

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

This EIA form will assist you to ensure we meet our duties under the Equality Act 2010 to take account of the needs and impacts of the proposal or function in relation to people with protected characteristics. Please note, this is an ongoing duty. This means you must keep this EIA under review and update it as necessary to ensure its continued effectiveness.

Section 1: Proposal details

Directorate / Service Area:		Person undertaking the assessment:	
Place and Economy / Highways, Transport Strategy and Funding		Name:	Stacey Miller
Proposal being assessed:		Job Title:	Transport & Infrastructure Officer
Mill Road ETRO – Active Travel Fund scheme (Tranche 1)		Contact details:	Stacey.Miller@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Business Plan Proposal Number: (if relevant)		Date commenced:	1 st February 2021
		Date completed:	14 th June 2021
Key service delivery objectives:			
<p><i>Include a brief summary of the current service or arrangements in this area to meet these objectives, to allow reviewers to understand context.</i></p> <p>Active travel, including walking and cycling, is a priority and local transport objective in Cambridgeshire. All transport infrastructure requirements and schemes are recorded in the Cambridgeshire Transport Investment Plan. Schemes are prioritised and funding sought as opportunities arise. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) is the local transport authority for Cambridgeshire. Active and sustainable travel are amongst the objectives as detailed in the CPCA Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>Employment - Connect all new and existing communities sustainably so all residents can easily access a good job within 30 minutes by public transport, spreading the region's prosperity</p> <p>Resilience - Build a transport network that is resilient and adaptive to human and environmental disruption, improving journey time reliability</p> <p>Accessibility - Promote social inclusion through the provision of a sustainable transport network that is affordable and accessible for all</p> <p>Health & Wellbeing - Provide 'healthy streets' and high quality public realm that puts people first and promotes active lifestyles</p> <p>Climate Change - Reduce emissions to as close to zero as possible to minimise the impact of transport and travel on climate change</p>			
Key service outcomes:			
<p><i>Describe the outcomes the service is working to achieve</i></p>			

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

Funding and delivery of an accessible, resilient, sustainable and safe local transport network.

What is the proposal?

Describe what is changing and why

On the 9th of May 2020, the Government announced that an emergency active travel fund of £250M was being made available for authorities in England which would be used to deliver pop-up cycle lanes, wider pavements that allow for social distancing, safer junctions, and cycle and bus-only corridors.

The funding and associated guidance recognise that with requirements for social distancing, effective public transport capacity will be 10-20% of pre COVID-19 levels. Many parts of the road network do not have the physical or environmental capacity to cater for the displaced public transport trips, if those trips are made by car. For the transport network to operate effectively as the economy and society transition back to more normal levels of activity, more people will need to walk, cycle or work at home.

Funding was allocated to transport authorities to deliver the required schemes. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) was allocated £642,429, from a first tranche of £45M nationwide.

The CPCA requested that Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council develop proposals for temporary or experimental measures, and agreed to passport the funding and forward fund works by the Councils in advance of the receipt of funding from government. Cambridgeshire received £468,000 in the first tranche of funding. Government guidance on the use of the first tranche of the funding requires that delivery of measures should be completed within eight weeks from the receipt of funding. An initial list of temporary schemes was developed jointly with the District Councils and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).

The forward funding from the CPCA meant that some early schemes could be designed and implemented very quickly to meet the very tight deadlines set by Government. The Mill Road Bus Gate Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) which restricts vehicular traffic over the railway bridge, except for buses, cyclists and pedestrians, was identified as a scheme that should be delivered in tranche 1.

The Bus Gate ETRO was supported by a series of build outs using water filled barriers along the length of Mill Road, to assist social distancing.

The six-month objection period has since passed and a decision as to whether the ETRO will be removed or made permanent will be taken at Highways and Transport Committee in June 2021. This scheme specific Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) focusses on the impact of the scheme in its current form.

What information did you use to assess who would be affected by this proposal?

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

For example, statistics, consultation documents, studies, research, customer feedback, briefings, comparative policies etc.

The lists of temporary scheme proposals across all five districts in Cambridgeshire to support walking and cycling have been developed by the County Council in discussion with the city and district Councils and the Greater Cambridge Partnership.

The Mill Road ETRO scheme was one of an initial list of proposed schemes for Tranche 1, and following technical work and supportive discussions with local Members was agreed to be implemented, constructed by Skanska through the CCC Highways contract.

The proposal had been assessed against how it fits with government guidance, direct transport benefits and impacts on the wider network, and the capability to deliver them quickly. An initial EqIA for the Tranche 1 programme was produced considering the impact on protected characteristics.

The implemented scheme has now undergone the statutory six-month objection period, and an additional six-week public survey to understand public feedback on the scheme. Now the scheme has been in operation for a significant period of time and extensive public comment has been received, a detailed consideration of protected characteristics can be made to assist with a decision on the future of the scheme.

Are there any gaps in the information you used to assess who would be affected by this proposal?

If yes, what steps did you take to resolve them?

Despite the initial tight timescales involved which provided challenges to assessing a scheme specific Equality Impact Assessment, it is now felt that since the scheme has been operational and extensive public engagement has now taken place over a period of 8 months, it has enabled a more thorough understanding of the issues.

Who will be affected by this proposal?

A proposal may affect everyone in the local authority area / working for the local authority or alternatively it might affect specific groups or communities. Describe:

- If the proposal covers all staff/the county, or specific teams/geographical areas;*
- Which particular employee groups / service user groups would be affected;*
- If minority/disadvantaged groups would be over/under-represented in affected groups.*

Consider the following:

- What is the significance of the impact on affected persons?*
- Does the proposal relate to services that have been identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics / who are rurally isolated or experiencing poverty?*
- Does the proposal relate to an area with known inequalities?*

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

- *Does the proposal relate to the equality objectives set by the Council's Single Equality Strategy?*

The Mill Road community:

The restriction on through access over the Mill Road bridge can have impacts on those who live, work or access Mill Road, who will no longer be able to access over the railway bridge in any motorised private vehicle, and therefore has to find an alternative route by car or choose to walk or cycle as an alternative.

All residents wishing to cross the railway who live on or near to Mill Road who continue to travel by private vehicle will experience the same level of inconvenience from increased journey times and therefore does not significantly impact any specific persons with protected characteristics. There is public parking on either side of the railway bridge (at Gwydir Street car park and Great Eastern Street), and blue badge holders are still able to park on yellow lines, providing that it is not during the hours of operation of a prohibition on loading/unloading, to allow closer access. Some feedback has suggested that the reduction in vehicular traffic has had a positive impact on those using mobility aids due to reduced pavement parking.

The buildouts along Mill Road do reduce the opportunity for blue badge holders to park closer to some of their destinations. Therefore, there is a negative impact to blue badge holders regarding the build out design. The temporary nature of the design of the build outs has been a challenge to ensure it is accessible for all, for example the temporary tarmac used in replacement to a dropped kerb provides a negative impact for those with disabilities such as poor sight, using a wheelchair or mobility scooter or those with a pushchair. The build-outs in their current form will be removed. If members decide to include build-outs as part of a permanent restriction a more appropriate design will be used.

All residents who rely on taxis or private hire vehicles (PHV) have been impacted by the Bus Gate as neither taxis or PHVs are exempt, and the longer journeys do result in an increase in fares. Some residents who rely on these services are those unable to drive owing to choice or low income and includes disabled or elderly residents, who are often not able to choose walking or cycling as an alternative method of travel. Therefore, there is a negative financial impact on taxi/PHV users including the disabled and/or elderly.

The scheme supports use of sustainable transport methods such as walking, cycling and buses by creating a more reliable bus route. This has a positive impact on people who cannot afford to own a private car but are able to use alternative modes of travel. Feedback from the bus operator has indicated reduced delays along the corridor due to the reduction in congestion and improved reliability of journey times. This would make bus services a more attractive alternative, particularly important as COVID restrictions ease and passenger transport is once again encouraged.

Access on Mill Road is only restricted at the railway bridge and all vehicular traffic has access up to this point. Signage is in place to notify road users of the restriction and that all businesses remain open. No parking spaces along Mill Road

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

have been removed. However, the buildouts do provide some restrictions to direct access outside some premises. The increase in journey times to access businesses or properties on or near to Mill Road has impacted visitors, employees and delivery vehicles who are not able to access over the bridge, however there is no significant specific impact to any persons with protected characteristics.

The improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists presents a positive impact for residents and visitors to Mill Road of all demographics who choose to walk or cycle on the road. Feedback has noted that the reduction in motorised traffic and pavement parking has allowed safer, more accessible travel for younger pedestrians and cyclists or families using these modes of transport and has therefore had a positive impact on younger people and families, as well as the wider community who have chosen to walk and cycle more. The reduction in traffic has reported to have improved air quality and reduced noise pollution which is a significant positive impact to all the immediate community and those accessing Mill Road.

Some feedback has mentioned a perceived reduction in personal safety along Mill Road at night due to the reduction in traffic, and in particularly the negative impact on women alone at night who may choose to walk instead of paying for a longer taxi journey.

There is a negative impact on members of the community who would usually access their place of worship by travelling by private vehicle over the bridge, but now have a longer journey to do so. Those who are able would be able to walk or cycle as an alternative, but for those who have impaired mobility will be more negatively impacted by the scheme.

The wider community:

The restriction on through access over the Mill Road bridge can have impacts on the wider community.

The restriction of through traffic over the railway bridge will impact on road users that would have previously used Mill Road to access Cambridge City Centre who now experience longer journey times using alternative routes. However, there is no significant impact on specific persons with protected characteristics.

Residents of surrounding roads are impacted by the traffic displaced by the restrictions on Mill Road. There are a number of arterial roads, such as Coldhams Lane, Newmarket Road and Hills Road that are used as an alternative route, as well as some side-streets off Mill Road that are used to accommodate turning traffic. These roads may experience increased traffic levels and the negative impacts this causes, such as increased noise and air pollution and more unpleasant walking or cycling environment. The increased traffic on alternative routes may have some impact on people with protected characteristics for example those with respiratory problems or reduced mobility.

Overview:

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

The Mill Road proposal initially intended to reduce inequality by protecting public health by enabling physical distancing, safe and sustainable journeys and reducing harmful impacts of motor traffic. It is understood that certain protected groups, including older people, men and people from Black/Asian background, are more vulnerable to Covid-19. The scheme has potential to provide a green legacy in respect to increasing active travel.

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

Emergency legislation relating to Traffic Regulation Order and the application of public sector equality duties.

Consultation evidence

State who was consulted and when (e.g. internal/external people and whether they included members of the affected groups). State which potentially affected groups were considered. Append consultation questions and responses or equivalent.

Due to the very tight timescales involved, no public consultation was undertaken prior to implementation of the Mill Road proposal. Local stakeholders were consulted on the development of the proposal:

- County Council officers
- City Council officers
- Greater Cambridge Partnership

Key stakeholders were engaged prior to implementation:

- Local bus operators
- Emergency services
- Cambridge Cycle Campaign
- Local Councillors

Since the implementation of the scheme, it has been subject to a statutory six-month objection period where email representations were made to the Council and logged. An additional six-week online public survey was undertaken to gather public feedback on the scheme. Due to COVID-19 restrictions public events were not possible. Reports of both engagement activities can be found here [\[link\]](#).

Based on consultation evidence or similar, what positive impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

This includes impacts retained from any previous arrangements. Use the evidence you described above to support your answer.

ETRO:

- Reduced volume of traffic and improved space for cycling has encouraged more people to cycle along Mill Road, including young people travelling to school, families and wider demographics taking up cycling instead of using a private car.
- Reduced volume of traffic has created a safer and more pleasant environment for pedestrians to walk along Mill Road and spend more time there.
- Reduced congestion on Mill Road has created an improved bus corridor and resulted in less delays to bus services. More reliable bus routes make travelling by bus a more attractive form of travel and positively impact users who are unable to travel by private car.
- Reduced volume of traffic and congestion has improved air quality and reduced noise pollution making it a more pleasant and safer environment to spend time in.

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

Build outs:

- Additional space created by build outs has enabled safe spaces to pass other pedestrians during social distancing restrictions, ensuring pedestrians do not step out on to a busy road to pass others.
- Reduced pavement parking has had a positive impact on those using mobility aids and has created a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

Based on consultation evidence or similar, what negative impacts are anticipated from this proposal?

This includes impacts retained from any previous arrangements. Use the evidence you described above to support your answer.

ETRO:

- Increase in journey time for all road users, including taxis, blue badge holders and delivery drivers who would usually travel over Mill Road bridge to access services on or around Mill Road, or who use it as a through route. However, blue badge holders will not experience this negative impact disproportionately more than other road users.
- Increase in taxi/PHV fares for those who rely on them as a form of transport as taxis and PHVs are restricted from access over the bridge.
- Impact on personal safety of pedestrians with reduction in traffic, in particular at night-time and for women who choose to walk instead of taking a longer more expensive taxi journey.

Build outs:

- Impact on blue badge holders who may not be able to park as close to their destination than prior to the build outs being in place.
- Temporary design of supporting works to build outs e.g. tarmac instead of dropped kerbs, is not accessible for all, in particular for those using mobility aids, poor of sight, or using a pushchair.
- Intermittent design of build outs causes some congestion along Mill Road, in particular when vehicles are parked around the build outs and obstruct traffic flow further.
- Intermittent design of build outs causes some safety issues for cyclists who are not left with sufficient space from passing vehicles.

How will the process of change be managed?

Poorly managed change processes can cause stress / distress, even when the outcome is expected to be an improvement. How will you involve people with protected characteristics / at risk of poverty/isolation in the change process to ensure distress / stress is kept to a minimum? This is particularly important where they may need different or extra support, accessible information etc.

The scheme was implemented under emergency measures in June 2020. Consultation was only possible once the scheme was in place and a six-month objection period began as part of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). However, that objection period has now ended and an additional non-statutory public survey has been undertaken to ensure all public feedback is

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

understood prior to making a decision on whether the scheme should be made permanent or removed.

A decision will be made by members of the Highways and Transport committee in July 2021.

How will the impacts during the change process be monitored and improvements made (where required)?

How will you confirm that the process of change is not leading to excessive stress/distress to people with protected characteristics / at risk of isolation/poverty, compared to other people impacted by the change? What will you do if it is discovered such groups are being less well supported than others?

As the scheme has been in place since June 2020, it has given those people affected by the scheme time to adjust, and if it was made permanent, no further changes would be experienced. For people who feel they have been significantly negatively affected by the scheme, the permanency of it may cause them stress or distress.

If there is a decision to remove the ETRO and vehicular traffic was again allowed access over the bridge, those people affected by the scheme would be allowed to readjust back to how they lived prior to the change. This may be a positive change for some, but for others who had benefitted from the scheme, this may cause them stress or distress.

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities



Section 4: Equality Impact Assessment - Action plan

See notes at the end of this form for advice on completing this table.

Details of disproportionate negative impact (e.g. worse treatment / outcomes)	Group(s) affected	Severity of impact (L/M/H)	Action to mitigate impact with reasons / evidence to support this or Justification for retaining negative impact	Who by	When by	Date completed
Financial impact on people who rely on taxis/PHVs as a form of travel	Elderly, disabled, low income, non-drivers	L	Consider allowing an exemption to allow access for taxis and PHVs across the bridge dependent on the decision of the ETRO as part of a wider review of the County Council's exemption policy.	H&T Committee	July 2021	
Design of supporting build outs	Cyclists, mobility aid users	M/H	Consider the removal or re-design of build outs dependent on the decision of the ETRO	Project team/Executive Director & C/VC	Latest July 2021	
Impact of reduced traffic flow on perception of personal safety along Mill Road, particularly at night	Women, young persons, racial minority groups, gender reassignment	M	Monitor activity levels as covid-19 restrictions are lifted and business re-open. The 'opening-up' of the many hospitality business in the area should increase footfall in the area at night. This issue should also be considered alongside the consideration of allowing an exemption to taxis/PHVs across the bridge.	Project team	If made permanent – July 2022	

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

Section 5: Approval

Name of person who completed this EIA:	Stacey Miller	Name of person who approves this EIA:	Jeremy Smith
Signature:		Signature:	
Job title:	Transport & Infrastructure Officer	Job title: <i>Must be Head of Service (or equivalent) or higher, and at least one level higher than officer completing EIA.</i>	Group Manager Transport Strategy and Funding
Date:	14 th June 2021	Date:	14 th June 2021

Guidance on completing the Action Plan

If our EIA shows that people with protected characteristics and/or those at risk of isolation/poverty will be negatively affected more than other people by this proposal, complete this action plan to identify what we will do to prevent/mitigate this.

Severity of impact

To rate severity of impact, follow the column from the top and row from the side and the impact level is where they meet.

		Severity of impact				Priority and response based on impact rating		
		Minor	Moderate	Serious	Major	High	Medium	Low
Likelihood of impact	Inevitable	M	H	H	H	<i>Amend design, methodology etc. and do not start or continue work until relevant control measures are in place.</i>	<i>Introduce measures to control/reduce impact. Ensure control measures are in use and working.</i>	<i>Impact may be acceptable without changes or lower priority action required. Or justify retaining low impact</i>
	More than likely	M	M	H	H			
	Less than likely	L	M	M	H			

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

	Unlikely	L	L	M	M	<i>Or justify retaining high impact</i>	<i>Or justify retaining medium impact</i>	
--	-----------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	---	---	--

Actions to mitigate impact will meet the following standards:

- *Where the Equality Act applies: achieve legal compliance or better, unless justifiable.*
- *Where the Equality Act does not apply: remove / reduce impact to an acceptably low level.*

Justification of retaining negative impact to groups with protected characteristics:

There will be some situations where it is justifiable to treat protected groups less favourably. Where retaining a negative impact to a protected group is justifiable, give details of the justification for this. For example, if employees have to be clean shaven to safely use safety face masks, this will have a negative impact on people who have a beard for religious reason e.g. Sikhism. The impact is justifiable because a beard makes the mask less effective, impacting the person's safety. You should still reduce impact from a higher to a lower level if possible, e.g. allocating work tasks to avoid Sikhs doing tasks requiring face masks if this is possible instead of not employing Sikhs.