

Title: Structures Maintenance Policy Statement	Date: 05.03.20
	Stage: Draft
	Service Area: Place
	Lead Officer: Sue Stevenson

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

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 Policy looks at the way the Council manages its structures and includes information on how they are inspected, assessed, prioritised and maintained.

The Highway Authority, Under Section 41A(1) of the Highways Act 1980, are responsible for the maintenance of highways maintainable at the public expense.

The policy outlines how areas of concern will be identified and dealt with, for the benefit of all highways users.

The policy affects all people in the borough as they potentially all face some risk when traversing highways structures or coming to harm due to a highways structures defect. The policy aims to reduce this risk through the adoption of risk management principles. Consideration is given towards external factors as well as condition of the bridge itself and the impact this could have on users.

The policy has been updated to reflect the changes set in place by the new Code of Practice.

People of different ages

Physical access over bridges for pedestrians, including elderly people, depends on adequate provision of a footway and routes clear of obstacles. Similarly, access through subways can be equally [undesirable](#) for elderly people, especially when they lack lighting or clear views.¹ The new policy should improve the quality of maintenance regimes and improve access for people of all ages. There will be no worsening of the current service.

Gender

¹ [Estimating Preferences for Different Types of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities, 2017](#)

The confidence that different genders have with use of highways structures (particularly subways or tunnels) differs depending on their nature and the individuals' confidence in that environment. Where subways or tunnels lack lighting, clear views of the route ahead or are not overlooked, they are less likely to be popular with users [especially lone females](#).² Signage and surface quality may also have an effect. The maintenance and inspection regimes identified in the policy should ensure that the routes do not become less appealing to users due to poor maintenance. There will be no worsening of the current service.

People with disabilities

Physical access over bridges for people with mobility or visual impairments depends on adequate provision of a footway and routes clear of obstacles. The new policy should be more proactive than reactive and result in a lower frequency of structural repairs. This should reduce the length of time footways or carriageways are blocked with maintenance equipment associated with the maintenance of structures. There will be no worsening of the current service.

Race

There is no evidence that this would be a relevant issue for structures maintenance.

Religion or belief

There is no evidence that this would be a relevant issue for structures maintenance.

Sexual orientation

There is no evidence that this would be a relevant issue for structures maintenance.

Marriage and civil partnership

There is no evidence that this would be a relevant issue for structures maintenance.

Pregnancy and maternity

Where highways structures are not well maintained there could be an increased likelihood of women who are heavily pregnant tripping and/or falling as they may be unsteady on their feet. The new maintenance policy should improve the quality of maintenance regimes and reduce the likelihood of slips and trips from occurring. There will be no worsening of the current service.

² [Estimating Preferences for Different Types of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities, 2017](#)

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 the above information and the results and measures below combined with the nature of the policy we do not believe that we need further data 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)

Based on the information above the proposed policy has not been changed.

The policy is based on the new code of practice with a focus on minimising risk to all users.

This should not result in a lower quality of service for any group of residents.

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).