

**2023/24 PEDESTRIAN CROSSING REVIEW**  
**APPENDIX 4 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING REVIEW EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and  
Integration Impact Assessment**



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, services, functions, and structures both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, and cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

<b>Directorate:</b> <b>City Development</b>	<b>Service area:</b> <b>Highways &amp; Transportation</b>
<b>Lead person:</b> <b>Jonathan Waters</b>	<b>Contact number:</b> <b>0113 3787492</b>
<b>Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment:</b> <b>2/3/2023</b>	

<b>1. Title:</b> <b>The Pedestrian Crossing Review process. Equality Impact of the current process for determining the priority list for the installation of pedestrian crossings</b>						
Does this relate to:						
<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Other</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Is this:						
<input type="checkbox"/> New/ proposed		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already exists and is being reviewed		<input type="checkbox"/> Is changing		
(Please tick one of the above)						

**2. Members of the assessment team:**

Name	Organisation	Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist
Jonathan Waters	Traffic Engineering – Leeds City Council	Senior Traffic Engineer

### 3. Summary of strategy, policy, service, function or structure that was assessed:

This EIA concerns a long established process of assessing requests for provision of pedestrian crossing facilities through an annual review. The Pedestrian Crossing Review formed part of the implementation of the priorities and actions as identified in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 (WYLTP3):

- O1 – Low Carbon. To make substantial progress towards a low carbon, sustainable transport system for West Yorkshire, while recognising transport's contribution to national carbon reduction plans; and
- O3 – Quality of life. To enhance the quality of life of people living in, working in and visiting West Yorkshire.

It will continue to meet the objectives of the new LTP3 *My Journey* which contains proposals “to define, develop and manage networks and facilities to encourage walking and cycling” and to “develop a model for transport planning at a community level to enhance local accessibility”, to improve safety and security seeking to minimise transport casualties and to address barriers to travel.

The review considers requests for provision of formal crossing facilities across Leeds and recommends locations which merit such provision and what type of crossing should be provided. The aim of the review is to get approval to fund pedestrian facilities where these:

- facilitate pedestrian journeys by overcoming a barrier or severance
- link communities to facilities, such as schools, shops, transport infrastructure, community centres, surgeries etc
- enable safe journeys to school on foot
- help reduce the number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured and improve road safety

The review is conducted in accordance with the guidelines developed in 2002-08, which reflect the three key principles underpinning the evaluation and recommendations made for every site studied:

- The ease with which pedestrians can currently cross the road;
- Whether a crossing will be used regularly; and
- Is a crossing the most appropriate road safety measure or would other measures be more suitable.

**4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment**

(complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function, structure or event)

**4a. Strategy, policy or plan**

(please tick the appropriate box below)

The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please provide detail:**

The Vision for Leeds specifies the following objectives:

- Increase investment in other forms of transport, such as walking and cycling routes, to meet everyone's needs
- Local services, including shops and healthcare, are easy to access and meet people's needs

The review recommends sites, assessed according to the above guidelines, which meet the criteria for an LTP investment in a new pedestrian crossing facility. The site assessment guidelines include access to local services.

**4b. Service, function, event**

please tick the appropriate box below

The whole service (including service provision and employment)	<input type="checkbox"/>
A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Procuring of a service (by contract or grant)	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please provide detail:**

The Pedestrian Crossing Review aims to provide an impartial assessment of all requests received and to recommend provision of crossings at locations which meet the criteria for a particular facility in terms of:

- pedestrian demand,
- traffic flows and
- difficulty of crossing.

The review uses a framework approved by the Highways Board to assess each location against the three key principles outlined above. The framework has three categories of crossing facilities:

- signal controlled crossing
- zebra crossing
- informal crossing facilities, such as a pedestrian refuge,

Sites are assessed against a set of objective criteria to determine the most appropriate facility for each site.

Sites with high vehicular flows (over 1000 vehicles per hour) travelling at speed of over 35mph and high pedestrian demand (typically over 70 pedestrian movements in the busiest hour) would generally merit a signal controlled crossing. For less busy sites (flows typically over 700 vehicles, traffic speed <35 mph 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, over 40 pedestrians in the busiest hour) a Zebra crossing may be more appropriate. Sites which do not meet the above criteria may benefit from some informal measures to assist pedestrians in crossing the road.

Other factors weighed in favour of the potential provision include demand from particularly vulnerable pedestrians (children, elderly and disabled people) and presence of local facilities as 'attractors'.

The process is undertaken by the Traffic Engineering section and based on data of pedestrian demand, traffic flows, site visits and accident statistics. It does not aim to initially produce detailed designs.

## **5. Fact finding – what do we already know**

Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring, service level equality targets and customer/ staff feedback.

