



Oxfordshire County Council

Equalities Impact Assessment

Experiment allowing Cycling in Sheep Street, Bicester

March 2024

Contents

Section 1: Summary details	3
Section 2: Detail of proposal.....	4
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics	7
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts.....	11
Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts.....	12
Section 4: Review	13

Section 1: Summary details

Directorate and Service Area	<p>Directorate: Environment and Place</p> <p>Service: Placemaking</p>
What is being assessed (e.g. name of policy, procedure, project, service or proposed service change).	The assessment pertains to an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) designed to permit cycling in Sheep Street Bicester, where currently there is a traffic regulation order governing “no cycling”.
Is this a new or existing function or policy?	This represents a newly proposed function, specifically an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). The proposal aligns with the recommendations outlined in the Bicester Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), Oxfordshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and complies with national guidance, including the Department for Transport’s Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20).
Summary of assessment Briefly summarise the policy or proposed service change. Summarise possible impacts. Does the proposal bias, discriminate or unfairly disadvantage individuals or groups within the community? (following completion of the assessment).	The policy involves implementing an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) on Sheep Street, Bicester, allowing unrestricted cycling at all times.
Completed By	Hanaii Faour, Assistant Transport Planner, Transport and Infrastructure
Authorised By	Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)

Date of Assessment	19 March 2024
---------------------------	---------------

Section 2: Detail of proposal

<p>Context / Background</p> <p>Briefly summarise the background to the policy or proposed service change, including reasons for any changes from previous versions.</p>	<p>The proposal to implement an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) allowing cycling at all times in Sheep Street in Bicester arises from the need to enhance cycling infrastructure in alignment with local and national policy. Feedback from residents and stakeholders underscores the demand for improved cycling facilities, particularly in central areas like Sheep Street. This initiative reflects a broader shift towards sustainable transport and addresses concerns about safety, congestion, and environmental impact.</p>
<p>Proposals</p> <p>Explain the detail of the proposals, including why this has been decided as the best course of action.</p>	<p>The proposal entails implementing an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) on Sheep Street in Bicester, allowing cycling at all times. This initiative aligns with the Bicester Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), Oxfordshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan and national guidance, such as the Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/20 (LTN 1/20).</p> <p>The key elements of the proposal are as follows:</p> <p><u>Removal of "No Cycling" restriction:</u> The ETRO will change the current regulations on Sheep Street to remove the restriction on cycling, enabling cyclists to use the street at all times. This scheme aims to enhance cyclist access and promote sustainable transport in the area.</p> <p><u>Duration of ETRO:</u> The Experimental TRO will be in effect for up to 18 months. During this period, the feasibility and impact of allowing cycling on Sheep Street will be assessed through monitoring, data collection, and stakeholder feedback.</p> <p><u>Financial Considerations:</u> The total project cost is estimated to be £15,520, including contingency. Funding for the implementation of the ETRO will be sourced from Section 106 held developer contributions (£15,520.05).</p> <p><u>Alignment with LCWIP and National Guidelines:</u> The proposal is in line with the objectives outlined in the LCWIP, which emphasizes the development of cycling infrastructure to promote active travel. Additionally, adherence to</p>

	<p>national guidelines, such as LTN 1/20, ensures consistency with best practices in urban planning and transportation.</p> <p><u>Flexible Implementation:</u> To facilitate adaptability and reversible changes, an Experimental TRO is preferred over a standard Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). This approach allows for monitoring of the order in situ and flexibility in case amendments are required based on feedback and observations.</p> <p><u>Safety Considerations:</u> The safety of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, is paramount. Surveys and observations will be conducted before and during the ETRO to address any safety concerns and ensure a safe environment for everyone.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal aims to create a more inclusive and sustainable transportation environment in Bicester by allowing cycling on Sheep Street. By aligning with local and national strategies and prioritizing stakeholder engagement and safety, the proposal seeks to enhance cyclist access and contribute to the broader goals of promoting active travel and reducing carbon emissions.</p>
<p>Evidence / Intelligence</p> <p>List and explain any data, consultation outcomes, research findings, feedback from service users and stakeholders etc, that supports your proposals and can help to inform the judgements you make about potential impact on different individuals, communities or groups and our ability to deliver our climate commitments.</p>	<p>Based on the surveys conducted in May 2023 and late February/early March 2024, it's evident that up to 2.6% of road users are cyclists, despite cycling not being permitted on the road. This suggests that cyclists are utilising the road despite regulations prohibiting their presence. This situation underscores the potential of the road to become a significant route in Bicester's active travel network.</p> <p>Integrating this road into the active travel network aligns with broader goals of reducing reliance on motorised vehicles and fostering a more active community. By allowing cyclists access to this route, it can contribute to the delivery of climate commitments by promoting sustainable modes of transportation and reducing carbon emissions associated with motorised travel.</p>

<p>Alternatives considered / rejected</p> <p>Summarise any other approaches that have been considered in developing the policy or proposed service change, and the reasons why these were not adopted. This could include reasons why doing nothing is not an option.</p>	<p>In the development of the proposal, various approaches were considered, and alternatives were evaluated. The rejected alternatives and the reasons for their exclusion are as follows:</p> <p><u>No Action:</u> The option of maintaining the existing TRO without changes was considered. However, given the community's evolving needs and the LCWIP's emphasis on enhancing cycling accessibility, doing nothing was deemed incompatible with the long-term vision and objectives.</p> <p><u>Partial Cycling Permissions:</u> Another alternative involved permitting cycling only during specific times of the day. This option was rejected to maintain simplicity and promote continuous cycling access, as recommended by LTN 1/20. The experimental TRO tool allows cycling at the busiest times of day and for people to use the consultation period to provide their views on whether cycling should be permitted at all times of day.</p> <p><u>Segregated Cycling Spaces:</u> Incorporating physical segregation between walking and cycling zones was contemplated. However, studies suggesting better interaction in shared spaces and concerns from pedestrian feedback led to the rejection of this alternative. There was concern that cyclists would travel at a faster speed if provided with a segregated cycleway.</p> <p>In conclusion, the chosen proposal represents a balanced and well-informed recommendation based on evidence and stakeholder input. The rejected alternatives were carefully considered, and their exclusion is justified by the pursuit of sustainable and community-centric urban planning.</p>
--	--

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Protected Characteristics

Protected Characteristic	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Allowing cycling in Sheep Street, an off road route, may enable people who do not currently cycle to cycle as they perceive the route is safer than the current on-road routes, younger people and older people are often those who feel less confident in riding.</p> <p>Older people or people with young children walking in Sheep Street may feel intimidated by cyclists travelling at speed through the street and feel at greater risk of being hit by a cyclist than when cycling is not permitted in the street.</p>	<p>Consider the use of “Share with Care” signage.</p> <p>The ETRO allows for us to test cycling in Sheep Street to gain people’s lived experience of pedestrians and cyclists sharing the space along with other town centre activities.</p>	Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)	The ETRO consultation period is 6 months and people may provide their views during this time.

Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Allowing cycling in Sheep Street may enable people with disabilities who use their bike as a mobility aid to have increased access to shops and services which they may have found difficult to access if they dismounted their bike at the current restriction points.</p> <p>Some people with disabilities such as sight or hearing impairments or mobility issues (among other disabilities) may feel intimidated by cyclists travelling at speed through the street and feel at greater risk of being hit by a cyclist than when cycling is not permitted in the street.</p>	<p>Consider the use of “Share with Care” signage.</p> <p>The ETRO allows for us to test cycling in Sheep Street to gain people’s lived experience of pedestrians and cyclists sharing the space along with other town centre activities.</p>	Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)	The ETRO consultation period is 6 months and people may provide their views during this time.
Gender Reassignment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Marriage & Civil Partnership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Pregnancy & Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The ETRO enables pregnant/maternity women who use their bike as a mobility aid to have increased access to shops and services which they may have found difficult to access if they dismounted their bike at the current restriction points.</p> <p>Some pregnant/maternity women may feel intimidated by cyclists travelling at speed through the street and feel at greater risk of being hit by a cyclist than when cycling is not permitted in the street.</p>		Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)	The ETRO consultation period is 6 months and people may provide their views during this time.
Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Community Impacts

Additional community impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner (* Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Rural communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Armed Forces	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Areas of deprivation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Section 3: Impact Assessment - Additional Wider Impacts

Additional Wider Impacts	No Impact	Positive	Negative	Description of Impact	Any actions or mitigation to reduce negative impacts	Action owner* (*Job Title, Organisation)	Timescale and monitoring arrangements
Staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Other Council Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Social Value ¹	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

¹ If the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 applies to this proposal, please summarise here how you have considered how the contract might improve the economic, social, and environmental well-being of the relevant area

Section 4: Review

Where bias, negative impact or disadvantage is identified, the proposal and/or implementation can be adapted or changed; meaning there is a need for regular review. This review may also be needed to reflect additional data and evidence for a fuller assessment (proportionate to the decision in question). Please state the agreed review timescale for the identified impacts of the policy implementation or service change.

Review Date	December 2024
Person Responsible for Review	Jacqui Cox, Place Planning Manager (North)
Authorised By	