

Appendix C

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: Highways & Transportation
Lead person: Ian Moore	Contact number: 87317

1. Title: Highways Infrastructure Maintenance (Roads) Revenue Programme 2023/24		
Is this a:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy / Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service / Function	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify		

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
This screening focuses on the Highways Maintenance Programme funded from Leeds City Council's Revenue Budget. It also looks at the prioritisation process used to determine which works will be carried out over the coming year to improve the overall condition of residential and other unclassified roads in Leeds.

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 1. Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment 2. Advancing equality of opportunity 3. 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)

Budget Allocation & Prioritisation Process

Highways Services is provided with a budget each year from Leeds City Council's Revenue Fund, to cover the maintenance of local roads across the City. In terms of the process for allocating funds, prioritisation of works is conducted throughout the city based on need. Money is allocated to roads in primarily residential areas based on need and does not take into account the economic prosperity or background of the population.

90% of the funding is for reactionary and routine repairs of a minor nature, e.g. pot hole repairs. This will remove hazards that are a potential danger to the public, particularly those with mobility issues, blind or partially sighted and carers (supporting wheelchairs and pushchairs).

10% of the funding is targeted at preventative maintenance; low cost measures that will slow the deterioration of the roads and footpaths.

'Need' is determined by:

- Routine visual inspections undertaken by inspectors, which also consider the location and local amenities e.g. – if there is a school or old people's home.
- Reports made by members of the public

The prioritisation exercise used by the service, and the services provided as a whole, were reviewed as part of an EIA in April 2008. This covered the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan, the procedures for carrying out inspections of highway condition, scheduling and completion of highways maintenance work. The EIA covered both maintenance carried out in house and by designated contractors.

The information contained within the EIA is still relevant as the procedures have not changed. The findings of that EIA were that overall, the work Highways Maintenance

perform and deterioration of the network generally will have a greater impact on the elderly, disabled people and people with push chairs.

A related Equality Impact Assessment was completed in January 2011 covering "The impact of financial decisions on the provision of a Highway Maintenance Service". This considered the impact of funding cuts on the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan.

Customer Satisfaction

Before and after each residential maintenance scheme, customer satisfaction data is collected. This enables us to monitor our performance and make improvements to the service we deliver.

• 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)

Key findings from both EIA's were as follows:

Positive Impacts

1. Highway maintenance work is an opportunity to provide improved mobility features.
2. Consultation with Councillors and Area Management Teams is proactive with other stakeholder's views being taken into account through focus groups and scheme specific correspondence.

Negative Impacts

3. There are issues with some communities having the perception that other areas receive a better service with more road maintenance being carried out; failing to accept that allocation is based on need.

• Actions

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

1. Refresh the EIA conducted in 2008.
2. Continue to select work based on objective condition assessment from machine base surveys and allocate on a needs basis as per the Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan and have a greater transparency on where money is spent.
3. Take every opportunity during maintenance work to provide dropped crossings at road junctions to aid those people with mobility problems in particular those with wheel chairs and push chairs.
4. Continue with letter drops to residents affected by maintenance work which includes the encouragement and gives opportunity for anyone with a special need or is disabled to have a contact point to discuss the immediate impact of the scheme.
5. Continue with customer feedback surveys which can be analysed for equality issues as well as comment on schemes' outturns.

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:	TBC as part of Service Planning process
Date to complete your impact assessment	TBC
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	Tony Penniston, Principal Engineer, Highways Asset Mgt

6. Governance, ownership and approval

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

Name	Job title	Date
Simon Swift	Executive Manager Asset Management	

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