

Template reviewed Nov 2021

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) was introduced as part of the Equality Act 2010, which protects people from discrimination in the workplace, in the provision of services and in wider society.

The duty requires all public bodies to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination
- Advance equality of opportunity
- Foster good relations between different people

Public bodies demonstrate this due regard in different ways, including producing robust equality impact assessments when considering changes to policies and services.

An EqIA enables us to check the potential impacts on residents and employees of our policies, services and projects. It's an opportunity to challenge how we currently do things.

Carrying out an EqIA should not create extra work; it should be part of your normal service planning process. Most of the information required should already be available to you through other work already undertaken e.g. service user monitoring, analysis of complaints and national research.

The purpose of an EqIA is to *take account* of equality as plans develop, to promote and assist the consideration of equalities issues arising in plans and proposals and to ensure that where possible adverse or disproportionate impacts are minimised and positive impacts are maximised. As such where possible an EqIA should be started at the outset of a project/proposal and continually be developed and reviewed until a final proposal is adopted. An EqIA should be used to ensure decision makers have all the information they need regarding potential impacts to ensure they have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty when making judgements.

Carrying out EqIAs should be an integral part of policy or service development/change and larger projects may need more than one EqIA if different areas are impacted by the change.

Any project that requires consultation will automatically require an EqIA.

All approved and signed EqIAs are recorded in a central register. Please email your completed draft EqIA to equalities@buckinghamshire.gov.uk. Previous EqIAs can be made available for information upon request. For any questions or if you require support in completing your EqIA please contact Maria Damigos and Natalie Donhou Morley directly.



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Part A (Initial assessment) - Section 1 - Background

Proposal/Brief Title: Transport for Buckinghamshire (TfB) Highway Network Hierarchy

OneDrive link to report/policy:

Related policies: Asset Management Policy and Strategy

Date: 15th March 2022

Type of strategy, policy, project or service:

Please tick one of the following:

- Existing
- □ New or proposed
- X Changing, update or revision
- □ Other (please explain)

This assessment was created by:

Name: Keith Carpenter

Job Title: Asset Manager

Email address: keith.carpenter@buckinghamshire.gov.uk

Briefly describe the aims and objectives of the proposal below:

To review whether roads are in the appropriate hierarchy category. Good asset management practice requires a Maintenance (Network) Hierarchy to be established to support the creation of levels of service and for the statutory network management role to develop coordination and regulate occupation. The carriageway hierarchy plays a key role in the Council's maintenance approach and influences safety inspection frequencies, response to defects and prioritisation of capital schemes.

The Code of Practice "Well Managed Highways Infrastructure" (the Code) Recommendation 12 states that a network hierarchy based on asset function is the foundation of a risk-based maintenance strategy. The hierarchy should consider current and expected use, resilience, local economic and social factors (industry, schools, hospitals and similar).

The Code provides further guidance:

" A network hierarchy based on asset function is the foundation of a risk-based maintenance strategy. It is crucial in establishing levels of service and to the statutory network management role for developing co-ordination and regulating occupation.

It is important that the hierarchy adopted reflects the whole highway network and the needs, priorities and actual use of each infrastructure asset. The carriageway hierarchy, for



Template reviewed Nov 2021

example, may be determined by traffic volume or by local social and economic importance – perhaps a route leading to a major hospital or industrial area, or urban, rural or busy shopping street, residential street, etc. Hierarchy may also be influenced by factors such as pedestrian or cyclist usage. Collectively, these issues may be referred to as the 'functionality' of the section of highway in question.

Hierarchies should be dynamic and regularly reviewed to reflect changes in network characteristics and functionality so that maintenance strategy reflects the current situation, rather than the use expected when the hierarchy was originally defined."

It is therefore important that the hierarchy is kept up to date and reviewed to reflect current usage. In adopting best practice as recommended by the Code, a number of datasets that best reflect the function of the road, have been used as part of this review:

- a) Traffic Flows
- b) Member Engagement feedback
- c) Key Receptor locations
- d) Winter Maintenance Routes
- e) Traffic Sensitive Streets
- f) Bus Routes

Given that this review focussed on the road hierarchy (there is a separate hierarchy for footways and cycleways) relevant and available functional data was considered in the review. It is recognised that road users, irrespective of age or disability are licensed to drive on the road network and that the licensing process assesses their ability to drive. It may be considered therefore that any licenced vehicle user is fit to drive on the road network. The purpose of the review is to ensure the function of every road is assessed appropriately, using available data that represents the road's function, to ensure an equitable discharge of highway services across the road network.

