

# Public Document Pack



Contact: Jacqui Hurst  
Cabinet Secretary  
Direct : 020 8379 4096  
or Ext:4096  
e-mail: [jacqui.hurst@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jacqui.hurst@enfield.gov.uk)  
Date: 8 February 2016

To All Members of the Cabinet

**Cabinet – Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2016: Part 1 Agenda – “To Follow” Pack – 2<sup>nd</sup> Despatch**

Please find attached the following document listed as “To Follow” on the Cabinet Part 1 agenda for the meeting on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2016:

**Agenda Item 9 – Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A105 – Appendix E – Predictive Equalities Impact Assessment**

Yours sincerely,

*Jacqui Hurst*

Jacqui Hurst (Democratic Services)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

<b>Department:</b>	Regeneration & Environment	<b>Service:</b>	Traffic & Transportation
<b>Title of decision:</b>	Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105	<b>Date completed:</b>	11/01/16
<b>Author:</b>	Paul Rogers	<b>Contact details:</b>	<a href="mailto:paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk">paul.rogers@enfield.gov.uk</a> 020 8379 3340

### Equality Act 2010 – Section 149

#### Public sector equality duty

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have 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.
- (2) A person who is not a public authority but who exercises public functions must, in the exercise of those functions, have due regard to the matters mentioned in subsection (1).
- (3) Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
  - (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
  - (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
  - (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- (4) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.
- (5) Having due regard to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
  - (a) tackle prejudice, and

(b) promote understanding.

(6) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

(7) The relevant protected characteristics are—

age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

(8) A reference to conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act includes a reference to—

(a) a breach of an equality clause or rule;

(b) a breach of a non-discrimination rule.

(9) Schedule 18 (exceptions) has effect.

**Type of change being proposed:** (please tick)

New project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy change or new policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grants and commissioning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget change	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

**1** *Describe the change, why it is needed, what is the objective of the change and what is the possible impact of the change:*

**Background**

With traffic levels increasing year on year, air quality will get worse and Enfield's roads will eventually grind to a halt. This will be exacerbated by the expected increase in the population by an additional 80,000 by 2040. Doing nothing is not an option. The Cycle Enfield programme is an opportunity to start addressing these problems by enabling residents to consider making journeys by bike instead of the car. Cyclists are able to make more efficient use of road space relative to all other modes of surface transport except buses and do not emit pollution. Cycle Enfield will also enable us to make significant public realm improvements at town centres along the route, thereby making them more attractive and encourage people to spend more time and money in local shops and restaurants.

Cycle Enfield is about delivering a network of safe, direct and legible cycle routes and a programme of supportive measures to encourage more people to cycle. This will deliver many economic, environmental, health and transport benefits for local residents and businesses.

Between 17 July and 9 October 2015, Enfield Council undertook a public consultation on the A105 scheme. We wrote to all properties within 400 metres of the proposed route, inviting local residents and business owners/managers to attend an exhibition and participate in the consultation. We also consulted residents associations, disability groups, cycling groups, the Police, London Ambulance Service and London Fire Brigade, transport user groups and bus operators. Detailed information on the proposals was published at <http://cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say/a105-scheme-consultation>. We provided copies of the consultation documents to those people that requested them in hard copy and accessible formats e.g. large print, Braille and audio.

The focus of the A105 consultation was about shaping the scheme to provide high quality, segregated facilities to encourage more people to cycle whilst meeting the needs of residents, businesses and visitors to Enfield. Enfield Council received a total of 1,646 responses to the A105 consultation. The majority of respondents supported the overall proposals with 50.7% (835) fully supporting and 8.6% (142) partially supporting the scheme. 38.9% of respondents (640) did not support the scheme and 1.8% (29) either had no opinion or were unsure.

### **Proposal**

The A105 is the first of our main road cycling schemes and involves the installation of lightly segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the A105 between Enfield Town and Palmers Green. Additional traffic lights will be installed to remove conflicts and enable cyclists to pass safely through junctions. The scheme also involves significant public realm improvements at Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill, the creation of two minor areas of 'shared space', installation of new zebra crossings, side road entry treatments, raised tables and the remodelling of key junctions. To accommodate the new cycle lanes, it will be necessary to remove all central refuges, two sections of bus lane and approximately 70 kerb-side parking spaces. Relevant guidance, best practice and further engagement with stakeholder groups will help to develop the detailed designs and address comments and concerns raised by or on behalf of older people and those with disabilities.

