

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Linthorpe Road Cycleway Retention			
Coverage:	To cover the proposed retention of the cycleway on Linthorpe Road between Borough Road and Ayresome Street			
This is a decision relating to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Function
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process/procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> Programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organisational change	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)		
It is a:	New approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision of an existing approach:	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>Description:</p>	<p><u>Key aims, objectives and activities</u></p> <p>The aim of the report and assessment is to evaluate the options around the decision whether to retain the current infrastructure or remove it. This impact assessment sets out the likely understood impact of a decision to retain the infrastructure. A further impact assessment has been completed to assess the possible decision to remove the infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Statutory drivers</u></p> <p>As a Highway Authority, the Council has statutory duties, as set out within the Traffic Management Act 2004. “It is the duty of a Local Traffic Authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as is reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives;</p> <p>(a) Securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the Authority’s road network; and</p> <p>(b) Facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another Authority is the Traffic Authority.”</p> <p>The introduction of cycle facilities will allow the Council to provide safe, attractive facilities to encourage uptake of active, sustainable transport.</p> <p>The proposals follow Department for Transport (DfT) guidance in the form of LTN 1/20, which sets out the requirements to install quality infrastructure to enable more people to cycle safely and more often.</p> <p><u>Differences from any previous approach</u></p> <p>Retaining the corridor layout will not result in any changes.</p> <p><u>Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries</u> (internal and external as appropriate)</p> <p>Key stakeholders include Residents, Businesses, Politicians, Council Officers, Public Transport operators, disability groups, taxis, Emergency services, Tees Valley Combined Authority and visitors to the area</p> <p><u>Intended outcomes</u></p> <p>This impact assessment sets out the impact of the proposal to retain the infrastructure will allow the increase in sustainable modes, and ensure that accident levels have the best possible chance of remaining low. A solution to address the trip hazard can be implemented should the infrastructure be retained. The scheme has witnessed the following positive statistics since implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 48% increase in the number of cycles on average per day. - 17% increase in the number of pedestrians on average per day. - 2% increase in the number of cars on average per day. - 7% increase in the number of movements overall on average per day. - 9% reduction in cycling related accidents.
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>February 2025</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Date of next review:	N/A
-----------------------------	-----

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>The project aims to improve access to sustainable transport for all residents. This will assist in improving accessibility to education, employment, training, retail and leisure facilities by making reasonable adjustments to services provided to new proposals, and retrofitting existing infrastructure, and therefore not impact negatively upon human rights.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the Human Rights Act 1998.</p>
Equality Could the decision result in adverse differential impacts on groups or individuals with characteristics protected in UK equality law? Could the decision impact differently on other commonly disadvantaged groups?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>The infrastructure was installed to include recommendations identified from a pre-scheme EIA. This included the creation of disabled car parking spaces to mitigate the impact of a reduction in general capacity. Retaining the infrastructure as is will retain the disabled parking spaces recommended.</p> <p>Since implementation, there has been some discussion from the RNIB that the bus stop provision is not suitable for visual impairment as it requires users to cross the cycleway to access the waiting facility. There are zebra crossings at the locations with the required tactile paving and other infrastructure to support accessibility, but poor behaviour (not giving way by cyclists) remains a problem globally. The provision however fits with LTN 1/20 guidelines relating the government policy.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that there are any adverse impacts upon equality.</p> <p>Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this continues to be accessible to people from all disadvantaged groups.</p>
Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*	☒	☐	☐	<p>Although the project has received criticism, there is no evidence to suggest that retaining the infrastructure will impact negatively upon relationships between different community groups. Businesses are opposed to the infrastructure as they claim there is a detrimental impact upon them, however this is unsubstantiated. This project will help to maintain sustainable access routes to communities and safe road networks. Anti-social and illegal behaviour (failing to give way to pedestrians on Zebra crossings at bus stop islands) remains a global problem, and could create community tension between highway users. This is not an issues specific to this scheme, so it is anticipated that this will not create a specific cohesion issue.</p> <p>Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this continues to be accessible to all of the community.</p>

* Consult the Impact Assessment further guidance for details on the issues covered by each of these broad questions prior to completion.

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
Armed Forces Could the decision impact negatively on those who are currently members of the armed forces of former members in the areas of Council delivered healthcare, compulsory education and housing policies?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	People who access services such as Council delivered Healthcare, compulsory education and housing typically are less affluent, and less likely to have access to a private car. The retention of infrastructure that supports social mobility will assist these people accessing services. Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this continues to be accessible to Armed Forces.
Care leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	People who have been supported by care are typically are less affluent, and less likely to have access to a private car. The retention of infrastructure that supports social mobility will assist these people accessing services. Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this continues to be accessible to Care Leavers.
Next steps: ➡ If the answer to all of the above screening questions is No then the process is completed. ➡ If the answer of any of the questions is Yes or Uncertain, then a Level 2 Full Impact Assessment must be completed.				

Assessment completed by:	Chris Orr	Head of Service:	Craig Cowley
Date:	16 th January 2025	Date:	16 th January 2025