The hierarchy has been reviewed using a range of data and 106 changes, out of 6790 sections (1.6%), to the hierarchy are proposed as a result. Of the 106 sections (out of a total of 6790) undergoing a hierarchy change, 76 will have their inspection frequency increased, 23 will undergo no change, and only 7 (0.1%) will have their inspection frequencies decreased. The overall impact of the review has therefore been minimal.

The 7 roads that had their inspection frequency reduced were:

- Thornton Road a minor rural lane between Thornton and Beachampton was reduced to category 4B (annual inspections)
- Bristle Hill Buckingham a narrow lane linking School Lane and Castle Street was reduced to category 4B (annual inspections)



Template reviewed Nov 2021

- School Lane Buckingham a narrow lane linking West Street and Nelson Street was reduced to category 4A (quarterly inspections)
- Rickmansworth Lane, Chalfont St Peter from A413 Gravel Hill to Chesham Lane a minor, semi-rural lane was reduced to category 4A (quarterly inspections)
- Middle Green Road Slough a minor rural lane from St Mary's Road to the County boundary was reduced to category 4B (annual inspections)
- West Common, Gerard's Cross a minor semi-rural lane bordering West Common, was reduced to category 4B (annual inspections)
- Redhill, Denham a minor semi-rural lane running alongside the A40 was reduced to category 4B (annual inspections).

Category 4A roads are Local Link Roads – other C roads and non-traffic-sensitive bus routes linking smaller villages and industrial areas to distributor roads.

Category 4B roads are Local Access Roads – providing local access to small settlements and urban estates.

As mentioned before, this review considered the function of the road carriageway only, as footways and cycleways have their own hierarchy. The review considered available data that represents the function of the road in determining the hierarchy category as recommended in the Code.

Of the seven roads out of a total of 6790 in the network, that had their hierarchy categories reduced, there was nothing in the data to suggest that the elderly, young, pregnant or disabled were disproportionately affected by the changes, given that these 7 roads are now consistent with all other roads in the network with a similar function.

What outcomes do we want to achieve?

To have confidence that all roads are categorised correctly to ensure the council's services are applied equitably across the county.

Does this proposal plan to withdraw a service, activity or presence? No

Please explain your answer: The review does not remove any road from any existing service.

Does this proposal plan to reduce a service, activity or presence? No

Please explain your answer: The purpose of the review is to have confidence that all roads are categorised correctly. All roads will continue to receive services required to discharge the Council's duties under the Highways Act 1980, such as highway safety inspections, with frequencies appropriate to the hierarchy category.

Does this proposal plan to introduce, review or change a policy, strategy or procedure? No

Please explain your answer: The related Asset Management Strategy requires a hierarchy to be established. The review does not change the requirements of the Strategy.



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Does this proposal affect service users and/or customers, or the wider community? No

Please explain your answer: A change to a road's hierarchy category may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. This approach ensures services are applied equitably across the county. Any defects found will be risk-rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation.

Does this proposal affect employees? No

Please explain your answer: The review does not impact on the resources required to undertake the services.

Will employees require training to deliver this proposal? No

Please explain your answer: Employees are already trained to undertake the existing services which are to continue.

Has any engagement /consultation been carried out, or is planned in the future? No

Please explain your answer: No formal consultation has been carried out but the review took on board feedback from Members during their annual Asset Management meetings, about the appropriateness of hierarchy categories for roads in their constituency.

Section 2 - Impacts

Please highlight potential impacts (including unintended impacts or consequences) for each protected characteristic*/equality groups below. Where there are negative or positive impacts please give more details of the impact. Where the impacts are unclear please explain why.

Age*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>

Details: A change to a road's hierarchy category resulting from the review may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. Any defects found will be risk rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation. Only 7 roads in the county will have their inspection frequency reduced as a result of the review.

Disability*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>

Details: A change to a road's hierarchy category resulting from the review may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. Any defects found



Template reviewed Nov 2021

will be risk rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation. Only 7 roads in the county will have their inspection frequency reduced as a result of the review.

