



# Equality Impact Assessment

Name of the proposal, project or service
<b>Exceat Bridge Replacement and Improvement to A259 Corridor</b>

File ref:		Issue No:	2
Date of Issue:	07/11/19	Review date:	07/06/21

## 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 ..... 2

Part 3 – Methodology, consultation, data and research used to determine impact on protected characteristics ..... 5

Part 4 – Assessment of impact ..... 7

Part 5 – Conclusions and recommendations for decision makers ..... 21

Part 6 – Equality impact assessment action plan..... 24

## 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 **Full guidance notes are included in the EqIA template, but these have been deleted in this version for brevity.**

## 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.**

Exceat Bridge Replacement and Improvement to A259 Corridor

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

This project seeks to address a long standing and well known bottleneck within the East Sussex network and contribute towards economic growth, specifically economic connectivity, within the area.

The project was initiated to explore options to replace the deteriorating Exceat Road Bridge over the Cuckmere river and unlock the full capacity of the network to support employment and housing growth.

The bridge is coming to the end of its serviceable life and has a number of structural defects and layout issues. Following an options appraisal it was determined that it would be more beneficial to replace the existing bridge with a new one designed to address these issues and meet the needs of its users.

The project will address current constraints affecting those with protected characteristics including:

- major congestion spot due to constrained traffic flow/capacity issues, the impact of which is long queues of traffic in both directions from the bridge
- poor access for pedestrians and cyclists
- increasing pollution and health inequalities
- long-term network resilience

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

Pippa Mabey, Project Manager – Highways Funding and Development, Highways Contracts Management Group, CET

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

The following will be affected by the project:

- Local residents and businesses
- Tourists
- Walkers & cyclists
- Wheelchair users and those with disabilities
- Elderly
- People using the road network to travel to work

The project will deliver:

- A new two-lane bridge to replace the existing single-lane priority bridge on a better and safer alignment.
- New footway and crossing points to allow pedestrians to walk safely to the visitor centre, car parks, pub and Country Park without having to cross the road. The footway will be made wide enough to convert into a footway and cycleway so that it can connect to any future cycleways in the area.
- Creation of a shared meeting space in front of the Cuckmere Inn, new viewing platforms on the bridge, cycle racks and benches to support tourism.
- Reduced speed limits, improvements to bus stops, dropped kerbs and better lighting to further improve safety and accessibility.
- Environmental mitigation work that will improve local habitats including restoration of a saltmarsh, adding value and interest to the Park.

It aims to achieve the following objectives:

- Improve the overall connectivity between two of the county's Growth Areas and identified Priority 1 LUF areas (Newhaven and Eastbourne) that suffer from multiple sources of deprivation.
- Address future resilience on the Major Road Network and reduce the risk of bridge failure and the consequential impact this would have for communities linked by the A259.
- Enabling free flowing traffic and consequently remove the current queueing and idling of vehicles, meaning a reduction in carbon emissions and pollution.
- An enhanced, sensitively designed bridge within the protected environment of the South Downs.
- Making pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the bridge and its environs safer, more attractive and accessible to visitors.
- Improve bus journey times by 1 to 3 minutes between Eastbourne and Brighton allowing buses to run more reliably and offer a more attractive travel option for residents and commuters serving the coastal communities along the A259.

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

The ESCC Project Board are responsible for overseeing the project and the work will be instructed and delivered through the current contract mechanisms within our Highways and Infrastructure Services Contract 2016-23.

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

Our Highway service contract providers and sub-contractors are responsible for carrying out the work and recording network information:

<b>Partner</b>	<b>Nature of involvement (financial, operational etc.)</b>
East Sussex County Council	Financial, Project Management. Lead Applicant
Jacobs	Design, Project Management, Operational
Costain	Operational

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

There is a statutory duty on service providers under the Equality Act 2010 to take reasonable steps to remove or alter physical features to improve access for people with disabilities, or provide an alternative method of making services available. (B.4.4.3, Well Managed Highway Infrastructure, 2016)

All new and existing highways related policies are approved by the Lead Member for Transport and Environment and are monitored in conjunction with the highways performance management framework.

All proposals have been developed with reference to the relevant design guidance and in compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act, Manual for Streets 1 and 2, LTN1/20 Cycling Design Guidance, LTN3/08 Developing Streets for mixed purpose, LTN1/97 Keeping the Buses Moving and national best practice recommendations for inclusivity.

