



SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road

Equality Impact Assessment
1007/6.15.2/188



October 2013



EIA PRO FORMA

| | |
|--|--|
| Title: A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road | Date: 24th September 2013 |
| | Stage: draft <i>(delete as applicable)</i> |
| | Service Area: Major Projects |
| | Lead Officer: Emma Hughes |

Stage 1: Do you need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)?

Not all policies will require an EIA: these key questions will help you to decide whether you need to conduct an EIA (see guidance notes at the end of this form).

Yes, an EIA is required as a project of this scale.

Stage 2: What do you know?

An EIA should be based upon robust evidence. This stage will guide you through potential sources of information and how to interpret it. Understanding the current context is a key stage in all policy making and planning (see guidance notes at the end of this form).

The A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6MARR) Scheme

The Proposed Preferred Scheme comprises a new dual carriageway connecting the A6 to Manchester Airport. The scheme travels adjacent to Bramhall, Cheadle Hulme, Hazel Grove, Handforth, Poynton and Wythenshawe District Centres and Gatley and Heald Green Local Centres. The broad route of the scheme is illustrated in Figure 1.1.

The new road is approximately 10 kilometres long, of dual 2-lane carriageway standard and would include seven new junctions and four improved junctions. It also incorporates a further 4 kilometres of existing A555 dual carriageway to the south of Bramhall (the central section of the scheme). There are four rail crossings in the new sections including the Hazel Grove to Buxton Line, West Coast Main Line (Stockport to Stoke), Styal Line and the Styal Line Northern Airport Spur. A pedestrian and cycle route is proposed for the whole length of the scheme, including retrofitting it to the 4 kilometre existing section of A555.

The scheme will be delivered by three councils, namely Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester City.

At present, there is no direct east-west transport link through south east Greater Manchester and Cheshire East. The lack of this connection is contributing to congestion on a number of major and minor roads. Consequently, the congestion is constraining the local economy, affecting air quality in local areas and reducing access to key destinations. These problems will continue to become significantly worse in the future if no action is taken. The A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road has been identified as the best solution to address this problem, as part of the overall South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS).

The SEMMMS strategy is a 20 year transport plan covering an area to the south east of Manchester including parts of Cheshire East, Derbyshire, Manchester, Stockport and Tameside local authority areas. The broad route for the SEMMMS Relief Road has been well established in local plans since the 1990s. Specific plans for a Relief Road have been around since 2001 when the SEMMMS Strategy recommended that the three councils work on developing plans for improving transport in the area for the benefit of both local communities and the local economy. These plans have included public transport, walking and cycling improvements over the last ten years.

The Phase 1 and 2 consultations on the scheme were open to anyone wishing to respond. Although the Phase 1 and 2 consultation leaflets were distributed to a defined area, a variety of methods were used to advertise the consultation to the wider community including press

advertising, the scheme website and road signs. Therefore it was not possible to identify the affected population in advance of the consultations. However, the Social and Distributional Impact Assessment report for the scheme provides detailed analysis of the directly affected population, in line with national guidance.

Consultation on the A6MARR

Extensive consultation on the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road scheme has been undertaken, in two separate phases. The Phase One consultation was carried out between 22nd October 2012 and 25th January 2013. The Phase Two consultation was held between 3rd June and 19th July 2013.

The first phase of consultation was designed specifically to capture overall opinion of the scheme and preferences on the layout of six junctions along the proposed route. General comments about the scheme were also captured. All feedback from the first phase of consultation was considered in the development of the design for the emerging preferred scheme, which has been presented during the Phase Two consultation.

The purpose of the Phase Two consultation was to provide feedback from the Phase One consultation to the public and seek comments on the emerging preferred scheme in order to inform the development of the preferred scheme for the planning application.

A range of considerations were made to ensure that the consultation was accessible to all:

- Holding exhibitions in venues across the affected area that were wheelchair accessible and could be accessed non-car modes of transport;
- Holding exhibitions during the day time and evening;
- Ensuring the text and colour scheme on leaflets and exhibition boards could be legible to the visually impaired;
- Holding exhibitions at 9 locations across the affected area;
- Including a language panel on the leaflet with a total of nine languages of communities known to reside within Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester City councils areas;
- Offering a telephone and email helpline to provide further information up request for those unable to attend exhibitions;
- Provision of the consultation leaflet in the format of audio tape, CD, or in large print or braille upon request.

During both phases of consultation, information regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents was gathered.

Phase 1 Consultation Results

During the Phase 1 consultation respondents were asked a range of questions in order to ascertain their socio-demographic characteristics. The results are as follows:

Gender:

- Male = 55.5%;
- Female = 22%;
- Preferred not to answer = 4.9%; and
- No answer = 17.6%.

Disability and Life Limiting Illness:

- Yes = 9.3%;
- No = 67.2%;
- Preferred not to answer = 7.6%; and
- No answer = 16%.

Religion:

- Christian = 48%
- No religion = 19%
- Other = 5%
- Muslim = 1%
- Jewish = 0%
- Buddhist = 0%
- Hindu = 0%
- Sikh = 0%
- Prefer not to answer = 9%
- No answer = 17%

Age:

- 65+ = 22.3%;
- 55-64 = 13.8%;
- 45-54 = 11.6%;
- 35 – 44 = 9.5%;
- 25-34 = 5.1%;
- <25 = 1.2%; and
- No answer = 36.6%.

Ethnic Group:

- White = 70.8%;
- Mixed = 0.4%;
- Black or Black British = 0.3%;
- Other = 3.2%;
- Prefer not to Answer = 7.5%; and
- No Answer = 16.8%.
- Asian or Asian British = 1%;

Sexuality:

- Heterosexual = 64.3%;
- Lesbian = 0.2%;
- Gay Man = 0.7%;
- Bisexual = 0.4%;
- Prefer not to answer = 15%; and
- No answer = 19.3%.

Phase 2 Consultation

Given the extensive nature of the socio-economic data that was captured as part of the Phase 1 consultation, a reduced number of socio-demographic questions were asked during the Phase 2 consultation. The result of the are as follows:

Gender:

- Male = 63.4%;
- Female = 26.3%;
- Preferred not to answer = 9%; and
- No answer = 0.5%.

Age:

- 65+ = 43.6%;
- 55-64 = 23.3%;
- 45-54 = 17.1%;
- 35 – 44 = 10.5%;
- 25-34 = 5.1%; and
- <25 = 0.4%.

Disability and Life Limiting Illness:

- Yes = 11.5%;
- No = 75.3%;
- Preferred not to answer = 10.9%; and
- No answer = 2.3%.

Whilst the nature of the consultation is self-selective and therefore not representative of the population as a whole, it is clear from the data that feedback has been received from a cross section of groups within each socio-demographic characteristic.

Specific engagement has been undertaken with vulnerable road users (i.e. pedestrian, cyclists and equestrians) via the Vulnerable Road User Group (VRUG) which has been set up specifically for the scheme, with meetings held associated with each design iteration for the scheme. Disability Stockport is an invitee to the VRUG meetings. The project team has also attended the Stockport Disability and Transport meeting to discuss the scheme.

Direct engagement has also taken place with Queensgate Primary School, which is situated in close proximity to the scheme, in the form of Local Liaison Forum meetings for parents, governors and teachers at the school. The meetings at the school have been held associated with each phase of consultation for the scheme.

