network for the benefit of bus passengers including those with protected characteristics.

Q2. Does this work affect passengers? Please provide details of how.

The proposal will adversely affect existing passengers of route 648 and to a lesser degree, users of routes 248 and 346.

- The proposal will break those trips whose origins are west of Upminster and whose destinations are on St Mary’s Lane and Front Lane (south of the railway line).
- Those travelling between Romford and Upminster and between Upminster and Cranham, there will be 2 less journeys available to them in the morning and the afternoon.
- Most passengers using the 648 will continue to be able make their journey on either route 248 (every 8 minutes) or route 346 (every 15 minutes) without the need to change buses. Sufficient capacity is available on these routes to accommodate those passengers.
- For those passengers who no longer have a direct bus service, they can take route 248 and interchange onto the 346 at Upminster. It is highly unlikely these passengers would incur a financial penalty for doing this although there would be a time penalty. It is likely most of these passengers will instead walk from St Mary’s Lane / Front Lane to either Upminster or Cranham and catch the 248. The implication of this is longer journey times through longer walk times to the bus service.

The stops considered most likely to be used by passengers as an alternative to their existing stops are:

Stop Location	Stop Name	Stop Letter	Direction
St Mary’s Lane	St Laurence Church	M	Westbound only
Station Road	Upminster Station	C	Both
Station Road	Gaynes Road	D	Both
St Mary’s Lane	St Laurence Church	R	Eastbound only
St Mary’s Lane	Corbets Tey Road	F	Eastbound only
Front Lane	Moor Lane, Cranham	-	Westbound only
Front Lane	Moor Lane, Cranham	-	Eastbound only

Table 1: Summary of likely alternative stops that will be used by 648 passengers



Step 2: The Evidence Base

Users of the 648 will primarily be young people of secondary school age. However the bus is available to all. There are around 200 passengers per day on route 648. Around 70% of users are children travelling to get to the school. The remainder are adults with 6% travelling for work; 2% to shop and the remainder for other reasons.

Age

Young People

- 70 per cent of passengers on route 648 are children.
- Thirty per cent of LB Havering residents are young people under 25.¹
- Twenty nine per cent of bus users in London are young people under 25, which is lower than the population of London as a whole (32 per cent).²

Older People

- Eighteen per cent of the London Borough of (LB) Havering residents are aged 65 or over.³
- Eight per cent of bus users in London are aged 65 or over, which is lower than the population of London as whole (11 per cent).⁴
- The bus is a key form of transport for people aged 65 and over, with 61 per cent saying they use the bus at least once a week (the same amount as for all Londoners).⁵

Disability

- Seventeen per cent of LB Havering residents have a disability which limits their day today activities.⁶
- Ten per cent of bus users in London are disabled ⁷, which is lower than the population of London as a whole (14 per cent) ⁸.
- Data on bus usage by carers is not currently available.

Gender

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop.
- Fifty two per cent of LB Havering residents are women and forty eight per cent are men.⁹
- Fifty seven per cent of day bus users in London are women, which is higher than the population of London as a whole (51 per cent).¹⁰
- Forty three per cent of day bus users in London are men, which is lower than the population of London as a whole (49 per cent).¹¹

¹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

² <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

³ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

⁴ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

⁵ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

⁶ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

⁷ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

⁸ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

⁹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

¹⁰ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>



- The bus is the second most frequently used type of transport (after walking) among women, with sixty three per cent using the bus at least once a week. Women are also more likely than men to be travelling with buggies and/or shopping, and to be travelling with children. Women are significantly less likely than men to say that they are 'not at all worried' about personal security while using public transport in London (14 per cent compared with 28 per cent). Thirty four per cent of women say they are generally worried compared with men (27 per cent).¹²

Gender Reassignment

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop or London wide.
- Data on LB Havering residents who share this protected characteristic is not currently available.
- Individuals who have undergone or are undergoing gender reassignment are statistically more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse.¹³ One in five LGBT people in Britain (21 per cent) have experienced a hate crime or incident due to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity in the last 12 months.¹⁴ Two in five trans people (41 per cent) have experienced a hate crime or incident, because of their gender identity in the last 12 months and one in six LGB people, who aren't trans (16 per cent), have experienced a hate crime or incident due to their sexual orientation in the same period.¹⁵

Marriage/Civil Partnership

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop or London wide.
- Data on LB Havering residents who share this protected characteristic is not currently available.