Officers have carefully considered the concerns and issues raised in the consultation with respect to equalities, and have already made a number of design changes, e.g. the introduction of buffer strips at bus stop boarders. Any remaining concerns will be addressed during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation.

### **Comments from Key Stakeholders**

Below are common issues raised by respondents, with officer responses shown in italics:

Concerns about response times for emergency service vehicles

*Officers met with the Metropolitan Police and London Fire Brigade to discuss possible impacts of the scheme on their emergency response times. No concerns were raised at these meetings or via the consultation. London Ambulance Service have so far turned down our repeated requests for a meeting. However, there will be other opportunities for them to provide comments during the statutory consultation.*

Concerns about the effects of the scheme on shops and businesses

*Loading bays at Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green will be retained in their existing locations. At Lodge Drive car park, we will create 20 new parking bays. These will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy. At Ford's Grove car park, we will introduce pay & display parking to increase turnover of parking spaces. As at Lodge Drive, 20 parking bays will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy.*

Concerns about the effects of the scheme on the night time economy

*Loading bays at Winchmore Hill and Palmers Green will be retained in their existing locations. At Lodge Drive car park, we will create 20 new parking bays. These will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy. At Ford's Grove car park, we will introduce pay & display parking to increase turnover of parking spaces. As at Lodge Drive, 20 parking bays will be free for the first 45 minutes to enable people to visit local shops and takeaways. After 6.30 pm parking will be free to support the evening economy.*

Concerns about cyclist behaviour

*These will be addressed by cycle training and enforcement*

Concerns about a lack of parking close to shops

*As much on-street parking as possible is retained given the need to maintain continuous segregated cycle facilities. Additional parking is provided in Lodge Drive car park and Fords Grove car park will be managed to better support the town centre.*

Concerns about the level of provision of disabled parking

*Apart from the disabled bays in Lodge Drive and Ford's Grove car parks, there are currently no disabled parking bays along the A105. We will review disabled parking provision during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation, including looking at the need for additional dedicated bays for blue badge holders in side roads. Although not directly raised during the consultation it is acknowledged that some blue badge holders may be parking on the residential sections of the A105 even through there are no dedicated bays at present. This will be addressed at the detailed design stage and footway crossovers provided (subject to planning permission being granted) where parking is displaced by Cycle Enfield and parking can be safely provided off-street.*

Concerns about Dial-a-Ride services

*Dial a Ride vehicles will be able to stop briefly in cycle lanes to pick up and set down passengers*

Concerns about loading

*The loading bays at Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill will all be retained in their existing locations.*

Concerns about the arrangements for pedestrians at bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes

*Bus stop boarders and bus stop by-passes have been successfully introduced in Camden, Central London and Lewes. Accident rates did not go up and people soon got used to the new arrangements. As a result of comments received, we have incorporated a 500mm wide buffer between the kerb and the cycle lane at most bus stop boarders.*

Concerns about the removal of informal crossing points and central refuges

*The proposals involve installing new zebra crossings and replacing some informal crossings with zebra crossings*

Conflict with the blind and partially sighted

*We will follow the relevant guidance during the detailed design phase.*

Allocation of spending

*The funding can only be used to deliver the Mayor's Cycling Vision for London.*

Below are the comments of disabilities groups consulted relevant to the EQIA. Officer responses are shown in italics.

### **Over 50s forum**

The Enfield Over 50's forum partially supports the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105 and submitted the following comments:

We have no problem with the idea of the A105 corridor being safe for cyclists. However we are concerned about pedestrians getting off buses and having to cross the cycle lane to reach the pavement. In addition we oppose the loss of on-street parking, for residents on the route as well as for businesses, and the lack of convenient stopping places for service vehicles, e.g. minibuses picking up elderly or disabled people from their homes, because of the restriction of parking kerbside where there is a cycle lane. This is of particular concern because those who use such vehicles are less able physically, often have sight difficulty and find a particular problem in inclement weather.

*Officers have addressed these concerns by:*

- *Improving the design of most of the bus boarders so they incorporate a buffer strip between the bus and the cycle lane.*
- *Minimising the loss of parking in residential sections and allowing blue badge holders and dial-a-ride vehicles to park in the cycle lane to set down and pick up.*
- *Providing additional parking in Lodge Drive and Ford's Grove car parks which will be free for blue badge holders.*
- *Reviewing the provision of parking for blue badge holders as part of the development of detailed design.*

### **Guide Dogs for the Blind**

Guide Dogs for the Blind do not support the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105 and submitted the following comments. The comments provide a useful checklist of issues to be addressed as part of the detailed design but officers' initial responses are set out below in italics.

Shared surface streets

The shared space concept is intended to be a way to provide an attractive environment, with slower traffic, less street clutter and a people friendly space. All of which we would support. However, one of the ways of implementing a shared space scheme is by introducing a shared surface street, sometimes called a level surface. This is where the footway and carriageway are of the same level with no kerb upstand. There may also be on uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.

*The shared space concept has only been applied to two lightly trafficked service roads along the A105. These will be carefully designed to mitigate the concerns of people with impaired vision and mobility.*

## Key concerns:

- You have to make eye contact

Pedestrians, motorists and cyclists have to make 'eye contact' to decide who moves first. This obviously compromises the safety, independence and confidence of blind and partially sighted people. Blind and partially sighted people face a similar problem when crossing a standard road. *However, bringing the road up to footway level will lead to drivers being more cautious and improve safety for all road users.*

- People rely on the kerb

Blind and partially sighted people, particularly guide dog owners and long cane users, use the kerb as a navigation clue to know where they are in a street.

*A low kerb will be incorporated at the detailed design stage to provide a navigation clue.*

## Tactile paving

Tactile paving should be provided at signal controlled crossings; dropped kerbs; or where the footway and carriageway are level at a junction; top and bottom of steps; at station platforms; and shared cycle and pedestrian routes. It is important that the appropriate tactile paving surface is used and the correct specification followed. All the different types and the recommended layout are provided in the Department for Transport 'Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces'.

*We will follow best practice where applying tactile paving to the A105 scheme at the detailed design stage.*

## Pedestrian crossings

Controlled crossings should be provided and must have visual, audible and tactile signals. In addition they must have tactile paving as recommended in the 'Guidance on the use to tactile paving surfaces'.

*A number of new controlled pedestrian crossings are proposed in the A105 scheme and these will be of great benefit to the visually and mobility impaired. These will all be constructed with the relevant visual, audible and tactile signals and paving.*

## Street furniture

Street furniture should be provided in a consistent pattern and not create obstructions on the footway. They should have good contrasting features and at the same time not cause glare as can be the case with stainless steel.



*The A105 proposals provide an excellent opportunity to declutter the high streets and provide a consistent pattern of street furniture.*

#### Visual contrast

Material, features and street furniture should have good tonal and colour contrast to enhance visibility for blind and partially sighted people with some residual vision. In addition, they should retain their contrasting features in wet and dull weather conditions. Uniform lighting is also essential and should enhance the street environment at night.

*These principles will be applied at the design stage.*

#### Bus Stop By-passes

We understand that from a cycle safety point of view, this is a positive design, to segregate them from the traffic, and allow an easy approach to the bus stop for buses. However, Transport for London/Enfield Borough Council has a duty of care to pedestrians, especially, in this case blind and partially sighted pedestrians - in its current form, we don't believe that has happened.

*We believe that the current design for bus boarders does make it clear that pedestrians have right of way. However we will carefully consider all the points made by Guide Dogs for the Blind at the detailed design stage and make amendments where necessary.*

#### **Royal National Institute for the Blind**

The RNIB do not support the Cycle Enfield proposals and provided some general comments. Concerns were expressed about inaccessible crossings, a negative impact on public transport and the disruptive impact arising from proposed changes to the locations of crossings.

*These comments will be addressed during the detailed design phase, building on the more detailed comments provided by Guide Dogs for the Blind.*

#### **Age UK**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Age UK*

#### **Enfield Disability Action**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Enfield Disability Action*

#### **Enfield Vision**

*No comments or suggestions were received from Enfield Vision*

## 2 Do you carry out equalities monitoring of your service? If No please state why?

The 'service' in this instance relates to users of the A105 corridor, including residents, businesses and community uses located along the route. However, there is limited specific information about the characteristics of the range of service users, which includes private vehicle users; taxis/minicab users; bus users; dial-a-ride users; pedestrians and cyclists. This is partly due to the range of organisations involved in providing services and partly due to the difficulty in collecting relevant equalities monitoring data.

Some context about the areas served by the A105 corridor is provided in the 2011 Census and the analysis included in the [ward profiles](#) for Bush Hill Park, Grange, Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill wards. The table below summarises some of the relevant characteristics of the key indicators and compares these to the borough average:

	<b>Aged 65+</b>	<b>Health/Disability<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Borough</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>
Bush Hill Park	18.0%	7.1%
Grange	19.7%	6.2%
Palmers Green	13.8%	7.4%
Winchmore Hill	15.3%	6.3%

1. Persons with long term health problems/disability - limiting a lot

This suggests that a higher than average proportion of people living in the four wards are 65 or over (particularly in Grange and Bush Hill Park wards). It is also clear that a significant number of residents have a long term health problem or disability that is significantly limiting, albeit the proportion are either around or below the borough average..

The section below summarises the equalities monitoring carried out in relation to the A105 consultation itself. This highlights the support/partial support for the scheme falls below 50% for those aged 60 and above; that men are more positive about the proposals than women; and that the majority of disabled people did not support the proposal. To address these concerns there will need to be continuing engagement with all affected parties, both to help inform the detailed designs and to address identified issues and concerns post-implementation.

### **Protected characteristic: Age**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 3.2% (53) are aged 0-24, 77.2% (1,271) are aged 25-64, 18.3% (302) are 65 and above and 1.2% (20) preferred not to say.

Below is a table showing how the level of support for the proposals varies with age. The table excludes the responses of 20 people who preferred not to tell us their age.

Level of support	Age Group																	
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-84	85+
Support	2	9	5	6	16	51	101	128	111	104	108	73	50	43	13	6	2	0
Don't support	0	0	0	4	10	19	19	29	48	63	79	77	84	86	57	22	17	10
Partially support	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	10	15	14	18	17	18	16	7	3	5	4
Not sure	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	2	1	1	1
No opinion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total	2	9	5	10	27	74	136	167	174	183	206	171	160	151	79	32	25	15

From the above table it is apparent that:

- Respondents aged 50-54 submitted more responses than any other group
- 100% of respondents aged 14 and under support the proposals.
- The level of support (full + partial) decreases with age and dips below 50% at 60 years of age

**Protected characteristic: gender**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 56.3% (927) are male, 42.0% (691) are female, 0.4% (6) are transgender and 1.3% (22) preferred not to say.

Below is a breakdown showing how the level of support for the proposals varies by gender.

Level of Support	Gender			
	Female	Male	Prefer not to say	Transgender
Support	308	518	5	4
Don't support	308	315	15	2
Partially support	62	79	0	0
Not sure	13	12	2	0
No opinion	0	3	0	0
Total	691	927	22	6

From the above table it is apparent that:

- 53.5% of women who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)
- 64.4% of men who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)
- 66.7% of transgender people who responded to the consultation support the proposals (full + partial)

**Protected characteristic: disability**

Of the 1,646 people who responded to the consultation 2.9% (48) are limited a lot by a health problem or disability, 6.6% (109) are limited a little by a health problem or disability, 86.8% (1,428) are not affected by a health problem or disability and 3.7% (61) preferred not to say.

Below is a breakdown showing the level of support for the proposals from respondents who have a health problem or disability.

