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.

Service area: Highways and Transportation				
Contact number: 39 51470				
1. Title: Leeds Core Cycle Network – Route 9 Chapeltown to City Centre Cycle Route				
Strategy / Policy X Service / Function Other				
If other, please specify				
2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening				
Provision of a cycle route between Eastgate roundabout in the City Centre and Sheepscar Interchange (for Chapeltown Road) with a spur to Meanwood Road. The scheme involves some shared-use footways, where pedestrians and cyclists will be expected to share space. Although statistics do not indicate that such facilities cause actual conflict, there is a perceived danger within the visually impaired community that can put them off using such facilities.				
t				

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	Х	
equality characteristics?		
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the	X	
policy or proposal?		
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or		X
procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by		
whom?		
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment		X
practices?		
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on		X
 Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and 		
harassment		
Advancing equality of opportunity		
Fostering good relations		

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)

Consultation has taken place with a number of equality groups including details of finalised proposals sent in July 2013 plus:

- A consultation leaflet was posted to 8500 residents in areas around the proposed route.
- Leaflets and posters were also sent to Libraries, Community Centres and Residents Association Centres in affected areas.
- Details were posted on Talking Point between 8th May 2012 and 3rd July 2012 with further details available on the Leeds City Council website.
- Member consultation (May and July 2012 and July 2013)
- Emergency Services and Metro Consulted (May 2012 and July 2013)
- Leeds Cycling Consultation Forum (Various meeting between 2009 and 2013)
- The above followed an initial round of consultation in 2009. This involved Councillor and Emergency service consultation, public exhibitions and other public consultations.

At an early stage, designs included proposals to provide bi-directional, segregated (with white line only) and unsegregated shared-use of the footways on the west side of the road, with informal crossings provided across junctions. Discussions with cyclists and visually impaired groups led us to the conclusion that we should be looking to provide a route to a higher standard. In particular the visually impaired wanted to see cyclists more robustly segregated from pedestrians. Since then we have been working with cyclists to produce a cycle route that is direct, convenient, suitable for novice and experienced cyclists and does not cause undue conflict with the visually impaired.

The full Cycle Infrastructure Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment has been used in the development of these proposals.

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)

Manual Counts on Regent Street (outside job centre) showed that nearly 4000 pedestrian trips, of which 27 were by obviously visually impaired (users of white canes or guide dogs) were made on the footway in a 12 hour period, along with 101 cycle trips. Since first consultation the majority of shared-use footway on Regent Street and Sheepscar Street South has been removed from proposals and kerbed segregation is now proposed. This should alleviate any potential anxiety by providing a cycle route separate to the footway and one of a quality that can attract cyclists that are currently using the footway.

Shared-use is now only required where:

We propose to convert existing pedestrian crossings to Toucans. However cyclists will need to make a 90 degree turn to leave the carriageway or side road to access the crossings. This will cause them to travel at low speed and so risk of conflict is likely to be low.

Three short sections of footway between North Street and Sheepscar Street North, on Regent Street outside Regent House and outside 100 Meanwood Road where widths do not allow full segregation but do more than meet guidance criteria (for both width and user numbers) for unsegregated shared-use.

The scheme and above decisions have led to the following impacts: (see full Cycle Infrastructure Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment for more info.)

Positive

- These new facilities will have a positive impact for cyclists particularly elderly and young cyclists, who are most vulnerable, and help provide safe access to more jobs and services for them.
- The proposals will help increase the level of less assertive cyclists, in particular females by providing safer facilities.
- Thanks to adapted bikes, cycling is open to people with a range of disabilities and safer routes have a role to play in enabling people with disabilities to cycle.
- It will also have a positive impact on pedestrians, the visually impaired, pushchair users etc by providing a quality alternative to using footways for cyclists.
- Better indication of which footways cyclists are allowed to use (and which are appropriate for their use) will help reduce use of footways less appropriate for cycle use elsewhere

Negtive

 Potential conflict between cyclists and pedestrians arising despite the measures described above. Any residual risk will be mitigated against by highlighting the need for cyclists to be considerate to other highway users in led rides and training activities to be undertake on this route as part of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund's "go:cycling" project and by a forthcoming "Safer Cycling" campaign to be led by Leeds City Council.

Actions

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

N/A

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

N/A

(Include name and job title)

6. Governance, ownership and approval				
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening				
Name	Job title	Date		
Gwyn Owen	Projects Manager	19/09/2013		
_	(Transport Projects)			

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.

If this screening relates to a **Key Delegated Decision**, **Executive Board**, **full Council** or a **Significant Operational Decision** a copy should be emailed to Corporate Governance and will be published along with the relevant report.

A copy of **all other** screening's should be sent to <u>equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</u>. For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file (but not published).

Date screening completed		
	Date screening completed	

	19 Sept 2013
If relates to a Key Decision - date sent to	
Corporate Governance	
Any other decision – date sent to Equality Team	
(equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk)	