

Equality Impact Assessment Form



Section 1 - What is the policy or activity trying to achieve?	
Describe the policy/strategy/procedure/function which is the subject of this impact assessment.	Godalming Greenway Gateway route selection (The Burys)
Name and telephone number of officer completing assessment	Thomas Lankester, 3567
Date completed	10/06/2022
What outcomes are wanted from this policy/activity, what are you trying to achieve? Selection of final Greenway section route	
Who is affected by this policy/activity?	Pedestrians, cyclists (normal and diversity), mobility users
Who are the main people involved in this activity?	Project sponsor: Kelvin Mills, project manager: Thomas Lankester
Is the responsibility for the proposed policy/activity shared with another department, authority or organisation? If so, what responsibility and with whom is it shared?	WBC Greenspace Team – route and measures through Phillips Memorial Park SCC Transport Planning – route and measures along The Burys

Section 2 - Information Gathering and Consulting Stakeholders	
Do you have any monitoring data available on the number of people (from protected characteristic groups) who are using or are potentially impacted upon by your policy/activity?	Census 2011 data formed the basis for the gender equality impact modelling. The same base data informed the assessment of impact on enhanced mobility inclusion.
If monitoring has NOT been undertaken or information is not available, specify the arrangement you intend to make; if not please give a reason for your decision.	
What research or consultation has been undertaken to understand the impacts of the strategy/policy/procedure/project/function?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A traffic survey was carried out on The Burys in July 2021. Traffic volumes were found to be comparable to pre-pandemic usage of Crown Court Car Park (the main destination / traffic source on The Burys). • A public consultation on route options was conducted over a 6-week period in October – November 2021.

- Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT) modelling was used to explore both enhanced mobility inclusion and gender equality.
- Research included review papers by Sustrans (Inclusive city cycling. Women: reducing the gender gap, 2018), CyclingUK (Why don't more women cycle?, 2017), Pucher and Buehler (Making Cycling Irresistible, 2008).
- The Department for Transport's Route Selection Tool was employed to determine and score the route options based on 5 key outcomes, including comfort level of users in a shared use environment.

Section 3 – Assess the Impact on Protected Characteristic Groups

Section 3 – Assess the Impact on Protected Characteristic Groups				
Sex				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Women	In the UK, women make up under 30% of cycle trips compared to 45-55% of cycle journeys made by women in Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands. 58% of inactive adults in the UK are women. The principal reason given by women for impeded mobility is safety. The proposed scheme will improve safety and priority for active travel users (especially cycling).			For the 2011 Census Waverley 007 Medium Level Super Output Area, PCT modelling found that gender equality reduces time lost to sick leave by 73 days.
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Men	Whilst the perception of safety deters men from cycling less than women, the improved safety and priority will encourage more men to cycle and be more physically active.			
Gender Reassignment				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Transgendered Men/Women	As above, transgender adults will generally benefit from safer,			

	higher priority cycling and walking infrastructure.			
Race - The categories used in the Race section are those used in the 2001 census. Consideration should be given to the needs of specific communities within the broad categories.				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Asian		Yes		
Black		Yes		
Mixed race		Yes		
White		Yes		
Chinese		Yes		
Gypsy, Roma, Traveller		Yes		
Other racial or ethnic groups - specify		Yes		
Disability - Long term health impairment could include, mental health problems, asthma, heart conditions, chronic fatigue etc.				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Physical	The cycle street option will improve the safety and priority of diversity cycle users and on-road (Class 3) mobility scooter users.		The off-carriageway option involves shared use which is likely to make some mobility / wheelchair / diversity cycle users feel uncomfortable.	.
Sensory			The off-carriageway option involves shared use which is likely to make some sensory impaired users feel uncomfortable.	
Learning			The off-carriageway option involves shared use which introduces a less well-ordered element and more complex interactions than on a standard footway.	

Long Term Health Impairment		Yes		
Mental health		Yes		
Sexual orientation				
Heterosexuals, lesbians, gay men and bisexuals	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
		Yes		
Age				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Older people	Generally, maintaining an active lifestyle is particularly important for the elderly. Those with knee problems and those no longer able to drive can benefit from cycling, maintaining independence and physical activity.		The off-carriageway option involves shared use which may make some older pedestrians feel more vulnerable or anxious. This concern was expressed at public consultation.	Percentage of trips by cycle in countries with good infrastructure is far higher across all age groups but disproportionately more for the 65+ age group compared to the UK average.
Younger people and children	The cycle street option increases safety and cycle priority, enabling younger, less confident and less experienced children to be more independent and increase physical activity through cycling.		Young children may find it harder to judge and negotiate the shared use space section associated with the off-carriageway option. This concern was expressed at public consultation.	
Religion or belief – Faith or belief groups cover a wide range of groupings, the most common of which are Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews, Muslims, and Sikhs. Consider faith or belief categories individually and collectively when considering positive and negative impacts.				
Faith or belief groups	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
		Yes		

Pregnancy and Maternity				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Pregnancy and Maternity			Pregnant women and those with pushchairs / toddlers are likely to feel less comfortable negotiate the shared use space section associated with the off-carriageway option. This concern was expressed at public consultation.	
Marriage and Civil Partnership				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Marriage and Civil Partnership		Yes		
Other groups				
	Positive impact (it could benefit)	Neutral	Negative impact (it could disadvantage)	Additional Comments
Carers				
Socio-economic disadvantage	Reducing motor vehicle (private car) speed and priority will increase low cost mobility for the socio-economically disadvantage.			
<p>If you have indicated there is a potential negative impact on any group, are these intentional and of a high impact?</p> <p>Intended – i.e. can be justified in terms of legislation e.g. concessionary fares for over 60s Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>High Impact? – i.e. it is or may be discriminatory against some groups Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If there are no potential negatives impacts on any groups go to section 6</p>				

Section 4 - Consider Alternatives or Changes

Change - Explain how policy/activity has changed/needs to change	Reasons for the Change
<p>The public consultation favoured the off-carriageway option (42%) over the cycle street option (25%). Conversely the special interest groups (Sustrans and FoE Godalming) favoured the cycle street option with only Godalming Cycle Campaign showing a preference for the off-carriageway option.</p> <p>The cycle street option is recommended, despite the off-carriageway option being favoured by general public responses to the public consultation.</p>	<p>The cycle street option provides clear safety and priority improvements that will encourage more cycling. This was acknowledged by all 3 of the special interest organisations commenting on The Burys cycle street option.</p> <p>The shift of traffic away from the footway and reduced motor vehicle speeds with the 20mph zone will benefit pedestrians, pushchair and mobility users. This point was expressed at public consultation.</p> <p>The off-carriageway option involves a section of shared use at the area of highest pedestrian movements. This reducing comfort for all users and disproportionately more so for some vulnerable groups. This option also lacks the benefits of traffic management and motor vehicle speed reductions adjacent to the footway on The Burys.</p>

Section 5 - Action Planning

Issue	Action required	Officer	Timescale	Resource implications	Comment

Section 6 Sign off

Name	Date
Name of Assessor:	

Signed off by:	Richard Homewood	14 June 2022
Name of HOS or Director	Richard Homewood	14 June 2022

Further guidance

If you need more advice and guidance, you may find the following sources useful:

- [Government Equality Office: Equality Act guidance](#)
- [Equality and Human Rights Commission; Public Sector Duty](#)
- [Equality and Human Rights Commission: *Protected Characteristics*](#)