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Number of respondents with a health problem/ disability</b>
Support	48
Don't support	88
Partially support	18
Not sure	3
No opinion	0
Total	157

From the above table it is apparent that 42.0% of respondents with a health problem or disability support the proposals (full + partial), 56.1% don't support the proposals and 1.9% are not sure. Some of their concerns, such as those relating to bus stop boarders, have already begun to be addressed and any remaining concerns will be addressed during the detailed design phase and statutory consultation.

<b>3. Equalities Impact</b> <b>Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group</b>	Disability	Gender	Age	Race	Religion & Belief	Sexual Orientation	Gender reassignment	Pregnancy & Maternity	Marriage & Civil Partnerships
Does equalities monitoring of your service show people from the following groups benefit from your service? (recipients of the service, policy or budget, and the proposed change) <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Could the proposal discriminate, directly or indirectly these groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could this proposal affect access <u>to information</u> about your service by different groups in the community?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Could the proposal have an adverse impact on relations between different groups?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

<sup>1</sup> Although not directly supported by primary data, it is likely that all of the protected groups are users of the A105 corridor

If Yes answered above – please describe the impact of the change (including any positive impact on equalities) and what the service will be doing to reduce the negative impact it will have.

\*If you have ticked yes to discrimination, please state how this is justifiable under legislation.

The two protected groups impacted by the A105 proposals are Age and Disability. The preliminary designs have been amended to take account of comments, concerns and suggestions received and thereby prevent, reduce or mitigate any negative impacts as follows. Further changes will be made during the detailed design phase following input from specialist consultants and/or representatives of relevant organisations.

## Protected characteristic: Age

### Positive Impacts

- Providing segregated facilities will have a positive impact by enabling people of all ages to cycle.
- Replacing informal crossings with zebra crossings will have a positive impact by making it safer for people of all ages to cross the A105
- Supporting measures such as the Bush Hill Park inclusive cycling scheme and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

### Negative Impacts

Impact	Mitigation
Possible conflict with cyclists at bus stop boarders	Installation of buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving to inform cyclists that they are entering an area used by pedestrians and must give priority to pedestrians. Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.
Possible conflict with cyclists if pedestrians drift into parallel cycle track and vice versa	Existing footway widths have been maintained (including those in town centres) and new cycle tracks will be designed with a contrasting surface and clear markings to minimise risk.
Longer distance to walk to some bus stops	Most bus stops are kept in or close to their current locations. However, the current northbound stop close to The Fox is moved further away from Skinners Court extra care flats, but is still within TfL's 400m standard.
Loss of pedestrian refuges	Existing pedestrian refuges have been replaced with zebra crossings where feasible and new zebra crossings introduced. The general narrowing of traffic lanes is also expected to result in reduced speeds along the corridor, potentially making it safer to cross away from formal crossing points.
Change in road layout could result in short term uncertainty whilst all road users adapt to the new road layout	Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following the opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.

## Protected characteristic: Disability

### Positive Impacts

- Replacing informal crossings with zebra crossings will have a positive impact by making it safer and easier for people with disabilities to cross the A105.
- Side road entry treatments in Palmers Green town centre will make it easier for wheelchair users and people with restricted mobility to cross the side roads
- Supporting measures such as the Bush Hill Park inclusive cycling scheme and cycle training for older adults may encourage more to take up cycling and remain physically active.

### Negative Impacts

Impact	Mitigation
Possible conflict with cyclists at bus stop boarders	Installation of buffer strips, ramps, signage and distinctive paving to inform cyclists that they are entering an area used by pedestrians and must give priority to pedestrians. Publicity campaign to be launched prior to and following opening of route to inform pedestrians and cyclists how to use the new facilities.
Possible conflict with other roads users in 'shared space' areas.	Shared surface treatments are only proposed in two lightly traffic service roads on the A105. The detailed designs will be developed in conjunction with local groups and or specialist advisers, but will involve the use of contrasting materials, tactile surfaces, low kerbs and other measures to help blind and partially sighted pedestrians navigate safely.
Loss of parking for blue badge holders	Blue badge holders will continue to be able to park in marked bays on-street and in off-street car parks for free. Dedicated blue badge bays could be included in the final design or post-implementation if necessary.  Footway crossovers will be provided on the residential sections of the A105 (subject to obtaining planning permission) to enable people, including blue badge holders to park off-street where practicable.
Reduced opportunity for dial-a-ride,	The traffic orders will be drafted to enable Dial-a-Ride vehicles and taxis and minicabs



taxi/minicabs to pick up and set down	transporting Taxicard holders to set down and pick in the cycle lane. The maximum period that such a vehicle can stop will be determined in consultation with relevant disability groups.
Change in road layout could result in short term uncertainty and confusion whilst all road users adapt to the new road layout	Prior to completion, targeted engagement with a wide range of local disability groups to raise awareness of the scheme and its possible impacts. Post completion, provision of advice and/or training in use of new facilities.