No specific demographic trends were discernible in the responses to the consultations.

Scope of the EqIA

Based on Department for Transport guidance, it is considered appropriate to consider following impacts of the scheme in relation to this EqIA:

- Noise
- Air Quality
- Accidents
- Severance

- Accessibility
- Security
- User Benefits

Data Sources

The **Social and Distributional Impact (SDI) Appraisal** for the scheme, which has been produced in line with Department for Transport (DfT) guidance, forms part of the business case for the scheme. The DfT's WebTAG guidance identifies the different groups which should be considered when identifying the impacts of the scheme and the information contained with the SDI analysis forms the basis for this EqlA. The SDI appraisal considers:

'**Social**' impacts relate to effects on individuals and society and lend themselves to assessing the social change processes invoked by the introduction of a transport intervention. These impacts include the effects on communities such as cohesion, stability and services; people's way of life (how they live, work and play); the environment such as the quality of the air and landscape; the health and wellbeing; personal fears and sense of security.

'**Distributional**' impacts relate to the extent to which there are differences in the way impacts affect different groups in society.

The term SDIs has evolved since it was first introduced in the Department's Guidance on Transport Innovation Funds (TAG Unit 3.12.4) and further research has enabled the development of eight new SDI indicators as follows

- High levels of **noise** can be experienced adjacent to busy transport corridors. The evidence suggests that children are vulnerable to high levels of noise, which affects their concentration when learning;
- Similarly, poor **air quality** can also be experienced in areas adjacent to busy and congested road corridors, which often pass through deprived urban areas. Whilst it is well understood that poor air quality has serious health implications, particularly respiratory disease, there is limited evidence on the social groups that are at particular risk;
- Children and older people are at particular risk from **accidents** on the road network (as pedestrians), whilst young male drivers and motorcyclists are also high risk groups. There is also a clear link between pedestrian accidents and social class: children from Social Class V are five times more likely to be involved in fatal accidents than those from Social Class I¹;
- Certain groups of people have particular concerns about their **personal security** when using the transport network, including women (who value the ability to call for help if needed), younger people (who fear bullying), older people (many of whom wish to see greater control of youth behaviour) and disabled people (who often feel vulnerable to bullying and verbal abuse);
- **Severance** of communities by traffic and transport infrastructure is a particular problem for people without access to a car, some older people, people with disabilities, and school children, because they are often reliant on walking in the local community and in some cases have restricted mobility;
- **Accessibility** to services is often a particular problem for young people living in rural areas (access to further education and employment), school children (availability of school buses), some older people (physical mobility in boarding / alighting and on board the vehicle), disabled people (physical accessibility and lack of information), black and minority

¹ White, D *et al*, *Road accidents and children living in disadvantaged areas: a literature review* (Scottish Executive, 2000)

ethnic (BME) communities (routes to specialist shopping centres or places of worship) and carers (who have complex travel needs);and

- Low-income households and deprived communities often do not benefit from the **transport user** benefits resulting from improvements to the transport system if they are not users of the network, either because they do not have access to a car or have limited travel horizons in their use of public transport.

The **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)** for the scheme is another key evidence base for this EqIA. An HIA is a key systematic approach to predicting the magnitude and significance of the possible health and wellbeing impacts, both positive and negative, of new plans and projects.

The key population groups that were considered are:

- Adults and children living, working and undertaking recreational activities within 200m of the road.
- Adults and children living and working within 1km of the road.
- Adults and children living and working beyond 1km and up to the administrative boundaries of Stockport, Manchester City and Cheshire East Councils. The road will be used by those outside these areas but they are likely to be similar to the impacts for those within the three Council areas.

Other population sub-groups that the HIA focused on are:

- Users of services/amenities
- Adults and children living in particularly isolated areas that could be affected by the Scheme

The main vulnerable groups that were considered by the HIA are:

- children and young people
- older people
- people with disabilities
- women
- unemployed and low income groups
- people from minority ethnic backgrounds
- people with existing health conditions (with a focus on existing cardiovascular and respiratory disease)

Social and Distributional Impact Assessment Findings

Noise

Any intervention that increases traffic levels and/or speeds or reduces physical gaps between people and traffic will give rise to noise impacts within a localised area. This relates to new roads such as the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road as well as impacts on the existing network through the redistribution of traffic.

The DfT's WebTAG guidance states that the only clearly established evidence of a social impact of noise is on children's concentration when learning although there is no quantitative cause-effect relationship. It is therefore necessary as part of the SDI assessment to examine the impact of noise on schools in the area.

The SDI appraisal also requires the assessment of noise impacts against English income deprivation quintiles.

One school located within a 250m buffer of the scheme is reported to have a major adverse noise impact. In addition, the locations and impact on Places of Worship (PoWs) were also examined, which shows the majority of PoWs experiencing no change in noise levels. Only one PoW is located within a 250m of the buffer of the scheme and demonstrates a negligible beneficial noise impact.

The SDI appraisal also requires the assessment of noise impacts against English income deprivation quintiles. Approximately half of the proposed scheme alignment runs through areas within the 20% least deprived within England, whilst the airport end of the proposed scheme passes through areas within the 20% most deprived.

Table 2 displays the proportions of properties in each of the national income deprivation quintiles within the noise assessment area, the three relevant local authorities and nationally.

Table 2: Proportion of vulnerable groups in assessment area, compared to local and English proportions

| | | Noise Assessment Area | Stockport, Cheshire East ² and Manchester | England |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---------|
| Income Quintile | 1 - most deprived | 10.7% | 31.7 % | 20.0% |
| | 2 | 5.0% | 16.8% | 20.0% |
| | 3 | 13.3% | 16.5% | 20.0% |
| | 4 | 33.0% | 14.5% | 20.0% |
| | 5 - least deprived | 37.9% | 20.5% | 20.0% |

The level of noise impacts likely to be experienced by the vulnerable groups is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of noise impacts across vulnerable groups

| | | Noise increase | No change | Noise decrease |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Income Quintile | 1 - most deprived | 12.9% | 10.1% | 3.0% |
| | 2 | 8.5% | 2.7% | 3.5% |
| | 3 | 7.5% | 16.0% | 25.1% |
| | 4 | 23.1% | 39.8% | 36.0% |
| | 5 - least deprived | 48.0% | 31.4% | 32.4% |

The Table shows that the most deprived income quintile has 12.9% of residents experiencing an increase in noise levels, compared with 48% of residents within the least deprived income quintile.

Air Quality

The DfT’s WebTAG guidance states that children are at more risk from air pollution due to the fact that they generally spend more time outside and therefore experience more exposure to harmful pollutants that impact on lung development. Although there is not currently enough evidence to conclude that these groups are more at risk as a result of poor air quality, it is recommended that consideration is given to the changes in air quality that are experienced by children.

Within the scheme area the proportions of children are similar to that of Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester local authorities as well as England as a whole. The data shows a higher proportion of under-16s to the north of the airport in Wythenshawe where properties are shown to experience either no change or small adverse impacts in air quality.

