

APPENDIX B

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: Safer Roads Fund – A252 Chilham to Charing

What is being assessed? Highway Project

Responsible Owner: Tim Read

Date of Initial Screening: 13/09/2017

Date of Full EqIA :

| Version | Author | Date | Comment |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Jamie Watson | 13/09/17 | First draft |
| 2 | A Agyepong | 21/9/2017 | Comments for review |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |

APPENDIX B

Screening Grid

| Characteristic | 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? | Assessment of potential impact HIGH/MEDIUM LOW/NONE UNKNOWN | | Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes what? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why? | Could this policy, procedure, project or service promote equal opportunities for this group? YES/NO - Explain how good practice can promote equal opportunities |
|----------------|---|--|----------|--|---|
| | | Positive | Negative | Internal action must be included in Action Plan | If yes you must provide detail |
| Age | No –All proposed alterations will benefit this characteristic such as central refuge islands and slowing vehicles speeds | High | Low | <p>Yes - A safety audit will be completed at the design and construction stage</p> <p>The design will meet all statutory requirements including the Equality Act 2010, with all good practices in mind.</p> <p>The design will meet recommended guidance from the Department for Transport</p> <p>The need for the scheme has been identified through analysis of crashes between 2012 and 2014.</p> | <p>Yes – The improvements which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved curve delineation Protected turn lane (unsignalised 3 leg) Delineation and signing (intersection) Central hatching;Refuge Island Clear roadside hazards - passenger side Clear roadside hazards - driver side Roadside barriers - passenger side Roadside barriers - driver side Shoulder sealing passenger side (<1m) Speed management reviews Traffic calming; Skid Resistance (paved road); Street lighting (intersection) Shoulder rumble strips; Parking improvements; Sight distance (obstruction removal) Shoulder sealing driver side (<1m) are expected to improve road safety and |

APPENDIX B

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------|-----|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | reduce road traffic casualties amongst less experienced and vulnerable users, including adolescent and elderly groups. |
| Disability | Yes – as above | High | Low | Yes – As above. | Yes. A central refuge island in Charing and generally slower speeds will increase mobility for all, especially those with physical disabilities. |
| Gender | No | None | | No | N/A |
| Gender identity | No | None | | No | N/A |
| Race | No | None | | No | N/A |
| Religion or belief | No | None | | No | N/A |
| Sexual orientation | No | None | | No | N/A |
| Carer's Responsibilities | No | None | | No | Yes – Carers may benefit from a central refuge island in Charing and slower speeds will assist generally. |

APPENDIX B

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

| Low | Medium | High |
|---|--|--|
| Low relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement. | Medium relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a Judgement. | High relevance to equality, /likely to have adverse impact on protected groups |

State rating & reasons : **LOW** – this is a Highway scheme that improves the the whole route using numerous measures to encourage slower speeds and general awareness of the environment.

Context: -

The Safer Roads Fund totals £175m between 2017/18 and 2020/21. The Department for Transport has invited proposals from eligible local highway authorities to improve the safety of 50 specific sections of local A' roads, where the risk of fatal and serious collisions is highest, based on the analysis by the Road Safety Foundation between 2012 - 2014.

The eligible roads within Kent are:

A252 between Charing and Chilham – 14.1 km in length

A290 between Canterbury and Whitstable - 8.6km in length

Benefits:

The programme aims to reduce death and serious injury through a programme of systematic assessment of risk, identifying the major shortcomings that can be addressed by practical road improvement measures.

Aims and Objectives:

It aims to ensure that assessment of risk lies at the heart of strategic decisions on route improvements, crash protection and standards of route management.

Beneficiaries: All road users will benefit.

APPENDIX B

Information and Data:

Casualty data (Number of collisions- 10 in total, 9 serious and 1 fatal)

| | Deaths | Serious injuries |
|---|--------|------------------|
| Vehicle occupant crash type | | |
| Run-off road loss of control driver-side | | 1 |
| Run-off road loss of control passenger-side | | 3 |
| Head-on loss of control | 1 | |
| Head-on overtaking | | 1 |
| Intersection | | 3 |
| Vehicle/property access | | |
| TOTAL (vehicle occupants) | 1 | 8 |
| Motorcycle crash type | | |
| Motorcycle run-off loss of control driver-side | | |
| Motorcycle run-off loss of control passenger-side | | |
| Motorcycle head-on loss of control | | |
| Motorcycle head-on overtaking | | |
| Motorcycle intersection | | |
| Motorcycle property access | | |
| Motorcycle along (i.e. sideswipe) | | |
| TOTAL (motorcycle) | | |
| Pedestrian crash type | | |
| Pedestrian walking along road | | |
| Pedestrian crossing side-road | | |
| Pedestrian crossing through-road (surveyed road) | | 1 |
| TOTAL (pedestrian) | | 1 |
| Bicycle crash type | | |
| Bicycle along | | |
| Bicycle at intersection | | |
| Bicycle run-off road | | |
| TOTAL (bicycle) | | |

APPENDIX B

Casualty data (Number of casualties- 12 KSI in total, 1 fatal and 11 serious)

| | Deaths | Serious injuries |
|---|--------|------------------|
| Vehicle occupant crash type | | |
| Run-off road loss of control driver-side | | 1 |
| Run-off road loss of control passenger-side | | 4 |
| Head-on loss of control | 1 | |
| Head-on overtaking | | 2 |
| Intersection | | 3 |
| Vehicle/property access | | |
| TOTAL (vehicle occupants) | 1 | 10 |
| Motorcycle crash type | | |
| Motorcycle run-off loss of control driver-side | | |
| Motorcycle run-off loss of control passenger-side | | |
| Motorcycle head-on loss of control | | |
| Motorcycle head-on overtaking | | |
| Motorcycle intersection | | |
| Motorcycle property access | | |
| Motorcycle along (i.e. sideswipe) | | |
| TOTAL (motorcycle) | | |
| Pedestrian crash type | | |
| Pedestrian walking along road | | |
| Pedestrian crossing side-road | | |
| Pedestrian crossing through-road (surveyed road) | | 1 |
| TOTAL (pedestrian) | | 1 |
| Bicycle crash type | | |
| Bicycle along | | |
| Bicycle at intersection | | |
| Bicycle run-off road | | |
| TOTAL (bicycle) | | |

Involvement and Engagement: KCC has worked closely with the Road Safety Foundation for much of the analysis. The measures being proposed have not at present involved the local community as much of the improvements do not require material change to the road. Where new signals and Traffic Orders are suggested then they will be consulted on in the design stage. The proposals following a successful bid for funding will be accessible via the KCC website consultations page, with hard copies available if requested. Local groups with an interest in these improvements will be consulted including, Parish, District and County Councillors for the area.

Potential Impact: Highway scheme - Low impact.

Adverse Impact: None.

Positive Impact: Medium.

APPENDIX B

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 the final design. The local Joint Transport Board and local groups will be informed of any changes. 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: _____ Name: Tim Read

Job Title: Head of Transportation Date: _____

DMT Member

Signed: _____ Name: Roger Wilkin

Job Title: Director of Highways,
Transportation and Waste Date: _____

APPENDIX B