

## PART A - Initial Equality Screening Assessment

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality and diversity.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provide a record of both the process and decision. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions.

Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality and diversity
- whether or not equality and diversity is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an Equality Analysis (Part B).

Further information is available in the Equality Screening and Analysis Guidance – see page 9.

1. Title	
<b>Title:</b> Transport Capital Programme 2024-25	
<b>Directorate:</b> Regeneration and Environment	<b>Service area:</b> Transportation Infrastructure
<b>Lead person:</b> Nat Porter	<b>Contact:</b> nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk
Is this a:	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strategy / Policy</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Service / Function</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>	
<b>If other, please specify</b>	

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening
Approval of Transport Capital Programme 2024-25.

3. Relevance to equality and diversity
All the Council’s strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – borough wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality and diversity.
The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, civil partnerships and marriage, pregnancy and maternity and other socio-economic groups e.g. parents, single parents and guardians, carers, looked after children, unemployed and people on low incomes, ex-offenders, victims of domestic violence, homeless people etc.

Questions	Yes	No
Could the proposal have implications regarding the accessibility of services to the whole or wider community? <i>(Be mindful that this is not just about numbers. A potential to affect a small number of people in a significant way is as important)</i>	✓	
Could the proposal affect service users? <i>(Be mindful that this is not just about numbers. A potential to affect a small number of people in a significant way is as important)</i>	✓	
Has there been or is there likely to be an impact on an individual or group with protected characteristics? <i>(Consider potential discrimination, harassment or victimisation of individuals with protected characteristics)</i>	✓	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns regarding the proposal? <i>(It is important that the Council is transparent and consultation is carried out with members of the public to help mitigate future challenge)</i>	✓	
Could the proposal affect how the Council's services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom? <i>(If the answer is yes you may wish to seek advice from commissioning or procurement)</i>		✓
Could the proposal affect the Council's workforce or employment practices? <i>(If the answer is yes you may wish to seek advice from your HR business partner)</i>		✓
If you have answered no to all the questions above, please explain the reason		

If you have answered **no** to all the questions above please complete **sections 5 and 6**.

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above please complete **section 4**.

#### 4. Considering the impact on equality and diversity

If you have not already done so, the impact on equality and diversity should be considered within your proposals before decisions are made.

Considering equality and diversity will help to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and take active steps to create a discrimination free society by meeting a group or individual's needs and encouraging participation.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below using the prompts for guidance and complete an Equality Analysis (Part B).

- **How have you considered equality and diversity?**

The report details a programme of work, and its division of themes. General consideration has been given to equalities implications of work in these themes; however specific impacts will not be identifiable until individual schemes are identified. It is proposed as schemes are identified under each theme, the programme and schemes within them will be subject to an update of this Initial Screening Assessment, with individual schemes subjected to Equality Analysis as required by RMBC Policy.

- **Key findings**

Local and national data identify a number of inequalities in respect of transport which will need to be considered in the development of the programme, some of which may be cause of or an effect of existing traffic and transport conditions. Headline inequalities identified are –

- Children, young people and the elderly are overrepresented amongst road traffic casualties relative to their population size;
- Wheelchair and mobility scoot users express notably worse satisfaction with provision of safe and level crossing points, and obstruction of footways, than others;
- Men are overrepresented amongst road traffic casualties relative to the average;
- Access to cars is lower amongst people of non-White ethnicity, and amongst lower income households;
- People without access to cars travel significantly less far despite spending similar (but slightly lesser) amounts of time travelling compared to the average. They are also more dependent on non-motorised travel, and especially buses, for their mobility.

**Age**

In Rotherham, amongst all road traffic casualties, adults (and in particular young adults) are overrepresented relative to their populations. However, amongst non-motorised users a different picture emerges - with children, young adults and the elderly all overrepresented in road traffic casualties, relative to their population.

The National Highways & Transport (NHT) Network survey indicates middle aged people are less satisfied with cycle routes and traffic congestion than the population generally, with the elderly being more satisfied with road safety than other age groups. Young adults and the elderly report lesser ease of access to facilities compared to other groups. Unfortunately, this survey gives no data on satisfaction amongst those younger than 16 years.

In 2019, nationally children and young adults travelled less distance than the average. Young people are also more dependent on walking, and along with the elderly, on using buses than people on average, when expressed as a proportion of their total mobility.

Noting this measures much broader activity than walking or cycling (whether for transport or otherwise), but also that walking is the most common broad activity recorded, the Active Lives survey indicates similar levels of activity nationally amongst most age groups, except this declines amongst elderly people of 75 years or older. Unfortunately this data set did not include for children.

### **Disability**

The NHT surveys indicates wheelchair and mobility scooter users are considerably less satisfied with pavement condition compared to others, but indicated similar levels of satisfaction in respect of other aspects. However, the reported significantly worse ease of access scores compared against respondents generally. Of note to this programme, levels of satisfaction were notably poor relative to people generally in respect of provision of safe crossing points, provision of dropped kerbs and keeping pavements clear of obstruction.

