

A38 Derby Junctions
TR010022
Volume 6
6.8 Equality Impact Assessment

Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

April 2019

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A38 Derby Junctions
Development Consent Order 202[]

Equality Impact Assessment

| | |
|---|--|
| Regulation Number | Regulation 5(2)(q) |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010022 |
| Application Document Reference | 6.8 |
| Author | A38 Derby Junctions Project Team, Highways England |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | April 2019 | DCO Application |

| EQUALITY IMPACT SCREENING AND ASSESSMENT | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|----------------|
| Name of Practice/Policy | A38 Derby Junctions | Proposed or Current | Current |
| Person Completing the Assessment | | Callum Spence | |
| Directorate | | Major Projects (RIP Midlands) | |
| Date: March 2019 | | Eql Register Ref No: (Obtained from the EDI Advocate) | MPS97 |
| <p>The scheme will replace three roundabouts on the A38 in Derby with grade separated junctions to reduce high levels of congestion and improve safety.</p> <p>It will grade separate the three remaining major at-grade junctions on the A38 through Derby between the A38/A5148 junction (near Lichfield) and the M1(Junction 28). The scheme aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve journey times on this strategic route; • Improve journey reliability times along the A38; • Improve local journey times; • Improve safety; • Have a neutral or positive impact on the local environment. • Encourage economic growth. <p>Subject to securing a DCO, preliminary works are planned to start in late 2020, with the main construction works following in early 2021. The Scheme is due to fully open to traffic in 2024.</p> <p>Key stakeholders include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derby City Council and Councillors • Derbyshire County Council and Councillors • Erewash Borough Council (planning authority) • Highways England Area 7 Asset Team • Statutory Bodies; • Local action groups; • Local enterprise groups; • Large local businesses • University of Derby • Royal School for the Deaf Derby • Pauline Latham OBE MP • Breadsall Parish Council & Breadsall Action Group • Little Eaton Parish Council • Local residents • Property residents in Queensway and Ashbourne road • Euro garages (owners of Esso PFS at Markeaton junction) • McDonalds (at Markeaton junction) • MoD / Army Reserves <p>The customers affected are strategic road users and local road users including Pedestrians and Cyclists.</p> | | | |

| B: SCREENING (Stage 1) Questions considered to establish impacts from the outset for new or changing policies/practices | Sex | Religion or Belief | Age | Disability | Race | Sexual Orientation | Gender Re-assignment (include transsexual and transgender) | Pregnancy & Maternity | Marriage & Civil Partnership |
|--|-----|--------------------|-----|------------|------|--------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1: Is there any indication or evidence that different groups have different needs, experiences, issues or priorities in relation to the practice/policy? | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| 2: Is there evidence or an indication of higher or lower uptake by different groups? | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| 3: Do people have different levels of access? Are there social or physical barriers to participation (e.g. language, format, physical access)? | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| 4: Is there an opportunity to advance equality or foster good relations by altering the policy/practice? | N | N | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | |
| 5: Is there an opportunity to advance equality or foster good relations by working or engaging with other organisations or the wider community? | N | N | Y | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| 6: Is there stakeholder (staff, Trade Unions or public) concern about the policy/practice in terms of actual, perceived or potential discrimination against a particular group? | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| 7: Is there potential for, or evidence that any part of this policy/practice may adversely affect equality of opportunity for all or may harm good relations between different groups? | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| 8: Is there any potential for, or evidence that any part of the policy/practice could discriminate indirectly or directly? (Consider those who implement it on a daily basis). | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |

C: The rationale behind the rating (at Section B) and details of the evidence utilised to inform the screening decision.

This assessment has been carried out using Highways England's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion sifting Tool (EDIT) and available data from the 2011 census to further understand the demographics of the region. We have also used data collected from the public consultation held in February and March 2015. Using these data sources is considered enough evidence to provide a robust screening assessment in line with equality duty.

The EDIT tool uses hot spot mapping in an initial sift to identify whether it is likely that Equality, Diversity and Inclusion issues are likely to be a factor in the effective delivery of any scheme. At this stage the tool recommends that these issues may be a factor in the effective delivery of the A38 Derby Junctions scheme and therefore further steps will be conducted. The overall EDIT percentage that was generated was 61%.

The EDIT will be revisited and refined in conjunction with the EqIA in subsequent stages of the scheme.