In particular, the air quality impacts are most significant to children when they are outdoors and

² Due to the size and spread of Cheshire East, only output areas in Macclesfield have been used for demographics

therefore an assessment of schools in the area has also been undertaken due to the fact that children spend time walking to and from school and playing outside. Three schools within the scheme area receive adverse changes in air quality as a consequence of the scheme.

The SDI appraisal also requires the assessment of air quality impacts against English income deprivation quintiles. Approximately half of the proposed scheme alignment runs through areas within the 20% least income deprived within England, whilst the airport end of the proposed scheme passes through areas within the 20% most income deprived.

Table 3.4 displays the proportions of properties in each national income deprivation quintiles within the air quality assessment area against the relevant local authorities and national breakdown.

Table 4: Proportion of vulnerable groups in air quality assessment area

| | | Air quality assessment area | Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester | England |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------|
| Income Quintile | 1 - most deprived | 24.7% | 20.6% | 20.0% |
| | 2 | 20.6% | 14.4% | 20.0% |
| | 3 | 20.3% | 17.1% | 20.0% |
| | 4 | 18.5% | 16.9% | 20.0% |
| | 5 - least deprived | 15.9% | 31.0% | 20.0% |

The level of air quality impacts likely to be experienced by vulnerable groups within the area is shown in Table 5. This identifies that a quarter of residents in deprivation income Quintile 1, 2 and 3 will experience an improvement in air quality levels, compared with only 11% of residents in the least deprived quintile 5. A deterioration in air quality was highest for those living in quintile 5 (35%) and quintile 4 (27%).

Table 5: Distribution of air quality impacts across vulnerable groups

| | | Improvement in air quality | No change | Deterioration in air quality |
|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Income Quintile | 1 - most deprived | 27% | 2% | 15% |
| | 2 | 22% | 2% | 16% |
| | 3 | 24% | 1% | 7% |
| | 4 | 17% | 0% | 27% |
| | 5 - least deprived | 11% | 4% | 35% |

Accidents

Any intervention that increases traffic levels and speeds or reduces physical separation between people and traffic can give rise to increases in accidents. According to the DfT's WebTAG guidance, there are several potential vulnerable groups in terms of accidents including children and younger people, young men (particularly as drivers) and older people as well vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists. There is also evidence that people living in more deprived areas are more vulnerable to accidents on the highway network.

The data shows that the proportions of under 16s, young adults (16-25 years) and older people within a 1km buffer of the proposed scheme alignment are in similar to proportions with wider local

and national levels. The exception being young males aged 16-24 years, this group represent 7.5% of the demographics of the study area compared with less than 1% in the wider local area and England.

Analysis has been undertaken to identify significant concentrations of vulnerable groups that might be impacted within the scheme area using STATS 19 data on personal injury accidents for the five years from 2005 to 2009³. This data profiles casualties by age, gender and type of road user and deprivation score and is used to identify the baseline conditions in terms of victim typology. Table 6 presents this data at a national and assessment area level for comparison.

Table 6: All Accident Casualties 2005-2009: Accident Impact Area

| | Accident casualties- All Roads | Accident Casualties - Assessment Area | Difference |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Car | 64.9% | 67.0% | 2.1% |
| Pedestrian | 12.2% | 11.9% | -0.3% |
| Motorcyclist | 9.3% | 6.8% | -2.5% |
| Cyclist | 6.7% | 7.3% | 0.6% |
| Fatal | 1.1% | 0.8% | -0.3% |
| Serious | 11.1% | 8.7% | -2.4% |
| Slight | 87.8% | 90.5% | 2.7% |
| Male | 58.1% | 54.9% | -3.2% |
| Female | 41.9% | 45.1% | 3.2% |
| <16 | 10.0% | 9.0% | -1.0% |
| 70+ | 5.3% | 5.8% | 0.5% |
| Male drivers aged 16-24 | 15.6% | 14.3% | -1.3% |

Table 6 shows that the proportion of vulnerable user accident casualties in the assessment area is generally in line with the national rate of accident casualties. There are slightly fewer pedestrian, motorcycle, and accident involving young male drivers and children and a slightly higher casualty rate for cyclists and older people.

Table 7 profiles casualties between 2005 and 2009 by vulnerable user type, age group and residential deprivation score on highway network links experiencing a reduction (>30% or <30%), no change (>5% or <5%) or increase (>30% or <30%) in accidents within the assessment area.

The table shows that for the majority of highway network links with accidents involving vulnerable users groups over the last 5 years there will be either no change or a reduction in accidents. In all cases there are more links experiencing a reduction in accidents involving vulnerable users than for links experiencing an increase in accidents.

³ Road Casualties Online

<http://www2.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/accidents/roadcasualtiesonline/index.html>

Table 7: Summary of accidents savings from accident analysis: Accident Casualty Types between 2005 and 2009

| Vulnerable Group /Accident Type | Change in Accident Rates | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Significant reduction (>30%) | Slight reduction (<30%) | No Significant Change (<5% or <5%) | Slight Increase (<30%) | Significant Increase (>30%) |
| Car | 5.4% | 26.2% | 57.6% | 9.3% | 1.5% |
| Pedestrian | 4.0% | 29.5% | 53.9% | 11.3% | 1.4% |
| Motorcyclist | 7.9% | 26.7% | 52.1% | 12.4% | 0.9% |
| Cyclist | 7.2% | 28.6% | 50.7% | 12.6% | 0.9% |
| Fatal | 3.1% | 23.4% | 62.5% | 7.8% | 3.1% |
| Serious | 5.9% | 28.1% | 54.3% | 10.5% | 1.2% |
| Slight | 5.5% | 26.8% | 56.5% | 10.0% | 1.3% |
| Male | 5.8% | 26.6% | 56.1% | 10.1% | 1.4% |
| Female | 5.0% | 27.3% | 56.6% | 9.8% | 1.2% |
| <16 | 4.6% | 25.1% | 56.0% | 13.5% | 0.9% |
| 70+ | 4.9% | 29.4% | 51.2% | 13.0% | 1.5% |
| Male drivers aged 16-24 | 7.2% | 24.0% | 55.9% | 10.9% | 2.1% |

Severance

Severance is often an unintended consequence of a measure intended to address other problems. Severance issues may be identified at an early stage and in many cases a design solution may reduce or eliminate impacts.

According to the DfT's WebTAG guidance, there are certain groups that are particularly vulnerable to the effects of severance. These include no car households, older people, children and people with disabilities. Table 8 provides a breakdown of the number and proportion of these groups living within the severance assessment area and a comparison with the proportions of these populations living within local authorities of Manchester, Cheshire East and Stockport as well as the national levels. The table shows that overall the proportion of vulnerable groups within the scheme area is either in line or lower than the local or regional rates with significant lower of non-car ownership and low levels of people aged over 70 years.

However, data shows that there are concentrations of some of the vulnerable groups at a higher level than the three main local authorities – Stockport, Manchester and Cheshire East rate located within the scheme area. There are a number of schools located within a 1km buffer of the scheme alignment and the relatively high percentage of children in some areas (over 24%) show that there are likely to be many walking journeys to/from schools within the scheme area where there may potentially be changes in traffic flow.

Table 8: Vulnerable Groups living within Severance Impact Area

| Vulnerable Group | % of total population in study area (1Km buffer) | % Cheshire East/ Stockport/ Manchester | % England |
|---|--|--|-----------|
| Children: aged <16 | 18.1% | 18.9% | 18.7% |
| Older people: aged 70+ | 10.2% | 6.7% | 17.3% |
| Disability Living Allowance (DLA) Claimants | 5.7% | 5.5% | 3.7% |
| No Car Households | 7.5% | 13.6% | 10.7% |
| Overall population in 1km buffer area | 49,163 | | |

Accessibility

Transport scheme options will often have differentiated impacts on accessibility as experienced by different groups of people. This reflects a range of social and distributional factors including differences in travel needs and places of residence.

According to the DfT’s WebTAG guidance, there are certain groups that are particularly vulnerable to the effects of poor accessibility. These groups include no-car households, young people, older people, households with dependent children, black and minority ethnic communities and people with disabilities.

The socio-demographic profile for the area provided shows that the proportions of these groups within the study area are in line with/ or lower than national or local rates. However these groups are more likely to be users of public transport services and therefore the impacts of the proposed scheme on bus service accessibility will disproportionately impact on these vulnerable users.

Due to the limited availability of journey time data from the traffic modelling outputs and any future proposed timetabling and re-routeing of local bus services it is not possible to undertake a full accessibility appraisal based on any future scenario Accession model. Therefore the accessibility appraisal of SDIs follows a qualitative assessment to consider the likely impacts to bus services and the potential impacts this may have on vulnerable groups.

It is not considered that any major changes will occur to bus timetables as a result of the scheme. - Although traffic flow changes occur on many of the routes used by bus services it is unlikely that this will be of a magnitude to impact on journey times and speeds.

However, residents could benefit from potential new bus routes created as a result of the scheme and may experience improvements in journey time. This would be particularly beneficial for bus users living along the A6 including those in Disley and Hazel Grove and from Stockport. Where there are high proportions of younger and older people.

Security

Some schemes may introduce perceived or real security risks that affect transport choices by different groups of people. Where choices are constrained by concerns regarding security and especially where those affected do not have access to a car, access to certain places or travel at desired times may be denied to members of these groups.

There are certain groups that have particular concerns about their personal security including older people, children, women, black and minority ethnic residents and people with disabilities.

There are certain groups that have particular concerns about their personal security including older people, children, women, black and minority ethnic residents and people with disabilities. Table 9 shows the concentration of each of these vulnerable groups compared to local and national levels.

Table 9: Concentration of Vulnerable Groups in Security Impacts Area

| Vulnerable Group | % Scheme Area (1km buffer) | % Cheshire East/ Stockport/ Manchester | % England |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|
| Older People (Aged 70+) | 10.2% | 6.7% | 17.3% |
| Children (People Aged Under 16) | 18.1% | 18.9% | 18.7% |
| Women | 51.8% | 50.4% | 50.8% |
| Disability Living Allowance Claimants | 5.7% | 5.5% | 3.7% |
| Black and Minority Ethnic Residents | 7.2% | 13.6% | 10.7% |

This shows that the area has a similar proportion of younger people, women and people with disabilities in line with local and national proportions. However the study area has higher proportions of older people compared with the region, but lower proportions of BME communities. The data shows that within the scheme area there are high concentrations of:

- Children aged under 16 in the Woodhouse estate; and
- Older people in the Styal area

Police crime maps⁴ shows that for December 2011 the neighbourhood areas of Stockport East, Cheshire East and Woodhouse Park and Sharston all had an average level of crime and anti-social behaviour compared with the rest of England and Wales based on the number of crimes per 1000 people within the population area. However, the most common incidents reported within the area involve anti-social behaviour and violent crimes. Security issues are often linked to perceptions of poor security and therefore good design of public transport stops, interchanges and passenger facilities is fundamental to improve the actual and perceived levels of security.

There is no information available regarding public transport users in the area but based on previous experience these are likely to be older and younger people and people without access to a car of which there are high concentrations. It is anticipated that the improved network infrastructure including pedestrian crossings, safety barriers and pedestrian deterring pavement and planting will help to provide a more controlled area for the safe crossing of pedestrians. This will provide some positive impact on security. Furthermore the design of the scheme has taken into account landscaping issues that help to minimise concealed areas and ensure open visibility and clear sight lines.

User Benefits

In the majority of cases user benefits are associated with any new transport intervention but these are generally net outcomes. Within the net outcome some people may experience disbenefits for example through longer journey times or lower public transport service frequencies.

In the case of user benefits, it is necessary to understand the income distribution of users in the assessment area. This has been undertaken by mapping income deprivation according to their

⁴ <http://www.police.uk>

national rank, using data from the Indices of Deprivation (ID 2010) Income Domain at Super Output Area level.

Overall, 96% of the population within the assessment area experience a benefit as a result of the scheme, and just under 4% of residents experience a disbenefit, as shown in Table 10. A higher proportion of residents in the two most deprived income quintiles experience benefits of the scheme compared to those in the two least deprived areas.

Table 10: Distribution of user benefits across population by Income Deprivation Quintiles

| Income Quintile | Impact | | Total in assessment area |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Benefit | Disbenefit | |
| 1 – most deprived | 138,678 (99.8%) | 247 (0.2%) | 138,926 (17.3%) |
| 2 | 129,236 (98.0%) | 2,614 (2.0%) | 131,850 (16.4%) |
| 3 | 140,672 (97.5%) | 3,651 (2.5%) | 144,322 (18.0%) |
| 4 | 159,147 (91.5%) | 14,759 (8.5%) | 173,906 (21.6%) |
| 5 – least deprived | 204,870 (95.5%) | 9,554 (4.5%) | 214,425 (26.7%) |
| Total Population | 772,604 (96.2%) | 30,825 (3.8%) | 803,428 |

Summary of Impacts

Table 11 presents a summary of the key social and distributional impacts for inclusion in the Appraisal Summary Table.

Table 11: Summary of Key Impacts

| Assessed Indicator | Summary of Key Impacts | Seven Point Scale Assessment |
|--------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Noise | <p>Overall 7% (1,727) of households in the assessment area experience a decrease in noise levels and 39% (10,172 households) were forecast to have an increase, though the majority of these increases were measured as minor adverse.</p> <p>Income deprived quintile (3) demonstrates the lowest proportion of net losers (4%); with Quintile 5 experiencing the highest proportion (51%).</p> <p>Taking into account the overall noise impacts, especially those living in properties located in the most deprived income quintile and for the impact on schools in the area, the scheme has been appraised as having a moderate adverse impact on noise SDIs.</p> | Moderate Adverse |
| Air Quality | <p>Overall 20% (2,156) of households experience deterioration in air quality and 79% in the assessment area (8,687 households) were forecast to have an improvement in air quality as a result of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>The most income deprived quintile (1) demonstrates the highest proportion of net winners (31.5%); with the least deprived quintile (5) showing the smallest proportion of net winners (2.4%) for the air quality assessment.</p> <p>Taking into account the above assessment for each of the</p> | Moderate Beneficial |

EIA PRO FORMA

| | | |
|---------------|---|---------------------|
| | quintiles, especially those living in properties located in the most deprived income quintile, the scheme has been appraised as having a large beneficial impact on air quality. | |
| Accidents | There is an overall reduction of 885 accidents forecast over the 60 year appraisal period. The SDI analysis used 5 years worth of casualty data to identify the potential impacts as a result of the change in accident numbers on potentially vulnerable groups through mapping casualty locations and analysing demographic and user information. The assessment identified that the benefits are proportionately distributed across different user groups and past locations of accident show that there is likely to be more vulnerable users experiencing a reduction in accidents than those experiencing an increase in accidents. There the scheme demonstrates a moderate beneficial impact on accidents. | Moderate Beneficial |
| Severance | The Scheme will result in a reduction of traffic on local residential and rural roads potentially providing improved conditions for pedestrians and removing potential barriers caused by traffic levels. However the level of severance will be increased in some areas, these are at the location of the scheme itself and at roads predicted to receive an increase due to traffic accessing the new road. | Slight Beneficial |
| Accessibility | There is no current information from public transport operators regarding potential changes to their services as a result of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. Accession analysis shows that the population able to access the airport by PT is wide reaching. Reduction in traffic flows in the local area may reduce rat running and enable bus services to run more efficiently. The scheme should in particular provide improvements for PT passengers travelling to the airport (or destinations on the way) from the A6 Corridor and Stockport. The scheme is assessed as having a slight beneficial impact on accessibility. | Slight Beneficial |
| Security | Overall the assessment demonstrates a slight beneficial impact on security across the scheme area as a result of the proposed scheme. | Slight Beneficial |
| User Benefits | The proportion of residents experiencing benefits from the scheme is fairly distributed across income groups. Only around 4% of residents within the assessment area experience disbenefits as a result of the scheme, and the majority of these residents live within the least deprived income quintiles within the assessment area. The value of these disbenefits is also considerably lower than the value of benefits experienced in each income quintile. As such the SDI appraisal had assessed user benefits as moderate beneficial . | Moderate Beneficial |

Table 12 summarises the impacts discussed above on each of the relevant vulnerable groups.

Table 12: SDI Appraisal Summary

| DISTRIBUTIONAL IMPACTS | | SOCIAL IMPACTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Income Groups (Income Domain) | | | | | User Groups | | | Social Groups | | | | | |
| Impacts | Most Deprived Least Deprived | | | | | Pedestrians | Cyclists | Motorcyclists | Children & Young People | Young Males | Older People | No Car Households | Women | People with Disabilities | Black and Minority Ethnic |
| | 0-20% | 20-40% | 40-60% | 60-80% | 80-100% | | | | | | | | | | |
| User benefits | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Noise | xx | xx | x | x | xxx | | | | * | | | | | | |
| Air quality | ✓✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Accidents | | | | | | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | ✓✓ | | | | | |
| Security | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Severance | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Accessibility | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |

Key:
 ✓✓✓ = Large Beneficial ✓✓ = Moderate Beneficial ✓ = Slight Beneficial
 x = Slight Adverse xx = Moderate Adverse xxx = Large Adverse 0 = Neutral

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Findings

The Scheme has a complex set of positive and negative health and wellbeing impacts for residents, users of amenities and workers in.

Overall, the health and wellbeing impacts across the life of the Scheme are mostly positive particularly for residents, users of amenities and workers who live in areas where traffic is removed for their local roads and also for those who live along the length of the proposed route, for whom the road improves connectivity and accessibility to services and amenities further away.

The positive health and wellbeing impacts are widespread across the wards in Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester and occur:

- Along the route - through increased employment (particularly during the construction phase), the potential for business growth and development, improved connectivity and accessibility to services and amenities further away.
- On surrounding local roads - through reductions in noise, visual intrusion and air pollution and increased community cohesion.
- The greatest positive impacts are likely to be experienced by the more disadvantaged residents in Manchester who live near local roads that traffic will be diverted from.

The negative health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be experienced by residents living close to the proposed road, the characteristics of whom are identified within the Social and Distributional Impact Assessment report. The majority of the potential negative health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be relatively minor, short term (largely during the construction phase), temporary and localised. However, for a small number of residents, some of the potential negative health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be permanent in nature due to loss of homes or gardens; loss of land; loss of some of the footpaths and cycle networks. In addition for some residents, workers and users of amenities there is likely to be a minor to moderate negative health and wellbeing impact because of some increased noise, air pollution and visual intrusion long term because of the proximity of the Scheme to where they live, work or use amenities.

The main vulnerable groups that were considered in the HIA are:

- children and young people
- older people
- people with disabilities
- women
- unemployed and low income groups
- people from minority ethnic backgrounds
- people with existing health conditions (with a focus on existing cardiovascular and respiratory disease)

Health impacts on children and young people

During the construction phase, the potential health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be from:

Physical injury: there are potentially higher risks of physical injury because of increased lorry traffic and exposure to all types of traffic for longer due to temporarily reduced access on some roads and the temporary severance of footpaths and cycleways. This is likely to affect, in particular, children and young people who walk, cycle and/or use buses.

Mental health and wellbeing: the noise and other disruptions from construction work could adversely affect learning, studying, relaxation and sleep.

Transport and Connectivity: construction work and construction related traffic is likely to generate congestion in some areas and make journey times longer. This could make it difficult for some

children to get to and use educational, leisure and shopping amenities.

Learning and education: children and young people attending schools and other educational establishments along the Scheme are likely to be affected by some noise, dust and visual intrusion. This could have an impact on their learning and also exacerbate existing respiratory conditions in children.

Leisure and recreation: during both the construction and operation phases through the loss of some recreational greenspace and sports field land. Some other greenspaces will be very near the proposed route and therefore children using these spaces could experience higher levels of noise, visual intrusion and air pollution.

During the operation phase the potential health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be from:

Transport and connectivity: journey times are likely to improve for both cars and buses. For some children the proposed route is likely to improve their access to school and leisure activities.

Learning and education: children and young people attending schools and other educational establishments along the Scheme are likely to be affected by some noise intrusion. This could have an impact on their learning.

Crime and safety: in areas where new footpaths and cycleways are near homes and particularly back gardens there are likely to be safety concerns for allowing children to play unsupervised in back gardens and potentially increasing the risk of burglary.

Social capital and community cohesion: in areas where new footpaths and cycleways are incorporated into the scheme and where traffic is reduced as some car drivers reduce their use of residential roads in favour of the Scheme, this is likely to encourage children and young people to walk and cycle to school.

Health impacts on women

During the construction phase, the potential health and wellbeing impacts are likely to be from:

Lifestyle and daily routine: there is likely to be disruptions to residents' daily routine particularly women who generally undertake most of the household chores. Construction work taking place along different sections and some temporary junction closures could also reduce on-street social interactions.

Transport and connectivity: those women reliant on public transport and walking to amenities could face greater disruption.

During the operation phase the potential health and wellbeing impacts on women are likely to be similar to those experienced by other residents depending on where along the scheme that they live.

Health impacts on older people

Older people are likely to have a similar set of health and wellbeing impacts to women though the significance of the negative impacts in particular are likely to be greater for this group of residents, particularly if they live close to the construction activities, are dependent on public transport and/or have a long term disability or health condition.

They are also more likely to reduce going outdoors, find it more difficult to go about their daily activities and more easily lose contact with friends and family during the construction phase because of the general disruption and difficulties caused by construction activities.