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

On completion of the project, people will be able to access the new bridge, footpath, cycle path and crossing as they can currently access the area – there are and will be no restrictions. During the construction phases, access will be maintained so there will be no disruption to service provision.

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

N/A

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

How: The project is a major infrastructure project that is being carried out in several phases over several years.

When: If the project runs to plan the new Exceat bridge, foot and cycle path and pedestrian crossing will be operational by February 2024.

Where: Exceat Bridge and Seven Sisters Country Park Visitor Centre, on the A259, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 4AB Exceat bridge is part of the A259, one of the principal road networks in East Sussex which serves two of the County's growth areas for housing and employment; Newhaven and Eastbourne/South Wealden. The A259 is a critical route for economic connectivity from the East of the county, along the East Sussex coast to Brighton and through to West Sussex, including linkage to a key port at Newhaven.

**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 <b>X</b> marked against them			
	Employee Monitoring Data		Staff Surveys
	Service User Data	x	Contract/Supplier Monitoring Data
<b>X</b>	Recent Local Consultations		Data from other agencies, e.g. Police, Health, Fire and Rescue Services, third sector
<b>x</b>	Complaints	x	Risk Assessments
	Service User Surveys	x	Research Findings
<b>x</b>	Census Data	x	East Sussex Demographics
	Previous Equality Impact Assessments	x	National Reports
	Other organisations Equality Impact Assessments		Any other evidence?

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

Issues raised by respondents to the consultation (including those with protected characteristics) have been considered and assessed where appropriate to determine whether alternative measures or additional mitigations are necessary. This assessment is set out in appendix 2.

Our assessment concludes that, in most cases, the issues raised are unlikely to materialise. In most cases, the alternatives suggested are not appropriate for safety reasons or because of the highly sensitive nature of the area and the need to balance heritage, environmental and safety elements. However, where possible changes have

been made to the designs to accommodate the needs of all users e.g. improved design of viewing platforms to make barriers easier to see over. In all cases, suitable mitigation measures are in place to remove or minimise any negative effects.

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

An option study was carried out to consider a variation of proposals to address the Exceat Bridge issues and select the best option. These options were as follows:

- Option 1- Replace bearings, construct new footbridge and repaint the original girders
- Option 2- Replace bearings, provide vehicular containment parapets, construct new footbridge.
- Option 3- Widen the existing deck, replace bearings and reconstruct existing deck with vehicular containment parapets.
- Option 4- Build new bridge and demolish the existing bridge.

All **project design** complies with the Disability Discrimination Act, Manual for Streets 1 and 2, LTN1/20 Cycling Design Guidance, LTN3/08 Developing Streets for mixed purpose, LTN1/97 Keeping the Buses Moving and national best practice recommendations for inclusivity.

An **economic appraisal** has been carried out in relation to the proposal.

**Road safety audits** have been carried out and used to inform the design.

A **public and stakeholder consultation** took place online during 2020 with options to complete paper or telephone surveys. Telephone and email support was available for anyone needing assistance.

Information was provided to local businesses to display in their premises. Posters were displayed on and around the site and information was shared on websites, social media and the press.

We contacted key stakeholders directly asking them for feedback and their help in reaching people who might be affected by the proposals. These included:

- Eastbourne Access and Eastbourne Disability Involvement Group
- Public Transport Providers and Liaison
- Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company Ltd.
- Local Residents and Residents groups

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

The option study recommended that best option would be 4, if the funding can be obtained as it provides a solution for all deficiencies.

The economic appraisal of the Exceat Bridge Replacement demonstrates that the proposed scheme offers high value for money, with a benefit cost ratio of 2.12. In addition to the monetised benefits they found that the scheme would:

- Deliver congestion benefits at other times, with observed traffic volumes during the weekday shoulder peak and Saturday lunchtime peak similar to the weekday AM and PM peak hours
- Improve journey time reliability for vehicular traffic including bus services that serve the A259 corridor
- Reduce the likelihood of severance
- Reduce air pollution from queuing vehicles
- Enhance ecological diversity and value in the long-term through the provision of 1ha of mosaic wetland habitat
- Improve network resilience – the A259 is a key alternative to the A27
- Support tourism and planned housing growth.

The response to the public consultation which took place in 2020 was largely positive towards a new structure. There was no significant difference between responses from those with protected characteristics and those without.

Positive feedback from people with protected characteristics included statements that it would improve travel times to the local hospital, reduce emissions and provide easier pavement accessibility across the bridge. Concern was noted around the viewing platforms and their need to be accessible to all and the safety of children using the viewing platforms. The design has been modified as a result.

See appendix 1 and 2 for further details.

## 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?

Sussex has a higher population of people aged over 65 than the average for England and Wales.

Age	All people	Percent aged 0-14	Percent aged 15-29	Percent aged 30-44	Percent aged 45-64	Percent aged 65+
Geography						
England and Wales	56,075,912	17.6	19.9	20.5	25.4	16.4
South East	8,634,750	17.8	18.6	20.4	26.1	17.2
East Sussex	526,671	16.1	15.9	17.2	28.0	22.7
Eastbourne	99,412	15.7	18.5	18.3	25.1	22.4
Seaford	23,571	13.3	13.8	14.3	28.3	30.4
Newhaven	12,232	18.3	18.2	19.7	26.6	17.2

Source: 2011 Census, Office for National Statistics

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

Eastbourne, Seaford and Newhaven have a higher percentage of over 65 than the South east in total. These towns will be the main sources for those using the Exceat bridge. In response to a public consultation nearly 50% of all respondents advised they belonged to an age group above 60.

Option	Total	Percent
<b>Under 18</b>	1	0.10%
<b>18 - 24</b>	12	1.19%
<b>25 - 34</b>	76	7.55%
<b>35 - 44</b>	91	9.04%
<b>45 - 54</b>	154	15.29%
<b>55 - 59</b>	95	9.43%
<b>60 - 64</b>	121	12.02%
<b>65 - 74</b>	262	26.02%
<b>75+</b>	106	10.53%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	40	3.97%
<b>Not Answered</b>	49	4.87%

**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?**

Any age groups that particularly benefit from improved accessibility such as raised kerbs at bus stops, better crossings, wider footways, benches and shorter journeys will be more affected by the project. (See full details of design elements included to support those with protected characteristics at appendix 1)

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

It will have a positive impact on these age groups. In response to public consultation, it was noted that access to the nearest hospital is over the bridge and therefore a 2 way system would enable a quicker travel time.

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

See full details of design elements included to support those with protected characteristics at appendix 1.

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these changes and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

**f) Provide details of the mitigation.**

See mitigation measures in section 3.2 above.

**How will any mitigation measures be monitored?**

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are

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

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

Type	All people	Percent people with long-term health problem or disability	Percent day-to-day activities limited a little	Percent day-to-day activities limited a lot	Percent people without long-term health problem or disability
Geography					
England and Wales	56,075,912	17.9	9.4	8.5	82.1
South East	8,634,750	15.7	8.8	6.9	84.3
East Sussex	526,671	20.3	11.2	9.2	79.7
Eastbourne	99,412	21	9.7	11.3	79.0
Seaford	23,571	23.2	10.0	13.1	76.8
Newhaven	12,232	18.9	8.5	10.4	81.1

Source: 2011 Census, Office for National Statistics

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

In response to a public consultation 7.35% of 1,007 respondents advised that they considered themselves to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010.

##### 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?

People with mobility disabilities or disabilities that affect their ability to cross the road or mean they particularly benefit from improved accessibility such as raised kerbs at bus stops, better crossings, wider footways, benches and shorter journeys will be more affected by the project. (See full details of design elements included to support those with protected characteristics at appendix 1)

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

It will have a positive impact on those with a disability because it will improve accessibility.

See appendix 1 for details of design elements incorporated to improve accessibility for people with disabilities.

In response to a public consultation, out of those who considered themselves disabled, 79.7% felt the proposals to replace Exceat bridge were good. This is very similar to the proportion of positive responses overall.

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these changes and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

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

See full details of design elements included to support those with protected characteristics at appendix 1.

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

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

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

Race categories are: Colour. E.g. being black or white, Nationality e.g. being a British, Australian or Swiss citizen, Ethnic or national origins e.g. being from a Roma background or of Chinese Heritage

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

Ethnicity	All people	% White British and N Irish	% White Irish	% Gypsy or Irish Traveller	% Other White	% Mixed heritage	% Asian/ Asian British	% Black/ Black British	% other ethnic group
England and Wales	56,075,912	80.5	0.9	0.1	4.4	2.2	7.5	3.3	1.0
South East	8,634,750	85.2	0.9	0.2	4.4	1.9	5.2	1.6	0.6
East Sussex	526,671	91.7	0.8	0.2	3.4	1.4	1.7	0.6	0.3
Eastbourne	99,412	87.4	1.0	0.1	5.6	1.8	2.8	0.8	0.5
Seaford	23,571	93.8	0.8	0.0	2.5	0.9	1.5	0.3	0.2
Newhaven	12,232	93.0	0.6	0.1	3.2	1.2	1.1	0.4	0.3

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above who will be impacted by the project.