To further investigate the impact on specific groups as mentioned in Section B of this assessment 2011 census data has been analysed to give an understanding of the potential impacts of the scheme given the known demographics of the area.

Derby is more ethnically diverse than the national average. There is no evidence or concern that the scheme will have an impact, negative or positive, on equality of opportunities.

Using neighbourhood data from the area surrounding the scheme show that there is a greater proportion of elderly (those aged over 65) around the scheme than the national average. 24% of those living in neighbourhoods (middle layer super output areas) adjacent to the scheme are at retirement age compared to the national average of 20% (June 2012 data used). This accounts for some of the increased engagement with the scheme from this demographic.

2015 Public Consultation,

36% of the questionnaires received in the public consultation are from retirement age persons which is higher than the proportion of the overall population that they are in the area. This shows an increased interest in the scheme. Their satisfaction with the proposed scheme is comparable to the average for all respondents. There are various sources of evidence that the elderly have become apathetic to the outcome of consultation because the scheme has been talked about since the 70's and there is doubt that it is going to happen. There is evidence in both the questionnaire responses and from public consultation events.

This is contrasted with only 2.5% of the respondents aged 16-24, far below the scheme surrounding area of 13%. This suggests that those in the 16-24 age range have filled a questionnaire only if they had strong feelings about the scheme. Out of these respondents there were significantly fewer that agreed with the need for improvements with only 58% agreeing compared to an average of 81%. The main reason for this is that they feel the pinch point scheme at Markeaton has improved the traffic flow enough. Only one of those that don't see a need for improvement attended the public consultation event. To engage with this age group, advertising and consultation material has been placed on social media in an effort to reach a younger demographic that uses social media as opposed to

traditional media sources.

The disabled generally showed the same satisfaction rate as the non-disabled apart from at Markeaton. 47% of this group were satisfied with the proposed option compared to an average of 58%. It cannot be attributed to the possible replacement of the footbridge as the support for the replacement is the same from the disabled as everyone else. There are large numbers of 'no preference' from the disabled with comments saying they do not use the junction. This suggests that they use this junction less than the rest of the respondents. There is an opportunity to improve accessibility for the disabled to bring their usage of the junction to expected levels. This can be included in Designated Funds schemes that run parallel to the main scheme. Examples such as a green foot bridge and a combined cycle/bridleway in Little Eaton will increase accessibility and address the needs of the local communities as well as increasing connectivity.

There was a lower response rate and a lower satisfaction rate among women than men in the public consultation questionnaire. None of the comments specified that there were disadvantaged because of their gender therefore there is no evidence for this to be attributed to any part of the scheme.

The incident statistics from 2007-2013 don't indicate vulnerability in a protected characteristic on the scheme site. This is partly because of the lack of detailed casualty information. There is however a vulnerability to cyclists on the scheme with 1 of the 8 serious injuries a cyclist (<http://www.road-injuries.info/map.html>).

This EqIA will be monitored at appropriate points during the PCF process. The EqIA will be revisited and refined where required in PCF Stage 4 prior to Stage Gate Assessment Review.

The performance of the implemented scheme will be measured in line with the Post Opening Project Evaluation (POPE) methodology this would include consideration of equality impacts as appropriate.

2018 Statutory Public Consultation

A further Statutory Public Consultation was carried out in September/October 2018, but due to the nature of the questions in the questionnaire, no further information relating to EDI protected characteristics such as age, gender or disability was obtained. Derby City Council was consulted from an EDI perspective to ensure accessibility of the consultation for all EDI stakeholders.

The consultations took place at seven locations across the areas surrounding the scheme. Building accessibility checklists were completed for each venue so that they were fully accessible and British Sign Language interpreters were provided at two venues located close to the Royal School for the Deaf Derby. This was to address them as an EDI stakeholder and was a recommendation from Derby City Council. Further information and questionnaires with free-post envelopes were provided both online and at eight locations around the scheme. This was to cater to anyone that did not attend the consultation event and to allow them to send feedback on the consultation. Links to the building accessibility checklists along with the consultation briefing pack are provided below.