Pregnancy/Maternity

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop or London wide.
- Data on LB Havering residents who share this protected characteristic is not currently available.
- Women make up fifty seven per cent of the ridership on buses in London¹⁶ and a significant number of these may be accompanied by young children or may be pregnant. Women are more likely than men to be travelling with buggies and/or shopping, and to be travelling with children.¹⁷

¹¹ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

¹² <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

¹³ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination>

¹⁴ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination>

¹⁵ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination>

¹⁶ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>



Race

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop.
- Twelve per cent of LB Havering residents are from BAME communities.¹⁸
- Eighty eight per cent of LB Havering residents are White.¹⁹
- Forty seven per cent of bus users in London are from BAME communities²⁰, which is higher than the population of London as a whole (40 per cent).²¹
- Fifty three per cent of bus users in London are White²², which is lower than the population of London as a whole (60 per cent).²³
- BAME Londoners are less likely than White Londoners to be in employment (57 per cent BAME compared with 64 per cent White). They are also more likely to live in households with an average annual income below £20,000 (33 per cent BAME compared with 25 per cent White).²⁴
- The bus is the second most frequently used type of transport (after walking) among BAME people, with sixty five per cent using the bus at least once a week.²⁵

Religion/Belief

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop or London wide.
- A summary of the percentages for LB Havering and London residents, who share this protected characteristic, is set out in the following table.²⁶

Havering	Christian	Buddhist	Hindu	Jewish	Muslim	Sikh	Other religion	No religion	Religion not stated	All categories: Religion
Number of Residents	155,597	760	2,963	1,159	4,829	1,928	648	53,549	15,799	237,232
Percentage of Residents	65.6%	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.3%	22.6%	6.7%	100.0%
<i>London - Number of Residents</i>	3,957,984	82,026	411,291	148,602	1,012,823	126,134	47,970	1,694,372	692,739	8,173,941
<i>London - Percentage of Residents</i>	48.4%	1.0%	5.0%	1.8%	12.4%	1.5%	0.6%	20.7%	8.5%	100.0%

Table 2: Summary of the percentage of residents by Religion/Belief in LB Havering and London.

Sexual Orientation

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop.
- Data on LB Havering residents who share this protected characteristic is not currently available.

¹⁸ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

¹⁹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

²⁰ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

²¹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

²² <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/tfl-bus-users-survey.pdf>

²³ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

²⁴ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

²⁵ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

²⁶ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>



- A summary of the percentages for London residents who share this protected characteristic is set out in the following table.²⁷

Sexual Identity	Number (thousands)	Percent of population
Heterosexual or straight	6,342	90%
Gay or lesbian	140	2%
Bisexual	44	1%
Other	41	1%
Don't know or refuse	496	7%
Total	7,063	100%

Table 3: Percentage of London Residents by sexual identity.

- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans (LGBT) people are statistically more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse. One in five LGBT people in Britain (21 per cent) have experienced a hate crime or incident due to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity in the last 12 months.²⁸ Two in five trans people (41 per cent) have experienced a hate crime or incident, because of their gender identity in the last 12 months and one in six LGB people, who aren't trans (16 per cent), have experienced a hate crime or incident due to their sexual orientation in the same period.²⁹

Other – For example; People who are on Low Incomes, Homeless, or Refugees

- Data on bus usage by individuals who share this protected characteristic is not currently available by bus stop or London wide.
- Thirty per cent of LB Havering residents live in lower income households (less than £20,000 per year), compared to 28 per cent of Londoners.³⁰
- The bus is the second most common type of transport used by Londoners on lower incomes (69 per cent use the bus at least once a week, compared with 59 per cent of all Londoners), but this group tends to travel less frequently than Londoners overall (2.2 trips per weekday on average compared with 2.4 among all Londoners).³¹
- Londoners with a lower household income are less likely to hold an Oyster card than all Londoners (49 per cent compared with 60 per cent), but more likely than all Londoners to have an older person's Freedom Pass (26 per cent compared with 15 per cent).³²
- Disabled Londoners are more likely to live in a household with an annual income of £20,000 or less than non-disabled Londoners (61 per cent of disabled Londoners compared with 25 per cent of non-disabled Londoners).³³
- Jobseekers are concerned that a lack of transport acts as a barrier to accessing employment and one in four (25%) say that the cost of transport presents a problem getting to interviews.³⁴
- There is substantial discrepancy between ethnic minority groups, with the proportion that have an annual household income of less than £20,000 ranging from 27 per cent of mixed ethnicity Londoners up to 41 per cent of black Londoners.³⁵

²⁷ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/datasets/sexualidentityuk>

²⁸ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination>

²⁹ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/lgbt-britain-hate-crime-and-discrimination>

³⁰ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³¹ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³² <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³³ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³⁴ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³⁵ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>



There is overlap between many of the groups mentioned above, as demonstrated in the findings of the London Travel Demand Survey (2016/17), summarised in the following table. This table shows the London proportion of each group across the top, made up by each group at the side. London Travel Demand Survey (LTDS) data in this summary excludes children under five.³⁶

	BAME	Older people	Younger people	People on low incomes	Disabled people	Women
BAME		23%	46%	44%	32%	38%
Older (65+)	8%			24%	44%	14%
Younger (24 & under)	33%			30%	11%	26%
Low income (<£20,000)	33%	54%	32%		61%	31%
Disabled	8%	32%	4%	20%		10%
Women	51%	55%	49%	55%	56%	
<i>More likely than other groups to be...</i>	Younger	Low income and disabled	BAME	BAME, older and disabled	Low income and older	

Figure 1: Overlap of some key Groups of London Residents

- Londoners living in lower income households (below £20,000) are more likely to be:
 - Older people (24 per cent are aged 65+³⁷, whereas people in this age group make up 11 per cent of the total London population³⁸). This group of people are less likely to use technology but are more likely to own a Freedom Pass.
 - Disabled people (20 per cent³⁹, compared with 14 per cent of all Londoners⁴⁰).
 - Women (55 per cent⁴¹, compared with 51 per cent of all Londoners⁴²).
 - BAME people (44 per cent⁴³, compared with 40 per cent of all Londoners⁴⁴).

³⁶ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³⁷ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

³⁸ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

³⁹ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

⁴⁰ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

⁴¹ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

⁴² <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>

⁴³ <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities-2019.pdf>

⁴⁴ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/census/2011census>



Step 3: Impact

Protected Characteristic		Explain the potential negative impact
Age	Y	<p>Young People</p> <p>The primary impact will be longer journey times. This will be either due to passengers walking further to an alternative bus stop to catch route 248 or by catching route 346 and interchanging onto a 248 and thus incurring wait time for a second bus.</p> <p>For those selecting to walk further, Coopers Company and Coborn school is approximately 15 minutes walk from the junction of St Mary's Lane and Station Road. Although this is significantly sized junction there are signalised pedestrian crossing on each arm.</p> <p>For those selecting to interchange, route 346 is every 15 minutes and route 248 every 8 minutes. Travel for school age children is free. Interchange would most likely occur on Station Road requiring children to cross the road.</p> <p>It is considered highly unlikely that children will no longer be able to attend school. However, consultation will be undertaken to better understand issues around school travel.</p> <p>Older People</p> <p>The primary impact will be as for young people. Freedom passes should ensure there is no financial penalty from the proposal. Unlike with school children there is a higher risk, (but still very low) that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.</p>
Disability including carers	Y	<p>The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. Depending on the nature and severity of the disability it can be expected that changing buses to complete the journey will be the most likely impact rather than walking to an alternative bus stop. Freedom passes should ensure there is no financial penalty for changing buses. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.</p>
Gender	Y	<p>The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.</p>
Gender reassignment	Y	<p>The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal</p>



		would result in some journeys no longer being made.
Marriage/ Civil Partnership	N	TfL does not anticipate that the proposals will have a disproportionate negative impact on individuals that share the protected characteristic of being married/in a civil partnership.
Pregnancy/ Maternity	Y	The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.
Race	Y	The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.
Religion or Belief	Y	The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.
Sexual orientation	Y	The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.
Other – For example; People who are on Low Incomes, Homeless, or Refugees	Y	The primary impact will be increased journey time as described above. For those choosing to complete their journey by bus, the interchange should be possible within the hour meaning there would be no financial penalty. There is a very low risk that the proposal would result in some journeys no longer being made.



Q5. Given the evidence listed in step 2, consider and describe what potential positive impacts this work could have on people related to their protected characteristics?

Protected Characteristic		Explain the potential positive impact
All (except below)	Y	The proposal would allow resources (financial, human and capital) to be better utilised elsewhere on the network generating more benefit for those with a protected characteristic at a London wide level.
Marriage/ Civil Partnership	N	TfL does not anticipate that the proposals will have a disproportionate positive impact on individuals that share the protected characteristic of being married/in a civil partnership.

Step 4: Consultation

Q6. How has consultation with those who share a protected characteristic informed your work?

List the groups you intend to consult with or have consulted and reference any previous relevant consultation? ⁴⁵	If consultation has taken place what issues were raised in relation to one or more of the protected characteristics?
Coopers Company & Coborn School	
Statutory Consultees	
Other stakeholders e.g. politicians and disability groups	
Public	

⁴⁵ This could include our staff networks, the Independent Disability Advisory Group, the Valuing People Group, local minority groups etc.



Q7. Where relevant, record any consultation you have had with other projects / teams who you are working with to deliver this piece of work. This is really important where the mitigations for any potential negative impacts rely on the delivery of work by other teams.

None



Step 5: Informed Decision-Making

Q8. In light of the assessment now made, what do you propose to do next?

Please select one of the options below and provide a rationale (for most EqIAs this will be box 1). Please remember to review this as and when the piece of work changes

1. Change the work to mitigate against potential negative impacts found	
2. Continue the work as is because no potential negative impacts found	
3. Justify and continue the work despite negative impacts (please provide justification)	<p>Work will continue to the next stage – namely consultation. The justification for this is that the proposal will benefit bus users overall by allowing resources to be better utilised across the network while the disbenefit to users locally will be minimal.</p> <p>The next stage of this work will be to request LCP to carry out consultation and provide analysis of the feedback when this is complete. This will be followed by a further review of the responses to consultation prior to a final decision being made. If there are any changes to the proposals, this will be reflected in the EqIA.</p>
4. Stop the work because discrimination is unjustifiable and no obvious ways to mitigate	

Step 6: Action Planning

Q9. You must address any negative impacts identified in step 3 and 4. Please demonstrate how you will do this or record any actions already taken to do this. Please remember to add any positive actions you can take that further any positive impacts identified in step 3 and 4.

Action	Due	Owner
Public Consultation	2020	LCP

