

Template for Impact Assessment Level 1: Initial screening assessment

Subject of assessment:	Linthorpe Road Cycleway Removal			
Coverage:	To cover the proposed removal 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Description:

Key aims, objectives and activities

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 retain the infrastructure

Statutory drivers

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;

- (a) Securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the Authority's road network; and
- (b) Facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another Authority is the Traffic Authority."

The introduction of cycle facilities will allow the Council to provide safe, attractive facilities to encourage uptake of active, sustainable transport.

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.

Differences from any previous approach

The Council has not reversed a scheme of this size on the basis of Political decision alone.

Key stakeholders and intended beneficiaries (internal and external as appropriate)

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.

Intended outcomes

Removal will create more car parking/loading space along the corridor, and remove the issues raised surrounding pedestrian safety from those tripping on infrastructure crossing at non designated crossing points.

Live date:	November 2025, pending construction requirements
Lifespan:	N/A
Date of next review:	N/A

Screening questions	Response			Evidence
	No	Yes	Uncertain	
<p>Human Rights Could the decision impact negatively on individual Human Rights as enshrined in UK legislation?*</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project will remove sustainable transport infrastructure in support of additional vehicular capacity. This will improve accessibility to the local economy, however will reduce access to the wider Town Centre for those without access to private cars.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of the Human Rights Act 1998.</p>
<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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The infrastructure that was installed considered the needs of those with disabilities (mobility and visual impairment for example) by creating disabled car parking spaces to ensure accessibility in light of the removal of parking spaces for those with blue badges. There is no indication from the proposed layout that this provision will be retained, although there will be an increase in capacity for all vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will re-open carriageway junctions with Linthorpe Road, at Southfield Lane and Albert Terrace increasing the number of junctions that must be crossed by visually impaired. These junctions that are currently continuous footway will be reverted back to un-controlled crossings, which is detrimental to those with disabilities. This is particularly pertinent to Albert Terrace, as the off-set crossroad junction arrangement creates difficulty for vehicular movements.</p> <p>The plans also indicate that junctions that were narrowed to reduce vehicular speed and reduce crossing point distance are to be re-widened. This creates a safety issue for vulnerable road users as it will take longer to cross the road, and vehicular speed will be increased.</p> <p>The on-carriage protected cycleway physically separates different highway users, reducing the risk of collision. The removal of this protected space will create a less safe environment for vulnerable road users, such as cyclists and pedestrians. Pavement cycling is raised often as an issue from all highway users. The removal of the infrastructure is likely to increase incidents of pavement cycling due to the concerns of cycles and vehicles mixing on carriageway. Although this is illegal, it is incredibly difficult to enforce, and will likely increase incidents, which is a particular concern to those with visual impairment.</p> <p>Creating a vehicular-centric highway corridor will increase the accessibility and subsequent volume of vehicles on the corridor. This will create a more congested environment, further compounding the issues associated with Road Safety for cyclists on the carriageway, and pedestrians attempting to cross roads.</p> <p>The removal of the pedestrian signalised crossing that was installed at Clifton Street will reduce the capability for vulnerable Road users to cross the road. This will reduce designated crossing points along the corridor from 5 to 4 (20% reduction)</p> <p>The current bus stop alignment has created bus stop islands, which requires pedestrians to cross the cycleway to access. This has been raised as a concern by disability groups, and the removal would be advantageous.</p> <p>Evidence used to inform this assessment includes analysis of statutory guidance in relation to accessibility, including the Access for All legislation and from viewing the proposed infrastructure plans.</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
<p>Community cohesion Could the decision impact negatively on relationships between different groups, communities of interest or neighbourhoods within the town?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The community was consulted on the removal of the scheme, which identified that the majority were in favour of removal. The area is typically less affluent than the rest of the Borough, and car ownership is significantly lower in this area. Removing infrastructure that supports social mobility may present an accessibility barrier to those that do not have access to a private vehicle. This may create tension between those with and without vehicular accessibility, and reduction in accessibility to services.</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 may not continue to be accessible to people from all disadvantaged groups, as the infrastructure will be altered.</p>
<p>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?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>It is possible that this group of people will be impacted upon negatively. 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 removal of infrastructure that supports social mobility may act as a barrier to these people accessing services.</p> <p>Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the removal of current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this may not continue to be accessible to Armed Forces, as the infrastructure will be altered.</p>
<p>Care leavers Could the decision impact negatively on those who are care experienced?*</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>It is possible that this group of people will be impacted upon negatively. People who have been supported by care are typically are less affluent, and less likely to have access to a private car. The removal of infrastructure that supports social mobility may act as a barrier to these people accessing services.</p> <p>Evidence to support this assessment includes analysis of the removal of current provision which allows all people to use the facilities. The proposed decision impact which will be that this may not continue to be accessible to Care Leavers, as the infrastructure will be altered.</p>
<p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➡ 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