| Confirmation – State whether a full equality impact assessment is required (Tick box as appropriate) | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|----------------|---|
| Yes | ✓ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjustment required to prevent potential discriminatory practice and to remove barriers to equality of opportunity. Further evidence/consultation required to enable a sound equality decision. <p>Proceed to Sections D – H</p> | | |
| No | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy/practice is robust in terms of equality. The impact on different groups is considered to be ‘neutral’ with no risk of discrimination and any minor impacts can be justified. <p>Proceed to Section E1 and Sign-off at H</p> | | |
| D: ASSESSMENT (Stage 2) | | | | |
| The level of impact on protected characteristics gauged from available information, research, consultation | | | | |
| Equality Group (Protected Characteristics) | Positive Impact | Negative Impact | Neutral Impact | Summary of reasons and evidence sources (data research and consultation) supporting this analysis |
| Sex | | | X | |
| Religion or Belief | | | X | |
| Age | | | X | |
| Disability | | X | | The Royal School for the Deaf Derby are looking to revise their access which brings it closer to our proposed roundabout. This is currently being investigated and we may need to agree departures from standards with HE SES. Engagement with them is ongoing to resolve this. |
| Race | | | X | |
| Sexual Orientation | | | X | |
| Gender Reassignment (Incl. Transsexual and Transgender) | | | X | |
| Pregnancy & Maternity | | | X | |
| Marriage & Civil Partnership | | | X | |

Potential Risks Identified – Including insufficient information to make robust decisions (Yes/No ticked as appropriate)

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| No | | |
| Yes (Mitigating action shown in Section F) | ✓ | Identified Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible severance for pedestrians and cyclists during construction • Reduction in access for the disabled and elderly during construction |

E: Options: The rationale behind the decision reached.

| | |
|---|---|
| E1: Proceed with the policy/practice because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the decision can be justified (At screening or in Section D) ○ there is no reasonable alternative ○ the Senior Reporting Officer/Programme Delivery Director is content to defend any potential challenge and is willing to sign-off in 1. Section H | ✓ |
| E2: Make adjustments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to demonstrate how activities will lead to a fair outcome (Ensure further evidence is gathered to ensure any barriers are removed and referenced in Sections F and G) | |
| E3: Withdraw it because there is obvious detriment (Sign Off in Section H) | |

F: Description of additional evidence, research and consultation undertaken, required, ongoing or captured. This is to ascertain how the policy or practice will advance equality, foster good relations and/or eliminate discrimination. Reference the evidence sources

| Activities to address any potential negative impacts or risks to deliver positive impacts | Provide activity completion dates |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| A WCHAR (Walking, Cycling & Horse-Riding Assessment Report) assessment is being produced to ensure that the scheme reduces severance compared to the current situation. | Preliminary Design, Stage 3 |

| Any crossings including footbridges and underpasses will comply with Access to and use of buildings: Approved Document M and all signalised crossings will include tactile paving and tactile cones. | Construction, Stage 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Continue to engage with stakeholders, such as the Royal School for the Deaf Derby, regularly to ensure that they bring forward any concerns they have. This will be done in line with the communications plan. Regular newsletters are also produced to engage with as many of the public as possible. This engagement will continue in the construction phase. | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Only where available and only where appropriate in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) include photographic evidence or links to the difference made via the EqlA activity. E.g. images of a successful installation of footbridges, shared accessible footpaths. (Ignore if not appropriate or where no permissions to use images could be provided): N/A</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>G: <u>Monitoring (Stage 3)</u> Detail how you will monitor the actual outcomes of the policy/practice throughout the project lifecycle and explain how/when you will review them. Agreed actions to implement the findings of this assessment.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Monitoring Action</th> <th>By Whom</th> <th>By When</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Update the report</td> <td>Project Team</td> <td>PCF Stage 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Monitoring Action | By Whom | By When | Update the report | Project Team | PCF Stage 4 | | | | | | |
| Monitoring Action | By Whom | By When | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Update the report | Project Team | PCF Stage 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>H: Sign-off by Highways England Senior Responsible Owner (SRO), or for Major Project schemes, the Programme Delivery Director (PDD), (or the Programme Internal Sponsor or Project Sponsor if the PDD has delegated sign-off).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Name</td> <td>Graham Littlechild</td> <td rowspan="2">Date</td> <td rowspan="2">19/03/2019</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Job Title</td> <td>Senior Project Manager</td> </tr> </table> | | Name | Graham Littlechild | Date | 19/03/2019 | Job Title | Senior Project Manager | | | | | | |
| Name | Graham Littlechild | Date | 19/03/2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job Title | Senior Project Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Revision date: 12 March 2018