

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 & Economy		Name:	Stuart Rushby
Proposal being assessed:		Job Title:	Project Manager
Ring Fort Path		Contact details:	01223 699186
Business Plan Proposal Number: (if relevant)		Date commenced:	8/9/2020
		Date completed:	17/9/2020
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>There is a lack of direct access for pedestrians and cyclists between Histon and Impington, and the new development of Orchard Park, which lies north of Kings Hedges Road in Cambridge.</p> <p>This has led to the creation of an informal path down a steep bank, linking the two communities. The path is steep and slippery with users climbing over the safety barriers at Histon Interchange to access. It is used as it avoids a longer walk down Histon Road, Kings Hedges Road & back up Ring Fort Road from the south.</p> <p>The current situation excludes mobility impaired users and cyclists who would have to lift their bike over the safety barrier and down the embankment. The aim of the project is to create a safer link for users via a set of steps.</p>			
Key service outcomes:			
<p><i>Describe the outcomes the service is working to achieve</i></p> <p>A safer link for users between Histon, Impington and Orchard Park either via a set of steps.</p>			

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

What is the proposal?
<p><i>Describe what is changing and why</i></p> <p>To build a set of steps to allow access into the north-western corner of Orchard Park. This would improve connections for people using the sports facilities, Orchard Park in general and also access to the villages of Histon and Impington to the north. This new facility would also give options for runners, walkers and leisure cyclists looking to connect with neighbouring villages. Such activity could help to support the local economy.</p> <p>The project team have considered options for steps constructed from concrete, steel and timber. The steps would incorporate a concrete or metal channel for cyclists to run their wheels in to push cycles up / down the steps (as per Sustrans / DfT guidance). The construction of the steps would be in a relatively small area with minimal impact onto the existing embankment and planting. A single lamp column would illuminate the structure meaning ecological impacts would be reduced.</p> <p>Other options have been considered but due to financial and technical constraints, these are not possible and so the only available option is that of steps.</p>
What information did you use to assess who would be affected by this proposal?
<p><i>For example, statistics, consultation documents, studies, research, customer feedback, briefings, comparative policies etc.</i></p> <p>Public Consultation in 2014 Informal consultation with Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum</p>
Are there any gaps in the information you used to assess who would be affected by this proposal?
<p><i>If yes, what steps did you take to resolve them?</i></p> <p>No</p>
Who will be affected by this proposal?
<p><i>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:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If the proposal covers all staff/the county, or specific teams/geographical areas;</i> • <i>Which particular employee groups / service user groups would be affected;</i> • <i>If minority/disadvantaged groups would be over/under-represented in affected groups.</i> <p><i>Consider the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is the significance of the impact on affected persons?</i>

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

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

The proposal would directly affect local residents and visitors to the Orchard Park area. This includes the following user groups: school students, any local non-motorised users including disability groups and guests of the nearby hotel.

- More people cycling and walking contributes towards healthier communities, improved productivity, reduced traffic congestion, reliability of journey times and adds capacity into an already constrained road network, all of which contributes to economic wellbeing.
- A new foot and cycle route would link residential areas to employment sites and provide a safe traffic free route to schools in the area.
- The new link would make it more convenient to take journeys by foot and cycle between the two communities.

The steps would not be DDA compliant. However, alternative access to Orchard Park would still be available as it is now via Kings Hedges Road, so whilst there is benefit granted to some users, there is no dis-benefit to users unable to use the proposed steps.

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

Section 2: Scope of Equality Impact Assessment

Scope of Equality Impact Assessment					
<i>Check the boxes to show which group(s) is/are considered in this assessment. Note: * = protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010.</i>					
*	Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	*	Disability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
*	Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	*	Marriage and civil partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>
*	Pregnancy and maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	*	Race	<input type="checkbox"/>
*	Religion or belief (including no belief)	<input type="checkbox"/>	*	Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>
*	Sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	Rural isolation	<input type="checkbox"/>		Poverty	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 3: Equality Impact Assessment

The Equality Act requires us to meet the following duties:

Duty of all employers and service providers:

- *Not to directly discriminate and/or indirectly discriminate against people with protected characteristics.*
- *Not to carry out / allow other specified kinds of discrimination against these groups, including discrimination by association and failing to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people.*
- *Not to allow/support the harassment and/or victimization of people with protected characteristics.*

Duty of public sector organisations:

- *To advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with protected characteristics and others.*
- *To eliminate discrimination*

For full details see the [Equality Act 2010](#).

