

**City of York Council  
Equalities Impact Assessment**

**Who is submitting the proposal?**

<b>Directorate:</b>	Place		
<b>Service Area:</b>	Transport		
<b>Name of the proposal :</b>	City of York Council Vehicle Crossing Policy		
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Traffic and Highway Development Manager		
<b>Date assessment completed:</b>	20/05/2021		
<b>Names of those who contributed to the assessment :</b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Area of expertise</b>
Helene Vergereau	Traffic and Highway Development Manager	CYC	Transport
Heidi Lehane	Senior Solicitor	CYC	Legal

## Step 1 – Aims and intended outcomes

1.1	<b>What is the purpose of the proposal?</b> Please explain your proposal in Plain English avoiding acronyms and jargon.
	The proposal is to adopt a vehicle crossing policy for City of York Council to support the vehicle crossing application process
1.2	<b>Are there any external considerations?</b> (Legislation/government directive/codes of practice etc.)
	Vehicle crossing applications are considered by the Highway Authority under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 and through the planning process.
1.3	<b>Who are the stakeholders and what are their interests?</b>
	Residents who want to build a new dropped crossing to access their drive or improve an existing crossing. Road users including pedestrians, cyclists, motorised vehicle users – impact on road safety, access to private dwellings. People living with reduced mobility – as previous as well as impact on ability to travel on footways.
1.4	<b>What results/outcomes do we want to achieve and for whom?</b> This section should explain what outcomes you want to achieve for service users, staff and/or the wider community. Demonstrate how the proposal links to the Council Plan (2019- 2023) and other corporate strategies and plans.

	<p>This policy will support the following objectives from the Council Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. getting around sustainably – by ensuring that suitable vehicle crossing are permitted, avoiding parked vehicles encroaching on footways and ensuring adequate consideration for road safety</li> <li>b. a greener and cleaner city – as above</li> <li>c. an open and effective council – by providing clear information on how decisions on vehicle crossing applications are made</li> </ul>
--	--

## Step 2 – Gathering the information and feedback

<b>2.1</b>	<p><b>What sources of data, evidence and consultation feedback do we have to help us understand the impact of the proposal on equality rights and human rights?</b> Please consider a range of sources, including: consultation exercises, surveys, feedback from staff, stakeholders, participants, research reports, the views of equality groups, as well your own experience of working in this area etc.</p>	
	<b>Source of data/supporting evidence</b>	<b>Reason for using</b>
	Consultation feedback	Consultation specifically conducted for this policy (although response was low)
	Research and benchmarking	Reviewing approaches used by other local authorities and research into footway and dropped crossing design's impact on road safety and accessibility
	Experience of qualified officers working in this area	Consultation conducted internally within the Council including StreetWorks and Highway inspectors as well as development control officer.

### Step 3 – Gaps in data and knowledge

3.1	What are the main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your proposal? Please indicate how any gaps will be dealt with.	
<b>Gaps in data or knowledge</b>		<b>Action to deal with this</b>
No gaps identified		

### Step 4 – Analysing the impacts or effects.

4.1	Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments? Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
<b>Age</b>	Mixed impact anticipated. Positive impact: reduction in the number of vehicles encroaching on footways when parked on private driveways, reduced number of very wide crossings permitted, kerb line definition retained with a 25mm check to make it easier for people with reduced mobility to use the footways and reduce the risk to children using the footway. Negative impact: some applications may be refused based on the criteria set out in the policy, for users with reduced mobility. This may result in some applicants finding it more	+ and -	M

4.1	<p><b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.</p>		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
	<p>difficult to access their vehicle if it needs to be parked in the street rather than on a private drive. Older residents or people using pushchairs may find it more difficult to walk where vehicle crossings are provided, due to the sloping nature of the footway. This can be particularly difficult if there are a number of consecutive dropped kerbs. This policy aims to retain a minimum width without a slope where possible and reduce the number of very wide dropped kerbs. The policy is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in the number of dropped crossings approved however so the benefit for older people with reduced mobility and children using the footway is likely to be relatively limited.</p>		
<b>Disability</b>	<p>Mixed impact anticipated. Positive impact: reduction in the number of vehicles encroaching on footways when parked on private driveways, reduced number of very wide crossings permitted, kerb line definition retained with a 25mm check to make it easier for people with a disability/reduced mobility to use the footways. Negative impact: some applications may be refused based on the criteria set out in the policy, for users with reduced</p>	<b>+ and -</b>	<b>M</b>

4.1	<p><b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.</p>		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
	<p>mobility. This may result in some applicants finding it more difficult to access their vehicle if it needs to be parked in the street rather than on a private drive.</p> <p>People with a disability or reduced mobility may find it more difficult to walk or use a wheelchair where vehicle crossings are provided, due to the sloping nature of the footway. This can be particularly difficult if there are a number of consecutive dropped kerbs. This policy aims to retain a minimum width without a slope where possible and reduce the number of very wide dropped kerbs.</p> <p>The policy is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in the number of dropped crossings approved however so the benefit for people with a disability or reduced mobility is likely to be relatively limited.</p>		
<b>Gender</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Marriage and civil partnership</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Pregnancy</b>	Mixed impact anticipated.	<b>+ and -</b>	<b>M</b>

4.1	<p><b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.</p>		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
<b>and maternity</b>	<p>Positive impact: reduction in the number of vehicles encroaching on footways when parked on private driveways, reduced number of very wide crossings permitted, kerb line definition retained with a 25mm check to make it easier for people with reduced mobility or with pushchairs to use the footways.</p> <p>Negative impact: some applications may be refused based on the criteria set out in the policy, for users with reduced mobility or young families. This may result in some applicants finding it more difficult to access their vehicle if it needs to be parked in the street rather than on a private drive.</p> <p>People with reduce mobility and people using pushchairs may find it more difficult to walk where vehicle crossings are provided, due to the sloping nature of the footway. This can be particularly difficult if there are a number of consecutive dropped kerbs. This policy aims to retain a minimum width without a slope where possible and reduce the number of very wide dropped kerbs.</p> <p>The policy is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in the number of dropped crossings approved however so the</p>		

4.1	<b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
	benefit for people with reduced mobility, people using pushchairs and children using the footway is likely to be relatively limited.		
<b>Race</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Religion and belief</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Neutral	<b>0</b>	
<b>Other Socio-economic groups including :</b>	<b>Could other socio-economic groups be affected e.g. carers, ex-offenders, low incomes?</b>		
<b>Carer</b>	Mixed impact anticipated. Positive impact: reduction in the number of vehicles encroaching on footways when parked on private driveways, reduced number of very wide crossings permitted, kerb line definition retained with a 25mm check to make it easier for people with reduced mobility to use the footways. Negative impact: some applications may be refused based on the criteria set out in the policy, for users with reduced mobility. This may result in some applicants finding it more	<b>+ and -</b>	<b>M</b>



4.1	<p><b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.</p>		
Equality Groups and Human Rights.	Key Findings/Impacts	Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)	High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)
	<p>difficult to access their vehicle if it needs to be parked in the street rather than on a private drive. Carers for people with a disability or reduced mobility may find it more difficult to walk or use a wheelchair where vehicle crossings are provided, due to the sloping nature of the footway. This can be particularly difficult if there are a number of consecutive dropped kerbs. This policy aims to retain a minimum width without a slope where possible and reduce the number of very wide dropped kerbs. The policy is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in the number of dropped crossings approved however so the benefit for carers is likely to be relatively limited.</p>		
Low income groups	Neutral	0	
Veterans, Armed Forces Community	Neutral	0	
Other	Neutral	0	
Impact on human rights:			

4.1	<b>Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any adjustments?</b> Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.		
<b>Equality Groups and Human Rights.</b>	<b>Key Findings/Impacts</b>	<b>Positive (+) Negative (-) Neutral (0)</b>	<b>High (H) Medium (M) Low (L)</b>
List any human rights impacted.	Neutral	0	

**Use the following guidance to inform your responses:**

Indicate:

- Where you think that the proposal could have a POSITIVE impact on any of the equality groups like promoting equality and equal opportunities or improving relations within equality groups
- Where you think that the proposal could have a NEGATIVE impact on any of the equality groups, i.e. it could disadvantage them
- Where you think that this proposal has a NEUTRAL effect on any of the equality groups listed below i.e. it has no effect currently on equality groups.

It is important to remember that a proposal may be highly relevant to one aspect of equality and not relevant to another.

<p><b>High impact</b> (The proposal or process is very equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is significant potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or public facing The proposal has consequences for or affects significant numbers of people The proposal has the potential to make a significant contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights.</p>
<p><b>Medium impact</b> (The proposal or process is somewhat equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is some evidence to suggest potential for or evidence of adverse impact The proposal is institution wide or across services, but mainly internal The proposal has consequences for or affects some people The proposal has the potential to make a contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p>
<p><b>Low impact</b> (The proposal or process might be equality relevant)</p>	<p>There is little evidence to suggest that the proposal could result in adverse impact The proposal operates in a limited way The proposal has consequences for or affects few people The proposal may have the potential to contribute to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p>

## Step 5 - Mitigating adverse impacts and maximising positive impacts

5.1	<b>Based on your findings, explain ways you plan to mitigate any unlawful prohibited conduct or unwanted adverse impact. Where positive impacts have been identified, what is been done to optimise opportunities to advance equality or foster good relations?</b>
<p>Where people with reduced mobility may be refused a dropped crossing due to the proposal not meeting the policy requirements, other solutions may be possible to implement such as the provision of an on-street disabled bay close to the dwelling.</p> <p>The policy aims to maintain good quality footway provision where possible for people with a disability/reduced mobility, people with pushchairs and children by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ensuring that adequate space is available on the drive accessed through the dropped crossing for vehicles not to overhang on the adopted highway/footway</li><li>• Ensuring that access to and from the driveway is safe for all users (considering visibility, manoeuvring, proximity to junctions, etc)</li><li>• Reducing the width of dropped crossings where possible whilst enabling shared crossings between neighbouring properties where applicable</li><li>• Retaining an area of footway without any slope where possible</li><li>• Ensuring that dropped crossings are constructed with limited gradient (slope) – no more than 1:10</li><li>• Ensuring that redundant crossings are reinstated, reducing the number of areas with a slope where possible</li></ul>	

## Step 6 – Recommendations and conclusions of the assessment

6.1	<b>Having considered the potential or actual impacts you should be in a position to make an informed judgement on what should be done. In all cases, document your reasoning that justifies your decision. There are four main options you can take:</b>
-----	--

- **No major change to the proposal** – the EIA demonstrates the proposal is robust. There is no potential for unlawful discrimination or adverse impact and you have taken all opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitor and review.
- **Adjust the proposal** – the EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. This involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance quality or to foster good relations.
- **Continue with the proposal** (despite the potential for adverse impact) – you should clearly set out the justifications for doing this and how you believe the decision is compatible with our obligations under the duty
- **Stop and remove the proposal** – if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you should consider stopping the proposal altogether. If a proposal leads to unlawful discrimination it should be removed or changed.

**Important:** If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason in the justification column.

<b>Option selected</b>	<b>Conclusions/justification</b>
No major change to the proposal	

**Step 7 – Summary of agreed actions resulting from the assessment**

8.1	<p><b>How will the impact of your proposal be monitored and improved upon going forward?</b> Consider how will you identify the impact of activities on protected characteristics and other marginalised groups going forward? How will any learning and enhancements be capitalised on and embedded?</p>		
	<p>Feedback from applicants and road users will be monitored for any equality issues.</p>		
7.1	<p><b>What action, by whom, will be undertaken as a result of the impact assessment.</b></p>		
	<p><b>Impact/issue</b></p>	<p><b>Action to be taken</b></p>	<p><b>Person responsible</b></p>
			<p><b>Timescale</b></p>

**Step 8 - Monitor, review and improve**

Feedback from applicants and road users will be monitored for any equality issues.