

Template for Impact Assessment Level 2: Full impact 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 type="checkbox"/>
It is driven by:	Legislation:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local or corporate requirements:	<input checked="" 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 retain 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>The Council has not reversed a scheme of this size on the basis of Political decision alone.</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>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</p>
<p>Live date:</p>	<p>November 2025, pending construction requirements</p>
<p>Lifespan:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Date of next review:</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Human Rights						
Engagement with Convention Rights (as set out in section 1, appendix 2 of the Impact Assessment Policy).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Equality						
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Younger people (up to the age of 17) do not have access to private vehicles, have less disposable income and often have to travel independently. Young people are also disproportionately involved in road accidents. The removal of the segregated infrastructure will negatively impact on this road user type as it will create a safety implication that may prevent their uptake.</p> <p>The removal of the segregated infrastructure will likely result in more pavement cycling as those with no other transport choice feel it necessary to remove themselves from sharing road space with vehicles. This may increase both actual and perceived issues of collisions as pedestrians and cyclists use the same space (albeit illegally). This is often raised as an issue for pedestrians, however elderly people are more vulnerable to this activity.</p> <p>It is unlikely that these concerns can be mitigated.</p> <p>Evidence used to support this comes from a reduction in the number of complaints received regarding pavement cycling following the infrastructure installation, and from observing the infrastructure plans.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified				Rationale and supporting evidence	
	None	Positive	Negative			Uncertain
			Justified	Mitigated		
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The current alignment has catered for disabled people with the creation of disabled parking bays to mitigate the reduction in overall capacity. The current scheme does not identify whether these disabled bays will be retained. The issue can be mitigated via confirmation that the disabled bays will be retained following removal of the cycleway.</p> <p>The current infrastructure layout segregates pedestrians, cyclists and motorised vehicles. This is beneficial from a road safety perspective for all road users, but particularly pertinent to address concerns from disability groups; particularly visually impaired. The removal of the segregation will likely result in more pavement cycling as those with no other transport choice feel it necessary to remove themselves from sharing road space with vehicles. This may increase both actual and perceived issues of collisions as pedestrians and cyclists use the same space (albeit illegally). This is often raised as an issue for pedestrians, however visually impaired people are more vulnerable to this activity, which is highlighted in RNIB policy. There has been a reduction in the number of complaints regarding pavement cycling since the infrastructure was installed. This will not be able to be mitigated should removal of the infrastructure proceed.</p> <p>The Re-opening of side roads, and re-widening of the crossing points will increase the volume and speed of vehicles on the carriageway. It will also increase the number and distance that people will need to cross along the corridor. These additional junctions will also not be signalised. This poses a significant risk to those with disabilities. This could be mitigated by retaining the narrower road crossings, and providing infrastructure that supports pedestrians to cross safely, such as signalised crossing points, or raised/give way infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed scheme includes the removal of the signalised pedestrian crossing point at Clifton Street. Removal will reduce the number of safe crossing points on the route from 5 to 4. This will create severance for all pedestrians to cross the road safely, but particularly pertinent to visually impaired people, who rely on signalised crossing points. This could be mitigated by retaining the signalised crossing point at Clifton street.</p> <p>Issues surrounding the accessibility of the bus islands has been raised by RNIB as users must cross the cycleway to access. Although there are give way markings on the cycleway, anti-social/illegal movements that do not observe this requirement occur, resulting on concerns from vulnerable road users. This is a global issue which is difficult to enforce. The removal of the scheme will remove this perceived issue.</p> <p>Evidence used to justify these points relate to analysis of accident statistics (most accidents occur at junctions, therefore increasing the number of junctions increases the risk). Assessment of RNIB policy also supports segregation of cycles and pedestrians.</p>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Gender reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Pregnancy / maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Religion or belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Women typically do not cycle as much as men. One of the main barriers for this is due to safety, both physical and perceived. The removal of segregated infrastructure will increase the physical risk associated with cycling, and is likely to impact negatively upon women wanting to cycle.</p> <p>It is unlikely that this could be mitigated. Evidence of this imbalance comes from numerous studies in to the reasons for fewer female cyclists, of which safe infrastructure is a key proponent from a physical and perceived safety issue.</p> <p>https://www.cyclinguk.org/article/campaigns-guide/women-cycling https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S221414051830121X</p>
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Marriage / civil partnership**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Dependants / caring responsibilities**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.
Criminal record / offending past**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No issues identified from EIA 1.

** Indicates this is not included within the single equality duty placed upon public authorities by the Equality Act. See guidance for further details.

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Community cohesion						
Individual communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated.</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>
Relations between communities / neighbourhoods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated.</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>
Armed Forces Covenant						
Council delivered healthcare services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>People who access services such as Council delivered Healthcare 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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated.</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>

Assessment issue	Impacts identified					Rationale and supporting evidence
	None	Positive	Negative		Uncertain	
			Justified	Mitigated		
Compulsory Education - admissions; educational attainment and curriculum; child wellbeing; transport; attendance; additional needs support; and Service Pupil Premium funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>People who access services such as Council delivered compulsory education 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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated</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 this group, as the infrastructure will be altered.</p>
Housing, homelessness and disabled facilities grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>People who access services such as 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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated</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 this group, as the infrastructure will be altered.</p>
Care leavers						
Care experienced people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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. It is unlikely that this could be mitigated</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>

Next steps:

- If the answer to some questions remains Uncertain, then further work must be undertaken to clarify impacts. Repeat the process until there is certainty, but ensure that the amount of work undertaken is proportionate to the decision required. No relevant report should be submitted for approval until there is a satisfactory level of certainty around the impacts of the recommended decision.
- Be sure that any likely differential impacts identified through the process (positive or negative) are well evidenced and clearly marked in the template.
- Where the impact is negative, be clear that this can be justified with the justification outlined. If it cannot, the recommended decision must be reviewed.
- Where negative impacts are unjustified and *unavoidable*, actions must be put in place to remove or mitigate impacts. These should be listed in the action plan below.
- The results of the IA process (including changes made to the proposed approach and further actions) should be outlined the main body of the report, and the completed IA template appended to that report.

In addition to the above the report author may also wish to consider completing a discretionary Health impact assessment. Guidance on when this is appropriate should be sought from the Public Health team.

Further actions		Lead	Deadline
Mitigating actions	<p>Several mitigations can be accommodated to address inequality issues. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirmation that disabled car parking spaces will be retained 2. Ensure that junctions will remain at current widths and provide infrastructure to support road crossing by pedestrians. 3. Confirmation that signalised crossing points will be retained 4. Increased enforcement to reduce/eliminate illegal pavement cycling <p>This however only addresses some of the issues identified. It is not known how other issues could be mitigated to ensure that those with protected characteristics would be adversely impacted upon.</p>		
Promotion	Decisions will be publicised using the Councils website and social media opportunities.		
Monitoring and evaluation	Implementation of the decision will be monitored via the use of modal movement counters already in situ on the route, and monitoring complaints and concerns highlighted to the Council by the public.		

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