

# Equality Analysis (EA)

Financial Year  
**2014/15**

## Section 1 – General Information (Aims and Objectives)

Name of the proposal including aims, objectives and purpose

*(Please note – for the purpose of this doc, 'proposal' refers to a policy, function, strategy or project)*

Borough Wide 20mph Limit – to introduce a default speed limit of 20mph on all roads within the borough (except Aspen Way and A12).

See Appendix  
**A**

Current decision  
rating



### Conclusion - To be completed at the end of the Equality Analysis process

*(the exec summary will provide an update on the findings of the EA and what outcome there has been as a result. For example, based on the findings of the EA, the proposal was rejected as the impact on a particular group was unreasonable and did not give due regard. Or, based on the EA, the proposal was amended and alternative steps taken)*

The analysis has concluded that 20mph speed limits on roads within the London Borough of Tower Hamlets will help to make the roads safer for all road users, leading to reduced numbers of road traffic collisions involving traffic and pedestrians. This will have a positive impact on all local people, with particularly positive impacts on certain age groups (children, teenagers and the elderly) and ethnic groups. Vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists will particularly benefit from this initiative. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

**Name:**

(signed off by)

**Date signed off:**

(approved)

**Service area:**

CLC

**Team name:**

Transport and Highways

**Service manager:**

Margaret Cooper

**Name and role of the officer completing the EA:**

Tom Rawlings – Road Safety Engineer

## Section 2 – Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)

What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff?

ACCSTATS data, which is included in the report, giving details of all reported accidents in the borough over the past 3 years. TfL's Road Safety Action Plan for London has also informed the analysis.

### Section 3 – Assessing the Impacts on the 9 Groups

Please refer to the guidance notes below and evidence how you're proposal impact upon the nine Protected Characteristics in the table on page 3?

**For the nine protected characteristics detailed in the table below please consider:-**

- **What is the equality profile of service users or beneficiaries that will or are likely to be affected?**

Use the Council's approved diversity monitoring categories and provide data by target group of users or beneficiaries to determine whether the service user profile reflects the local population or relevant target group or if there is over or under representation of these groups

- **What qualitative or quantitative data do we have?**

List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data available  
(include information where appropriate from other directorates, Census 2001 etc)

- *Data trends – how does current practice ensure equality*

- **Equalities profile of staff?**

Indicate profile by target groups and assess relevance to policy aims and objectives e.g. Workforce to Reflect the Community. Identify staff responsible for delivering the service including where they are not directly employed by the council.

- **Barriers?**

What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups? Eg- communication, access, locality etc.

- **Recent consultation exercises carried out?**

Detail consultation with relevant interest groups, other public bodies, voluntary organisations, community groups, trade unions, focus groups and other groups, surveys and questionnaires undertaken etc. Focus in particular on the findings of views expressed by the equality target groups. Such consultation exercises should be appropriate and proportionate and may range from assembling focus groups to a one to one meeting.

- **Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact?**

Management Arrangements - How is the Service managed, are there any management arrangements which may have a disproportionate impact on the equality target groups

- **The Process of Service Delivery?**

In particular look at the arrangements for the service being provided including opening times, custom and practice, awareness of the service to local people, communication

Please also consider how the proposal will impact upon the 3 One Tower Hamlets objectives:-

- Reduce inequalities
- Ensure strong community cohesion
- Strengthen community leadership.

**Please Note -**

Reports/stats/data can be added as Appendix

Target Groups	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s)
Race	Positive	<p>Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</p> <p>Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making</p> <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reducing inequalities</li> <li>-Ensuring strong community cohesion</li> <li>-Strengthening community leadership</li> </ul>
Disability	Positive	TfL’s Road Safety Action Plan for London highlights the fact that nearly 40 per cent of Londoners are from BAME groups and that Londoners from BAME groups suffer a disproportionately high number of road casualties. Whilst the most casualties on London’s road, across all modes, are in the “White” ethnic group, when consideration is given to the number of people in each ethnic group, TfL have identified that Black and Asian road users are at a higher risk as car occupants than other groups, Black road users have the highest risk of being a pedestrian casualty and white pedal cyclists have a higher risk compared to other groups of cyclists. A 20mph limit will therefore have a particularly positive effect on these ethnic groups.
Gender	Positive	A 20mph limit has the potential to reducing vehicle speeds and making the Borough safer for people with disabilities or mobility limitations. It also has potential to smooth traffic flow during peak periods thereby improving journeys made using vehicles, for example, users of mobility transport services.
Gender Reassignment	Positive	The RAC has identified that road accident deaths account for 13% of all external causes of death: for males road accidents account for 15% and for women the figure is 8%. However, this correlation varies by age group and mode of travel. A 20mph limit is will have a positive effect on all groups regardless of their characteristics.
Sexual Orientation	Positive	A 20mph limit is will have a positive effect on all groups regardless of their characteristics.
Religion or Belief	Positive	A 20mph limit is will have a positive effect on all groups regardless of their characteristics.
Age	Positive	A 20mph limit will help to address safety issues by reducing vehicle speeds and making the Borough more pedestrian-friendly which is particularly pertinent to vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly.
Marriage and Civil	Positive	A 20mph limit is will have a positive effect on all groups regardless of their characteristics.

Partnerships.		
Pregnancy and Maternity	Positive	A 20mph limit is will have a positive effect on all groups regardless of their characteristics.
Other Socio-economic Carers	Positive	TfL's Road Safety Action Plan for London highlights the fact that there are large areas of deprivation in the Capital. Londoners who live in the most deprived areas suffer a disproportionately high number of road casualties. Research has shown that the strongest relationship between deprivation and injury risk is for pedestrians: the most deprived are more than twice as likely to be injured as the least deprived. A reduction in vehicle speed has the potential to not only reduce the number of personal injury collisions but also the severity, therefore the initiative is likely to result in greater benefits to those in lower socio-economic groups.

## Section 4 – Mitigating Impacts and Alternative Options

From the analysis and interpretation of evidence in section 2 and 3 - Is there any evidence or view that suggests that different equality or other protected groups (inc' staff) could be adversely and/or disproportionately impacted by the proposal?

NO

If yes, please detail below how evidence influenced and formed the proposal? For example, why parts of the proposal were added / removed?

*(Please note – a key part of the EA process is to show that we have made reasonable and informed attempts to mitigate any negative impacts. An EA is a service improvement tool and as such you may wish to consider a number of alternative options or mitigation in terms of the proposal.)*

*Where you believe the proposal discriminates but not unlawfully, you must set out below your objective justification for continuing with the proposal, without mitigating action.*

n/a

## Section 5 – Quality Assurance and Monitoring

Have monitoring systems been put in place to check the implementation of the proposal and recommendations?

Yes

How will the monitoring systems further assess the impact on the equality target groups?

Personal injury collision statistics can be compared to previous years to measure the success of the limit, this can be broken down by sex, age, travel modes and can drill down into local area details or site specific problems.

Does the policy/function comply with equalities legislation?  
(Please consider the [OTH objectives](#) and [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) criteria)

Yes

If there are gaps in information or areas for further improvement, please list them below:

n/a

How will the results of this Equality Analysis feed into the performance planning process?

The findings support the progression of the 20mph limit.

## Section 6 - Action Plan

As a result of these conclusions and recommendations what actions (if any) **will** be included in your business planning and wider review processes (team plan)? Please consider any gaps or areas needing further attention in the table below the example.





Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
<b>Example</b> 1. Better collection of feedback, consultation and data sources 2. Non-discriminatory behaviour	1. Create and use feedback forms. Consult other providers and experts 2. Regular awareness at staff meetings. Train staff in specialist courses	1. Forms ready for January 2010 Start consultations Jan 2010 2. Raise awareness at one staff meeting a month. At least 2 specialist courses to be run per year for staff.	1.NR & PB 2. NR	

Recommendation	Key activity	Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress	Officer responsible	Progress
<b>Assessment of impact of 20 mph limit : before and after study.</b>	Compare personal injury collision statistics for 6 and 12 months post-implementation of the 20mph limit to previous years broken down by gender, race, age and travel modes.	Due to 6 month delay in availability of accident data, first monitoring will be available March 2016.	<b>T Rawlings T&amp;H</b>	

Page 52

## Appendix A

**(Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria**

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Risk</b>
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . It is recommended that the use of the policy be suspended until further work or analysis is performed.	<b>Suspend – Further Work Required</b>	<b>Red</b> 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . However, a genuine determining reason may exist that could legitimise or justify the use of this policy.	<b>Further (specialist) advice should be taken</b>	<b>Red Amber</b> 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination (as described above) exists and this risk may be removed or reduced by implementing the actions detailed within the <i>Action Planning</i> section of this document.	<b>Proceed pending agreement of mitigating action</b>	<b>Amber</b> 
As a result of performing the analysis, the policy, project or function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.	<b>Proceed with implementation</b>	<b>Green:</b> 

This page is intentionally left blank