(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)

### **Service - Background Information**

The service is provided throughout the city. Customers of the service include all members of the community who need to travel on foot and cross roads, as well as:

- Residents
- Businesses
- Doctors' Surgeries
- Community Groups
- Councillors
- Local organisations e.g. – schools
- Parish Councils
- Other Council Services

The approved schemes are mainly funded through the LTP. Some schemes are linked to new developments and can be funded through Section 106 agreements as part of planning consents.

## **Compliments & Complaints**

When a site does not justify the provision of a formal crossing facility, this sometimes prompts requests for reconsideration or justification from ward members. The delivery of development funded schemes is contingent on the development commencing which, on occasion, is sometime after the planning consent; where the measures may be of wider benefit to the community this can result in dissatisfaction with the delivery of the service.

## **Assessment Process**

Leeds City Council has an agreed framework for the assessment of potential pedestrian crossing locations which considers the road safety history, a site assessment, current pedestrian usage of the location and the volume of traffic.

Locations which fulfil the criteria in the framework are put forward for funding and inclusion in the annual programme within the Local Transport Plan (LTP). Factors used to make the assessment include:

- Accident statistics – road safety history
- Site assessment – current features including crossing opportunities
- Traffic flows
- Usage of roads by pedestrians at different points and times during the day
- Crossing difficulties
- ‘Special considerations’ – such as the presence of a school, sheltered accommodation, high proportion of children crossing

These items are recorded and evaluated, and a recommendation on the course of action is made.

## **Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information**

### **Please provide detail:**

None. The service is provided throughout the City based on need. Surveys do distinguish on age i.e. adults, children, and older people.

### **Action required:**

Have regard for road safety records and analysis.

## **6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested**

☐

Yes

☒

No

### **Please provide detail:**

Public consultations involved the policies which the pedestrian crossing review helps to deliver rather than the review process itself. Lack of infrastructure, safety and lack of education were identified through consultations for the LTP3 as the main barriers to walking and cycling. The Vision for Leeds and its objectives mentioned above were developed in consultations with local residents. The review framework was revised in 2016 to give a more flexible approach, and to specifically include needs of older people, disabled people and children.

**Action required:**

No action required at present. Reduced budget may mean that fewer schemes will be delivered. However, this will depend on the agreed priorities year on year, which will have regard to the overall pedestrian crossing review process.

**7. Who may be affected by this activity?**

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

**Equality characteristics**☒**Age**☒**Carers**☒**Disability**☐**Gender reassignment**☐**Race**☐**Religion  
or Belief**☒**Sex (male or female)**☐**Sexual orientation**☐**Other**

(for example – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background, education or skills level)

**Please specify:**

The work undertaken by the service has a positive effect on local people and communities generally, but in particular; older and younger people, pregnant women, people with children and disabled people.

**Stakeholders**☒**Services users**☒**Employees**☐**Trade Unions**☒**Partners**☒**Members**☒**Suppliers**☐**Other please specify****Potential barriers.**☒**Built environment****services**☒**Location of premises and**☒**Information  
and communication**☒**Customer care**

☐

Timing

☒

Stereotypes and assumptions

☒

Cost

☒

Consultation and involvement

☐

specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services, function or structure

Please specify

## 8. Positive and negative impact

Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

### 8a. Positive impact:

The assessment framework considers the demand from children and elderly people and factors such as the proportion of children, enabling journeys to school and the proportion of elderly people are weighed positively in the decision making process to recommend the provision of a crossing. No specific data is gathered in terms of disability, sexual orientation or race, however, site observations/ request details do provide some indication of demand from pedestrians with a mobility impairment. Whenever possible, these are factored into the decision making process.

The review assesses the level of demand for a crossing at a particular point, ensuring that the provision of a crossing meets the existing need for a specific facility to enable pedestrians to safely cross the road. This has a positive impact on people's ability to make journeys on foot, including elderly and disabled people and children.

There is a misconception that pedestrian facilities are only provided in the aftermath of a serious accident. The review provides a clear framework for assessment of sites and helps dispel such myths.

#### Age:

- **Older people** often require a longer time to cross and are unable / find it difficult to cross unless there are large gaps in traffic. The review collect information about the number of elderly people crossing at the location assessed.
- **Young people** are enabled to cross the road in relative safety and formal facilities help promote independence, for example on a journey to school. Installation of new facilities on a route to school may include specific road safety training for school children on how to use the crossing.

#### Disabled people:

Formal crossing facilities include features which benefit disabled pedestrians such as dropped kerbs for wheelchair users and tactile paving to assist blind and partially sighted pedestrians. Signal controlled crossings also have tactile and audible signals corresponding to the 'green man' phase. At-grade crossings are more inclusive than bridges and underpasses and are accessible to all. Blind pedestrians do not have to judge the direction and speed of traffic and can cross in greater confidence at a formal crossing point.