Noting this measures much broader activity than walking or cycling (whether for transport or otherwise), but also that walking is the most common broad activity recorded, the Active Lives survey indicates notably lower levels of activity nationally amongst people with disabilities.

### **Race**

Based on national data for England for 2019, there are notable racial inequalities in transport. For example, people of Asian ethnicity are 17% more likely to be in an household without access to a car compared to average; people of Black, African and/or Caribbean ethnicity are more than twice as likely not to have access to a car.

Noting this measures much broader activity than walking or cycling (whether for transport or otherwise), but also that walking is the most common broad activity recorded, the Active Lives survey indicates notably lower levels of activity nationally amongst Black and non-Chinese Asian people relative to the average.

### **Sex**

In Rotherham, men are overrepresented amongst all road casualties, relative to size of population. This is particularly significant for those killed or seriously injured, and also for non-motorised users.

In England before COVID-19, men are more than twice as likely to report cycling for travel at least twice in the previous 28 days as women. For walking, rates are similar between men and women.

The NHT survey did not find significant differences in satisfaction in transport services between men and women. Women responded indicating they found it slightly easier to access services than others. By both measures, those responding with gender other than male or female gave generally poorer scores.

On average, women travel around 14% less than men in total, with greater reliance on buses and less use of cars and bicycles than for men.

### **Sexual orientation**

Noting this, measures much broader activity than walking or cycling (whether for

transport or otherwise), but also that walking is the most common broad activity recorded, the Active Lives survey indicates similar levels of activity amongst people identifying as heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual, but with a lower level of activity observed amongst those with other sexual orientations.

**Religion & belief**

Noting this measures much broader activity than walking or cycling (whether for transport or otherwise), but also that walking is the most common broad activity recorded, the Active Lives survey indicates lower levels of activity amongst people identifying as being of the Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim or Sikh faiths relative to the average.

**Income**

Access to cars correlates with increasing income levels, with nearly twice as many households in the poorest income quintile having no access to a car compared to the average. Annual mobility shows a similar pattern, with people in the local income quintile travelling 36% less than people on average, and 55% less than those in the highest income quintile.

People in the lowest income brackets travel more by bus than people in higher brackets, and less by trains and bicycles. As a proportion of total mobility, people on lower incomes are 60% more dependent on walking, and more than twice as dependent on buses, relative to the average.

Despite this, the Active Lives survey indicates lower levels of activity amongst lower social groups relative to higher ones.

**Access to cars**

Access to a car is observed to have a considerable impact on travel behaviour. Nationally in 2019, people in households travel only around half the milage of people in households with one car, and only a third of the milage of people in households with multiple cars – yet still spend 87% and 77% of the time travelled by those groups.

Nationally, people without access to cars are also more dependent on other modes of transport, as illustrated in the table below. This is especially significant in respect of bus usage.

*Variance between people in households without access to cars compared to general population (NTS, 2019)*

	<i>Absolute mileage</i>	<i>Proportion of total mileage</i>
Car (including as passenger)	-85%	-67%
Walk	+39%	+293%
Cycle	+32%	+267%
Bus	+149%	+853%
Rail	-13%	+119%

Unfortunately, no data or evidence is available in respect of transport inequalities relating to **gender re-assignment, marriage & civil partnership or pregnancy & maternity.**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Actions</b></li> <li>- Ensuring prioritisation mechanisms for each theme respond to the equalities data highlighted above, and programmes consider existing transport inequalities and are prioritised in a manner that helps address these;</li> <li>- This includes ensuring consultation and engagement activity seeks the view of groups with protected or other characteristics where there may be inequalities of which we are unaware and/or lack information;</li> <li>- Conduct an Initial Equality Screening Assessment on projects within each theme as these are developed;</li> <li>- Progress schemes to Equality Analysis where screening assessment indicates this is required.</li> </ul>	
Date to scope and plan your Equality Analysis:	See Actions – above.
Date to complete your Equality Analysis:	See Actions – above.
Lead person for your Equality Analysis (Include name and job title):	Nat Porter, Service Manager, Transport Planning & Policy

### 5. Governance, ownership and approval

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening:

Name	Job title	Date
Matthew Reynolds	Interim Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service	3 <sup>rd</sup> January, 2024

### 6. Publishing

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given.

If this screening relates to a **Cabinet, key delegated officer decision, Council, other committee or a significant operational decision** a copy of the completed document should be attached as an appendix and published alongside the relevant report.

A copy of **all** screenings should also be sent to [equality@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:equality@rotherham.gov.uk) For record keeping purposes it will be kept on file and also published on the Council's Equality and Diversity Internet page.

<b>Date screening completed</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> December, 2023
<b>Report title and date</b>	Transport Capital Programme 2024-25
<b>If relates to a Cabinet, key delegated officer decision, Council, other committee or a</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> March, 2024

<b>significant operational decision – report date and date sent for publication</b>	
<b>Date screening sent to Performance, Intelligence and Improvement</b> <a href="mailto:equality@rotherham.gov.uk">equality@rotherham.gov.uk</a>	3 <sup>rd</sup> January, 2024