We will also work to reduce poverty via procurement choices.

Research, data and/or statistical evidence
<i>List evidence sources, research, statistics etc., used. State when this was gathered / dates from. State which potentially affected groups were considered. Append data, evidence or equivalent.</i>
Not available, new route.

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

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.

A public consultation took place in November 2014. The consultation response showed strong local support to make provision for the link with 79% of respondents seeing a definite need for improved access between the communities in question.

Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum was contacted for comments on the options in August 2020.

The local County Councillor has been contacted about the steps proposal and supports it as does the Orchard Park Community Council. The Council's Cycle Champion has also been consulted and his view is that alternatives that are DDA compliant should be considered.

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.

If a scheme does not progress, the existing embankment, which is CCC owned and maintained, is likely to deteriorate further. The risk of users walking down the embankment slipping and sustaining injury is significant on a muddy route with a 7m level difference between top and bottom of the embankment. The establishment of a dedicated link would remove these issues.

This project will establish a safe link for children to access leisure facilities on Orchard Park and for links to schools in Histon and Impington. The steps will provide betterment for able bodied persons to the existing situation.

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.

Only 9% of the public consultation respondents felt there was no need for a scheme. Comments included: concern about conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, users negotiating steps, pedestrians and cyclists passing through A14/ B1049 junction, lighting and removal of trees.

The main disadvantage of the Steps Only option is that it is not inclusive to mobility impaired users, people with prams / buggies or cyclists who wish to remain mounted. The existing pedestrian / cycle route to enter Orchard Park is to continue down Histon Road to the junction with Kings Hedges Road and back into the

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

development. The length of this route from the top of the Histon Interchange to the Roundabout near Premier Inn on Ring Fort Road is 725m. In comparison the ramp option would provide this link at a distance of 360m. This means that whilst there is no benefit to such users, there is also no dis-benefit as the currently available route will be maintained.

A reply has been received from Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum. This stated, "We consider that steps would be wholly inappropriate and inaccessible for the disabled, for mothers with pushchairs and toddlers, for older people and for anyone with mobility problems. They would also prove to be very difficult for people pushing bicycles up them, even if there was a bicycle gutter. Steps would certainly not provide safe, off-road, easy access". They have suggested that additional funding should be sought to develop a Ramp option further.

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.

If steps are progressed we will need to make it very clear to users that there is an alternative available for cyclists and those unable to use the steps. This will avoid users who are not safe to use the steps trying to do so.

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?

The project team will continue to work with local disability groups and key stakeholders to ensure that the solution to be delivered meets their requirements as much as possible.

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
The Steps Only option is not inclusive to mobility impaired users, people with prams / buggies or cyclists.	Disability group, users with pushchairs & buggies	M	Though the Steps Only option will not be an improvement for the groups affected, there is no worsening of the existing facility either. The project team will work with disability groups and stakeholders on the alternative Kings Hedges Road access.	Project team	31/01/21	
With the Steps Only option, the only alternative access for mobility impaired users is the Kings Hedges access route which is much longer than a ramp option	All users including disability groups and users with pushchairs & buggies	M	The project team will work with disability groups and stakeholders on the alternative Kings Hedges Road access. This will ensure that there is clear signage to ensure users are aware of the alternative route.	Project team	31/01/21	

Equality Impact Assessment
For employees and/or communities

Section 5: Approval

Name of person who completed this EIA:	Stuart Rushby	Name of person who approves this EIA:	Graham Hughes
Signature:		Signature:	
Job title:	Project Manager	Job title: <i>Must be Head of Service (or equivalent) or higher, and at least one level higher than officer completing EIA.</i>	Service Director: Highways & Transport
Date:	11/09/2020	Date:	17/9/2020

Equality Impact Assessment For employees and/or communities

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	Amend design, methodology etc. and do not start or continue work until relevant control measures are in place. Or justify retaining high impact	Introduce measures to control/reduce impact. Ensure control measures are in use and working. Or justify retaining medium impact	Impact may be acceptable without changes or lower priority action required. Or justify retaining low impact
	More than likely	M	M	H	H			
	Less than likely	L	M	M	H			
	Unlikely	L	L	M	M			

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.