In response to a public consultation 85.80% of respondents advised that they were White British.

**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?**

No

**d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on those who are from different ethnic backgrounds?**

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all.

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these changes and use it to support future reviews and EqIAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

Where applicable with certain highway projects a separate EqIA will be carried out. The existing highway service contract provider is required to adopt and following ESCC equalities policies such as the Translation and Interpretation Policy.

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

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manages and monitors the contract and business service performance targets and ensures works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

**4.4 Gender/Transgender: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact**

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

Gender	Geography	All people
All people	England and Wales	56,075,912
	South East	8,634,750
	East Sussex	526,671
Males	England and Wales	27,573,376
	South East	4,239,298

<b>Females</b>	East Sussex	253,764
	England and Wales	28,502,536
	South East	4,395,452
	East Sussex	272,907

Source: 2011 Census, Office for National Statistics

In response to public consultation the following response were received on gender:

Option	Total	Percent
Male	526	52.23%
Female	408	40.52%
Prefer not to say	33	3.28%
Not Answered	40	3.97%

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

In response to public consultation, 0.3% advised that they identified as a identify as a transgender or trans person.

**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?**

No

**d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on different genders?**

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these policies and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

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

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manage and monitor the contract and business service performance targets and ensure works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

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

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

Marital Status	All people aged 16 and over	Percent single	Percent married	Percent in a registered same-sex civil partnership	Percent separated	Percent divorced	Percent widowed
Geography							
England and Wales	45,496,780	34.6	46.6	0.2	2.6	9.0	7.0
South East	6,992,666	31.9	49.3	0.2	2.5	9.1	6.9
East Sussex	435,515	29.1	48.4	0.3	2.7	10.7	8.7
Eastbourne	82,691	33.3	42.8	0.4	3.0	11.5	9.1

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

In response to public consultation, 54.42% advised that they were married or in a civil partnership. Of which 81.75% advised the proposals were good.

23.93% advised that there were not married or in a civil partnership. Of which 84.64% advised the proposals were good.

**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?**

No

**d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on people who are married or same sex couples who have celebrated a civil partnership?**

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these changes and use it to support future reviews and EqIAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

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

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manages and monitors the contract and business service performance targets and ensures works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

**4.6 Pregnancy and maternity: Testing of disproportionate, negative, neutral or positive impact.**

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

	Age of mother	Under 20	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40 and over
Geography	All live births						
England	663157	20963	96519	185960	210731	120330	28654
South East	101982	2797	12847	26970	33891	20711	4766
East Sussex	5219	186	839	1479	1568	916	231
Eastbourne	1048	44	178	282	338	166	40
Hastings	1115	67	236	341	256	180	35
Lewes	898	16	113	243	295	182	49
Rother	751	32	128	220	201	127	43
Wealden	1407	27	184	393	478	261	64

Source: Dataset: Live births by age of mother, 2001-2016 – districts ESIF

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

In response to public consultation, 0.79% advised that they were currently pregnant or have you been pregnant in the last year.

**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?**

Where pregnancy or maternity affects mobility or need for better accessibility (e.g. getting a buggy on/off a bus or crossing the road), people with this protected characteristic are likely to be more positively affected than others due to accessibility improvements.

**d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on pregnant women and women within the first 26 weeks of maternity leave?**

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all.

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these policies and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

**f) Provide details of the mitigation**

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manages and monitors the contract and business service performance targets and ensures works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

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

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

Religions	All people	% Christian	% Buddhist	% Hindu	% Jewish	% Muslim	% Sikh	% other religions	% no religion	% religion not stated
England and Wales	56,075,912	59.3	0.4	1.5	0.5	4.8	0.8	0.4	25.1	7.2
South East	8,634,750	59.8	0.5	1.1	0.2	2.3	0.6	0.5	27.7	7.4
East Sussex	526,671	59.9	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.7	29.6	8.1
Eastbourne	99,412	59.6	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.5	0.1	0.6	29.2	8

Source: 2011 Census, Office for National Statistics

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

In response to public consultation, 24.03% advised that they regarded themselves as belonging to any particular religion or belief, of that 78.93% advised the proposals were good.

57.50% advised that they did not belong to any particular religion or belief, of those 86.86% advised that the proposals were good.

##### 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?

No

##### d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on the people with different religions and beliefs?

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all.

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these policies and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

##### f) Provide details of any mitigation.

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manage and monitor the contract and business service performance targets and ensure works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

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

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

Estimates of the UK LGB population generally vary between 5%-7% of the overall population. Official estimates are often lower than this based on responses to surveys.

All estimates are subject to the very significant caveat that many LGB people are reluctant to 'come out' to policy makers and researchers, seeing little benefit in doing so and fearing discrimination and harassment. In addition, sources such as the census have not collected sexual orientation or gender identity data so far. Taking the Stonewall estimate as a guide, this means that in East Sussex with a population of 547,797 (East Sussex in Figures website) around 27,389- 38,345 people are likely to be LGB.

In response to public consultation the following responses were given.

Option	Total	Percent
<b>Bi/Bisexual</b>	15	1.49%
<b>Heterosexual/Straight</b>	685	68.02%
<b>Gay woman/Lesbian</b>	4	0.40%
<b>Gay Man</b>	23	2.28%
<b>Other</b>	21	2.09%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	126	12.51%
<b>Not Answered</b>	133	13.21%

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

The proportion of highway users with this protected characteristic is likely to be the same as in the population figures above.

**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?**

No

**d) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on people with differing sexual orientation?**

It will have a positive impact because it will improve accessibility for all.

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

We will monitor and take into consideration any feedback received specific to these policies and use it to support future reviews and EqlAs.

We will ensure that highway service policies are reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to help avoid any negative impact and ensure the advancement of equality.

**f) Provide details of the mitigation**

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

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

The Contract Management Group manages and monitors the contract and business service performance targets and ensures works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

The Contract Management Group will carry out a stakeholder consultation following construction to assess the impact of the scheme and determine if any further works are necessary.

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

**a) How are these groups/factors reflected in the County/District/ Borough? How is this group/factor reflected in the population of those impacted by the proposal, project or service?**

Rurality – The landscape in East Sussex is predominantly rural, however the majority of the population live in urban areas, 58% live in the coastal urban areas and a further 18% live in market towns.

Due to the rurality of the area the method of travel to work is predominantly by car or bus. According to the 2011 census, 55% in Eastbourne drive a car or van to work, 58% in Seaford and 56% Newhaven, these are the main population hubs around the Exceat bridge.

The project has the potential to positively impact those who rely on these methods to get to work via the A259 between Eastbourne, Newhaven and Seaford as it will reduce congestion and travel time (see figures at 2.2).

**b) Will people within these groups or affected by these factors be more affected by the proposal, project or service than those in the general population who are not in those groups or affected by these factors?**

Although people in rural areas may be affected differently or have different requirements of the service, following our research, we do not expect this project to affect these groups differently.

**c) What is the proposal, project or service's impact on the factor or identified group?**

The improvements to travel times and journey reliability along the A259 are expected to have a positive impact on economic connectivity in the wider area, supporting people living and working in rural areas to access services, work and leisure.

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

Rurality - The highways service has a good track record in engaging with parish councils in rural areas, as well as town councils in smaller towns, on a wide range of issue through the Strengthening Local Relations (SLR) and the Community Highways Initiatives. This provides an opportunity for rural communities to raise any concerns they have or make suggestions which will be taken into consideration when reviewing policies. Engagement and consultation with relevant stakeholders is already underway and will continue through the life of the project.

We will ensure that the policies are also reviewed against relevant best practice guidance to avoid any negative impact to the advancement of equality.

**e) Provide details of the mitigation.**

None necessary in the implementation of these changes.

However it should be noted that Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions and that, when appropriate, an individual EQIA will be completed for new highway schemes or projects.

Contractors are also required to undertake a risk assessment as applicable when carrying out works on the highway to ensure the corrective mitigation action is taken.

**f) How will any mitigation measures be monitored?**

The Contract Management Group manage and monitor the contract and business service performance targets and ensure works and services comply with the requirements of the Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. This contains specific clauses regarding equality and diversity.

**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.**

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

## Part 5 – Conclusions and recommendations for decision makers

### 5.1 Summarise how this proposal/policy/strategy will show due regard for the three 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;

This project takes into consideration national legislation and best practice guidelines.

The project will be implemented by the current highways and infrastructure services contract provider. Standard Diversity and Equality clauses are included in all highway contract Terms and Conditions.

The Highway Contract Management Group will monitor the project including its performance and compliance and investigate any complaints relating to equalities issues.

- Advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups

The highways contract and associated projects aim to support and deliver better value for money and improved network condition, improving access for older people and people with disabilities. This project has taken into consideration the needs of all highway users including these groups.

- Foster good relations between people from different groups

Customer focus and community engagement are embedded into the highways contract and service model and the current service provider is expected to liaise directly with local communities to deliver the service in a fair, transparent manner, considering the needs of all service users.

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

X	Outcome of impact assessment	Please explain your answer fully.
x	<b>A No major change</b> – 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.	<b>The analysis suggests there will be no negative impact made upon those with protected characteristics. Instead positive improvements will be made through this project making it more accessible to reach the Seven sisters County Park, cycleway, walkway and information centre. Additionally, for those who live in rural areas and/or rely on a vehicle to get to work, the creation of a 2 way bridge will reduce congestion, making travel times quicker and</b>
	<b>B Adjust the policy/strategy</b> – This involves taking steps to remove barriers or to better advance equality. It can mean introducing measures to mitigate the potential effect.	
	<b>C Continue the policy/strategy</b> - 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	

<p><b>D Stop and remove the policy/strategy</b> – 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.</p>	<p><b>reducing the environmental impact of the congestion.</b></p>
--	--

**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?**

The findings of this EqIA have been considered by the project team against the project’s implementation and mitigations put in place where necessary to ensure the project promotes equality, doesn’t discriminate and meets the terms of the Equality Act 2010.

The following outcomes will be monitored and evaluated by the Project Board following the completion of the project including seeking feedback from stakeholders including local disability groups:

**Key metrics for monitoring and evaluation**

- **Scheme Build.** Key metrics will include the programme, stakeholder management, risk register and scheme benefits. Information will be documented as part of the regular progress meetings, Project Board meetings, and Cabinet papers at key milestones. Feedback will be sought from stakeholders on impact of project.
- **Scheme Delivery.** A detailed comparison of the proposed scheme at funding approval, detailed design and the delivered scheme.
- **Scheme Costs.** A detailed comparison of the cost estimates at funding approval, detailed design, the outturn values once the scheme is delivered and for maintenance costs 5 years after opening.
- **Travel Demand.** Traffic survey (types and number of vehicles and non-motorised user survey). Numbers of passengers using the main bus services on the route.
- **Travel Times and Reliability.** Journey time survey from Seaford to East Dean. An analysis will be undertaken to identify any significant differences between outturn flows and/or speeds compared to those forecast for the scheme. Feedback will also be sought from Brighton and Hove Buses on reliability.
- **Carbon emissions and pollution** using modelling based on traffic data and a review of outturn traffic flows once the scheme is delivered to verify predictions.
- **Safety.** Sussex Police database analysed for slight, serious and fatal accidents at Exceat bridge. Feedback from stakeholders on near misses and perceived safety. Number of crossings made by non-motorised users.

**Governance arrangements**

## Equality Impact Assessment

The Project Manager and Project Delivery Team are responsible for delivering the plan, risk management, quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation. They will report to the Project Board and Senior Responsible Officer on progress at least once per quarter for the duration of the project and at lesser intervals post-construction. They will monitor the progress and impact of the project and present findings to the Council's Capital Board for review. A baseline report, and reports at one and five years after completion of construction will be reviewed by the Project Board and Senior Responsible Officer to assess the impact of the scheme. Scheme progress, monitoring and evaluation reports and lessons learned will be shared with the Government and key internal and external stakeholders as appropriate. This will include equality considerations.

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

Following completion of the project, monitoring will take place within 1 year and again at 5yrs.

<b>Date completed:</b>	<b>14/06/21</b>	<b>Signed by (person completing)</b>	<b>Stephanie Everest</b>
		<b>Role of person completing</b>	<b>Project Manager – Funding and Development</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15/06.21</b>	<b>Signed by (Manager)</b>	<b>Pippa Mabey Service Development Manager</b>

**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	Timescale	Resource implications	Where incorporated/flagged? (e.g. business plan/strategic plan/steering group/DMT)
N/A					

**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)
N/A					

**Appendix 1  
Improvements that will benefit people with protected characteristics**

Current issues	Protected characteristic(s) most affected	Proposal	Design compliant with
<p>Narrow footways cannot accommodate passing wheelchairs/pushchairs.</p> <p>Footway only on the north side of the bridge means that most pedestrians need to cross the carriageway twice to cross the river. Particularly unsafe for disabled persons or those with pushchairs.</p>	<p>Wheelchair and pushchair users</p>	<p>Wider footways to allow room for two wheelchairs to pass and with inclines of no steeper than 1 in 20.</p> <p>Footways on both sides of the bridge allowing continuous pedestrian passage without a need to cross the carriageway</p>	<p>Disability Discrimination Act</p>
<p>No raised kerbs at bus stops; harder for people with sight or mobility impairments to get on and off buses.</p>	<p>Vision and mobility impairments, wheelchair and pushchair users</p>	<p>Raised kerbs at bus stops to minimise height difference between kerb and bus floor. (All buses which serve this area are PSVAR compliant and capable of carrying wheelchair users.)</p>	
<p>Existing street lighting of poor quality with uneven distribution of light, especially over the bridge.</p>	<p>Vision impairments</p>	<p>New street lighting columns at pedestrian crossings, side road junction and shared space area.</p> <p>Low level wayfinding lighting over bridge.</p>	<p>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</p>
<p>No designated crossing points and very poor visibility at the location where most crossings are attempted</p>	<p>Mobility and vision impairments</p>	<p>Dropped kerbs and tactile paving at designated crossing points.</p> <p>Improved layout ensures good vehicle / pedestrian visibility at all crossing locations.</p>	<p>Manuals for Streets</p>

## Equality Impact Assessment

Nowhere safe for people to congregate that is easily accessible	Mobility impairments	Shared space area outside Inn. Wide areas and shallow gradients.	
No viewing platforms. Insufficient space to pass people stopping to admire the view on the bridge.	Age, disability	New viewing platforms. Railings rather than solid walls in shared space / viewing platforms. The railings' simple see-through design will allow, shorter people, those sat in wheelchairs or on benches to appreciate the views.	
No benches	Age, disability, maternity	Benches at three locations to provide rest spots, including space for wheelchairs.	

**Appendix 2 – Stakeholder feedback assessment (those with and without protected characteristics)**

Concerns	Evidence this is unfounded	Issues with alternatives	Mitigation measures in place
<b>Existing bridge with traffic lights would be sufficient</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Modelling suggests future traffic levels will be too high for traffic lights to prevent serious congestion</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>No benefits to non-motorised users; no long-term resilience for growth in area</p>	
<b>Improvements might increase traffic volumes, particularly HGVs, to an unacceptable level</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Although traffic is expected to increase nationwide, the nature and location of route means that the bridge is unlikely to be the cause of significant increased traffic. Journeys will simply become more efficient.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Expected improvements to bus service. Recent improvements on A27 which is better for HGVs and long-distance travelers</p>
<b>New bridge might result in higher traffic speeds making it less safe for pedestrians</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>The design of the new bridge alignment has been done in a way that will safely reduce vehicle speeds.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>The project includes reducing speed limits and provision of traffic calming</p>
<b>Controlled crossings or traffic islands needed for safety</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Road safety audit has concluded that uncontrolled crossing points, which will have significantly better visibility than the current provision will be safe and suitable for all pedestrians. Traffic modelling</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Not possible for environmental reasons as it is part of a dark skies area and the necessary increase in carriageway width to install traffic islands would necessitate a much higher retaining</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Installation of uncontrolled crossing points to encourage crossing at safe locations. Traffic speed management measures.</p>

	<p>confirms that the increase in wait times will be marginal.</p>	<p>wall infringing on the landscape including a significant reduction of the surrounding saltmarsh. Road safety engineers have confirmed that it would be safer for pedestrians to wait slightly longer on the side of the road, than become stranded in the middle of the road with passing traffic either side.</p>	
<p><b>Environmental concerns</b></p>	<p>✓ Environmental Statement and an Ecosystems Services assessment carried out.</p>		<p>✓ Mitigation strategy in line with National Planning Policy Framework and Environmental regulations. Includes restoration of nearby salt marsh.</p>