Health impacts on people with disabilities and long term health conditions

People with disabilities and long term health conditions would also have a similar set of health and wellbeing impacts to women and older people and again depending on their disability the significance of the negative impacts in particular is likely to be greater on this group of residents during the construction phase particularly if they live, work or use services close to construction activities.

Health impacts on people on low income/unemployed people

The construction work and continuous length of road is likely to create new jobs and attract new businesses and economic investment into Stockport, Cheshire East and Manchester. The route will also improve connectivity for local bus services.

Within the tender documents for the scheme it states that *“The Contractor shall comply and fully embrace the requirements of each local authority’s relevant employment strategy. The Contractor shall ensure that all opportunities to employ and train local people are investigated and implemented.”* All contractors tendering for the scheme have indicated that they would support this approach.

Cumulative impacts and long term implications

Construction phase impacts are likely to be felt from the beginning to the end of the construction phase by residents, users of amenities and workers along the Scheme and in surrounding areas, even when specific construction work is completed in the vicinity of where they live, use amenities or work. This is because the disruption at one point could have ripple effects across the different sections, including local roads which will be used particularly in areas with new section of road being constructed, unless this is well managed.

The Scheme will also permanently reduce some agricultural land, open spaces and recreational land. This could have some implications for wellbeing impacts on residents and users of amenities who enjoy these green and open spaces.

Most of the land that the passes through is designated greenbelt therefore it is unclear at this stage, what other developments, will happen at the same time as the construction phase of the Scheme.

There are a number of potential housing development that are likely to be built during the construction or operation of the Scheme. These include the Woodford development (750-850 homes), East Handforth development (1,800 homes). This is likely to increase the levels of traffic along the Scheme however relatively speaking the numbers of additional vehicles due to these developments is small compared to traffic from other areas.

Equality/Inequality impacts

The key equality/inequality issue is whether the negative health and wellbeing impacts from the economic, access/connectivity, community cohesion, and increased noise, visual intrusion and air pollution impacts fall disproportionately on already disadvantaged residents, users of amenities and workers along the route of the Scheme. And whether the positive health and wellbeing impacts accrue largely to those who are already better off from a health and wellbeing perspective.

The majority of negative impacts occur during the construction phase, are mostly temporary in nature and likely to be experienced by residents living within 200m of the Scheme. The greatest negative health and wellbeing impacts are on the small number of residents and business owners whose land is needed for the Scheme, particularly if all their land is needed and they therefore need to relocate.

The majority of the positive impacts, both during the construction and operation phases, are likely to be experienced by residents living both close to and further away from the Scheme.

Though there is greater deprivation at the western end of the Scheme – Woodhouse Park, (Wythenshawe, Manchester); Heald Green (Stockport; and Handforth), Wilmslow North (Cheshire East) – there are no particular or different impacts that these areas face compared to other areas along the Scheme route.

Stage 2a: Further Data and Consultation

If you feel that the data and past consultation feedback you have is not sufficient to properly consider the impact before a decision is made then you may wish to supplement your evidence base with more data or further consultation. This should be proportionate to the scale of the decision and will depend on the gaps in your current understanding (see guidance notes at the end of this form).

Based on previous experience, the DfT has developed WebTAG guidance on types of impacts that should be assessed in developing the scheme. The Business Case, Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement for the scheme will contain these appraisals.

As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the scheme (which will be reported in the Environmental Statement) a scoping report was produced which identified areas where data needed to be gathered in order for an assessment to be undertaken. This was consulted upon and informed the Environmental Impact Assessment.

Therefore, based on the above information and the results and measures below, it is not considered that further information is needed at this time.

Stage 3: Results and Measures

As a result of what you have learned in Stage 2 what will you do to ensure that no group is unfairly and unlawfully impacted upon as a result of the proposed change(s)? (see guidance notes at the end of this form)

In developing the scheme the project team has sought to address any impacts of the scheme where appropriate and proportionate. In doing so, aspects considered include:

- Design Standards;
- Addressing Noise and Air Quality Impacts of the Scheme;
- Pedestrian and Cycle Facilities;
- Complementary and Mitigation Measures;
- Design Changes in Response to Consultation Feedback;
- Replacement open space;
- Code of Construction Practice.

Further details of each these aspects of the scheme are set out below.

Design Standards

DDA Compliance

The scheme has been designed using the applicable current standards provided by the Highway Agency's – Standards for Highways, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The standards provided by the Highway Agency are applicable to all areas of the scheme with the exception of Public Rights of Way (PRoW). It should also be noted that design relaxations and constraints would ultimately be approved by the relevant Highway Authority, either Manchester City Council, Cheshire East Council and Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.

With a view to the above standards, the Highways Agency states that,
“The Highways Agency is committed to improving the accessibility of its network and services for disabled people and to meeting our legal obligations under the Disability Discrimination Acts (DDA) 1995 and 2005. The Agency embraces the ethos behind the DDA and recognises the importance of meeting the requirements of disabled people who need and want to use the network. Since the introduction of DDA legislation we have reviewed and updated our design standards to make them compliant with DDA standards.”

It can therefore be established that the scheme is compliant with the current DDA regulations. It is not wholly clear whether Public Rights of Way are subject to the DDA regulations, however for the purposes of the scheme, it has been assumed that they are a “function” of the public authority and so are subject to the regulations. The DDA regulations state, however, that the regulations do not apply to a local authority when exercising a statutory power. The statutory duties of the Highway Act stipulate that the highway authority is required to maintain the highway to a standard that is in keeping with the character of the highway and to a level that can be reasonably expected, however,

there are no regulations that stipulate that it is a requirement of the local authority to upgrade existing rights of way to be DDA compliant outside what can be reasonably expected as part of the Local Authorities Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP).

On the Public Rights of Way through the scheme the principles of “Gap, Gate, Stile” were adopted bearing in mind the nature of the right of way, the existing access provisions on the connecting right of ways and the consideration of landowners in the vicinity. The “Gap, Gate, Stile” principles recommend that the solution with least disruption is utilised where possible when choosing the access/egress. It suggests that the best solution is a gap, i.e. no obstruction, is the best solution, however this can be impractical in some scenarios due to livestock etc, it then goes on to gates which vary in their accessibility from a standard wicket gate (accessible) to a kissing gate (partially inaccessible, depending on design) and finally suggest that Stiles should only be used as a last choice as they are highly inaccessible.

The “Gap, Gate, Stile” principles are considered to be in parallel with the principles of “Least Restrictive Access” which similarly stipulates that the specified means of access to be installed must meet the highest possible access standard. Due to the wide and varied nature of the countryside and associated Rights of Way, it is widely agreed that there is no singular standard that is universally applicable. There are a number of standards which can be adopted depending on the context of the site, however due to the diversity of all sites the standards should be applied with consideration given to all constraints of the site. Further guidance is available in *The Countryside Agency’s – By All Reasonable Means: Inclusive Access to the outdoors for disabled people*. The standards recommended in this document predominantly aim to provide guidance on the auditing and designation of particular sites into certain categories, and then goes on to provide recommendations for the design of the categorised site.

The British Standard BS 5709 also provides guidance on the principles of “Gaps, Gates and Stiles” and provides a number of “rules” which are applicable to all structures in order to be compliant.

The Equality Act 2010 amalgamated all the discriminatory acts including the Disability Discrimination Act. There were no changes of note in relation to the regulations applicable in this scheme.

The Principal Contractor, on appointment, is charged with writing a Non-Motorised User (NMU) audit and NMU context report within his early development and adoption of the scheme design. He will be provided with all scheme design materials to date including drawings, minutes of stakeholder meetings, records of review (including COPECAT report), Local Authority officer comments (including the cycling officer, PRoW officer etc.) and consultation comments.

Road Safety

Road Safety Audits, which consider all road users including pedestrians and cyclists, have been undertaken at various stages in the scheme’s development. A Road Safety Audit will also be undertaken once the scheme has been implemented.

Security

The scheme has been developed to be secure by design. Greater Manchester Police’ Design for Security has been engaged with in developing the scheme design. No scheme can ever ensure complete security. Permeability should not be removed due to security concerns as the need for access must be weighed against other factors.

Addressing Noise and Air Quality Impacts of the Scheme

Noise

Appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures are proposed to address the noise impact of the scheme. Noise mitigation is defined as measures taken in order to control the level of noise perceived at a receiver point. These measures can include changing the location of the noise

source, changing the characteristics of the noise source or obstructing the propagation of the noise through the receiving environment. Noise mitigation measures on this scheme include the incorporation of bunds / landscaping and noise barriers. In addition low noise surfacing will also be utilised.

Air Quality

It is considered that there is no effective, viable and quantifiable mitigation measures for the scheme in the operation phase. However, based on the analysis, it is considered that there will be a significant net air quality benefit to sensitive receptors in the study area as a result of the implementation of the proposed scheme.

Pedestrian and Cycle Facilities

The scheme will include provision of a segregated pedestrian and cycle route adjacent to the new road and the existing length of the A555, providing a new link for the strategic cycle/pedestrian network.

This new link will be fully integrated with the existing local cycle and pedestrian network to maximise access to the new route and therefore the benefits associated with the Scheme. This route is intended for both commuting and leisure use.

The project team is currently developing proposals to connect the Scheme's pedestrian and cycle route with the existing local network to deliver an integrated and accessible new east-west link for pedestrians and cyclists.

The provision of these new links to the existing network will be an important component of the overall scheme, particularly when combined with the complementary measures described below. The pedestrian and cycle network will provide a high-quality, safe and direct east-west link, supporting the step-change in provision of infrastructure for non-motorised modes.

The walking and cycling facilities provided as part of the scheme will support access to employment and facilities for non-motorised transport users among young and more economically deprived groups.

An independent Concise Pedestrian and Cycle Audit (COPECAT) review has been undertaken on the preferred scheme. The results of the review demonstrate that the design principles for the pedestrian and cyclists' provision on the scheme are appropriate, maximise the benefits of the designs and provide suitable facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. The COPECAT review makes a number of suggestions for design modifications which are currently being considered with a view to incorporate them at the detailed design stage.

Complementary and Mitigation Measures

The scheme will reduce congestion on local roads in the surrounding areas, however, it is recognised that some areas will see some increases in traffic.

A package of measures, known as Complementary and Mitigation Measures, is being proposed to address these changes to traffic flows. Where there are predicted to be reductions in traffic flow, Complementary Measures will include schemes to encourage walking and cycling and support local centres.

Mitigation Measures will seek to address the impact of the scheme on local communities where there are predicted to be increases in traffic flow and junction delay.

These schemes will be site specific, route or centre based and could include:

- The provision of new cycleways and footpaths to link the existing network to the new, segregated cycleway forming part of the core scheme;
- Enhancement of existing networks for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders;
- Priority schemes for public transport;
- Public realm improvements;
- Modest traffic management proposals, such as traffic calming on residential routes; and
- Junction remodelling to optimise the operational capability of existing junctions, where required.

Based on the latest traffic modelling information a number of areas have been identified for Complementary and Mitigation Measures. The detail of the measures is still to be determined through further analysis and consultation. The needs of the groups included within this EqIA will be considered in the development of the Complementary and Mitigation Measures.

Design Changes in Response to Consultation Feedback

In developing the scheme the project team has sought to implement design changes in response to comments and concerns raised by local residents through Phase One and Two consultations in order to address the issues raised. This includes for example:

- East of Macclesfield Road/ South of Darley Road: the alignment of the relief road was moved further south, lowering the vertical alignment of the relief road and adjusting the design of the noise mounding accordingly.
- Woodford Road, Bramhall: the size of the junction was reduced by moving the east bound diverge slip road further south.
- A34/Stanley Road: Visual Mitigation (an earth mound) was introduced on the northwest side of the junction following requests from residents at the Woodford exhibition and Stanley Green LLF.

The Design Change Report has been produced which sets out in detail the design changes that have been made to the scheme as a result of the requests made during Phase One and Two public consultations and land owner/stakeholder meetings. Some design changes have also taken place independently of the suggestions of the public.

Replacement Open Space

There is a commitment to replace any formal and informal open space required for the scheme.

Code of Construction Practice

Construction of the scheme is programmed to take place from late 2014 to mid 2017.

We have developed a draft Code of Construction Practice (the Code) to protect the interests of local residents, businesses and the general public in the immediate vicinity of the construction works.

The Code will seek to minimise impacts, such as noise, vibration and traffic, during the period of construction.

The Code will be submitted as part of the Planning Application for the scheme. It will be the responsibility of the appointed contractor to comply with the Code.

The Code will include:

- Contractor Parking – The contractor is to agree any areas of parking for their employees that fall outside the boundary of the site compound with the relevant local authority prior to the commencement of the works. The contractor shall ensure that any disruption caused to local residents is kept to a minimum.
- The use of temporary signing to restrict vehicle types/sizes and sign agreed construction traffic routes. The requirement to access the site via these routes will be communicated to suppliers of the Contractor.
- Certain roads are 'traffic sensitive' routes and as such works affecting the carriageway are

EIA PRO FORMA

restricted to between 9.30am and 3.30pm on weekdays unless otherwise agreed with the three councils traffic managers and local Police.

- Agreements will be in place with local authorities on noise limits for work sites and other relevant issues before the works are due to commence on site. Measures to reduce noise during construction include:
 - Site compounds to be surrounded by fencing or other barriers, where appropriate.
 - Use of electrical items of plant instead of diesel or petrol plant in especially sensitive locations.
 - Exhaust silencing and plant muffling equipment to be maintained in good working order.
- The hours of working for the construction works are likely to be limited to between 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on a Saturday unless the Contractor proposes additional or alternative working hours for construction reasons or the contractor is required to undertake certain works outside these hours. It is anticipated that some works on the rail crossings will be undertaken at night times and weekends. In instances where the Contractor proposes a change to the working hours, prior approval will be sought.
- The Contractor will ensure that all reasonable measures are taken to protect local residents from nuisance and physical damage that may be caused by vibration.
- The Contractor will take all necessary measures to avoid creating a dust nuisance.
- A complaints procedure will be in place whereby members of the public can, if necessary, make contact by telephone direct with a "hot line" facility. Details of the named contacts to whom all written complaints, including emails, should be addressed will be available.

In addition to the Code, the contractor is to also adopt the recommendations of the Considerate Constructor Scheme which aims to ensure good construction practice on the part of the contractor.

