KENT COUNTY COUNCIL
EQUALITY ANALYSIS / IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EqIA)

This document is available in other formats, Please contact alternativeformats@kent.gov.uk or telephone on 03000 421553 (this number goes to an answer machine which is monitored during office hours)

Directorate: Growth Environment & Transport

Name of policy, procedure, project or service: A21 NMU to Tonbridge Station Cycle Route Scheme

What is being assessed? Highway Project

Responsible Owner: Tim Read
Date of Initial Screening: 2-5-17

Date of Full EqIA : N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>2-5-17</td>
<td>First draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Wynde</td>
<td>2/5/2017</td>
<td>Comments for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>2-5-17</td>
<td>Comments for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A Agyepong</td>
<td>3-5-17</td>
<td>Comments for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>3-5-17</td>
<td>Comments for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>3-5-17</td>
<td>Head of Service/Director approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>5-5-17</td>
<td>For Public Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>29-6-17</td>
<td>Post consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Padgham</td>
<td>29-6-17</td>
<td>Head of Service/Director approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect this group less favourably than others in Kent? YES/NO If yes how?</td>
<td>Assessment of potential impact</td>
<td>Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes what? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or belief</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Civil Partnerships</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer's responsibilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

**Proportionality** - Based on the answers in the above screening grid what weighting would you ascribe to this function – see Risk Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.</td>
<td>Medium relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.</td>
<td>High relevance to equality, /likely to have adverse impact on protected groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State rating & reasons : **LOW** – this is a Highway scheme that improves the continuity of cycling infrastructure between the A21 NMU and Tonbridge Station.

**Context:**

**Current Situation:**

Highways England is constructing a NMU (Non Motorised User) route facility as part of the A21 dualing scheme (Tonbridge – Pembury). The Scheme is intended to link the A21 NMU to Tonbridge Railway Station which will provide a continuous link for users.

**Benefits:**

The scheme will promote healthy living and encourage cycling within the area. This will turn assist with reducing congestion on the roads and also aid reduction of CO2 emissions. The route will encourage more people to cycle to work, school or to access the town centre and undertake longer journeys via the A21 NMU. The route will also support a reduction of local vehicular trips and improvement in local air quality.

**Aims and Objectives:**

To reduce the need and desire to travel by private car and thereby lower congestion. The scheme will deliver enhancements to non motorised users to make this mode more attractive when compared to the private car. The scheme will also promote a healthier living for all users.

**Beneficiaries:** All non motorised users

**Information and Data:**

Robust evidence has highlighted how active travel, specifically journeys made by cycle and on foot, can contribute to a wide range of outcomes. Active travel gives people an opportunity to be physically active as part of their daily routine, which will contribute to improved health as well as preventing or managing a range of chronic diseases. It can also contribute to improve air...
quality, reduced congestion and reduced carbon emissions through reducing the number of cars on the road.

Involvement and Engagement:

KCC undertook a Public Engagement Exercise in May 2017 to inform residents and the wider community of scheme proposals. Residents received a letter through their door explaining the proposals and referring them to where they could view full details. The proposals were accessible via the KCC website consultations page, with hard copies available in Tonbridge Library and Tonbridge Gateway. The following organisations were sent proposals directly:

- Age UK Sevenoaks & Tonbridge
- Arriva
- Carers First
- Centre for Independent Living Kent
- Citizens Rights for Older People (CROP)
- Community Safety Partnership
- Crossroads Care
- Cycle-ops – Tonbridge
- Cycles UK – Tonbridge
- Diversity House
- Guide Dogs for the Blind
- Hadlow College & West Kent College
- Hi Kent
- Imago Community
- Invicta Advocacy Network
- Involve Kent
- KASBAH - Supporting Disabled People Towards Independence
- KCC Public Health
- Kent Association for the Blind
- Kent Autistic Trust
- Kent Climate Change Network
- Kent Police
- Kent Wheelchair Users Group
- Kent Young Carers
- Maidstone - West Kent Hi Centre and Head Office
- Maidstone Mind
- Southeastern Railway
- Spokes
- Stagecoach
- Sustrans
- Take Off
- The Parents’ Consortium
- TM Active
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
- University of Kent
- Visit Kent
- Voluntary Action WK
- West Kent CCG
- Wheelchair Users Group
- Young Kent
- Young People Voluntary Action Kent (VSU in Kent)
- YWCA West Kent
- West Kent College
- Kent County Council
- Tonbridge Grammar
- Weald Grammar
- Hill View
- Hayesbrook
- Judd
- West Kent College
- Tonbridge Youth Forum
- Kent Youth County Council
- Sussex Road Community Primary School
- Stephens Primary School

Updated 01/09/2017
Consultation Feedback from respondents who declared themselves to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010 or an organisation representing people with disabilities:

Please see table at end of this document. There are no changes proposed as a result of feedback received from respondents declaring themselves disabled or organisations representing people with disabilities. This is due to technical, cost effectiveness, practicality or scheme scope reasons, or points raised were already addressed by the design.

A comment from one respondent asked how this scheme would increase mobility for physically disabled pedestrians on a shared use facility also used by cyclists. The wording in box 6 of the disability section of the screening grid has been modified to clarify this point.


Adverse Impact: None.

Positive Impact: Medium.

JUDGEMENT

Option 1 – Screening Sufficient: No

Justification: N/A.

Option 2 – Internal Action Required: Yes

Option 3 – Full Impact Assessment: Yes

Monitoring and Review: Kent County Council being the highway authority will manage the delivery and overall maintenance of the scheme. Regular project group meetings will be held to inform/update, monitor and review. This document will be regularly reviewed to reflect any concerns raised through the process. In particular the public consultation will seek comments from protected groups and responses will be used to inform further reviews of this document.

Sign Off

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree that no actions are required to mitigate any currently known adverse impact(s).

Senior Officer

Signed: Approved by email Name: Tim Read

Job Title: Head of Transportation Date: 5 May 2017 rev 29.06.17

Updated 01/09/2017
May 2017

DMT Member

Signed: 

Name: Roger Wilkin

Job Title: Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste

Date: 5 May 2017 rev 29.06.17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Issues identified</th>
<th>Action to be taken</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Cost implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age/ Disability / Carers Responsibilities</td>
<td>changes to accessibility, familiarity of surroundings,</td>
<td>Public Engagement Exercise 8-26 May 2017, letter drop to residents, direct information to local stakeholders and proposals on KCC website consultation page.</td>
<td>Feedback from stakeholders, community groups, residents and users that will be collated and used to inform and develop the design and construction process</td>
<td>Andy Padgham</td>
<td>May/June 2017</td>
<td>There may be additional costs regarding the construction elements and these will be assessed on a case by case basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from Consultation Respondents whom declared disabilities or responded on behalf of a disability group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's declared disability/capacity in which respondent is completing questionnaire</th>
<th>Agree/disagree</th>
<th>Respondent's Comments</th>
<th>KCC Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensory impairment Responding as ‘any other group’ (someone who works on the route and who commutes by bicycle)</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Separation of traffic and non-motor transport will promote bike use and reduce pollution</td>
<td>Noted as positive response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical impairment and long standing illness or health condition</td>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>I am in a wheelchair due to leg amputation. I need to be pushed everywhere. It would be good to</td>
<td>The provision of a signalised crossing in the section described by the respondent (between Tudeley Lane and Vauxhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding as 'Local resident'</td>
<td>have a safe crossing point on Pembury Road (traffic lights and proper green man crossing would be best, and for cyclists as well I think). Please incorporate this as part of the scheme. Maybe put it opposite the Vauxhall Inn or just up the road so it can be used by the school children. Existing crossings are unsafe for wheelchairs as they are not big enough to get a wheelchair and my pusher on them so I have to cross when there is a gap in the traffic, which can take ages. Also, if you plan to widen one pavement, please don't; narrow the pavement on the other side of the road anywhere as then it won't be wide enough for wheelchairs and mums with pushchairs etc. Also traffic goes too fast on Pembury Road; please make it a 20 mph zone like Goldsmid Road. Up from the Vauxhall Inn it is 60 miles an hour limit.</td>
<td>Roundabout) is not within the scope of the project. The route crosses this section of Pembury Road just to the northwest of the roundabout and it will be possible to negotiate the crossing in two halves by way of a widened refuge island. Provision of a signalised crossing in this section of Pembury Road, which is not a requirement of this scheme, would require a separate assessment of feasibility in respect of likely demand, crash data etc. There are no plans to reduce the width of any footways as part of this project, only widen them on one side. Strategic 'A' roads are not suitable to have 20mph speed limits imposed. It will therefore not be possible to reduce the 30mph section of Pembury Road to a 20mph limit. It is proposed to reduce the speed limit in Pembury Road that is currently national speed limit (60mph as noted by the respondent) to 40mph as part of this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No declared disability. Responding ‘On behalf of a charity, voluntary or community sector organisation (VCS)’ (guide dogs)</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Our only recommendation and question would be regarding the use of Tactile paving and delineator marker used to separate the cycle path from the Pedestrian path. We</td>
<td>There is no delineation between pedestrian- and cycle-use areas anywhere on this cycle route. The cycle route is fully shared use with equal access to all users. Buff coloured, pimple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would ask you follow the guidelines set out in the 'Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces' issued by the DfT.

tactile paving will be provided at all road crossings and corduroy paving across the footway where footway becomes shared use facility and vice-versa.