

## Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

### Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

<b>Name of Policy/Project/Decision</b>	Road Safety Scheme programme for 2025/2026
<b>Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)</b>	Kenneth Asquith
<b>Department/Team</b>	Transportation
<b>Proposed Implementation Date</b>	April 2025 – March 2026
<b>Author of the EqlA</b>	Kenneth Asquith
<b>Date of the EqlA</b>	18/03/2025

<b>1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?</b>
<p>The main purpose of the proposed report submission is for the decision to approve the ITB4 programme of road safety works for 2025-2026</p> <p>The outcomes of which would be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Reduce the number of injury collisions taking place at hotspot locations in the borough therefore reducing costs to society and reducing road danger.</li> <li>b) Improve Road Safety around schools therefore reducing improving road safety and reducing road danger.</li> <li>c) Introducing speed reduction measures to improve road safety</li> <li>d) Providing pedestrian facilities at key locations on the road network in Bury to improve road safety for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians and to increase permeability of the network for such road users.</li> </ul>

## Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

<b>2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?</b>
<p>Employees: <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Community/Residents: <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: <b>Yes</b></p> <p>If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.</p>
<b>2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation</b>
<p><b>Documentary Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Schemes selected are based around guidance around the selection of schemes by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) as ITB4 funding is provided by them and not by the Council.</li> <li>ii) <a href="#">The schemes chosen also support the 'Vision Zero' proposals of TfGM regarding injury collision targets for the whole of the Greater Manchester area.</a></li> <li>iii) The selected schemes also fit in to the aims and objectives of Bury's Road Safety Plan</li> <li>iv) Some of the schemes selected also tie in with Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control's (GMUTC) vision of providing pedestrian facilities at most intersections in the borough and also modernising old Pelican Crossings to new Pelican Crossings</li> </ul>
<p><b>Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v) Some schemes have been selected based on injury collision history records using the GMAXI injury collision analysis system</li> <li>vi) Other schemes have been selected based on priority assessment lists related to speed information, evidence of rat running traffic, footfall levels, Police concerns and existing injury collision information</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stakeholder information/consultation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vii) Any proposed scheme will be subject to scrutiny by the Council's Traffic Management Unit ( TMU ). This is a bi-monthly meeting that senior engineers attend, the Police, Emergency Services, Legal Services and TfGM ( primarily</li> </ul>

- representing the Bus companies). If a scheme is endorsed by TMU then it can progress to the next stage of consultation or implementation.
- viii) Where appropriate, informal consultation exercises will be undertaken with local residents and community groups who might immediately be impacted by any road safety schemes proposed.
  - ix) Local Councillors will be notified of any schemes proposed for informal consultation
  - x) Where appropriate, formal legal advertisement processes will be adhered to when progressing any scheme where it is relevant to do so.

**2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.**

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups? **N**
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic? **N**
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic? **N**
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal? **N**
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation? **N**
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)? **N**
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council? **N**

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
<b>Age</b>	The programme aims to improve road safety for people of all ages	Vision zero strategy aims and objectives		Positive
<b>Disability</b>	The programme aims to improve road safety for	Vision zero strategy aims and objectives		Positive

	people with limited mobility			
<b>Disability</b>	Disruption during works could affect accessibility and/or require longer journeys to alternate crossing points for people with limited mobility or accessibility needs		Each individual works will ensure accessibility is considered. Works on the programme will be for a limited time and alternate routes will be clearly signposted during works	Neutral
<b>Gender Reassignment</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Marriage and Civil Partnership</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Race</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Religion and Belief</b>	Access to places of worship may be disrupted during works		Each individual works will ensure access to places of worship is maintained safely during the works. Works on the programme will be for a limited time and alternate routes will be	Neutral

			clearly signposted during works	
<b>Sex</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Carers</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Looked After Children and Care Leavers</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Socio-economically vulnerable</b>	No impact identified			
<b>Veterans</b>	No impact identified			

#### **Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis**

<b>2.5 Characteristics</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Action Owner</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
N/a			

### **Section 3 - Impact Risk**

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

#### **3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)**

Impact x Likelihood = Score			Likelihood			
			1	2	3	4
			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

<b>Risk Level</b>	<b>No Risk = 0</b>	<b>Low Risk = 1 - 4</b>	<b>Medium Risk = 5 – 7</b>	<b>High Risk = 8 - 16</b>
-------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

<b>3.2 Level of risk identified</b>	2
<b>3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation</b>	i) Potential Objections to schemes at the Legal Stage ii) Potential rise in the Cost of schemes due to the 'Cost of Living Crisis'

#### Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

<b>4.1 Analysis Decision</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Reasons for This Decision</b>
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed	x	
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		

There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		
---	--	--

## Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager	Kenneth Asquith	18.03.2025	
Responsible Asst. Director/Director			
EDI	Lee Cawley	19.03.2025	QA Complete. Works will have an overall positive impact and improve road safety for all characteristics and circumstances. Accessibility may be disrupted during works however mitigations will ensure this is minimised as much as possible.

## EqIA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details