<b>4. Tackling Socio-economic inequality</b> Indicate Yes, No or Not Known for each group	Communities living in deprived wards/areas	People not in employment, education or training	People with low academic qualifications	People living in social housing	Lone parents	People on low incomes	People in poor health	Any other socio-economic factor Please state;
Will the proposal specifically impact on communities disadvantaged through the following socio-economic factors?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Does the service or policy contribute to eliminating discrimination, promote equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Could this proposal affect access to your service by different groups in the community?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	
<p>If Yes answered above – please describe the impact (including any positive impact on social economic inequality) and any mitigation if applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people living in deprived wards/areas by improving air quality and personal health and fitness. Any shift from public transport or car use to cycling has the potential to increase financial resilience by reducing spend on travel costs.</li> </ul>								

- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people who are currently unemployed by making it easier for them to attend training courses and job interviews.
- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people with low incomes as travelling by bike is a cheaper alternative than travelling by car or public transport.
- The A105 scheme will have a positive impact on people in poor health by improving air quality, increasing physical activity and helping to tackle obesity. Physical activity has been shown to reduce long-term conditions (heart disease, diabetes, musculo-skeletal problems, mental illness by 20 – 40% depending on the condition).

## **5. Review**

How and when will you monitor and review the effects of this proposal?

Monitoring and evaluation will take place throughout the life of the scheme.

Due to the difficulty in obtaining primary data about the characteristics of users of the A105 corridor, monitoring will take the form of continued engagement with key stakeholders representing the interests of older people and disabled people. One option would be the setting up of an equalities advisory group(s) to initially advise on the detailed design of the scheme, to provide feedback on its impact once implemented and to help identify further practical mitigation measures.

## Enfield Council Predictive Equality Impact Assessment/Analysis

### Action plan template for proposed changes to service, policy or budget

Title of decision: Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105

Team: Traffic & Transportation


Department: Regeneration & Environment

Service manager: David B Taylor

Identified Issue	Action Required	Lead Officer	Timescale/ By When	Costs	Review Date/ Comments
Stakeholder engagement	Hold Partnership Board meetings at key points Improve dialogue with disability groups and others to help inform detailed designs and throughout construction period	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Continue to minimise equalities barriers throughout detailed design, statutory consultation and implementation	Review/benchmark with models of good practice and attend training and workshops if appropriate  Establish specialist advisory group or seek specialist consultancy support to assist with the detailed design of the scheme	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Scheme publicity	Develop campaign aimed at relevant protected	Traffic & Transportation	During construction and after opening of	Fully funded by Transport for London	

	groups to highlight the changes to the road layout		relevant sections of A105 route		
Monitoring	Establish local stakeholder group(s) to provide feedback on the impact of scheme on relevant protected groups	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Access to service for all	Continue to promote cycling to relevant protected groups to increase take up of cycling	Traffic & Transportation	Ongoing	Fully funded by Transport for London	
Retrospective EQIA	Arrange for a retrospective EQIA to be carried in conjunction with relevant stakeholders/special advisors.	Traffic & Transportation	01/11/2017	Fully funded by Transport for London	

**Date to be Reviewed:** .....

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. D. Cragg", is written on a light-colored rectangular background.

**APPROVAL BY THE RELEVANT ASSISTANT DIRECTOR - NAME: Bob Griffiths    SIGNATURE:.....**

.....

**This form should be emailed to [joanne.stacey@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:joanne.stacey@enfield.gov.uk) and be appended to any decision report that follows.**

This page is intentionally left blank