

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

Before completing this form, please refer to the supporting guidance documents which can be found on the equality page of the intranet. The page also provides the name of your Corporate Equality Group member should you need any additional advice.

Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) are a planning tool that enable us to build equality into mainstream processes by helping us to:

- consider the equality implications of our policies (this includes criteria, practices, functions or services - essentially everything we do) on different groups of employees, service users, residents, contractors and visitors
- identify the actions we need to take to improve outcomes for people who experience discrimination and disadvantage
- fulfil our commitment to public service.

The level of detail included in each EIA should be proportionate to the scale and significance of its potential impact on the people with protected characteristics.

This assessment may be published on the Authority’s website as part of a Council or Cabinet Report. It can also be requested under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and can be used as evidence in complaint or legal proceedings.

Proposal details

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Name of the policy or process being assessed | Routes to Metro – Percy Main active travel improvements | |
| 2. Version of this EIA (e.g. a new EIA = 1) | 1 | |
| 3. Date EIA created | 14 October 2022 | |
| | Name | Service or organisation |
| 4. Principal author of this EIA | Kenneth Horn, Senior Traffic Engineer | WSP |
| 5. Others involved in writing this EIA <i>EIAs should not be completed by a sole author. Think about key stakeholders and others who can support the process and bring different ideas and perspectives to the discussion.</i> | Chris Hughes, Associate Director - Traffic Engineering, Active Travel and Road Safety John Cram, Integrated Transport Officer | WSP Regeneration and Economic Development, North Tyneside Council |

6. What is the purpose of your proposal, who should it benefit and what outcomes should be achieved?

The Authority has obtained grant funding from the Government's Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) for the 'Routes to Metro' project to improve local cycling, walking and wheeling links which support accessibility to Metro stations.

The proposals associated with this EIA involve improvements to cycling, walking and wheeling links to Percy Main Metro station via Chollerford Avenue, Norham Road, Alnwick Avenue and Elsdon Terrace.

The full scheme involves proposals to provide a cycleway with adjacent footway alongside Norham Road; install raised tables at side road junctions to make it easier to cross; introduce parking restrictions on a section of street; provide sections of shared use footway-cycleway and measures to facilitate on-carriageway cycling in residential streets; and install a new Toucan signalised crossing on A193 Wallsend Road.

At the junction of Norham Road and Verne Road new signalised arrangements are planned, to be installed as part of separate developer-led works.

7. Does this proposal contribute to the achievement of the Authority's public sector equality duty? Will your proposal:

Write your answers in the table

| Aim | Answer: Yes, No, or N/A | If yes, how? |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Eliminate unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment | No | |
| Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not | Yes | As the scheme has been designed to ensure that highway conditions are conducive to support greater usage of cycling, walking and wheeling, resulting in the potential positive impacts identified in section 11 below. |
| Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not | No | |

Evidence Gathering and Engagement

8. What evidence has been used for this assessment?

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant objectives of the Authority, e.g. to take steps and seek investment to make North Tyneside carbon net-zero by 2030 (Our North Tyneside Plan); improve the street network, putting cycling and walking first (North Tyneside Transport Strategy); and to increase levels of cycling each year (North Tyneside Cycling Strategy) ▪ Responses to public engagement undertaken between May and July 2021 ▪ Department for Transport Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) guidance |
|--|

9.a Have you carried out any engagement in relation to this proposal?

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | √ |
| Yes - please complete 9b | ✓ |
| No | |

| 9.b Engagement activity undertaken | With | When |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| Engagement on the full scheme was carried out in Summer 2021, via a news item on the Authority's website linking to the 'Placechangers' consultation website. | Residents, user groups and any other person wishing to respond | May to July 2021 |
| Technical consultation | Ward Members | Jan 2022 |
| Technical consultation | Relevant stakeholders, e.g. utilities and emergency services | During scheme development |
| Engagement via briefing sessions | Ward Members | Aug, Sep 2022 |

9. Is there any information you don't have?

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | √ | Please explain why this information is not currently available |
| Yes - please list in section A of the action plan at Q13 | ✓ | Views of stakeholders on the detailed notices/orders relating to the scheme – we will understand this by advertising the notices/orders Views of residents of households/premises directly affected by the scheme – we will understand this by contacting them by letter |
| No | | |

Analysis by protected characteristic

| | A | B | C |
|---|--|---|--|
| 11. Protected characteristic | Does this proposal and how it will be implemented have the <u>potential</u> to impact on people with this characteristic? (Answer – Yes or No) | If ‘Yes’ would the <u>potential</u> impact be positive or negative? (Answer – positive or negative) | Please describe the <u>potential</u> impact and the evidence (including that given in Q8 and 9) you have used |
| All Characteristics | No | | |
| Sex – male or female | No | | |
| Pregnancy and maternity – largely relates to employment, but also to some aspects of service delivery e.g. for breastfeeding women | No | | |

