

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

(Please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment guidance when completing this form)



Name of proposal	Transport Capital Programme 2021/22
Directorate and Service Area	Economy of Place / Strategic City Transport Management of Place / Highways and Traffic
Name of Lead Officer	Douglas Sole

Step 1: What is the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English, avoiding acronyms and jargon. This section should explain how the proposal will impact service users, staff and/or the wider community.

1.1 What is the proposal?

Cabinet report decision to allocate Department for Transport/West of England Combined Authority funding towards range of different Transport Projects and Programmes across the City in 19/20.

The exact details of the schemes are not fully developed, however budget is assigned as set out in Appendix A.

The main schemes are aimed at:

- Maintenance
- Improving road safety
- Improving accessibility for active travel modes
- Improving public transport connectivity

The programme may change during the 2021/22 financial year because of changes to budgets, new information received or changes in priority. As such there is the ability to change the scope of schemes and accommodate further mitigations later in the development process.

Step 2: What information do we have?

Decisions must be evidence-based, and involve people with protected characteristics that could be affected. Please use this section to demonstrate understanding of who could be affected by the proposal.

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

As most of these schemes are still in development generalisations based on data gathered during strategy consultations have been the main source of evidence.

Officers have used evidence and knowledge regarding a range of criteria in reaching decisions on proposed budget allocations, this includes but is not limited to:

- Citywide and Ward level data sources e.g.
 - Open Data Bristol
 - Bristol Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)
 - 2011 Census
 - Quality of Life survey
 - Bristol Ward Data Profiles.
- Neighbourhood Partnerships
- Local Councillor and member of the public requests
- Maintenance records and inspections.

For example we know there are differences by equality group and by deprivation in Bristol citizens' overall experience of transport issues in the city:

Characteristic	% for whom inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to:	% for whom parking issues prevents them from leaving their home when they want to	% who cycle to work
16 to 24 years	14.6%	16.0%	10.1%
50 years and older	8.7%	16.8%	8.0%
65 years and older	9.1%	16.6%	5.7%
Female	11.0%	17.2%	12.1%
Male	9.9%	19.0%	21.1%
Black, Asian and minority ethnicity	14.7%	20.5%	10.0%
White Minority ethnicity	14.3%	15.9%	20.8%
Disabled	17.7%	22.3%	5.1%
Carer	10.9%	21.4%	10.2%

Single Parent	9.8%	19.2%	18.3%
Religion or faith	9.9%	17.6%	10.2%
No religion or faith	9.3%	17.6%	20.8%
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	12.3%	16.3%	21.5%
10% most deprived	12.9%	18.4%	8.4%
Bristol Average	10.7%	18.2%	16.5%
<i>source: Quality of Life in Bristol survey 2019-20</i>			

2.2 Who is missing? Are there any gaps in the data?

We do not have accurate locality equalities data for some protected characteristics e.g. sexual orientation – especially where this has not historically been included in statutory reporting.

As the exact location and nature of many of the works is not yet known it is hard to be specific about the geographical demographics of schemes – however as schemes develop more detailed assessment of the demographics within each area can be carried out.

2.3 How have we involved, or will we involve, communities and groups that could be affected?

As new schemes are developed further analysis and, where appropriate, consultation will take place which will include seeking the views of citizens with protected characteristics.

All schemes are based on the priorities set out in the Bristol Transport Strategy, which consulted widely on the needs of all communities within Bristol.

We will continue to work with multi-agency partnerships e.g. Public Transport and Equalities Working group to embed good practice at a project level

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts on people with protected characteristics must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts in this section, referring to all of the equalities groups as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people with protected characteristics?

Whilst we are not aware of any significant negative impact from the overall setting of the Transport Capital Programme at this stage (i.e. this proposal) we need to ensure that our priorities support our overall Public Sector Equality

Duty to eliminate discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and foster good relations.

As the proposed works have not been fully defined it is not possible to fully assess the extent of all impacts for citizens or staff on the basis of their protected characteristics, however there are some assumptions that can be made.

Gender reassignment; Marriage & Civil Partnership; Race; Religion or belief; Sex; Sexual orientation: Whilst we have not identified any direct disproportionate adverse impact to these groups, there may be indirect impacts due to differing demographics in some areas of the city, and different transport modes being more prevalent among some groups. Some schemes may impact some transport modes or geographic areas disproportionately which could have an indirect impact on protected groups. We also need to ensure that there is sufficient consideration in project development for groups who may be more likely to be victims of hate crime, harassment and anti-social behaviour, including tackling violence against women.

Age; Disability; Pregnancy & maternity: These groups are most likely to be directly impacted by interventions. As these groups are most restricted in the modes of transport they can use to travel by, restrictions or diversions during construction, or permanently because of changes in traffic priority, are likely to impact members of these groups.

Allocation of funding to some areas over others will by necessity cause an opportunity cost, where prioritisation of one area over another could disadvantage a geographical area or protected group.

3.2 Can these impacts be mitigated or justified? If so, how?

Mitigations for impacts will need to be considered on a case by case basis for each scheme, but in most cases adverse impacts are likely to be short term in nature, for example disruption to travel in certain areas. These can be mitigated by ensuring the traffic movements of all modes of transport are considered, including pedestrians.

The opportunity cost of prioritisation has been mitigated by ensuring areas for work are prioritised based on already developed strategy and policy, which is aimed to improve health and connectivity and reduce inequality. This is balanced with the need for deliverability of schemes, and available external funding. The primary consideration is improving health and wellbeing by

increasing active transport, without impacting accessibility for all groups.

The maintenance budgets are prioritised based on the usage and estimated lifetime of the assets being maintained (structures, stretches of footway, etc.) however this calculation also considers other factors – with, for example, footways outside hospitals or care homes having a higher priority for maintenance due to the greater need of the groups using them. Local Area Committee schemes are decided through the separate Area Committee Process, with this funding supporting development and delivery of those schemes.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

Yes. As the proposed works have not been fully defined it is not possible to fully assess the extent of all impacts for people with protected characteristics, however there are some assumptions that can be made.

Gender reassignment; Marriage & Civil Partnership; Race; Religion or belief; Sex; Sexual orientation: However, there may be indirect benefits due to differing demographics in some areas of the city, and different transport modes being more prevalent among some groups. Some schemes may benefit some transport modes or geographic areas disproportionately which could create an indirect benefit for protected groups.

Age; Disability; Pregnancy & Maternity: These groups are more likely to have direct benefits, as improvements to walking routes and road safety disproportionately benefit the elderly, very young and those with physical disabilities. The increase in accessibility for all groups is a key aim of many of the transport schemes being funded – for example Safer Routes to School will benefit school age children primarily.

Indirectly most schemes are being aimed at increasing active travel, road safety or accessibility. The negative impact of motorised traffic (traffic collisions, air quality and community severance) tends to be highest in the most deprived areas of the city, as are poor connections for active transport and public transport modes. By prioritising funding on improving these elements there will be a disproportionate benefit to the most deprived communities. While socio-economic deprivation is not itself a protected characteristic, it is correlated with several protected characteristics.

3.4 Can they be maximised? If so, how?

Consultation on schemes will ensure that all groups are considered and to identify additional works that may be able to improve the schemes impacts.

Flexibility in the funding throughout the year will allow changes to scheme scope and allow other funding streams to be used to maximise benefits when opportunities are identified.

Step 4: So what?

The Equality Impact Assessment must be able to influence the proposal and decision. This section asks how your understanding of impacts on people with protected characteristics has influenced your proposal, and how the findings of your Equality Impact Assessment can be measured going forward.

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

The projects taken forward for funding were prioritised based on several criteria, and equalities impact was one of these, so this has changed the exact allocation of funding to each scheme. Other criteria were deliverability of schemes, strategic alignment, and financial impact.

As this proposal is purely related to funding allocation there is no further impact an assessment could have at this time.

4.2 What actions have been identified going forward?

During development of schemes each area will be completing an equalities assessment, the scale of which will depend on the scale and scope of the scheme.

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured moving forward?

Monitoring the impact of transport schemes on different groups is a difficult task, especially with the small scale of some of the schemes within this proposal. As such we propose that the overall city transport monitoring is used as a proxy measure for the success of this action – including monitoring from:

- Citywide data sources
- Neighbourhood Partnerships
- Local Councillor and member of the public requests
- Maintenance records and inspections

The results of which will help inform prioritisation of next year's funding.

Service Director Sign-Off: Nuala Gallagher	Equalities Officer Sign Off: <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i>
Date: 02/02/2021	Date: 2/2/2021