

Highways Hierarchy Definition Policy

Did you use the EIA Screening Tool? (Delete as applicable)

Yes (please attach upon submission) / ~~No~~

1. Explaining the matter being assessed

Is this a:

(Delete the ones that don't apply)

- Change to an existing strategy or policy
- ~~Change to a service or function~~
- ~~A new strategy or policy~~
- ~~A new service or function~~
- ~~Other~~

Summarise the strategy, policy, service(s), or function(s) being assessed. Describe current status followed by any changes that stakeholders would experience.

This change to the Highway Hierarchy Policy includes the following:

- Footways serving large schools (250+ pupils) will be be subject to hierarchy 2, which is an increase from hierarchy 3 in the current policy. Hierarchy 2 footways are subject to Highway Safety Inspections 4 times per year whereas hierarchy 3 footways are subject to inspections 2 times per year.
- A review of all footways in surrey has been undertaken to identify locations where footways should have their hierarchy increased to ensure key community facilities have suitable hierarchy assigned to them. For example residential care and nursing homes, dentists, doctors surgeries, hospitals, playgrounds, bus stops and other community facilities that are considered
- A new hierarchy category of 4a has been introduced to give greater weighting to capital footway maintenance priority

Describe the change being assessed in plain English. Give your rationale for writing the EIA. Identify the key stakeholders affected by this change, including residents and staff. Consider what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals.

How does your service proposal support the outcomes in [the Community Vision for Surrey 2030](#)?

Equality Impact Assessment

The proposal supports the Community Vision outcomes in the following ways:

- Well connected communities, with effective infrastructure, that grow sustainably
 - The footway hierarchy serves communities throughout the county helping to target safety inspection and maintenance works to the most important footways
- Businesses in Surrey thrive
 - Increased footway hierarchy is provided in areas with higher numbers of shops, business and key walking routes between residential areas and transport hubs
- Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer.
 - The footway hierarchy helps make journeys safer for pedestrians
- Children and young people are safe and feel safe and confident.
 - Increased footway hierarchy is provided around schools and routes between schools and community facilities.
- Everyone benefits from education, skills and employment opportunities that help them succeed in life.
 - Increased footway hierarchy is provided around schools and routes between schools and community facilities
- Everyone lives healthy, active and fulfilling lives, and makes good choices about their wellbeing.
 - The footway hierarchy helps focus resources on the most used pedestrian footways and should improve safety and usability of those footways

Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?

(Delete the ones that don't apply)

- County-wide

Equality Impact Assessment

Assessment team – A key principle for completing impact assessments is that they should not be done in isolation. Consultation with affected groups and stakeholders needs to be built in from the start, to enrich the assessment and develop relevant mitigation.

Detail here who you have involved with completing this EIA. For each include:

- Dan Squibb
- Surrey County Council
- Highways & Transport Asset Planning Team Manager (responsible for the Hierarchy Policy)

2. Service Users / Residents

Who may be affected by this activity?

There are 9 protected characteristics (Equality Act 2010) to consider in your proposal. These are:

1. Age including younger and older people
2. Disability
3. Gender reassignment
4. Pregnancy and maternity
5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
7. Sex
8. Sexual orientation
9. Marriage/civil partnerships

Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that there are other vulnerable groups which significantly contribute to inequality across the county and therefore they should also be considered within EIAs. If relevant, you will need to include information on the following vulnerable groups (Please **refer to the EIA guidance** if you are unclear as to what this is).

- Members/Ex members of armed forces and relevant family members (in line with the Armed Forces Act 2021 and [Statutory Guidance on the Armed Forces Covenant Duty](#))
- Adult and young carers*
- Those experiencing digital exclusion*
- Those experiencing domestic abuse*
- Those with education/training (literacy) needs
- Those experiencing homelessness*
- Looked after children/Care leavers*
- Those living in rural/urban areas
- Those experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage*
- Out of work young people)*
- Adults with learning disabilities and/or autism*
- People with drug or alcohol use issues*
- People on probation
- People in prison
- Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers
- Sex workers
- Children with Special educational needs and disabilities*

Equality Impact Assessment

- Adults with long term health conditions, disabilities (including SMI) and/or sensory impairment(s)*
- Older People in care homes*
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities*
- Other (describe below)

(*as identified in the Surrey COVID Community Impact Assessment and the Surrey Health and Well-being Strategy)

Equality Impact Assessment

Age including older or younger people

Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.

As recommended by the [Code of Practice Well Managed Highway Infrastructure](#) The hierarchy policy considers older and younger people by giving weight to places people walk to or between, such as schools, care homes, doctors surgeries, dentist, shopping centres, transport hubs and bus stops, and considering local routes to parks, playgrounds, childcare centres, and car parks.

Schools of 250+ pupils are being given an increased footway hierarchy of 2 increasing from 3 in the current policy. A review of all local walking routes around schools is being undertaken to ensure where reasonable an increase hierarchy is assigned to key routes between schools and local facilities such as shops.

A review of the footway hierarchy across Surrey has been undertaken to ensure hierarchy is increased between key facilities where significant pedestrian use might be expected, particular attention being given to facilities where younger or older users are likely to walk – such as schools, child care facilities, parks and playgrounds, care homes and residential facilities, doctors, dentists, opticians bus stops and shops.

Describe here suggested mitigations to inform the actions needed to reduce inequalities.

One identified

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

None identified

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

No significant negative impacts are identified. It should be noted that footway hierarchy cannot be increased around all facilities that might draw foot traffic and a risk based approach must be taken, the community facilities identified are considered to be desirable destinations for all pedestrians including those who are younger or older, and increasing the footway hierarchy around those facilities should benefit all pedestrians.

Equality Impact Assessment

Disability

Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.

As part of the review of footway hierarchy across Surrey a dataset providing the location of residential homes and health facilities has been used. These facilities and the logical routes to community facilities most likely to be the driver of foot traffic have been considered and footway hierarchy has been increased where appropriate to link obvious walking routes between residential and health facilities to other local community facilities where pedestrian access is considered likely. These include shopping and village centres, doctors, dentists and other healthcare facilities and bus stops. The intention of this is to benefit those people by increasing the hierarchy of local footways linking facilities which will result in a higher frequency of safety inspection and greater priority in maintenance decision making.

Describe here suggested mitigations to inform the actions needed to reduce inequalities.

See above

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not aware of any

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

No significant negative impacts are identified. It should be noted that footway hierarchy cannot be increased around all facilities that might draw foot traffic, the community facilities identified are considered to be desirable destinations for all pedestrians including those with disabilities, and increasing the footway hierarchy around those facilities should benefit all pedestrians, including those with disabilities.

Equality Impact Assessment

Older People in care homes

Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.

As part of the review of footway hierarchy across Surrey a dataset providing the location of care homes has been used. Each care home location has been considered and footway hierarchy has been increased where appropriate to link obvious walking routes between the care home or other residential care facility to other local community facilities where pedestrian access is considered likely. These include shopping and village centres, doctors, dentists and other healthcare facilities and bus stops. The intention of this is to benefit those people by increasing the hierarchy of local footways linking facilities which will result in a higher frequency of safety inspection and greater priority in maintenance decision making

Describe here suggested mitigations to inform the actions needed to reduce inequalities.

See above

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?

Not aware of any

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?

No significant negative impacts are identified. It should be noted that footway hierarchy will not be increased outside all care facilities, hierarchy has been increased where it is considered local foot traffic is likely, so if a care home is not close to other facilities the hierarchy will not be increased based on the existence of a care home alone as it will be assumed travel is by vehicle rather than pedestrian

3. Staff

No impacts have been identified for staff with protected characteristics

~~Describe here the considerations and concerns in relation to the programme/policy for the selected group.~~

~~Details on the service users/residents that could be affected. What information (data) do you have about them? How might they be impacted in a positive or negative way? (try to be as specific as possible)~~

~~Describe here suggested mitigations to inform the actions needed to reduce inequalities.~~

~~How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts (actions to mitigate or enhance impacts)? When will this be implemented by? Who is responsible for this? Include additional details in the "Actions & Decisions Tracker" (Section 5) and refer to the relevant item here.~~

~~What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decision makers need to be aware of?~~

~~If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.~~

~~Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated?~~

~~Identify negative impacts that can't be mitigated and explain why, together with evidence.~~

4. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation below.

- **Outcome One: No major change to the policy/service/function required.** This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken
- **Outcome Two: Adjust the policy/service/function** to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?
- **Outcome Three: Continue the policy/service/function** despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are:
 - Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact
 - Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact.
- **Outcome Four: Stop and rethink the policy** when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination. (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the [Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act](#) concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay).

Recommended outcome:

Outcome two

Explanation:

An adjusted policy is recommended that mitigates the risk to the groups identified above and is taken to Cabinet Member for Highways Transport and Economic Growth for approval which

Equality Impact Assessment

5. Action plan and monitoring arrangements

Insert your action plan here, based on the mitigations recommended.

Involve you Assessment Team in monitoring progress against the actions above.

Item	Initiation Date	Action/Item	Person Actioning	Target Completion Date	Update/Notes	Open/ Closed
1	Dec 2027	Review as part of Asset Strategy Review	Asset Planning Team Manager	March 2027		
2						
3						

6a. Version control

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
1			

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment.

Please include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you can refer to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process.

Equality Impact Assessment

For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

Equality Impact Assessment

6b. Approval

Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

The level of EIA sign off will depend on who the change affects. Generally speaking, for strictly internal changes, Head of Service/ Exec Director sign off should suffice. For changes affecting residents, the Cabinet Member is required to approve completed EIAs.

Approved by	Date approved
Head of Service	
Executive Director	
Cabinet Member	
Directorate Equality Group/ EDI Group (If Applicable) (arrangements will differ depending on your Directorate. Please enquire with your Head of Service or the CSP Team if unsure)	

Publish:

It is recommended that all EIAs are published on Surrey County Council's website.

Please send approved EIAs to: equalityimpactassessments@surreycc.gov.uk

EIA author:

6c. EIA Team

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Team Role

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009

Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009

SMS: 07860 053 465

Email: contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk