

Bexhill-on-Sea Cycling and Pedestrian Route (A)
Collington to Worsham

Appendix 2 – Equality Impact Assessment Report

Equality Impact Assessment

Project or Service Template

Name of the proposal, project or service
<i>Provision of a shared cycle/footway facilities in Bexhill</i>

File ref:	<i>SCH026A-D-RP-0001</i>	Issue No:	<i>P01</i>
Date of Issue:	<i>05 June 2020</i>	Review date:	<i>June 2022</i>

Contents

Part 1 – The Public Sector Equality Duty and Equality Impact Assessments (EIA).	2
Part 2 – Aims and implementation of the proposal, project or service	5
Part 3 – Methodology, consultation, data and research used to determine impact on protected characteristics	8
Part 4 – Assessment of impact	11
Part 5 – Conclusions and recommendations for decision makers.....	20
Part 6 – Equality impact assessment action plan.....	22

Part 1 – The Public Sector Equality Duty and Equality Impact Assessments (EIA)

1.1 The Council must have due regard to its Public Sector Equality Duty when making all decisions at member and officer level. An EIA is the best method by which the Council can determine the impact of a proposal on equalities, particularly for major decisions. However, the level of analysis should be proportionate to the relevance of the duty to the service or decision.

1.2 **This is one of two forms that the County Council uses for Equality Impact Assessments, both of which are available on the intranet. This form is designed for any proposal, project or service. The other form looks at services or projects.**

1.3 The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)

The public sector duty is set out at Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have “due regard” to the need to

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. (see below for “protected characteristics”

These are sometimes called equality aims.

1.4 A “protected characteristic” is defined in the Act as:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender Reassignment
- Pregnancy and Maternity
- Race (including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality)
- Religion or Belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Marriage and civil partnership are also a protected characteristic for the purposes of the duty to eliminate discrimination.

The previous public sector equalities duties only covered race, disability and gender.

1.5 East Sussex County Council also considers the following additional groups/factors when carry out analysis:

- Carers – A carer spends a significant proportion of their life providing unpaid support to family or potentially friends. This could be caring for a relative, partner or friend who is ill, frail, disabled or has mental health or substance misuse problems. [Carers at the Heart of 21stCentury Families and Communities, 2008]

Equality Impact

- Literacy/Numeracy Skills
- Part time workers
- Rurality

1.6 Advancing equality (the second of the equality aims) involves:

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristic
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people including steps to take account of disabled people's disabilities
- Encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low

NB Please note that, for disabled persons, the Council must have regard to the possible need for steps that amount to positive discrimination, to "level the playing field" with non-disabled persons, e.g. in accessing services through dedicated car parking spaces.

1.7 Guidance on Compliance with The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) for officers and decision makers:

1.7.1 To comply with the duty, the Council must have "due regard" to the three equality aims set out above. This means the PSED must be considered as a factor to consider alongside other relevant factors such as budgetary, economic and practical factors.

1.7.2 What regard is "due" in any given case will depend on the circumstances. A proposal which, if implemented, would have particularly negative or widespread effects on (say) women, or the elderly, or people of a particular ethnic group would require officers and members to give considerable regard to the equalities aims. A proposal which had limited differential or discriminatory effect will probably require less regard.

1.7.3 Some key points to note:

- The duty is regarded by the Courts as being very important.
 - Officers and members must be aware of the duty and give it conscious consideration: e.g. by considering open-mindedly the EIA and its findings when making a decision. When members are taking a decision, this duty can't be delegated by the members, e.g. to an officer.
 - EIAs must be evidence based.
 - There must be an assessment of the practical impact of decisions on equalities, measures to avoid or mitigate negative impact and their effectiveness.
 - There must be compliance with the duty when proposals are being formulated by officers and by members in taking decisions: The Council can't rely on an EIA produced after the decision is made.
 - The duty is ongoing: EIA's should be developed over time and there should be evidence of monitoring impact after the decision.
 - The duty is not, however, to achieve the three equality aims but to consider them – the duty does not stop tough decisions sometimes being made.
-

- The decision maker may take into account other countervailing (i.e. opposing) factors that may objectively justify taking a decision which has negative impact on equalities (for instance, cost factors)

1.7.4 In addition to the Act, the Council is required to comply with any statutory Code of Practice issued by the Equality and Human Rights Commission. New Codes of Practice under the new Act have yet to be published. However, Codes of Practice issued under the previous legislation remain relevant and the Equality and Human Rights Commission has also published guidance on the new public sector equality duty.

Part 2 – Aims and implementation of the proposal, project or service

2.1 What is being assessed?

a) Proposal or name of the project or service.

The project is to introduce a network of cycle/walking routes in the Bexhill area.

There are two routes:

Seafront to Sidley, which runs from De La Warr Parade via Bexhill Train Station, King Offa Way and Buxton Drive and ends next to All Saints Church of England Primary School; and Collington to Worsham, which connects the National Cycle Network Route 2 on the seafront and runs via Collington Train Station, Bexhill Leisure Centre, Bexhill Hospital to a new housing development in Wrestwood Road, where it links to an existing shared cycle/pedestrian footway to Bexhill Enterprise Park.

Further details of the route can be found within the Bexhill Consultation Drawing pack (Appendix A) prepared by East Sussex Highways (ESH) within this document.

b) What is the main purpose or aims of proposal, project or service?

The objective of the scheme is to provide safer, preferred walking and cycling routes connecting key trip attractors.

East Sussex County Council (ESCC) and Rother District Council worked in partnership to develop a Bexhill Walking & Cycling Strategy, with involvement from a variety of walking and cycling groups. This involved the identification of a network of walking and cycling routes which provided links between residential areas to key locations in the town, such as the Seafront, Town Centre, local train stations, schools, colleges & academies, Ravenside Retail & Leisure Centre, employment areas, health and leisure facilities. East Sussex Highways, a partnership between ESCC, Costain and Jacobs will now work to consult, plan and eventually deliver this project for those who live in, work in or visit Bexhill.

c) Manager(s) and section or service responsible for completing the assessment

Charles Emeanuwa – Project Manager, East Sussex Highways

ESH are responsible for the implementation of local transport schemes, on behalf of ESCC, which meet the objectives of the Council's third Local Transport Plan, namely: improving road safety, reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reduce the need and demand to travel, enhance the environment and maintain/manage the transport network.

2.2 Who is affected by the proposal, project or service? Who is it intended to benefit and how?

The routes for pedestrians are mainly on the footway with cyclists mainly on the carriageway. The proposal allows cyclists and pedestrians to share footways and footpaths in certain areas, providing cyclists with traffic-free and more direct alternatives to on road routes. As pedestrians will be sharing the space with cyclists on these footways and footpaths they will be affected by the proposals. In addition, the proposal includes a number of cycle specific measures such as toucan crossings, a parallel crossing, advisory cycle lanes and a contraflow cycle lane. Some of these facilities are shared with pedestrians and some require additional waiting/loading/stopping restrictions in order to protect the integrity of the facilities. This will affect the ability to park/load/drop off in certain locations.

How is, or will, the proposal, project or service be put into practice and who is, or will be, responsible for it?

ESCC manage and maintain the highway carriageways and footways in Bexhill. ESH\ESCC are leading the delivery of the proposal to introduce a pedestrian and cycle network within Bexhill, with ESH providing design support. ESH will construct the shared facility in Bexhill.

To permit cycling within Bexhill Down. There may be a requirement to amend any local byelaws to accommodate the scheme. The byelaw on Bexhill Down permits cycling where defined. ESCC are in discussion with RDC in order to overcome the issue about 'disturbing the soil' this will require a short report from RDC to a relevant committee within RDC. Further review will need to be undertaken to decide if and when this is required. The byelaw change will be made by RDC with support from ESH\ESCC.

Once the scheme and associated mitigation measures come into effect ESCC will be responsible for maintaining the routes and for advertising and promoting particular facilities where recommended in the Road Safety Audit. ESCC and RDC propose to work with all groups including cycle groups to enforce a self-management approach.

2.3 Are there any partners involved? E.g. NHS Trust, voluntary/community organisations, the private sector? If yes, how are partners involved?

The Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bexhill was prepared in 2014 by ESCC in partnership with RDC together with the voluntary sector and local walking and cycling groups. Details of the key stakeholders who were engaged with in preparing this document can be found within Appendix 3 of the Strategy document. We have also been liaising with Highways England, UKPN, private landowners and Rother District Council as part of the design process. We will need to liaise with other private landowners as the design evolves.

2.4 Is this proposal, project or service affected by legislation, legislative change, service review or strategic planning activity?

The Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bexhill prepared by ESCC is focused on identifying a boroughwide network of cycle and pedestrian routes.

The routes will require a number of legal footway/footpath conversions or changes to waiting/loading/stopping on the highway. Plus, the introduction of a contraflow cycle lane.

2.5 How do people access or how are people referred to your proposal, project or service? Please explain fully.

The cycle\pedestrian routes will be signed and open to the public at all times

2.6 If there is a referral method how are people assessed to use the proposal, project or service? Please explain fully.

Not Applicable

2.7 How, when and where is your proposal, project or service provided? Please explain fully.

Subject to ESCC Lead Member for Transport and Environment approval (programmed for December 2020) ESH will progress with the detailed design of the scheme. Given that the Bexhill Walking and Cycle Route will need to go through privately owned land, ESH will therefore undertake further consultation with all affected stakeholders during the preliminary and the detailed design stage. Subject to this consultation, together with further consultation with other key stakeholder groups and the outcomes of the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit process, construction will look to commence Winter 2021. At this stage the construction programme has yet to be determined but it is anticipated that the shared cycle/footway scheme will come into effect in Spring 2022.

Part 3 – Methodology, consultation, data and research used to determine impact on protected characteristics.

3.1 List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data or any consultation information available that will enable the impact assessment to be undertaken.

Types of evidence identified as relevant have X marked against them			
	Employee Monitoring Data		Staff Surveys
	Service User Data		Contract/Supplier Monitoring Data
	Recent Local Consultations		Data from other agencies, e.g. Police, Health, Fire and Rescue Services, third sector
	Complaints	X	Risk Assessments
	Service User Surveys	X	Research Findings
	Census Data	X	East Sussex Demographics
	Previous Equality Impact Assessments	X	National Reports
	Other organisations Equality Impact Assessments	X	Any other evidence? Consultation feedback conducted by Rother District Council on similar schemes

3.2 Evidence of complaints against the proposal, project or service on grounds of discrimination.

During the development of the Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bexhill, in June 2015 Amey on behalf of ESCC carried out a Stakeholder Engagement exercise. The purpose of the exercise was to document proposals and recommendations for a series of location specific traffic management and accessibility improvements to facilitate the on-going regeneration of Bexhill. As part of this report recommendations were made to improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. East Sussex Highway (ESH) has been in collaboration with ESCC and Rother District Council in order to design and construct improved cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. In order to consider and facilitate the needs of all stakeholders, ESH will engage with all stakeholders via a public consultation. The consultation will provide the opportunity for key stakeholders and members of the public to provide their opinions on whether the appropriate strategic routes had been identified to connect people with the places that they access for everyday journeys including for work, education and leisure town centre facilities. The consultation will also provide opportunities for stakeholders to consider whether the proposed facilities and associated measures are considered appropriate.

Bexhill Walking and Cycle Route Scheme is being promoted by ESCC. On behalf of the scheme promoters, ESH will be conducting consultation exercises in 2020 to seek feedback to proposals for the shared cycle/pedestrian route.

ESH will also consult any affected landowners, key stakeholder groups and ward\county councillors impacted by the scheme.

3.3 If you carried out any consultation or research on the proposal, project or service explain what consultation has been carried out.

Design guidance/studies

In developing the scheme, reference was made to the following documents:

- *Department for Transport (DfT) Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/12 'Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists';*
- *DfT LTN 2/08 Cycle Infrastructure Design;*
- *Shared Use Operational Review - Atkins 2012 (produced for the DfT).*

For shared use schemes LTN 1/12 acknowledges that these are often implemented to improve conditions for cyclists, and it is essential that they are designed to consider the needs of everyone expected to use the facility. The guidance states that poorly designed schemes and schemes where the available width is insufficient to comfortably accommodate the expected flows of pedestrians and cyclists are likely to reduce the amenity value of the route. It is acknowledged in the guidance that disabled people and older people can be particularly affected by shared use routes, but ultimately this will depend on the quality of the design. Therefore, the consideration of their various needs is an important part of the design of shared use schemes and the guidance refers to the need for authorities considering the possible implementation of shared use scheme to consider their duties under the Equality Act 2010.

LTN 1/12 also identifies a typical scheme development process whereby the promoter of a scheme considers whether suitable and viable cycle routes can be provided on the carriageway before considering a shared use route.

This suggested process identified in LTN 1/12 has been followed together with the findings detailed within the Atkins 2012 Shared Use Operational Review. The outcomes of the consultation exercise carried out with those affected by the scheme, including those with particular protected characteristics, have also been taken into consideration.

Consultation

Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bexhill:

ESCC carried out a consultation exercise in 2014. The consultation provided the opportunity for key stakeholders and members of the public to provide their opinion on whether the appropriate strategic routes had been identified to connect people with the places that they access for everyday journeys including for work, education and leisure town centre facilities.

3.4 What does the consultation, research and/or data indicate about the positive or negative impact of the proposal, project or service?

Consultation

Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bexhill:

Currently on going – Results to be advised when available.

Research

Reference: DfT LTN 1/12 ‘Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists’

For shared use schemes LTN 1/12 acknowledges that these are often implemented to improve conditions for cyclists, and it is essential that they are designed to consider the needs of everyone expected to use the facility. It is acknowledged in the guidance that disabled people and older people can be particularly affected by shared use routes, but ultimately this will depend on the quality of the design.

Reference: Shared Use Operational Review (Atkins, 2012)

Consultants Atkins produced a report in 2012 considering the operation of Shared Use routes. This was an evidence-based study into the factors which influence the design and operation of segregated (white line separating pedestrians and cyclists) and unsegregated pedestrian and cyclist shared use facilities.

Segregation by white line was found to be ineffective at supporting full compliance with segregation by pedestrians and cyclists. Their findings indicate that average cycle speeds are not significantly faster on segregated routes compared with unsegregated ones.

Observations indicated that maximum cycle speed decreases as pedestrian flow increases on shared use routes. This suggests that cyclists moderate their behaviour in the presence of pedestrians.

On shared use routes, segregating cyclists and pedestrians reduces the width available to each user group. This reduction could have implications for the level of comfort for all users.

Behaviour observed during the study by both pedestrians and cyclists on segregated and unsegregated routes was judged to be considerate by both user groups. Agreement was strongest on unsegregated routes, suggesting that behaviour is more considerate on these routes, where the requirement to interact with other types of user is clearer.

No collisions and no conflict of any significance took place during video surveys undertaken as part of the study. Most of the interaction recorded was relatively inconsequential, where one or more users adjusted their speed position. The most severe category of interaction observed was that of marginal conflict, where cyclists or pedestrians slowed down or changed direction, but movement was calm and controlled

Part 4 – Assessment of impact

4.1 Age: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

a) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the County/District/Borough?

The following details have been provided by ESCC, East Sussex in Figures. These represent a projected population profile, by age, for the County and Bexhill for 2018.

Population by age profile				
Age Group	County		Bexhill	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
0-10	64,373	12	12,160	13
11-17	41,157	8	7,022	8
18-24	35,464	6	7,183	8
25-34	52,653	10	11,204	12
35-44	57,278	10	10,564	11
45-54	78,101	14	13,496	15
55-64	75,257	14	11,985	13
65-74	74,843	14	10,334	11
75-84	45,623	8	5,478	6
85+	22,916	4	2,619	3
All	547,665	100	92,045	100

b) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the population of those impacted by the proposal, project or service?

Those who are likely to be more affected by the scheme are young children or older people. As the table in section (a) shows the age profile for Bexhill is similar compared with those for the County for these age groups. Bexhill has a marginally higher proportion of its population who are 17 years old or younger.

c) Will people with the protected characteristic be more affected by the proposal, project or service than those in the general population who do not share that protected characteristic?

Yes - Any persons of any age with mobility, sight, hearing impairment may be more adversely affected than the general population. Consequently, this group may feel more vulnerable/less safe sharing the footway with cyclists.

Young children may also be more adversely affected than the general population as they may be less aware of their surroundings, potentially walking into the path of an approaching cyclist if left unsupervised. However younger cyclists may also be impacted positively by having specific facilities which improves their safety.

d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on different ages/age groups?

Negative Impacts:

Older people who feel more vulnerable/less safe sharing footways/footpaths with cyclists may stop using the route which the shared facility follows.

Families with young children may consider the cycle route environment to be less safe when sharing with cyclists and may stop visiting the footways/footpaths that the shared facility follows.

The safety of pedestrians, particularly those who are less mobile. There were also concerns for the safety of young children who will be less aware of approaching cyclists.

Positive Impact:

By allowing cycling along this route, it provides less confident cyclists, such as children or older people, a safer environment to cycle. Allowing cycling along this route will also provide an environment for older people to cycle safely and remain active. This may encourage more people to cycle and use the route more often.

e) What actions will be taken to avoid any negative impact or to better advance equality?

In June 2019 ESH carried out a review of the proposed route of the shared Bexhill Cycle Route Review document (SCH026A-D-RP-0001). The purpose of this document was to determine the suitability to introduce a cycle route going East to West within Bexhill and identify where measures are required to reduce the potential risks associated in providing a shared facility.

The review used a risk-based approach to assess two scenarios. Initially a risk assessment of the proposed route considered how a cycle facility can be introduced without any modifications to the existing layout. From this exercise, it was possible to identify areas where, if left unmodified, the risks to public safety would be unacceptably high and unsuitable for the introduction of a cycle route.

The risk assessment was then repeated assuming that practicable mitigation measures had been carried out to reduce the level of risk. From this second assessment, it was possible to identify the residual risks and make a direct comparison between each option to determine which assessment, if any, presented the lowest level of risk.

The proposed mitigation measures are discussed in the following section.

f) Provide details of the mitigation.

The following mitigation measures will be introduced to facilitate cycling along the route in Bexhill:

- i. Where space permits existing paths or footways will be increased in width to provide an effective width of 3.0m. This is the minimum recommended width for a shared use route.*
- ii. Existing features, such as benches, signs etc. will be repositioned to provide an effective width of 3.0m.*
- iii. To ensure sufficient forward visibility is provided along the entire route it is proposed to cut back vegetation at key locations where visibility is currently restricted. These locations have been identified in the Route Review document ESH have prepared. By improving forward visibility will allow users of the route to see other approaching users and react accordingly.*
- iv. The use of coloured surfacing and effective use of signing and lining will be introduced at sections of the route where it is not practicable to introduce an effective width of 3.0m or at locations that are considered a higher risk of user conflict, such as locations of adjoining paths.*
- v. As part of the design process an independent safety review (Road Safety Audit) will be conducted. The purpose of this audit will be to identify potential risks in the proposed design so that these risks can be mitigated. A post construction Safety Audit will also be conducted.*

g) How will any mitigation measures be monitored?

It is recommended that RDC should undertake follow up user surveys once the permanent scheme and associated mitigation measures come into effect to assess the quality of their experience when using the route.

4.2 Disability: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

a) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the County, District & Borough?

The following details have been provided by ESCC, East Sussex in Figures. These represent a projected population profile, by disability, for the County and Bexhill for 2018.

Category	County		Bexhill	
	Numbers	%	Numbers	%
Higher severity disability	29,405	12	5,257	12
Lower severity disability	66,858	27	11,897	27
Locomotor disability	71,850	29	12,893	29
Personal care disability	37,438	15	6,718	15
Hearing disability	26,639	11	4,791	11
Sight disability	13,142	5	2,241	5
All	245,332	100	43,797	100

b) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the population of those impacted by the proposal, project or service?

As the table in section (a) show, the profile for Bexhill is the same as the population in the County.

c) Will people with the protected characteristic be more affected by the proposal, project or service than those in the general population who do not share that protected characteristic?

Yes - People who are less mobile, have balance problems or have hearing or visual impairments may feel more vulnerable/less safe sharing the footway and pathways with cyclists.

Yes - People who use vehicles may be impacted with parking restrictions along the route.

d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on people who have a disability?

Negative Impact Consideration:

Equality

Impact

By promoting cycling on this route, there is a risk that disabled people and other vulnerable groups are concerned for their safety and avoid using the streets and paths the cycle route passes through.

Typical concerns that could be raised through the consultation process related to the shared use environment and the safety of pedestrians, particularly those with disabilities. One of the main concerns was that cyclists would not be considerate to other users of the footway & pathways with the impact being that vulnerable pedestrians may not be aware of approaching cyclists. We will await response to see if this issue is a concern.

Positive Impact Consideration:

By creating a defined cycle route facility, less abled cyclists will feel more feel confident cycling within the defined route.

- e) **What actions are to/or will be taken to avoid any negative impact or to better advance equality?**

Refer to 4.1 (e)

- f) **Provide details of any mitigation.**

Refer to 4.1 (f)

- g) **How will any mitigation measures be monitored?**

Refer to 4.1 (g)

4.3 Ethnicity: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

It is not considered that this protective characteristic will experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact by the scheme to allow cycling in Bexhill on this defined route.

4.4 Gender/Transgender: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact Consider men, women, transgender individuals.

It is not considered that this protective characteristic will experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact by the scheme to allow cycling in Bexhill on this defined route.

4.5 Marital Status/Civil Partnership: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

It is not considered that this protective characteristic will experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact by the scheme to allow cycling in Bexhill.

4.6 Pregnancy and maternity: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.**a) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the County/District/Borough?**

The following details have been provided by ESCC, East Sussex in Figures. These represent a projected population profile, by age, for the County and Bexhill for 2018.

It is considered the likely age range of those who potentially will fall within this protected characteristic is between 16 and 54.

<i>Population by age profile</i>				
<i>Age Group</i>	<i>County</i>		<i>Bexhill</i>	
	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Numbers</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>0-10</i>	<i>64,373</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12,160</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>11-17</i>	<i>41,157</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>7,022</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>18-24</i>	<i>35,464</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7,183</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>25-34</i>	<i>52,653</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11,204</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>35-44</i>	<i>57,278</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10,564</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>45-54</i>	<i>78,101</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>13,496</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>55-64</i>	<i>75,257</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>11,985</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>65-74</i>	<i>74,843</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>10,334</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>75-84</i>	<i>45,623</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>5,478</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>85+</i>	<i>22,916</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2,619</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>All</i>	<i>547,665</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>92,045</i>	<i>100</i>

b) How is this protected characteristic reflected in the population of those impacted by the proposal, project or service?

As the table shows the age profile for Bexhill is marginally higher compared with those for the County for these age groups.

c) Will people with the protected characteristic be more affected by the proposal, project or service than those in the general population who do not share that protected characteristic?

New parents but more particularly their young children may be more adversely affected than the general population as they may be less aware of their surroundings, potentially walking into the path of an approaching cyclist if left unsupervised.

- d) **What is the proposal, project or service's impact on different ages/age groups?**

Negative Impacts Consideration:

Women who are pregnant, may feel more vulnerable/less safe on a shared path.

New parents with young children may consider the cycle route less safe when sharing with cyclists and may stop visiting this amenity.

Positive Impact Consideration:

By allowing cycling on shared footways and paths provides less confident cyclists, such as families with young children, a safer environment to cycle.

- e) **What actions are to/ or will be taken to avoid any negative impact or to better advance equality?**

Refer to 4.1 (e)

- f) **Provide details of any mitigation.**

Refer to 4.1 (f)

- g) **How will any mitigation measures be monitored?**

Refer to 4.1 (g)

4.7 Religion, Belief: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

It is not considered that this protective characteristic will experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact by the scheme to allow cycling in Bexhill along this route.

4.8 Sexual Orientation - Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Heterosexual: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

It is not considered that this protective characteristic will experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact by the scheme to allow cycling in Bexhill along this route.

4.9 Other: Additional groups/factors that may experience impacts - testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

There are no other groups which have been identified which are likely to experience disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.

4.10 Human rights - Human rights place all public authorities – under an obligation to treat you with fairness, equality, dignity, respect and autonomy. **Please look at the table below to consider if your proposal, project or service may potentially interfere with a human right.**

The scheme will not have human rights implications.

Articles	
A2	Right to life (e.g. pain relief, suicide prevention)
A3	Prohibition of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment (service users unable to consent, dignity of living circumstances)
A4	Prohibition of slavery and forced labour (e.g. safeguarding vulnerable adults)
A5	Right to liberty and security (financial abuse)
A6 & 7	Rights to a fair trial; and no punishment without law (e.g. staff tribunals)
A8	Right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence (e.g. confidentiality, access to family)
A9	Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (e.g. sacred space, culturally appropriate approaches)
A10	Freedom of expression (whistle-blowing policies)
A11	Freedom of assembly and association (e.g. recognition of trade unions)
A12	Right to marry and found a family (e.g. fertility, pregnancy)
Protocols	
P1.A1	Protection of property (service users property/belongings)
P1.A2	Right to education (e.g. access to learning, accessible information)
P1.A3	Right to free elections (Elected Members)

Part 5 – Conclusions and recommendations for decision makers

5.1 Summarise how this proposal/policy/strategy will show due regard for the five aims of the general duty across all the protected characteristics and ESCC additional groups.

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups
- Foster good relations between people from different groups
- Encourage more people to cycle and use the route more often
- Health benefits from model shift away from private vehicles

5.2 Impact assessment outcome Based on the analysis of the impact in part four mark below ('X') with a summary of your recommendation.

	Outcome of impact assessment	Please explain your answer fully.
	A No major change – Your analysis demonstrates that the policy/strategy is robust, and the evidence shows no potential for discrimination and that you have taken all appropriate opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations between groups.	<i>A package of mitigation measures will be introduced to facilitate cycling in Bexhill. These are described in paragraph 4.1 (f) of this assessment.</i>
X	B Adjust the policy/strategy – This involves taking steps to remove barriers or to better advance equality. It can mean introducing measures to mitigate the potential effect.	
	C Continue the policy/strategy - This means adopting your proposals, despite any adverse effect or missed opportunities to advance equality, provided you have satisfied yourself that it does not unlawfully discriminate	
	D Stop and remove the policy/strategy – If there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you will want to consider stopping the policy/strategy altogether. If a policy/strategy shows unlawful discrimination it <i>must</i> be removed or changed.	

5.3 What equality monitoring, evaluation, review systems have been set up to carry out regular checks on the effects of the proposal, project or service?

It is recommended that RDC should undertake further user surveys 12 months from when the permanent scheme and associated mitigation measures come into effect to determine/assess the quality of peoples experience when using the cycle scheme.

5.4 When will the amended proposal, proposal, project or service be reviewed?

12 months from when the permanent scheme and associated mitigation measures come into effect.

Date completed :	05 Jun. 20	Signed by (person completing)	Charles Emeanuwa
		Role of person completing	Scheme Project Manager for East Sussex Highways
Date:	05 Jun.20	Signed by (Manager)	James Vaks

Part 6 – Equality impact assessment action plan

If this will be filled in at a later date when proposals have been decided please tick here and fill in the summary report.



The table below should be completed using the information from the equality impact assessment to produce an action plan for the implementation of the proposals to:

1. Lower the negative impact, and/or
2. Ensure that the negative impact is legal under anti-discriminatory law, and/or
3. Provide an opportunity to promote equality, equal opportunity and improve relations within equality target groups, i.e. increase the positive impact
- 4. If no actions fill in separate summary sheet.**

Please ensure that you update your service/business plan within the equality objectives/targets and actions identified below:

Area for improvement	Changes proposed	Lead Manager	Time scale	Resource implications	Where incorporated/flagged? (e.g. business plan/strategic plan/steering group/DMT)

6.1 Accepted Risk

From your analysis please identify any risks not addressed giving reasons and how this has been highlighted within your Directorate:

Area of Risk	Type of Risk? (Legal, Moral, Financial)	Can this be addressed at a later date? (e.g. next financial year/through a business case)	Where flagged? (e.g. business plan/strategic plan/steering group/DMT)	Lead Manager	Date resolved (if applicable)