Stage 4: Decision Stage

Once your plan/policy is fully developed it will need to go through the correct scrutiny and approval channels: the EIA should be included as part of this (see guidance notes at the end of this form).

GUIDANCE NOTES

At all stages of the EIA process you can contact the Corporate Team or your directorate representative for advice. Before you reach the decision stage you can send the EIA form to the team for feedback and guidance. They can provide advice and make sure that there are no gaps that need addressing. Contact the team on ext 3125 or email gaynor.alexander@stockport.gov.uk or holly.rae@stockport.gov.uk .

Stage 1: Do you need to complete an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)?

Not all policies will require an EIA: these key questions will help you to decide whether you need to conduct one.

KEY QUESTION: IS A DECISION REQUIRED AT THE END OF THE PROCESS? YES/NO

An EIA must be carried out if a decision has to be made. This applies whether the decision is made at full council or by a service director. If you do not need to conduct an EIA, include a paragraph which states your reasoning.

Additional questions to consider:

- ◆ Is this a sub policy/plan? *There is no need to carry out an EIA on every single sub-policy or plan: the EIA carried out for the overarching policy/plan will apply in most cases.*
- ◆ Is this a local interpretation of national policy? *Government departments are also required to EIA new policies: you may be able to use this as your base.*
- ◆ Are you implementing a decision? *If you are writing procedure or a delivery plan you will not need to carry out an EIA. EIAs are only required to inform decisions.*

Examples:

An EIA would be required if:

- *you are proposing to terminate or redesign a service*
- *you are writing a key strategic policy such as the Housing Strategy.*

An EIA would not be required if:

- *you are writing a sub policy of e.g. the Housing Strategy (covered by an overarching EIA)*
- *you are writing an delivery plan for the NEET Strategy*
- *you are writing a local delivery plan for a Department of Health statutory policy (the DoH will have carried out a national EIA).*

Stage 2: What do you know?

An EIA should be based upon robust evidence. This stage will guide you through potential sources of information and how to interpret it. Understanding the current context is a key stage in all policy making and planning.

KEY QUESTION: WHAT DATA CAN YOU USE?

It is important to use a variety of sources to understand the climate in which you are proposing this change. Consider using the following sources:

- Profiling Stockport
- Diversity and Equality Annual Report
- Ethnic diversity service data
- Performance data
- Staff data profiles
- Service user profile data
- Financial data
- Pilot projects
- Feedback from complaints
- JSNA data hub.

Additional questions to consider:

- ◆ Is the data relevant? E.g. the data does not have to be specific to your service area as long as it is relevant
- ◆ Can you draw upon feedback and data from previous consultation exercises?
 - Feedback from focus groups
 - User feedback
- ◆ Consider talking to the equality expert in your directorate: they may know of other sources/consultations that will be of use.
- ◆ Are there any gaps in the data? How will you go about addressing these?

KEY QUESTION: WHAT DOES THE DATA TELL YOU?

- ◆ Are there any trends?
- ◆ Does it show anything about specific user groups? Pay particular regard to the protected groups; race, disability, gender, religion & belief, age, sexual orientation and gender reassignment. And also socio-economic status.

KEY QUESTION: WILL THE POLICY/PLAN IMPACT UPON ANY SPECIFIC GROUPS?

There is no statistical test: this is a judgement call to be informed by the data and your knowledge/experience of the service.

Could the impact be different for different groups?

Additional questions to consider:

- ◆ Consider how different groups will access your service - *are your opening hours suitable for families / older people / full time workers? Is your building accessible?*
- ◆ Consider how you will communicate the change should it go ahead. *Will you need to use different languages? Will you need to cater for people with disabilities such as visual or hearing impairments?*
- ◆ If you are proposing to target a certain population group will it leave other population needs unmet? *State your reasoning - e.g. ring-fenced funding; limited resource; the target group has particular problems which need to be addressed*
- ◆ Will the changes you are proposing impact upon other service areas?

Stage 2a: Further Data and Consultation

If you feel that the data and past consultation feedback you have is not sufficient to properly consider the impact before a decision is made, then you may wish to supplement your evidence base with more data or further consultation. This should be proportionate to the scale of the decision and will depend on the gaps in your current understanding.

KEY QUESTION: WHAT GAPS EXIST IN YOUR CURRENT UNDERSTANDING?

Once you have identified what gaps exist you can then decide what further sources of information you need in order to fully understand the equality implications of your proposal.

KEY QUESTION: WHAT GROUPS(S) WILL YOU CONSULT?

You may consider consulting with

- Council employee focus groups
- Trade Unions
- Service users
- Groups that don't currently use your service.

KEY QUESTION: HOW WILL YOU MAKE YOUR CONSULTATION ACCESSIBLE?

Look at what you already know from Stage 1 - this can help you to identify if there are any groups you will particularly need to cater for.

Additional questions for consideration:

- Consider how you will ensure that people with disabilities can take part
- How will you ensure people who speak other languages are catered for?
- Is your consultation material easy to understand?
- Can people respond in a number of ways? Particularly not just online.

- If people have questions who will they ask?
- If you are holding drop-in sessions will they be at different times so all groups can access them?

Stage 3: Results and Measures

As a result of what you have learned in Stage 2 what will you do to ensure that no group is unfairly and unlawfully impacted upon as a result of the proposed change(s)?

KEY QUESTION: HAVE YOU CHANGED ANYTHING AS A RESULT OF COMPLETING THE EIA?

This section will act as a record of the process: you should record any changes you have made and the reasoning behind them. Equally where you have decided not to make a change you should also record the reasoning.

It is important to record the process fully as it will strengthen the decision-making and ensure that decisions are transparent and well evidenced and enable them to stand up to scrutiny and challenge.

KEY QUESTION: IF YOU HAVE MADE CHANGES HOW WILL YOU KNOW THAT THEY ARE EFFECTIVE?

Here you should record how you intend to measure how successful the changes you have made in response to the EIA have been and how you will seek to further reduce impact in the future.

Additional questions for consideration:

- ◆ Are you going to monitor how your service is accessed?
- ◆ Will you seek customer feedback to make sure the changes are successful?
- ◆ Will you use performance measures to track success over time?
- ◆ How often will you report of your measures?
- ◆ And who will you report to?
- ◆ How often will you look to review the changes and seek to further reduce impact?

Stage 4: Decision Stage

Once your plan/policy is fully developed it will need to go through the correct scrutiny and approval channels: the EIA should be included as part of this.

KEY QUESTION: HAVE YOU INCLUDED THE COMPLETED EIA FOR CONSIDERATION ALONG WITH THE REST OF YOUR DOCUMENTATION?

The completed EIA form should be included as an appendix to highlight the key equality and diversity issues which ought to be considered as part of the decision.

KEY QUESTION: HAVE YOU SENT A COPY OF THE APPROVED POLICY/PLAN AND COMPLETED EIA FOR INCLUSION ON THE EIA REGISTER?

If your policy/plan is approved then a copy of the EIA will need to be added to the Council's [EIA register](#). EIAs must by law be accessible to the public and will be uploaded to the Council Website.

Make sure you send your completed form, along with the policy/plan, to gaynor.alexander@stockport.gov.uk or holly.rae@stockport.gov.uk. This requirement does not just apply to strategic policies but to all key decisions.