Pregnancy & maternity*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: A change to a road's hierarchy category resulting from the review may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. Any defects found will be risk rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation. Only 7 roads in the county will have their inspection frequency reduced as a result of the review.			
Race & Ethnicity*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the road network	e hierarchy has no impact a us	ser's race or ethnicity in	n using the
Marriage & Civil Partners	hip*		
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the road network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a user's marital status i	in using the
Religion & Belief*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the the road network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a user's religion or beli	ef in using
Sex*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a user's sex in using the	e road
Sexual Orientation*			
Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Details: The review of the hierarchy has no impact on a user's sexual orientation in using the road network.

Gender Reassignment* Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the using the road network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a user's gender or reas	signment in
Gender identity Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the the road network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a user's gender identity	γ in using
Carers Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: The review of the network.	e hierarchy has no impact on a	a carer's ability to use t	:he road
Rural isolation Positive	Negative	Unclear	<mark>None</mark>
Details: A change to a road's hierarchy category resulting from the review may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. Any defects found			
will be risk rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation. Only 7 roads in the county will have their inspection frequency reduced as a result of the review.			
Single parent families Positive	Negative	Unclear	None
Details: The review of the hierarchy has no impact on a single parent family's ability to use the road network.			
Poverty (social & econom Positive	nic deprivation) Negative	Unclear	None
Details: The review of the	e hierarchy has no impact on t	hose having social and	l economic

deprivation's ability to use the road network.



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Military families / veterans Positive Negative

Unclear

<mark>None</mark>

Details: The review of the hierarchy has no impact on a military or veterans family's ability to use the road network.

Section 3 – Is a full assessment required?

If you have answered yes to any of the initial assessment questions in section 1 of this EqIA, or have indicated a negative or unclear impact in section 2, it is likely you will need to complete part B of the EqIA form. Should you need guidance as to whether a full EqIA is needed at this time please contact Maria Damigos or Natalie Donhou Morley before continuing.

Following completion of part A, is part B completion required?

- 🗆 Yes
- 🗌 No
- Not required at this time

Explain your answer:

A change to a road's hierarchy category resulting from the review may change the frequency of safety inspections to better reflect the nature and usage of the road and be consistent with all other roads with similar nature and usage. Any defects found will be risk rated for impact and likelihood of causing an incident, irrespective of the hierarchy categorisation. This approach means all users of the road network are treated equitably by ensuring standards of service are applied consistently taking account of the nature and usage of the road network in determining hierarchy categories.

Of the 106 sections (out of a total of 6790) undergoing a hierarchy change, 76 will have their inspection frequency increased, 23 will undergo no change, and only 7 will have their inspection frequencies decreased. The overall impact of the review has therefore been minimal.

Have you completed an DPIA for this project/change? No

(As you are completing an EqIA, you may also require a DPIA - for more information please contact <u>dataprotection@buckinghamshire.gov.uk</u>)

Section 4 – Sign off (Only complete when NOT completing Part B)

Officer completing this assessment: Keith Carpenter Date: 26th May 2022

Equality advice sought from: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)

Service Director sign off: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)



Template reviewed Nov 2021

CMT sign off (*if deemed necessary by Service Director*) sign off: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)

Next review Date: 2025 - 2027

If required please complete part B (full assessment)

Part B (Full assessment) - Section 5 – Further information

Will there be an impact on any other functions, services or policies? If so, please provide more detail:

Are there any potential barriers to implementing changes to your service/strategy/policy/ project?

Section 6 - Information gathering – what do you need to know about your customers and making a judgement about potential impacts on them?

What data do you already have about your service users, or the people your policy or strategy will have an impact on, that is broken down by protected characteristics* and equality groups (non-statutory)?

Guidance note (delete after completion)

This will be more important for negative or unclear impacts identified in Section 2 above.

National data and research can be useful in identifying barriers, issues and areas where equality is likely to be a priority. These include Research undertaken by the Equality & Human Rights Commission, research undertaken by trades unions, commissioned research and reports, census data, labour force surveys

Institutional data such as ethnic monitoring data, surveys, consultations, and complaints and grievances can be used to identify local data.

Please also consider 'missing data' as thus may be indicative of discriminatory practice.

Once all available data has been gathered, it should be examined to check whether there is evidence of any of the following: lower take up/participation rates by disadvantaged groups generally, lower take up/participation by certain groups, eligibility criteria which disadvantages groups, access to services being reduced or denied to people, people facing increased difficulty as a result of a policy/practice, a policy/practice resulting in reduced benefits for equality groups.

Age*:

Disability*:

Pregnancy and maternity*:

Race*:



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Marriage & Civil Partnership*:

Religion or belief*:

Sex*:

Sexual orientation*:

Gender re-assignment*:

Gender identity:

Carers:

Rural isolation:

Single parent families:

Poverty (social & economic deprivation):

Military families / veterans:

Do you need any further information broken down by protected characteristic or equality group to inform this EqIA?

- 🗆 Yes
- 🗆 No

If yes, list here to help you gather data for the action plan in Section 11

Section 7 – Negative effects, impacts or consequences

Is there any potential for or actual direct or indirect discrimination or a disproportionate effect on a protected group or equality group?

Guidance note: Direct discrimination is when someone is treated unfairly because of a protected characteristic, such as sex or race or an equalities group, such as being a carer. For example, someone is not offered a promotion because they're a woman and the job goes to a less qualified man. Indirect discrimination can happen when there are rules or arrangements that apply to a group of employees or job applicants, but in practice are less fair to a certain protected characteristic.

- □ Yes
- □ No
- Not sure at this time

What are the potential negative effects, impacts or consequences and how have, or may, they arise:

Guidance note (delete after completion)



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Please state what the potential negative impact (s) are – Section 8 allows you to set out any minimising/mitigating actions.

State what the negative impact(s) are for each group, identified in Section 2. In addition, you should also consider and state potential risks associated with your proposal.

Section 8 – Proposals to remove or minimise negative effects, impacts or consequences

How is it proposed to mitigate or minimise the negative effects, impacts or consequences identified in Section 7?

Guidance Note (delete after completion)

Include details of steps proposed or taken to ensure that these measures will address and remove (or where not possible, minimise) any negative impacts identified above and by when. How severe are these impacts likely to be? Please also state how you will monitor the impact of your proposal once implemented.

What measures will be put in place to mitigate or minimise negative impact (provide details, including details of and additional consultation undertaken/to be carried out in the future). Please also identify actions you will take to assess whether these measures have addressed or will address and remove or minimise any negative impacts identified in your analysis? Please provide details. If you are unable to identify measures to mitigate/minimise impacts, please state so and provide a brief explanation.

Section 9 - Other factors to take into consideration:

Guidance note (delete after completion)

This should include balancing or other factors for decision makers to take into consideration such as positive impacts (financial or otherwise), costs and resources

Section 10 - Conclusion:

Section 11 - Action Planning

Guidance note (delete after completion)

Where the policy or practice would result in unavoidable or potentially unlawful impacts changes should clearly be made where possible and specific actions should be identified and noted in the action plan. The objectives of the policy or practice should be re-examined to find out if there is an alternative way of meeting the desired objectives without the adverse impact, and potentially creating a positive one.



Template reviewed Nov 2021

Where impacts are unavoidable the objective of completing the EqIA and the action plan is to demonstrate that impacts have been considered as part of the decision making process to ensure compliance with the PSED. An example to show how this works - where a council decides to close a care home, if they do so without considering the equalities implications (via an EqIA or otherwise) the decision is extremely likely to be quashed by the Courts on a challenge, as per previous case law. This would happen even if it is almost certain that examination of the equalities implications will have little or no impact on the final decision (e.g. due to a lack of resources to pay for the care home) - because the PSED was not part of the decision making process.

A properly completed EqIA should be a full and complete record to show that all equalities implications and the PSED were appropriately considered by the decision maker.

If the adverse impact is potentially unlawful and alternatives cannot be found, the policy or practice may need to be completely redesigned.

Section 12 - Monitoring Arrangements

What are the plans to monitor the actual and/or final impact? (The EqIA will help anticipate likely effect but final impact may only be known after implementation)

What are the proposals for reviewing and reporting actual impact?

Section 13 - Part A and B Sign off – (If Part B has not been completed please complete Section 4)

Officer completing Part A and B assessment: (Please insert Name(s)) Date: (Please insert Date)

Equality advice sought from: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)

Service Director sign off: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)



Template reviewed Nov 2021

CMT sign off (if deemed necessary by Service Director) sign off: (Please insert name) Date: (Please insert Date)

Next review date: