

Section 4

Equality Analysis Toolkit

UCLan Masterplan Highways Changes
For Decision Making Items

August 2018

Question 1 - What is the nature of and are the key components of the proposal being presented?

The UCLan Masterplan Highways Project aims to deliver the changes to the highway alignment needed to achieve the objectives of the UCLan Masterplan and in particular to free up the land required to construct one of the showpiece developments – the new Student Centre and University Squares Project.

The highway changes this will entail include:

- Modification of the current Adelphi/Fylde gyratory system to direct traffic along the southern and eastern boundary of the Square.
- Stopping up of Fylde Street in order to create the new square.
- Improvement of Marsh Lane junction with Corporation Street, with improved signals and clearer pedestrian crossing points.
- Adelphi Street to be closed to vehicles (except for service vehicles and cyclists) between Victoria Street and St Peter's Street.
- Adelphi Street to be made one way northbound from the junction with Moor Lane to St Peter's Street.
- Removal of parking and modification of junctions on Victoria Street to allow use by re-routed buses.
- Closure of Rodney Street and vehicular restrictions along part of St Peter's Square Street.

The project will also bring the style of public realm improvements already delivered elsewhere in the city centre (under the Fishergate Scheme phases 1 and 2) to the university campus area. The projects must be complementary in order to facilitate cost effective ongoing maintenance.

Investment across the city centre's public realm is well underway. The completed Fishergate Central Gateway Phase 1 works represented the first major phase of a wider programme of gateway development work to improve connectivity between the two transport hubs (railway station and bus station) and the key development and commercial "Opportunity Areas" that are located between and adjacent to them.

An aim of the project is to improve connectivity between the UCLan campus area and City Centre.

The UCLan Highways Project will further enhance this by connecting the city's university to the rest of the city centre and with a quality public realm environment.

All these changes correspond with promoting economic growth within the county as a key corporate strategic objective consistent with the aspirations of the City Deal programme and City Centre Plan (draft) alongside other key plans and strategies.

The design strategy will follow the Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/11 Shared Space, which is the current best practice document. NB This document was suspended in summer 2018 pending further research and updated guidance from the Government. In a letter dated 25/07/2018 the DfT also advised local authorities to "pause" any shared space schemes involving level surfaces which are still in the design phase and to await further guidance. The UCLan proposals do NOT involve a level surface - there remains a clear delineation between carriageway and footway with a raised kerb edge. The design principles will deliver an "informal streets" scheme rather than "shared space" as defined in the CIHT publication "Creating Better Streets: Inclusive and accessible places" (January 2018).

Question 2 - Scope of the Proposal

Is the proposal likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected?

The proposal will mainly affect the area of Preston around the UCLan campus area, but may impact people from across the county and beyond who study in, visit or pass through the area. Specifically these include:

- UCLan;

- Users of the campus area including students, staff, local residents, motorists (both those accessing the campus and those passing through);
- Local businesses and property owners located along the included routes;
- Preston City Council, Lancashire County Council and community groups wishing to hold events on the newly created event space represented by the new Square.

Question 3 – Protected Characteristics Potentially Affected

Could the proposal have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

And what information is available about these groups in the County's population or as service users/customers?

Younger people may be more impacted by the development, as it is to be expected that they will form a majority of students at UCLan although universities increasingly attract students from a wider age range. It is also recognised that staff and visitors will come from other age groups.

The full range of protected characteristics are likely to be represented amongst students, staff and visitors to the area.

Increased connectivity with the city centre will inevitably result in people with a range of protected characteristics who live, work and visit or pass through Preston potentially being affected by the proposal.

Specific concerns have been raised by disabled people and their representative groups which are addressed in this analysis.

Traditionally UCLan has had a strong reputation of being a university which is committed to meeting the needs of disabled students and may attract a higher proportion of such students arising from its reputation.

There are also concerns from disabled people – particularly visually impaired people – who use the surroundings as a route to reach other destinations or who may be affected by changes in bus routes which could result from the scheme.

Question 4 – Engagement/Consultation

How have people/groups been involved in or engaged with in developing this proposal?

Initially information and consultations which informed the original Fishergate Phase 1 and 2 projects was still available along with some of the Team who had been directly involved in those schemes. These included:

- A formal evaluation of Fishergate Central Gateway Phase 1 which highlighted how people felt about the scheme including their feelings of safety, any change in perceived or actual priorities over vehicles;
- A consultation workshop held with Mobility Stakeholder groups to review Fishergate Phase 1 and consider early designs for Fishergate Phase 2 including Cannon Street.
- Consultation with the general public via a drop in shop
- Ongoing engagement with Mobility Groups/Equality Representatives including representatives from Guide Dogs, Galloways, Deafway, Disability Equality North West, Lancashire

Visually Impaired Forum, Action for Blind People, East Lancashire Learning Disability Partnership Board, Lancs Physical Disability Partnership Board, RNIB, East Lancashire Deaf Society and University of Central Lancashire.

- Feedback from the Central and South Lancashire Learning Disability Partnership Board and individuals contacted through Lancashire County Council's Disabled Workers Forum and Preston Community Transport in addition to individual feedback received from disabled people and their carers/family members, Age UK's 55 Plus group.
- Involvement at specific points of the County Council's Equality and Cohesion Manager and colleagues from the Rehabilitation of Visually Impaired People (ROVI) Team;
- Work undertaken by a comprehensive Design Team including an experienced Landscape Architect and Urban Designer who have continued to work with the Team throughout the various projects and carried forward learning.
- Working with an independent design review team, Places Matter, to challenge the design.

A Lessons Learned session from Fishergate Phases 1 and 2 was held in December 2015 and the results shared with the design team.

Pedestrian surveys undertaken in February 2016.

Equality Representatives Workshops held in April 2016, July 2017 and May 2018 – detailed later.

Cycling representatives consultations took place in June 2016 and June 2018 – consultations had also been held for Fishergate Phases 1 and 2.

Consultations with representatives of taxi drivers took place in June 2016.

Public consultations to present early design stage design ideas to local residents and the general public and to obtain their feedback took place in September 2016.

Full public consultation took place during June 2017 to support the submission of the Student Centre & University Squares planning application in autumn 2017.

Information used included:

Design for Engineering Innovation Centre, Student Centre and associated public square identified operational requirements which impact on the highways network;

Traffic modelling conducted by Lancashire County Council combined with microsimulation network modelling by Crowd Dynamics;

Survey of local businesses servicing and loading requirements.

Use of the guidance explained in the DfT's Local Transport Note 1/11. NB This document was suspended in summer 2018 pending further research and updated guidance from the Government. In a letter to local authorities dated 25/07/2018 the DfT also advised the "pause" of any shared space schemes involving level surfaces which are still in their design phase and to await further guidance. The UCLan proposals do NOT involve a level surface – there remains a clear delineation between the carriageway and footway with a raised kerb edge. The design principles will deliver an "informal streets scheme" rather than a "shared space scheme".

Chartered Institute for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) "Creating Better Streets: Inclusive and accessible places" (January 2018).

Guide Dogs "The Importance of Controlled Crossings for People with Sight Loss" (Autumn 2017)

Influences and Considerations Arising from the Information Used

- Public consultation has enabled the initial proposals to be shared and the feedback received has been used to develop the design.
- At the Equality Representatives Workshop in April 2016 a number of issues and suggestions were raised:
 - It was asked what lessons had been learned from Fishergate Phases 1 and 2 and these were summarised as:

- (i) Concerns about the degree colour contrast between the kerb edge and channel especially in wet conditions
- (ii) There had been claims from several sighted pedestrians that the 40mm kerb height represented a trip hazard and had caused them to fall
- (iii) The provision of a number of courtesy crossings was thought to have worked well.
- (iv) Tactile paving at courtesy crossings was well-received.
- (v) A defined kerb edge of some description is preferred by many visually impaired users, whether using height and/or texture.

These lessons learned have been incorporated into the UCLan design.

- A query was raised about bus stop kerb design and **it was confirmed that raised kerbs will be provided to improve accessibility to/from buses as well as well designed bus shelters. There have subsequently been concerns raised about the visibility of bus shelters at some locations along Fishergate Phases 1 and 2 with improvements being considered that will be applied more widely if they are successful.**
- Provision of designated Blue Badge parking spaces close to buildings. **This will be incorporated into the design for the new Student Centre and the Engineering Innovation Centre. In addition there will be defined drop off areas for taxis and service vehicles.**
- How is traffic to be slowed down around the campus area in general to facilitate safe crossing by pedestrians? **The Design Team explained the design principles of narrowing the carriageways, widening footpaths, use of trees and street furniture to create "edge friction" are all aimed at increasing "driver uncertainty" and thus reducing speed and creating an environment of "courtesy" between motorist and pedestrian. It was also confirmed that Marsh Lane will continue as a signalised junction.**

- Accident rates. **The Design Team confirmed that early indications for Fishergate show a reduction in collisions in terms of frequency and seriousness.**
- Future proofing the scheme with regard to electric vehicles which are silent and quieter cars. **There is a pilot project in Coventry regarding this which the Team will keep under review. Additional alerting systems similar to pelican crossings (with speakers and rotating switch devices) to alert visually impaired people or other users may also be considered. In general it is to be noted, that the traffic will be slower.**
- How will LCC and the University work with key stakeholders to manage navigation around the campus during works?
 - (a) Communications Plan including use of the web site, email notifications and social media. Liaising with relevant organisations.
 - (b) Orientation training for disabled students/visitors as necessary.
 - (c) Published phased construction programme.
 - (d) Published Milestone Completion dates
 - (e) Notifications of all diversion works using web sites, and social media.
 - (f) Additional vigilance and monitoring/checking of footpath surfaces and crossing points by the Project Management Team.
 - (g) Creation of a Mitigation Team who can be contacted to deal with urgent matters as they arise and provide the necessary notifications to key groups and the University community.
 - (h) Signage which must be strategically located for footfall including symbols, tactile and Braille information.
 - (i) Tactile maps – possibly incorporating Braille – for orientation.
 - (j) Project Progress Reports, presentations and workshops to be held on a timely basis.

(k) Adjustments/facilities to be provided such as dropped kerbs for wheelchair users, ambulant disabled scooter users and parents with prams.

- At the further Equality Representatives sessions in July 2017 the visually impaired representatives raised a number of further concerns, particularly about the proposed road crossing arrangements:
 - (i) Visually impaired pedestrians are uncomfortable sharing pavements with cyclists and felt that they present as much of a hazard to them as motorists.
 - (ii) A lot of street furniture, particularly large benches, was said to be difficult to navigate with a guide dog. **Design Team advised that there are a lot of benches on Fishergate in order to allow people to sit and rest when tired from shopping on what is a key shopping street. The UCLan scheme will be a different kind of environment with potentially much less street furniture required.**
 - (iii) Representatives from both Galloways and National Federation of the Blind argued strongly for the provision of controlled crossings and stated categorically that courtesy crossings are not acceptable for visually impaired users, particularly if they use a long cane and travel independently or have reduced hearing as well. Zebra crossings were also rejected as a potential solution as not offering a sufficient level of confidence that a driver would stop. Groups representing people with learning disabilities have made similar points at other meetings. Visual Impairment group representatives confirmed that most visually impaired pedestrians would be prepared to take a slightly longer route (within reason) if it meant a controlled crossing could be used. **A new controlled (Puffin) crossing will be added on Walker Street approximately 80m from the proposed courtesy crossing. This will supplement the existing signal controlled crossings on Ringway and at its junctions with Corporation**

Street and Friargate, Marsh Lane junction, Moor Lane and Fylde Road (outside The Guild public house) which will remain.

- (iv) Visually impaired representatives also stated that the Fishergate Scheme, with its reliance on courtesy crossings, was excluding many blind and partially sighted people from the city centre as people feel it is too dangerous. **Design Team pointed out that statistics show that accident rates have reduced by half in the area.**
- (v) Reference was made to the April 2017 Women and Equalities Select Committee's recommendation that a moratorium is placed on new "shared space" schemes. **The scheme is being designed according to current guidelines. There is no guarantee that the Government will action all or any of the Select Committee's recommendations. However, we will work with equality groups and others to try and improve the scheme for everyone.**
- (vi) Concern was expressed about the use of raised metal stud materials (e.g. around loading bays and on some tactile surfaces) as these can become hot in the summer and present difficulties for guide dogs' paws/pads when walking on them. **This will be noted for detailed design.**
- (vii) Full height kerbs would be preferred with traffic kept off footways. **The design proposal is considering higher kerbs than those used on Fishergate but not full height kerbs, as these could present difficulties for other disabled people and full height kerbs would not have the desired slowing down effect on drivers. There will be a clear separation between the footway and carriageway and a kerb height of 60mm is being considered with a strong contrast in colour between kerb edge and carriageway to minimise potential trip hazards for all users.**

- (viii) Better bus shelters are needed as the present ones do not provide sufficient shelter in wet weather. **This element will be looked at as part of the detailed design process.**

A further session was held in May 2018 following a significant change to the scheme in response to planning conditions set by Preston City Council. These changes focussed the scheme more closely around the current Adelphi roundabout area, thus allowing the introduction of several additional signal-controlled crossing points around the perimeter of the scheme. However, those present raised the following concerns:

- (i) More controlled crossings are still required – particularly across Friargate and Corporation Street. The informal crossing points/courtesy crossings are still felt to be unsafe for a number of people with a variety of disabilities. Some people felt the proposed controlled crossing points were too far out of the way for people to walk to use them and concerns were raised by student representatives about the time this would take and the possibility of some students being late for lectures due to the time needed to follow a "safe" route. **Following ongoing dialogue with representatives of various disability and other groups a number of additional crossings are now being proposed to be delivered under the scheme. The present zebra crossing at the south end of Moor Lane will now be replaced by a new signal controlled crossing; there will be a new signal controlled crossing at Maudland Road and the present zebra crossing at the west end of Walker Street will be replaced by a new signal controlled crossing. The existing controlled crossing at the south end of Fylde Road will be updated and refreshed whilst the existing signal controlled crossing phases at the Marsh Lane/Corporation Street junction will be maintained. By contracting the geographical spread of the scheme, it has been possible to provide controlled crossing points closer to the new University Square to minimise time**

wasted on divergent journeys but still on the peripheries so as not to undermine the design principles. It is felt that the addition of further controlled crossings within the heart of the "informal streets" area would compromise the changes in driver behaviour that are key to delivering a safe scheme

- (ii) Concern was raised over the replacement of a zebra crossing on Friargate (at the northern end) with an informal crossing, as this was felt to represent replacing a current asset or recognisable feature with something inferior. **The zebra crossing at the north end of Friargate will be removed and replaced by an uncontrolled crossing. In the last 5 years there have been two reported incidents at this crossing, one serious and one slight. Generally feedback from visual impairment groups has been that, for many, zebra crossings are not their favoured solution in any case. The improved or new controlled crossings identified above are considered to offer a suitable and safer alternative that will satisfy the vast majority of pedestrian movements.**
- (iii) Strong reservations remain, especially amongst the visually impaired groups and community, about sharing pavement areas and the Square with cyclists. **The area already includes a shared cycle/footway and our records over the last 5 years do not show any reported incidents involving cyclist and pedestrian collisions.**
- (iv) It was suggested that additional measures, including controlled crossings, would be needed on Victoria Street if this was to be suitable to receive bus traffic. **Controlled crossings are being introduced at the junctions with Adelphi Street and Moor Lane, as well as a number of informal crossings along Victoria Street. A bus raised table is also being introduced at roughly the mid-point to further manage speeds of vehicles.**
- (v) Concerns were raised about the lifespan of materials to be used and the point made that defects such as lifting/wobbly flags, broken paving, etc present a particular hazard to

pedestrians with a range of disabilities. **There is an increasing body of evidence from similar schemes on Fishergate and elsewhere in the country to inform choices of materials and the techniques by which they are laid in order to minimise defects. The materials proposed for use are extremely robust and designed to have a long lifespan.**

- (vi) **Kerb height higher than 60mm requested. The Design Team is satisfied that 60mm represents the best compromise between the needs of various users and has already been increased in response to earlier consultations. A higher kerb would not deliver the required change in driver behaviour and could compromise the safety of the scheme.**
- (vii) **Design and tail lengths of tactile paving needs further consideration to avoid confusion on the part of visually impaired pedestrians (particularly those with little or no sight who are more reliant on the tactile element) between formal/controlled crossings and informal crossings. The tails will be different on the two types of tactile warnings of crossings to try to avoid this confusion. Tails on formal controlled crossings will be of the standard blister paving whereas the informal crossings will use an alternative directional paving solution to distinguish them. It is particularly important to ensure there is a clear distinction as, unlike Fishergate, this project will include both types of crossings and people will need to be certain which they are using.**
- (viii) **Colour differentiation and contrast needs very careful consideration to maximise the contrast in all weather conditions and to ensure crossing points are clearly visible and recognisable to drivers. The design provides the maximum possible contrast between kerb and carriageway with the use of a white kerb against unchipped black HRA. Colour contrast between tactile paving and main surface palette is also in line with design standards.**

- (ix) Kerbs and pathways need to be as flat, even and level as possible to be safely navigable by a range of disabled people. Steep falls and odd cambers need to be avoided. **The highways design is already based on avoiding such features and providing as even a footway surface as possible in line with current design standards.**

At the taxi drivers consultation a suggestion was made that one or more taxi ranks were made "accessible" by the provision of a raised kerb to mobility impaired passengers and those with pushchairs. **This will be incorporated into the design.**

Wheelchair users and other people with mobility difficulties have fed back regarding Fishergate that a more standard kerb height is not an issue for them so long as there is a sufficient number of informal/courtesy crossings are in place as they tend to use those in order to make use of the dropped kerb and more level crossing in these positions.

Equality groups representatives have welcomed the wider footways in the Fishergate scheme and requested that all unnecessary street furniture including A Boards/frames be removed as part of the project. **The basis of the design is such that all unnecessary street furniture will be removed and only essential items will be retained such as benches, litter bins, cycle stands and way finding signs. However, all of these should be placed in a "zone" with the trees running up the street to aid movement for all. It is fair to say that the success of this strategy in parts of Fishergate Phases 1 and 2 has been mixed, particularly as regards the positioning and continued use of A Boards. This will need to be addressed in the UCLan scheme, particularly in the areas where businesses are concentrated such as the southern end of Adelphi Street and Friargate. We do, however, expect fewer issues in the UCLan scheme given the street plan with fewer businesses being hidden down side roads.**

The scheme will be subject to a controlled parking zone which will only allow loading or parking in specific designated bays. These bays will be located within the street furniture zone referred to above and will be clearly identified.

It is anticipated that an initial period of proactive positive communication and enforcement will be used to explain the use of both the controlled parking zone and the designated parking bays.

Concerns have been raised about the various designs of loading bays and that some are easier to identify than others on Fishergate, especially for people with reduced vision. There have also been a number of instances of vehicles parking on the tactile paving of courtesy crossings instead of designated bays on Fishergate. **This will be borne in mind in the designs for the scheme.**

Communications will also attempt to reinforce the message around appropriate parking. In addition we expect problems of this nature to be fewer than on Fishergate due to different nature of the space with fewer businesses needing "on street" deliveries.

A number of disability related groups and individuals have suggested that on Fishergate consideration is given to benches with some form of armrest/support to help those with some mobility impairments who find this helpful to push themselves up from the seat/bench. **The design team will consider this suggestion when choosing street furniture for the UCLan scheme.**

Feedback received from the survey of local business requirements helped to inform the design in terms of loading bay provision, delivery times and wayfinding considerations.

Cycling representatives raised a number of issues and suggestions at the consultation meeting in June 2016.

- (i) Safety and legality of riding on the pavement. Experienced cyclists feel uncomfortable riding on the pavement and prefer to use the carriageway or a dedicated cycle lane. **The design**

intent is that cyclists will be able to safely use the carriageway.

- (ii) Signage needs to be legible and sensitive to cyclists' needs, not just motorists. **This will be considered at detailed design.**
- (iii) How are cyclists expected to travel through the new square? **Footpath widths around the square are at least 3.5m which will allow shared use if need be. Specific areas of joint use footway will be considered as part of the detailed design. It must be acknowledged that this is likely to be a concern to disabled people/equality groups.**
- (iv) Kerbs with colour contrasting from the gutter and textured tops of kerbs were preferred. Small kerbs are not ideal for cyclists. A 45 degree kerb without a polished surface may help. **Design and height of kerbs to be revisited as part of scheme but we must balance demand with the needs of other users, especially visually impaired people. A 45 degree kerb would need to be weighed against the need of visually impaired pedestrians for a clear, defined edge and would require further specific consultation. A higher kerb height than the 40mm used on Fishergate will be considered.**
- (v) A cycle lane if possible would help to promote confidence. **This would significantly widen the carriageway, increasing the distance for pedestrians to cross, increase the complexity of taking decisions about whether it is "safe" to cross and likely increase traffic speeds resulting in road safety problems. The design intent is for vehicular traffic to be moving slowly and the carriageway accommodate both cyclists and motorists, although some joint use areas will be considered.**
- (vi) Constant flow of traffic is less frustrating. **The principles are designed to provide slow, steady flow with pedestrians able to cross in the gaps. This should be less "stop-start" than the current situation with multiple traffic lights/signals.**
- (vii) Traffic speed exiting low speed areas needs to be addressed. **The design will ensure obvious "gateways" where change in driver behaviour is expected.**

- (viii) Pedestrian crossings to be wider and generous. **This will be incorporated into the scheme.**

Following the re-scoping of the scheme to respond to Preston City Council's planning conditions, cycling representatives were contacted again in June 2018 and gave updated feedback:

- (i) Some positive comments were received. Cyclists were pleased to see a cycle route running around two sides of the new square and felt that St Peter's Street and the southern end of Adelphi Street looked reasonably cycle friendly.
- (ii) Some concern about the lack of specific cycling provision along Fylde Road, north of the new square, after the cycle route diverts along Maudland Road. **The design intent is for the carriageway to accommodate both cyclists and motorists in single file and at low speeds. The carriageway will be narrowed in both direction and separated by a median strip to discourage cars from trying to overtake.**
- (iii) Reservations about areas of mixed use footpath to be shared with pedestrians and the feeling that these areas are dangerous to cyclists just as much as to pedestrians, especially those with disabilities who may not hear or see a cyclist approaching. **The area already comprises a shared use pedestrian/cycle facility. Our accident records over the last 5 years do not show any reported incidents involving cyclist and pedestrian collisions.**
- (iv) Query raised about what signage would be put in place to encourage sensible shared use of such areas. **Appropriate "shared use" signage will be considered as part of detailed design. The design team will also explore whether temporary signage could be used to draw attention to shared usage and the expectations around behaviour in the early stages of the scheme.**
- (v) Comments along the lines that the double roundel looked quite daunting although they did acknowledge that the current arrangement is also "terrifying". **A double roundel arrangement in this area was the only way to manage the**

number of roads converging at this point. Adelphi Street has been made one-way northbound from its southern end to try and reduce conflicting vehicle movements and the overall design principles of narrowed carriageways and slower traffic are aimed at maximising safety and ease of use by all highway users.

Statutory undertakings and emergency services were also consulted. Significant service diversions are likely to be required due to this project and the Student Centre and University Squares development, and these are being incorporated into the scheme design and budgets. A utilities consultant has been appointed to facilitate and co-ordinate this major piece of work across the two projects.

Question 5 – Analysing Impact

Could this proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way? This pays particular attention to the general aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty:

- To eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment or victimisation because of protected characteristics;
- To advance equality of opportunity for those who share protected characteristics;
- To encourage people who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life;
- To contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not/community cohesion;

It is intended that the improved public realm environment will create a space where an increased number of people will wish to spend time which should increase the quantity of natural surveillance present in this space. This increase may include families with young children, as

the space will be somewhere where events could take place which could prove attractive to young people or families to attend. It is anticipated that cultural events will take place in the Square which have the potential to bring different sections of the community together and increase the links between the University and the rest of the city. This will contribute to fostering good relations and community cohesion.

It is also anticipated that the improvements to the space will lead to an increase in those wishing to invest in the city centre thereby helping to promote the wider city. This could increase jobs in the city.

The main potential negative impact from the project is the removal of some controlled crossing points in the area. Throughout the discussions with Equality Groups on this scheme beginning in April 2016 there has been concern about this element. Concerns had been expressed about this element of the Fishergate Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects but some visually impaired people were prepared to see what would happen when controlled crossings were removed and if the changes in driver behaviour associated with the design principles could be achieved. The experience for many is that this has not been the case. Some campaigners had always been reluctant to accept the removal of controlled crossings and those views have gained much more support amongst visually impaired people and others with disabilities as a result of changes in driver behaviour not being sufficiently realised on Fishergate. The demand for the retention of controlled crossings in the UCLan project has therefore been far stronger, with calls for them to be included in the heart or close to the heart of the scheme.

In other schemes of a broadly similar nature it has been argued that the removal of controlled crossings discriminates against disabled people and particularly visually impaired people. It is the view of the design team that the increased number of controlled crossings now proposed for the UCLan scheme will provide suitable safe routes for visually impaired people and others and that the scheme does not discriminate against any protected characteristics groups.

However, should the area become or be seen as a "no go" area for significant numbers of visually impaired or other disabled people, this could impact the advancing of equality aim of the Public Sector Equality Duty as their ability or willingness to access UCLan and its educational or other facilities would be adversely impacted.

The changes made to the project in response to planning conditions has resulted in a tighter geographical focus and allowed the provision of additional controlled crossings on the scheme periphery but still within a reasonable walking distances which it is hoped will address these concerns.

It is also hoped that the increased provision of controlled crossings will reduce concerns from students about potentially being late for lectures if they need to take a longer, "safe" route. This may require further consideration from the University itself as the project develops and once facilities are in place.

Question 6 – Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of this proposal combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

This project has developed against a background of heightened interest in schemes/projects of this nature. It has been informed by Department for Transport guidance but also reflects more specific review and information from the CIHT's "Creating Better Streets Inclusive and Accessible Places" (January 2018).

There may be a perception from news reports and social media activity that the recent letter to local authorities about a "pause" on shared spaces with level elements will include this scheme. Both the letter and the DfT's "Inclusive Transport Strategy" make it clear that projects of this nature are not affected but that may not be understood or appreciated by some people.

Many groups, particularly those representing visually impaired people, have concerns about the amount of "street clutter" of both an official and unofficial nature. RNIB have a "street charter" campaign and

"Who Put That There" campaigns on this issue. However, it is possible that increasing guidance on security and safety within the public realm may be at odds with some of these recommendations as similar soft landscaping and other features have been proposed.

Question 7 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of the analysis has the original proposal been changed/amended, if so please describe.

The original design ideas have been developed and adapted following the ongoing discussions and public consultations, with specific changes having been made arising from feedback received. These include increasing the proposed kerb height to 60mm, the addition of several controlled crossing points and higher colour contrast between kerb and channel. Through the detailed design phase we will continue to work with stakeholders such as the equality groups' representatives to further improve the design.

Question 8 - Mitigation

Will any steps be taken to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of the proposal?

The key measures of mitigation taken so far include:

- Strong colour contrast to be provided between the kerb edge and channel.
- Introduction of a higher kerb than initially proposed – 60mm rather than 40mm.
- More visually distinctive loading bays and drop off areas.
- Wider central refuges.
- A new controlled crossing point on Walker Street.
- Controlled crossing points on the peripheries of the scheme at Fylde Road, Maudland Road and Moor Lane.
- Raised kerbs at bus stops and taxi ranks.

- Street furniture to be located in a clear zone and, where practicable, reduced amounts of it.
- Continued engagement with stakeholders including equalities/disability groups.
- Whilst work is ongoing development of communications strategies and support to assist orientation of disabled students, staff or others as needed.
- Development of orientation or familiarisation support arrangements for those requiring it when work is completed.

Question 9 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

This weighs up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of the analysis.

The scheme has been modified arising from consultations with various stakeholders including those with disabilities. However, it is recognised that there have been some requests/comments made which the design team have felt unable to accommodate – e.g. standard height kerbs and provisions of zebra or pelican crossings at specific locations – as these would comprise the intentions and basic principles and effectiveness of the scheme. That would mean that the investment made in the project would not meet its intended objectives.

It is acknowledged that some people may find the new area more difficult to use than the existing area but it is hoped that the mitigation will mean that most people can use it with no or only minor inconvenience, particularly when work is completed

Question 10 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is the final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Approval for the highways alignment works associated with the Student Centre and University Squares Project; part of the UCLan Masterplan.

Question 11 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

What arrangements will be put in place to review and monitor the effects of this proposal?

A Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation Framework will be developed. The likely contents of this will include:

- Road User satisfaction surveys;
- Orientation event sessions and feedback;
- Focus group workshops;
- Safety audits and road accident data;
- Traffic speeds and volume data;
- Cycle usage;
- Pedestrian usage including by classification which could include some protected characteristics elements;
- Pedestrian wait and crossing times.

Equality Analysis Prepared By: Sharon McGuinness (Project Manager, Programme Office) and Jeanette Binns (Equality and Cohesion Manager, Policy Information and Commissioning Service)

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Service Head:

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member or Director

For further information please contact

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk