

## APPENDIX 2



### 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.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Highways and Transportation</b>
<b>Lead person :Kasia Speakman</b>	<b>Contact number: 0113 37 87 533</b>

#### 1. Title: A6120 Leeds ORR Segregated Cycle Improvements (A61 – Red Hall)

Is this a:

☐

Strategy / Policy

☒

Service / Function

☐

Other

If other, please specify

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

The provision of a segregated cycle route along a section of the A6120, the current Outer Ring Road between A61 Harrogate Road and A58 Whinmoor. Currently the Outer Ring Road is a barrier to both pedestrians and cyclists, with intermittent and sub-standard footway provision, coupled with limited crossing opportunities, and no provision for cyclists with the heavy traffic acting as a barrier. It severs the connection between the residential areas positioned to the North and East of the Ring Road and the ward winning Rounday Park.

**The proposal is to provide a two way segregated cycle track and improve condition for pedestrians by upgrading footways, coupled with additional safe crossing facilities.**

### **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).

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
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?	?	
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"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>	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)

Potential impacts, both positive and negative, have been considered with the use of existing sources on information. This included published research, reports and examples of Best Practice, including: *Cycling and Older People City Boom report*, *Making walking and cycling normal: key findings from the understanding walking and cycling research project*, *Assessing Cycling Environments: Level of Service vs. Cyclist Perception Surveys*, *Shared Use Routes for Pedestrians and Cyclists: LTN 1/12*; the results of the Leeds Transport Conversation involving 8000 respondents, experience of delivering the Cycle Superhighway, including the involvement of access groups and in-house expertise of working in the field of access and mobility. At this stage it will be impossible to assess specific impacts on communities in terms of gender, age and race as the new cycle track will serve future communities in the new housing provision in the East Leeds Extension (ELE).

- **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)

The proposed segregated cycle route is likely to have positive impacts on a number of equality characteristics but in particular on children and older people, women and disabled people.

Children:

Children are unable to drive and so, given the extremely poor provision of public transport services (hourly service Monday to Friday, no evening or Sunday service) their ability to travel independently to school, activities or social reasons is severely affected. That 'Children can travel around the city safely and independently' was the first of the children's 12 wishes on how to make Leeds a Child Friendly City. The segregated cycle route, together with improved crossing opportunities and generally better pedestrian provision, would give children and young people a realistic alternative to being driven. This, in turn, is likely to produce other beneficial outcomes – improved social interaction,

improved cardio-vascular health and fitness, lower incidence of obesity.

Recent research suggests that children in rear seats of vehicles have greater exposure to air pollution than those walking or cycling along a busy corridor so this alternative provision, coupled with potential reduction in congestion, is likely to have additional benefits for children's health, in particular reducing incidence of asthma. Child casualties have recently increased in Leeds and 11-15 year olds are also most likely to be a casualty in a road traffic collision thus providing this increasingly independent cohort of young people with safe travel facilities is likely to reduce their chances of becoming a victim of an RTC. The provision of signal controlled crossings is also likely to have a positive impact on children who under the age of 12 are unable to effectively judge traffic speeds.

### Older People

The Cycle Boom study highlighted both benefits of cycling to older people and specific barriers for older cyclists. The latter included reduced ability to look behind which impacted on the ability to use busy roads and negotiate junctions. The ability to mount and dismount, negotiate space around pedestrians, dogs and obstacles is also diminished, especially when coupled with the loss of momentum on uphill sections.

With the advent and the subsequent reduction in cost of electric bikes these are becoming an increasingly attractive proposition for older people, especially those that have been cycling before. Thus the provision of safe, coherent segregated cycle facilities is likely to benefit those older people. It is also likely that the cycle track will be of benefit to mobility scooter users.

Additionally, older pedestrians in particular are uncomfortable sharing facilities with cyclists (reduced awareness of cyclists approaching from behind, reduced ability to move out of the way) – currently for any but the most experienced cyclist riding on the footway may be the only viable option. The provision of a segregated facility together with a consistent, continuous footway, are therefore likely to have beneficial impact on older people. Controlled crossings are also particularly appreciated by older people who may have concerns over their ability to cross the carriageway and effectively exploit any gaps in traffic.

The Leeds Transport Conversation has shown that travel within the neighbourhood and between adjacent neighbourhoods is especially important to older people

### Disabled people

Like older people, disabled people, especially blind and partially sighted people and deaf people, have concerns over sharing facilities with cyclists due to reduced ability of detecting cyclists and ability to react. Due to inclusive bike design cycling is an activity open to people with disabilities but this group, like children, rely on the provision of safe and adequate cycling facilities. The provision of a safe, segregated facility is thus likely to benefit disabled people in two ways – by keeping cyclists away from the footway and by enabling those wishing to cycle to do so safely and comfortably. The track is likely to be used by mobility scooter users - both enabling better access and reducing conflict with other users.

### Women

The feedback received through Leeds Transport Conversation indicates that women tend to rely on bus services more than men; they are also currently less likely to cycle. This means that women, particularly those in single-car or car-free households, are likely to be particularly impacted by the current lack of alternative to private car. Studies have also shown that women cyclists, less likely to occupy the primary road position, are more likely to be involved in certain type of collisions, for example with HGVs turning left.

According to the Leeds Transport conversation women were less likely to feel confident cycling in their local neighbourhood and less likely to rate current cycling infrastructure as good. Women are also much more likely to have family commitments – having an ‘inclusive’ cycling provision that can be used by families and young children may help unlock this mode for them.

Therefore it can be anticipated that the provision of a safe cycling alternative to private car may benefit women, both current cyclists and those new to cycling in particular.

There is unlikely to be a differential impact on other equality characteristics. There may be general benefits from improved access to active travel for BAME groups as some have specific predisposition towards cardio-vascular conditions/ Type2 Diabetes, the risk of which can be reduced with increased levels of physical activity. Currently this group are more likely than average to drive, but the Leeds Transport Conversation feedback show higher than average support for investing in high quality walking and cycling infrastructure from this group.

- **Actions**

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

**It will be important to avoid access restraints, eradicate the need to dismount (difficult or impossible for cyclists with disabilities or older cyclists), provide reliable detection of the cycle track when adjacent to any pedestrian facility (preferably full segregation) and consider the needs of disabled people around access to bus stops. It will be important to review feedback from the City Connect cycle superhighway especially in relation to disabled access.**

**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:

Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

#### **6. Governance, ownership and approval**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>

#### **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

<b>Date screening completed</b>	23/06/2017
<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	