

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

EIA Ref	PR/13/31	
Lead Officer	Name	Mick Noone
	Position	OD, Policy, Planning & Transportation
	Contact details	0151 511 7604

SECTION 1 –Context & Background

1.1 What is the title of the policy/practice?

East Runcorn Sustainable Transport Study - A558 improved junctions access (Sci - Tech Daresbury).

1.2 What is the current status of the policy/practice?

Existing ☒ Changed ☐ New ☐

1.3 What are the principal aims and intended outcomes of the policy/practice?

To address significant over capacity forecasted within the Designated Enterprise Zone. Implementation of policy recommendations will improve access and support economic growth.

1.4 Who has primary responsibility for delivering the policy/practice?

OD, Policy, Planning & Transportation

1.5 Who are the main stakeholders?

Halton BC, businesses, Langtree, Redway, STFC, road users, including pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and other users of the proposed bridleway.

1.6 Who is the policy/practice intended to affect?

Residents ☒ Staff ☐ Specific Group(s) ☒ (add details below)

Users of Sci-Tech Daresbury; employees of Sin – Tech Daresbury Enterprise Zone, prospective further housing development.

1.7 Are there any other related policies/practices?

Yes – contained within East Runcorn Sustainable Transport Study and the Core Strategy.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

SECTION 2 – Consideration of Impact

2.1 Relevance: – the Public Sector Equality Duty

Does this policy/practice/service have due regard to the need to: -

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conflict that is prohibited by the Equality Act 2010;
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between two persons who share a relevant protected characteristic; and
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Yes (✓) No ()

State reasons below

(Relevance to service users/staff)

Improvements to existing service, designed to be used by any/all protected groups.

2.2 Has data and information been used in determining the impact of the policy/procedure under review?

(for example research, surveys, complaints, consultation, , monitoring data)

Equality Group(s)	All
--------------------------	-----

Baseline data and information

Extensive and ongoing consultation carried out with service users and potential users during the course of the East Runcorn Sustainable Transport Study and the Core Strategy
Traffic flow monitoring and forecasts.

2.3 On the basis of evidence, has the actual/potential impact of the policy/practice been judged to be positive (+), neutral (=) or negative (-) for each of the equality groups and in what way? Is the level of impact judged to be high (H), medium ((M), or low (L)?

Protected Characteristic	Impact type +, =, -	Level H, M, L, -	Nature of impact
Age	=	/	
Disability	+	M	*Conforms to DfT disability access guidance – improvement include pavement works, kerbing and Toucan crossing.
Gender	=	/	
Race/ethnicity	=	/	
Religion/belief	=	/	
Sexual Orientation	=	/	

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

Transgender	=	/	
Marital status/ Civil Partnerships	=	/	
Pregnancy/Maternity	=	/	
In Halton two further vulnerable groups have been identified: -			
Carers	=	/	
Socio – economic disadvantage	+	M	The schemes are part of the wider East Runcorn Sustainability Transport Study – improved access to Daresbury and thereby significantly increased employment opportunities.

2.4 Does the policy/practice have any potential impact on safeguarding vulnerable people?

No

2.5 How will the impact of the policy/practice be monitored?

Traffic flow monitoring, economic and employment indicators

2.6 Who will be responsible for monitoring?

OD, Policy, Planning & Transportation.

2.7 If any negative impacts, or potential negative impacts, have been identified what mitigating actions will be put in place, thereby eliminating the need for a further Stage 2 assessment Where none have been identified insert 'no further action required' in the first column

Action & purpose / outcome	Priority	Timeframe	Lead Officer
No further action required	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.8 Summary of stakeholders involved in this review

Name / Job Title	Organisation / representative of
Rebecca Taylor, Policy Officer Les Unsworth, Policy Officer	HBC Policy and Development HBC Policy and Development

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT – STAGE 1

2.9 Completion Statement

As the identified Lead Officer of this review I confirm that:-
No negative impact has been identified for one or more equality groups and that a
Stage 2 Assessment is not required ✓

Signed: Rebecca Taylor

Date: February 2013

Completed EIAs should be sent to Les Unsworth, Corporate and Organisational Policy, to be given a unique reference number and for inclusion on the central register.

Appendix 1

Public Sector Equality Duty – EIA Checklist

The Equality Act s149 (the Public Sector Equality Duty) requires is that HBC has due regard to the need to:-

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

These are matters that we must show we have taken into the reckoning in making decisions about the Council's functions. We therefore need evidence of the following:

1. We know about the duty
2. We have reflected on the duty
3. We have consulted those affected or likely to be affected
4. We have used relevant information already in the council's possession (surveys etc.)
5. We have allowed adequate time for consultation with those affected and/or those who speak for those affected
6. We have allowed adequate time for earnest and genuine consideration of the information and views received
7. We have identified any adverse effects
8. We have sought to mitigate any adverse effects of decisions
9. We have identified principal options
10. Decision makers have not made up their mind in advance
11. We have considered all material considerations including our own financial situation, policy and strategy documents alongside along views received from consultees but have not applied those policies etc. In a rigid or unthinking way.