

Appendix B



Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: City Development	Service area: UTMC
Lead person: Joel Dodsworth	Contact number: 3788128

1. Title: UTMC CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2024/25

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy **Service / Function** **Other**

If other, please specify:

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

UTMC Capital Programme for the 2024/25 financial year, comprising refurbishment and upgrade of multiple traffic signal sites and implementation of fibre telecommunications.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		X
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The proposals set out in the report will result in reduced waiting times at the identified standalone crossings for pedestrians and cyclists (where applicable). This will help to reduce community severance.

Increased safety clearance times and green man extensions will help to provide more comfort to users of junctions and crossings that take more time to cross (i.e. young children and those with impaired mobility) and contribute to more inclusive infrastructure. Older people's organisations ran a 'Time to Cross' campaign which highlighted the difficulties and anxiety older people and disabled people have experienced in using crossings that rely on the calculated speed of 1.2m/sec.

Visually impaired people favour signal controlled crossings as they provide maximum level of reassurance that traffic has stopped at a red light and are often prepared to travel considerable distance away from their desire line in order to use a signal controlled crossing. Pavements are for People group comprising disabled people organisations and pedestrian charities has highlighted how disabled people, and blind and partially sighted people in particular, can be impacted by faults at signals that include pedestrian crossings. The refurbishment programme that will upgrade signal technology is likely to reduce faults.

There is a body of research that highlights road safety issues related to pedestrian delay at signal controlled crossings. The longer the delay, the more likely the pedestrian is to start to look to exploit gaps in traffic and cross contrary to signals. If the signals are perceived to be non-responsive and result in long delays between the pedestrian crossing being called and the green man appearing this can also lead to people being more tempted to cross in the shadow of the crossing.

Children, particularly older children and teenagers are the group least likely to adhere to traffic signals when using a pelican crossing. School children are reported to be very influenced by peer group pressure which encourages them to disobey pedestrian signals. Adolescents often fail to obey the traffic signals and/or fail to check that the road is clear. Nearly 25% of adolescents surveyed for a TRL study, reported never or hardly ever checking to make sure the traffic had completely stopped before crossing at a pedestrian crossing, and 25% reported they fairly often or very often getting partway across the road and having to run the rest of the way. Male children were more likely to cross without waiting for the green man than females and crossing during the red man was found to increase with age during adolescence. Studies have shown that young people (aged between 17 and 25 years) and especially young males, are more likely to cross the road at unmarked crossings and report more violations (disobeying the Highway Code), errors (e.g. in judgement when crossing the road) and lapses (e.g. in concentration) as pedestrian and therefore be more at risk.

Child pedestrians can experience greater difficulties in judging the relative speeds of oncoming traffic, and therefore children may be particularly disadvantaged by long delays at signal controlled crossings. Child pedestrians (aged under 16 years) account for approximately 35% of collisions. This represents a higher collision rate amongst child pedestrians as there are fewer children in the lower age bracket compared with the number of adults in the adult age bracket.

Increased reliability and smooth working of signals, including at pedestrian crossings, is likely to benefit the above groups in particular disabled people and older people who will be less able to cross without a green man.

- **Key findings (think about** any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

Improving the service for walking and cycling at signal-controlled crossing facilities will reduce barriers between communities, without significant impact on other road users. Improving level of service for bus users will improve access to amenities for those with limited access to other transportation.

People who are more likely to travel on foot and rely on the use of crossings are older people, disabled people, women and children so these proposals are likely to benefit these groups. Blind and partially sighted people are unlikely to be able to cross unassisted at faulty pedestrian signals. They are also much more likely to travel further and add distance to their journey just so that they can cross at a signal controlled crossing. This already impacts the time that their journey takes so reducing delay at non responsive signals will have a significant benefit to this group.

Older people are one of the biggest groups participating in walking and also form a significant proportion of bus users. Older pedestrians and females are more likely to choose to cross at signalised crossings (on green) than any other group. Older people need longer time to cross, and may be less able to walk to alternative facilities. They may be more apprehensive in exploiting existing gaps in traffic due to slower walking speed – this would increase the difficulty of crossing and waiting times. Although the collision rate amongst older pedestrians is lower, injuries to older people (over 65 years) tend to be more serious or fatal than injuries to other age groups.

Disabled people can also be more impacted by travel delays and longer journeys – these may exacerbate certain health conditions resulting in fatigue impacting activities in the aftermath. This means that a person affected may be not be able to travel or travel as frequently. Refurbishing traffic signals, leading to more reliable and faster journeys can reduce travel delay and therefore benefit this group of people.

- **Actions (think about** how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

A screening document will be prepared, and an independent impact assessment will be completed for each project, with the negative impacts being addressed, during the detailed design process as required.

The potential negative impact of the proposals set out in this report is that there will be a slight increase in stops for buses at crossings – this can impact negatively the equality groups that are more likely to be bus users – women, older people young people and some disabled people. This is being mitigated by introducing bus priority at each new crossing that will ensure that the green signal can be extended for buses.

Introduction of the nearside signals can benefit visually impaired people who are able to see the signal at close range. However this can also be a disbenefit, especially at wider crossings as a blind person has to negotiate a busy kerbside with waiting pedestrians in order to get to the display box and the rotating cone. The display can also be obscured by a single person standing next to it. At these busier locations a secondary display box will be considered, and a rotating cone added on both sides of the crossing.

Older people have also expressed concerns over the change of the green man display from far side to nearside; often not understanding where to look for the relevant display. The impact of this is likely to lessen as the new standard is rolled out city wide. The Influencing Travel Behaviour Team and Older Peoples Forum are involved in producing information on how to locate and use the new nearside display equipment.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment**.**

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	N/A
Date to complete your impact assessment	N/A
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	N/A

6. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Joel Dodsworth	UTMC Manager	March 2024

7. Publishing

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

Date screening completed	March 2024
Date sent to Equality Team	
Date published (To be completed by the Equality Team)	