

## Bristol City Council Equality Impact Relevance Check



This tool will identify the equalities relevance of a proposal, and establish whether a full Equality Impact Assessment will be required. Please read the guidance prior to completing this relevance check.

<b>What is the proposal?</b>	
Name of proposal	(Strategic City Transport) Removal of devolved NP Capitol allocation
Please outline the proposal.	Remove devolved NP funding that delivers local traffic scheme – this would have an impact on the delivery of local traffic schemes, approved 15/16 NP schemes, local CIL and S106 , local roads safety and cycling/walking benefits  <i>(for more details please refer to savings proposal document)</i>
What savings will this proposal achieve?	£410k from 17/18
Name of Lead Officer	Peter Mann

<b>Could your proposal impact citizens with protected characteristics?</b> (This includes service users and the wider community)
Please outline where there may be significant opportunities or positive impacts, and for whom.
No
Please outline where there may be significant negative impacts, and for whom.
The neighbourhood partnerships are an opportunity for local people to influence the local infrastructure. The capital schemes which are recommended by local people are prioritised if they solve local problems, such as residential roads being used as rat runs by commuters, and problems with parking, speeding etc. It is likely that a proportion of these schemes highlighted as important for people with protected characteristics such as schemes around schools or easier routes/dropped kerbs for people using electric scooters etc. Schemes have also been implemented by NPs which improve community cohesion by relieving parking pressures. It is hard to quantify whether local schemes in reality benefit people with protected characteristics more or less than traffic management measures which are prioritised by city council officers. However the removal of this funding would remove the opportunity for local people to affect a local traffic arrangement and the community would feel that this would disadvantage people with protected characteristics because there is less opportunity to request a change. Therefore whilst hard to prove, it is likely that older people, younger people, BME people, women and disabled people would feel disadvantaged by a decision to remove

delegated funding.

**Could your proposal impact staff with protected characteristics?**

(i.e. reduction in posts, changes to working hours or locations, changes in pay)

Please outline where there may be significant opportunities or positive impacts, and for whom.

No

Please outline where there may be negative impacts, and for whom.

Loss of 1.5FTE

**Is a full Equality Impact Assessment required?**

Does the proposal have the potential to impact on people with protected characteristics in the following ways:

- access to or participation in a service,
- levels of representation in our workforce, or
- reducing quality of life (i.e. health, education, standard of living) ?

Please indicate yes or no. If the answer is yes then a full impact assessment must be carried out. If the answer is no, please provide a justification.

YES

Service Director sign-off and date:

Equalities Officer sign-off and date: 4/10/2016  
Anne James- Equality and community cohesion  
Team leader