| | A | B | C |
|---|--|---|--|
| 11. Protected characteristic | Does this proposal and how it will be implemented have the <u>potential</u> to impact on people with this characteristic? (Answer – Yes or No) | If ‘Yes’ would the <u>potential</u> impact be positive or negative? (Answer – positive or negative) | Please describe the <u>potential</u> impact and the evidence (including that given in Q8 and 9) you have used |
| Age – people of different ages, including young and old | Yes | Positive | People for whom age makes crossing the road more difficult may experience a positive impact from the provision of a new signalised crossing, and raised table crossings of side roads, as part of the scheme. |
| Disability – including those with visual, audio (BSL speakers and hard of hearing), mobility, physical, mental health issues, learning, multiple and unseen disabilities | Yes | Positive | People for whom a disability makes crossing the road more difficult may experience a positive impact from the provision of a new signalised crossing, and raised table crossings of side roads, as part of the scheme. |
| | | Positive | Footway users with a disability (e.g. wheelchair users and visually or audio impaired people) may experience a positive impact from reduced incidence of people cycling on footways, as the proposals create a protected cycleway which is separate from the footway. |
| | | Negative | Temporary traffic management arrangements during construction have potential to have a negative impact on accessibility for people with a disability in the case of potential footway closures or reductions in available width. This can be reduced by seeking to ensure that construction partners do not obstruct footways which remain open, and in the case of closures provide appropriate access arrangements such as temporary dropped kerbs and safe temporary walking areas. |

| | | | |
|---|----|--|--|
| Gender reassignment - includes trans, non-binary and those people who do not identify with or reject gender labels | No | | |
| Race – includes a person's nationality, colour, language, culture and geographic origin | No | | |

| | A | B | C |
|--|--|---|--|
| 11. Protected characteristic | Does this proposal and how it will be implemented have the <u>potential</u> to impact on people with this characteristic? (Answer – Yes or No) | If ‘Yes’ would the <u>potential</u> impact be positive or negative? (Answer – positive or negative) | Please describe the <u>potential</u> impact and the evidence (including that given in Q8 and 9) you have used |
| Religion or belief – includes those with no religion or belief | No | | |
| Sexual orientation – includes gay, lesbian, bisexual and straight people | No | | |
| Marriage and civil partnership status - not single, co-habiting, widowed or divorced– only relates to eliminating unlawful discrimination in employment | No | | |
| Intersectionality - will have an impact due to a combination of two or more of these characteristics | No | | |

If you have answered **'Yes'** anywhere in column A please complete the rest of the form, ensuring that all identified negative impacts are addressed in either Q12 'negative impacts that cannot be removed' or Q13 'Action Plan' below

If you have answered **'No'** in all rows in column A please provide the rationale and evidence in the all characteristics box in column C and go to Q14 'Outcome of EIA'.

12.a Can any of the negative impacts identified in Q11 not be removed or reduced?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes - please list them in the table below and explain why | |
| No | ✓ |

| 12.b Potential negative impact | What alternative options, if any, were considered? | Explanation of why the impact cannot be removed or reduced or the alternative option pursued. |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Action Planning

| 13. Action Plan | Impact: (Answer remove or reduce) | Responsible officer (Name and service) | Target completion date |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Section A: Actions to gather evidence or information to improve NTC's understanding of the potential impacts on people with protected characteristics and how best to respond to them (please explain below) | | | |
| Displaying notices and publishing details of the proposals in accordance with the Authority's usual procedure | | Kenneth Horn (WSP) | 18 Nov 2022 |
| | | | |
| Section B: Actions already in place to remove or reduce potential negative impacts (please explain below) | | | |
| Consideration of accessibility factors as part of the scheme design process | Reduce | Kenneth Horn (WSP) | |
| | | | |
| Section C: Actions that will be taken to remove or reduce potential negative impacts (please explain below) | | | |
| Confirm that construction work takes account of accessibility factors, e.g., not obstructing footways which remain open, and in the case of closures providing appropriate access arrangements such as temporary dropped kerbs | Reduce | Kenneth Horn (WSP) John Cram | 31 Dec 2022 |
| | | | |
| Section D: Actions that will be taken to make the most of any potential positive impact (please explain below) | | | |
| Inform the public of any positive impacts as part of communications/publicity when the scheme is completed | | John Cram | 31 Mar 2023 |
| | | | |
| Section E: Actions that will be taken to monitor the equality impact of this proposal once it is implemented (please explain below) | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-------------|
| Take account of accessibility factors as progress on scheme construction is reviewed | | John Cram | 31 Mar 2023 |
| | | | |
| Section F: Review of EIA to be completed | | John Cram | 31 Mar 2023 |

14. Outcome of EIA

Based on the conclusions from this assessment:

| Outcome of EIA | Tick relevant box | Please explain and evidence why you have reached this conclusion: |
|--|-------------------|--|
| The proposal is robust, no major change is required. | ✓ | Several identified potential impacts are positive. Actions are specified to reduce the identified potential negative impact. |
| Continue but with amendments | | |
| Not to be pursued | | |

Now send this document to the [Corporate Equality Group member for your service](#) for clearance.

Quality assurance and approval

Questions 15-18 are only for completion by the Corporate Equality Group Member for your service

| | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|----------|--|
| 15. Do you agree or disagree with this assessment? ✓ | Agree | ✓ | Disagree | |
| 16. If disagree, please explain: | | | | |
| 17. Name of Corporate Equality Group Member: | Melissa Lackenby | | | |

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| 18. Date: | 18/10/22 |
|------------------|----------|

Conclusion:

- If the assessment is agreed, please send the document to the Head of Service for sign off.
- If you disagree return to author for reconsideration.

Questions 19-22 are only for completion by the Head of Service

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|----------|--|
| 19. Do you agree or disagree with this assessment? ✓ | Agree | ✓ | Disagree | |
| 20. If disagree, please explain: | | | | |
| 21. Head of Service: | John Sparkes (Director) | | | |
| 22. Date: | 19/10/22 | | | |

Please return the document to the Author and Corporate Equality Group Member.