

Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

www.rbwm.gov.uk



1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Improvement to junction of A308 Windsor Road with Holyport Road
Service area:	Infrastructure, Sustainability & Economic Growth
Directorate:	Place

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal:

- What are its intended outcomes?
- Who will deliver it?
- Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?

Remodelling of the junction of A308 Windsor Road with Holyport Road, to improve safety and address capacity issues for motor traffic. The project will be commissioned by Transport Department, designed by contractor Project Centre Limited, and constructed by term highway contractors.

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees?

- If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues.
- Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)

Yes.

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal?

For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

People who travel through this junction, including those in private motor vehicles, on buses, on foot and by bike.

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented?

For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?

No.

What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned?

- How has/will equality considerations be taken into account?
- Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement?

Public consultation was undertaken in February/March 2023. The outcome of this consultation was that a roundabout option would be preferred to the traffic signal option put forward. Public feedback has been incorporated into the revised design. The borough's Disability & Inclusion Forum were approached for feedback as part of the consultation process. It is noted that the current pedestrian crossing arrangements at the junction are not fully accessible.

What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment?

Please consult the Equalities Evidence Grid for relevant data. Examples of other possible sources of information are in the Guidance document.

Site surveys, including comparison of current highway design with Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility standards.

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'

More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the Guidance document.

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	<p>It can take older persons longer to walk across a road – shorter crossing distances with central islands can assist (evidence: Crossing the road in time: Inequalities in older people's walking speeds - ScienceDirect)</p> <p>The consequences of a trip or fall can be more serious for older persons, and associated with this the fear of a trip or fall can isolate older persons if they do not have confidence in a trip-free and conflict-free walking environment (evidence: Falls later in life (ageuk.org.uk)). Surfaces should be reasonably flat and evenly laid without trip hazards, and walking facilities should be separated from cycling facilities per modern design guidance (evidence: Near accidents and collisions between pedestrians and cyclists European Transport Research Review Full Text (springeropen.com))</p>	Yes – if addressed through junction design	(If not addressed through junction design)
Disability	<p>The junction can be modernised to Department for Transport Inclusive Mobility standards, to include tactile paving and appropriately sized refuges at crossing points and consideration for footway crossfalls which can be challenging to walk or wheel on. (Source: Department for Transport Inclusive Mobility).</p> <p>Cycle provision should be designed for the needs of disabled people cycling, including those using a bike as a mobility aid. This can be achieved by using modern cycle facility design guidelines found in Local Transport Note 1/20. (Source: Wheels for Wellbeing).</p>	Yes – if addressed through junction design	(If not addressed through junction design)
Sex			

Race, ethnicity and religion			
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Armed forces community			
Socio-economic considerations e.g. low income, poverty	<p>Car ownership can be prohibitively expensive for persons on lower incomes (evidence: <u>Trends in households without access to a car - The Health Foundation</u>). Improved bus, walking and cycling facilities offers greater, low cost mobility to persons in these groups which can support better access to work, education and essential shops and services.</p>	<p>Yes – if improved access to bus stops plus walking and cycling provision are addressed through junction design</p>	
Children in care/Care leavers			

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it?

For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group

Walking facilities, including crossings, will need to be modernised, to be flat and trip-free, separated from cycling and tactile paving deployed as needed.

Cycling facilities need to be designed to Local Transport Note 1/20 design guidance standards.

Bus stop should be accessible, with accessible desire-line crossings and easy for the bus to pull up straight to and in close alignment with the kerb for level boarding.

Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?

- For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.

N/A

How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?

See guidance document for examples of appropriate stages to review an EQIA.

The final junction design will be reviewed in light of Inclusive Mobility and Local Transport Note 1/20 standards.

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Dug Tremellen	Date: 25/09/2023
Approved by: Tim Golabek	Date: 26/09/2023

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	Date:
---------------------	--------------