The annual review provides an opportunity for members of the public (including disabled people) and for other bodies (such as schools) to request pedestrian facilities at specific locations. The requests receive proper consideration and the outcomes are based on an impartial assessment of need, including any special considerations (e.g. high proportion of children or elderly people crossing). This ultimately leads to installation of facilities which otherwise would not have been provided.

**Action required:**

No action required.

**8b. Negative impact:**

**General**

The review framework does not have negative impacts on equality characteristics. In terms of specific outcomes, potential negative impacts may be:

Traffic flows and congestion – increase in pedestrian facilities may produce delays on some congested routes. The type of facility is carefully considered for each specific location.

**Age and Disability**

Parking – if a crossing facility is provided this does remove kerbside parking, which may have a negative impact, particularly on elderly and disabled people. This does, however, depend on the frontage uses and restrictions will usually be quite limited in their extent.

If a site does not meet criteria for formal crossing facilities, the lack of such facility may impact most on children and elderly/ disabled people. Elderly and disabled people may be the most affected as they will find it more difficult to walk and cross at an alternative location, and will require additional time to cross. Blind people may also find it difficult or lack confidence to cross a busy carriageway without a dedicated facility. These factors are taken into consideration during site assessment, where relevant other more appropriate measures may be considered.

**Action required:**

**General:** Consultations on individual sites which do meet the criteria for provision at the detailed design stage to determine and overcome any potential negative impacts.

**Age:** Undertake further study at more marginal locations where there is a significant proportion of vulnerable pedestrians and where difficulty of crossing/ road safety history justifies this.



**Disabled people:** Continue to note and give consideration to the needs of disabled people when recommending sites for the provision of a crossing.

**9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities/teams identified?**

☒

Yes

☐

No

**Please provide detail:**

The provision of crossings helps overcome physical barriers and therefore links communities where severance by a busy road occurs. However, there is potential for one community to feel that they are being put at a disadvantage compared to neighbouring communities, if they receive their schemes and others do not. The assessment process aims to ensure that rational and fair decisions are made.

**Action required:**

- Continue to perform feasibility assessments on proposed schemes taking into account the needs of disabled people. Seek additional support /funding as required.
- Ensure that stakeholders are made aware of the funding pressures faced by the service in an attempt to manage expectations.
- Ensure transparency in the decision making process.

**10. Does this activity bring groups/communities/teams into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?**

☒

Yes

☐

No

**Please provide detail:**

Facilitating pedestrian journeys provides greater opportunities for residents and communities to meet and interact, e.g. on a journey to school.

**Action required:** None

**11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group/community/team at the expense of another?**

☒

Yes

☐

No

**Please provide detail:**

The overall reduction in available funding may mean ultimately a reduction in the number of schemes implemented. This could lead to a perception in communities that they are less important. However, the approval of the need for the facility is secured through the objective assessment and does not reflect funding constraints. In the event of restricted funding prioritised schemes would be carried forward for future funding.

**Action required:**

Ensure transparency in the decision making process and in how reports are published.

**12. Equality, diversity, cohesion and integration action plan**

(insert all your actions from your assessment here, set timescales, measures and identify a lead person for each action)

Action	Timescale	Measure	Lead person
Continue to perform feasibility assessments on proposed schemes taking into account the needs of disabled people. Seek additional support /funding as required.	Ongoing	Annual report submitted to the Highways Board for approval.	Jonathan Waters
Ensure that stakeholders are made aware of the funding pressures faced by the service in an attempt to manage expectations.	Ongoing	Awareness through the media etc of the Councils current financial constraints	Jonathan Waters/ Other Design Engineers
Ensure transparency in the decision making process.	Ongoing	Publication of reports and guidelines.	Jonathan Waters
Consult on individual sites at the detailed design stage to identify and help overcome any potential negative impacts	Ongoing	Increased public awareness & reduction in complaints	Design Teams.
Undertake further study at more marginal locations where there is a significant proportion of vulnerable pedestrians and where difficulty of crossing/ road safety history justifies this	Ongoing	Use and reference to the agreed frameworks as part of the decision process.	Traffic Engineers.
Continue to note and give consideration to the needs of disabled people when recommending sites for the provision of a crossing	Ongoing	Use and reference to the agreed frameworks as part of the decision process.	Traffic Engineers.

**13. Governance, ownership and approval**

State here who has approved the actions and outcomes from the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment

Name	Job Title	Date
Kate Morris	Head of Transport Policy	March 2023

**14. Monitoring progress for equality, diversity, cohesion and integration actions** (please tick)

- ☒ As part of Service Planning performance monitoring
- ☐ As part of Project monitoring
- ☐ Update report will be agreed and provided to the appropriate board  
Please specify which board
- ☐ Other (please specify)

**15. Publishing**

<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b>	