Leicestershire County Council

APPENDIX M
Equality & Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA)

This Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) will enable you to assess the **new, proposed or significantly changed** policy/ practice/ procedure/ function/ service** for equality and human rights implications.

Undertaking this assessment will help you to identify whether or not this policy/ practice/ procedure/ function/ service** may have an adverse impact on a particular community or group of people. It will ultimately ensure that, as an Authority, we do not discriminate and we are able to promote equality, diversity and human rights.

Please refer to the EHRIA guidance before completing this form. If you need any further information about undertaking and completing the assessment, contact your Departmental Equalities Group or equality@leics.gov.uk

**Please note: The term 'policy' will be used throughout this assessment as shorthand for policy, practice, procedure, function or service.*

Key Details	
Name of policy being assessed:	Passenger Transport Policy
Department and section:	Environment & Transport Strategy & Policy Team
Name of lead officer/ job title and others completing this assessment:	Holly Morrall Project Manager
Contact telephone numbers:	0116 30 52438
Name of officer/s responsible for implementing this policy:	Andy Yeomanson
Date EHRIA assessment started:	September 2017
Date EHRIA assessment completed:	August 2018

Section 1: Defining the policy

Section 1: Defining the policy
You should begin this assessment by defining and outlining the scope of the policy. You should consider the impact or likely impact of the policy in relation to all areas of equality, diversity and human rights as outlined in Leicestershire County Council's Equality Strategy.

1	What is new or changed in the policy? *What has changed and why?* The previous version of the Passenger Transport Policy (PTP) gave a brief overview of Leicestershire County Council's obligation to meet the essential transport needs of the county's residents, and that this would be met through the provision of a mix of conventional bus services for higher demand areas, which would be supplemented by provision of less frequent services by minibuses and taxi type vehicles in areas of low usage. The new version of the policy will also cover the policy objectives – i.e. what the Council is trying to achieve in terms of accessibility, and how those objectives are to be delivered, including what is value for money. This policy will also provide a framework against which existing services will be assessed in terms of their commerciality and value for money. This is as a result of a Cabinet decision in May 2014 that a report into the development and effectiveness of Community Bus Partnerships should be taken to January 2018 E&T Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then to Cabinet. It was also agreed that subsidised services should be reviewed if not operating commercially (a threshold of £5 per passenger journey was given as an initial point of reference for this). A Passenger Transport Strategy has also been developed to sit alongside the Policy, which is a high-level document setting out the strategic direction that we will apply to the delivery of the Passenger Transport Policy.
2	Does this relate to any other policy within your department, the Council or with other partner organisations? *If yes, please reference the relevant policy or EHRIA. If unknown, further investigation may be required.* • Local Transport Plan (LTP) • Communities Strategy
3	Who are the people/ groups (target groups) affected and what is the intended change or outcome for them? The proposal to review public transport provision including bus subsidies, Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) and Community Bus Partnerships (CBP) will have an impact across Leicestershire. However, it is considered that any changes will disproportionately affect groups such as rural communities, older people, people with limited mobility, people with a disability, and young people.

There is the potential that this review will result in a reduction in service provision, or in an increased cost to the public as a result of a reduction in LCC subsidies. This is dependent on the outcome of the review, which will explore the viability of the current service provision in terms of its cost-effectiveness.

We aim to mitigate against this by working with bus operators and communities to try and keep as much of the current provision as possible in operation. Where this is not possible due to lack of use and financial viability, we will work closely with stakeholders and the public to explore the possibility of alternative transport provision. This will involve working with communities to identify need, and design services which meet this need.

4	Will the policy meet the Equality Act 2010 requirements to have due regard to the need to meet any of the following aspects? **(Please tick and explain how)**			
		Yes	**No**	**How?**
	Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation	✓		Any changes made under this review and the introduction of a new policy will have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation. Consultation will ensure that we are responsive to need and any changes are not discriminatory in terms of protected characteristics and/or vulnerable groups. There will be ongoing engagement with equalities colleagues who will provide advice regarding any Equality Act or other legal implications.
	Advance equality of opportunity between different groups	✓		This review and updated policy will aim to advance equality of opportunity between different groups by enabling transport provision to continue wherever possible. Where services are found to be inefficient and no longer financially viable in terms of the number of people using them, LCC will attempt to ensure that alternative provision is available, although this may be less frequent and/or at increased cost to the service user. Any proposed changes to policy will be subject to robust consultation with target groups.
	Foster good relations between different groups	✓		The future provision of transport within Leicestershire will give due regard to how different groups can be brought together in order to foster good relations. In terms of commercial viability it is preferable to increase the number of passengers on each specific service, which should result in relationships being formed between different groups of

				people who may not otherwise have come into contact. Any proposed changes to policy will be subject to robust consultation with target groups.

Section 2: Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) Screening

Section 2: Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment Screening
The purpose of this section of the assessment is to help you decide if a full EHRIA is required.

If you have already identified that a full EHRIA is needed for a policy/ practice/ procedure/ function/ service, either via service planning processes or other means, then please go straight to Section 3 on Page 7 of this document.

Section 2
A: Research and Consultation

			Yes	**No***
5.	Have the target groups been consulted about the following?			
	a) their current needs and aspirations and what is important to them;		✓	
	b) any potential impact of this change on them (positive and negative, intended and unintended);		✓	
	c) potential barriers they may face		✓	
6.	If the target groups have not been consulted directly, have representatives been consulted or research explored (e.g. Equality Mapping)?		✓	
7.	Have other stakeholder groups/ secondary groups (e.g. carers of service users) been explored in terms of potential unintended impacts?		✓	
8.	*If you answered 'no' to the questions above, please use the space below to outline either what consultation you are planning to undertake or why you do not consider it to be necessary.			
	Full public consultation was carried out between 21 March – 13 June 2018.			

Section 2
B: Monitoring Impact

			Yes	**No**
9.	Are there systems set up to:			

		✓	
	a) monitor impact (positive and negative, intended and unintended) for different groups;	✓	
	b) enable open feedback and suggestions from different communities	✓	

An operational handbook is being developed to provide guidance to staff on processes under the new policy and strategy. Consultation and engagement with communities will ensure that any potential impacts of service changes are identified and monitored, and feedback and suggestions are welcomed and used to design new services where appropriate.

Note: If no to Question 9, you will need to ensure that monitoring systems are established to check for impact on the protected characteristics.

Section 2
C: Potential Impact

10.

Use the table below to specify if any individuals or community groups who identify with any of the 'protected characteristics' may **potentially** be affected by the policy and describe any positive and negative impacts, including any barriers.

	Yes	No	Comments
Age	✓		There is the potential that any changes may negatively impact on older people. A reduction in service may mean that it is more difficult for older people to access services and get around the county, which may lead to increased potential for isolation. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 59% were 65 and over. However, priority has been given to older people to reduce the risk of negative impacts to those who would struggle to access essential services without support. There is also therefore the potential for negative impacts on other age groups, as priority has been given to older people. However, 81% of those who responded to the consultation supported the proposed priority groups.
Disability	✓		A reduction in service may also impact people with a disability

			as they may find it more difficult to access services and move around the county. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 37% indicated that they have a long-standing illness, disability or infirmity. As above, priority has been given to people with disabilities to reduce the risk of negative impacts to those who would struggle to access essential services without support.
Gender Reassignment		✓	It is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate impact on this group. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 99.7% indicated that their gender identity is the same as at birth.
Marriage and Civil Partnership		✓	It is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate impact on this group.
Pregnancy and Maternity	✓		There is a risk that potential service reduction could impact on this group in terms of access to healthcare services. However, priority has been given to services which allow access to primary healthcare to reduce the risk of negative impacts to those who require these services.
Race		✓	It is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate impact on this group. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 96% indicated that their ethnic group is white.
Religion or Belief		✓	It is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate impact on this group. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 70% indicated that their religion

				is Christianity. 26% indicated that they do not follow any religion.
	Sex	✓		Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 65% were female. There is therefore a potential for a disproportionate impact on females as more females than males currently use supported services.
	Sexual Orientation		✓	It is not anticipated that there will be any disproportionate impact on this group. Of the consultation respondents who indicated that they use current subsidised services, 94% identify as heterosexual/straight.
	Other groups e.g. rural isolation, deprivation, health inequality, carers, asylum seeker and refugee communities, looked after children, deprived or disadvantaged communities	✓		A reduction in service may have a negative impact on rural communities as they may have reduced access to services and find it more difficult to get around the county. There may also be a disproportionate impact on areas of deprivation, particularly in rural areas, as those without access to other modes of transport may have their opportunities for travel reduced. However, priority has been given to isolated and employment-deprived areas to reduce the risk of negative impacts to those who would struggle to access essential services without support.
	Community Cohesion	✓		There is a risk that potential service reduction could limit some individuals from accessing community services or getting out into their community, which could have an impact on community cohesion.
11.	Are the human rights of individuals *potentially* affected by this proposal? Could there be an impact on human rights for any of the protected characteristics? **(Please tick)**			

Explain why you consider that any particular article in the Human Rights Act may apply to the policy/ practice/ function or procedure and how the human rights of individuals are likely to be affected below: [NB: include positive and negative impacts as well as barriers in benefiting from the above proposal]

	Yes	No	Comments
Part 1: The Convention- Rights and Freedoms			
Article 2: Right to life		✓	
Article 3: Right not to be tortured or treated in an inhuman or degrading way		✓	
Article 4: Right not to be subjected to slavery/ forced labour		✓	
Article 5: Right to liberty and security		✓	
Article 6: Right to a fair trial		✓	
Article 7: No punishment without law		✓	
Article 8: Right to respect for private and family life		✓	
Article 9: Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion		✓	
Article 10: Right to freedom of expression		✓	
Article 11: Right to freedom of assembly and association		✓	
Article 12: Right to marry		✓	
Article 14: Right not to be discriminated against		✓	
Part 2: The First Protocol			
Article 1: Protection of property/ peaceful enjoyment		✓	
Article 2: Right to education		✓	
Article 3: Right to free elections		✓	

Section 2
D: Decision

		Yes	No	Unknown
13.	Is there evidence or any other reason to suggest that:			

			✓		
	a) the policy could have a different affect or adverse impact on any section of the community;		✓		
	b) any section of the community may face barriers in benefiting from the proposal		✓		
13.	Based on the answers to the questions above, what is the likely impact of the policy				

No Impact ☐   Positive Impact ☐   Neutral Impact ☐   Negative Impact or Impact Unknown ✓

Note: If the decision is 'Negative Impact' or 'Impact Not Known', an EHRIA Report is required.

14.	Is an EHRIA report required?	Yes ✓	No ☐

Section 2: Completion of EHRIA Screening

Upon completion of the screening section of this assessment, you should have identified whether an EHRIA Report is requried for further investigation of the impacts of this policy.

Option 1: If you identified that an EHRIA Report *is required*, continue to Section 3 on Page 7 of this document.

Option 2: If there are no equality, diversity or human rights impacts identified and an EHRIA report *is not required*, continue to Section 4 on Page 14 of this document.

Section 3: Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) Report

Section 3: Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment Report

This part of the assessment will help you to think *thoroughly* about the impact of the policy and to critically examine whether it is *likely* to have a positive or negative impact on different groups within our diverse communities. It should also identify any barriers

that may adversely affect under-represented communities or groups that may be disadvantaged by the way in which we carry out our business.

Using the information gathered either within the EHRIA Screening or independently of this process, this EHRIA Report should be used to consider the impact or likely impact of the policy in relation to all areas of equality, diversity and human rights as outlined in Leicestershire County Council's Equality Strategy.

Section 3 **A: Research and Consultation**
When considering the target groups, it is important to think about whether new data needs to be collected or whether there is any existing research that can be utilised.

15.	Based on the gaps identified either in the EHRIA Screening or independently of this process, *how* have you now explored the following and *what* does this information/ data tell you about each of the diverse groups?
	
	    a) current needs and aspirations and what is important to individuals and community groups (including human rights);
	
	    b) likely impacts (positive and negative, intended and unintended) to individuals and community groups (including human rights);
	
	    c) likely barriers that individuals and community groups may face (including human rights)

a) *current needs and aspirations and what is important to individuals and community groups (including human rights)*

The needs and aspirations of individuals and communities have been explored using surveys which were carried out on specific services in October 2017, and a full public consultation which took place over a 12 week period between 21 March – 13 June 2018. The bus surveys took place only on services which will potentially be impacted by this change in policy, therefore targeting current service users. However, this was a snapshot and cannot be assumed to have gathered the views of all current service users, or others within the communities. The full public consultation allowed all current service users and other individuals/community members to voice their needs and what is important to them. There were 928 respondents to the consultation survey, 88% of whom were users of subsidised bus services in Leicestershire. During the consultation period, five public meetings were held throughout the county, which were attended by a total of 92 people.

The bus surveys gathered information about the current needs of service users with the following questions:
- *What is the main purpose of your journey today? (multiple choice answers: work/shopping/visiting friends or relatives/school, college or training/leisure/healthcare appointment/employer business/personal business/other):*
  This provided validation for the core journey purposes defined by the policy and strategy: food shopping (41% travelling to/from shopping), primary

healthcare (4% travelling for a healthcare appointment), and employment and training (19% travelling to/from work and 8% travelling to/from school, college and training).

13% were travelling to visit friends/relatives; 11% were travelling for leisure; and 4% were travelling on personal business.

- *If you were unable to make this journey by bus what would you do? (multiple choice answers: drive/get a lift with a friend or relative/take the train/cycle/walk/other):*
  48% of respondents selected 'other'. 21% would get a lift with a friend/relative; 15% would walk; 12% would drive; 2% would take the train; and 2% would cycle.

The public consultation gathered information about the current needs of respondents with the following questions:

- *If you didn't have access to any passenger transport services (buses or Demand Responsive Transport/Community Transport) in Leicestershire, how easy would it be to make journeys to… (work or training/school, college or education/food shopping/GP appointments, pharmacy services/hospital appointments/leisure/see friends and family/other)*
  This question validated the policy and strategy in the sense that there is the need for passenger transport provision across the county as without passenger transport provision:
  - 44% of respondents would find it not very/not at all easy to make journeys to work/training
  - 27% of respondents would find it not very/not at all easy to make journeys to school/college/education
  - 66% of respondents would find it not very/not at all easy to make journeys to do food shopping
  - 59% of respondents would find it not very/not at all easy to make journeys to GP appointments/pharmacy services

  The policy and strategy do not propose ceasing all passenger transport provision in the way that Northamptonshire County Council have done. Provision will continue where there is need – but it may not be in the form of a traditional bus service. It is anticipated that current DRT and CT provision will be expanded.

- *In total, how many cars or vans are owned or available for use by members of your household?*
  64.05% of respondents who currently use subsidised bus services in Leicestershire live in households which own or have available for use one or more cars/vans.

The public consultation also asked questions which focused on what is important to individuals and community groups:

- *To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following aspects of our proposals?*
  Overall there was broad agreement with the majority of aspects of our proposals – such as supporting operators to provide services commercially; core operating times; our proposed priority groups and journey purposes; supporting Community Transport schemes,; and encouraging and supporting communities to develop local transport solutions.
  The only aspect listed which was less supported was providing DRT as an

alternative solution where subsidised bus routes don't provide value for money – on this aspect, opinion was divided (35% in support and 37% against).

- o *Supporting operators to provide services commercially (so that they don't require council subsidy)*
  Of those who responded, 52% tended to/strongly agreed, and 24% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *Core operating times we proposed supporting (Monday to Friday 07:00 to 19:00 and Saturday 08:00 to 18:00)*
  Of those who responded, 72% tended to/strongly agreed, and 17% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *The groups we propose prioritising services for (elderly, disabled or isolated people)*
  Of those who responded, 81% tended to/strongly agreed, and 12% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *The types of journey we propose giving priority to (i.e. to food shopping, primary healthcare, and employment and training opportunities at a local centre)*
  Of those who responded, 80% tended to/strongly agreed, and 11% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *Providing DRT as an alternative solution where subsidised bus routes don't represent value for money*
  Of those who responded, 35% tended to/strongly agreed, and 37% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *Supporting Community Transport schemes*
  Of those who responded, 55% tended to/strongly agreed, and 19% tended to/strongly disagreed
- o *Encouraging and supporting communities to develop local transport solutions*
  Of those who responded, 42% tended to/strongly agreed, and 34% tended to/strongly disagreed

- *How could we best support communities to develop local transport solutions? What could these solutions look like?*
- *Is there anything else we could do to provide value for money passenger transport services?*
  These questions provided the opportunity for respondents to give us their suggestions and ideas for the future of Leicestershire service provision. The responses will all be reviewed and considered as we move forward with the implementation of the policy and strategy, should they be approved.

Individuals and representatives from community groups were also welcome to attend one of the five consultation events which were held across the county, in order to ask any questions they had and to give their views on what is important to them.

b) *Likely impacts (positive and negative, intended and unintended) to individuals and community groups (including human rights)*

Should the new PTPS be approved, all existing subsidised services will be reviewed against the approved assessment matrix. This review will be carried out using the most up to date and accurate data to ensure that a genuine assessment of each service is possible. This review will inform what action is

taken with specific services going forward, so it is not possible to predict at this stage what the service will look like in the future. However, it is certain that no subsidised services would be discontinued until at least June 2019.

It is anticipated that the reviews will highlight services which are currently representing poor value for money for LCC. This will be determined by reviewing each service against an objective scoring mechanism which uses the following indicators:

- Net subsidy cost per passenger-km. This is the main indicator of value for money and compares the cost of supporting the service with the actual or forecast demand
- Number of Leicestershire residents within the bus service's catchment area[1] who don't have access to another direct service to a local centre by other means (e.g. a commercial bus or train service stopping within 800m of their home), and who aren't within reasonable walking distance (800m) of a local centre. This indicator relates to the number of people for whom the service has a high value. Where the catchment area includes areas of employment deprivation[2], people within the employment-deprived areas will count double for this measure
- Journey purpose served[3]. Bus services that accommodate a number of high priority journey purposes are considered more 'valuable' than those that focus primarily on lower priority journey purposes

The objective scoring mechanism which will be used against each of these measures reflects their relative importance and is sufficiently 'fine-grained' to enable LCC to differentiate between the merits of different service options. The results of this scoring system will divide current subsidised services into those which have strong, marginal and weak cases for support. Those services which are assessed as having a weak case for support are not likely to continue in their current form. Those with a marginal case for support will be reviewed further to establish whether any support can be provided to enable them to continue in their current form, or whether needs can be met in a different way. Therefore, these reviews will lead to some services being discontinued. This could result in negative impacts for some current service users.

However, where a service is to be discontinued, there will be a period of consultation and engagement with current service users and communities, to establish whether there are essential needs which require alternative service provision. This would then be followed by a period of redesign, during which the service would work with service users and communities to design a service which best meets those needs. This would result in services being designed and commissioned which are of best value to the community.

It is therefore important to note that whilst services will close as a result of this policy change with negative impacts on current service users, the overall changes to provision are anticipated to have positive impacts. Services will be designed which are flexible and meet the needs of communities, rather than the current provision of infrequent, inflexible bus services which have low passenger usage. Services will be designed with

---

[1] Catchment area defined as within 800m of a bus stop.
[2] Defined for this purpose as Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) within the 30% most employment-deprived LSOAs in England, according to the latest indices of deprivation published by Government.
[3] Journey purposes served will be estimated based on best information available from known travel patterns information from operators and, where necessary, user surveys.

the needs of communities in mind. For example, services could be designed which coincide with market days in specific local centres to enable service users to travel at the times which are most suited to them.

It must be recognised that any service redesign will be based on levels of need, in line with the priority groups (older population, people with disabilities, isolated and employment-deprived areas) and journey purposes (food shopping, primary healthcare and employment and training opportunities at a local centre) outlined in the policy and strategy. Redesign will also be in line with the core operating times of Monday – Friday 07.00-19.00 and Saturday 08.00-18.00. Therefore if services are closed which do not meet these criteria, it is unlikely that alternative provision would be commissioned. In this case, current service users would be negatively impacted. This was noted in the consultation. 81% of respondents supported the priority groups; 80% supported the priority journey types; and 74% supported the core operating times identified.

16.	Is any further research, data collection or evidence required to fill any gaps in your understanding of the potential or known affects of the policy on target groups?

Should this new policy be approved, all currently subsidised services will be reviewed using the following measures:
- Net subsidy cost per passenger-km
- Number of Leicestershire residents within the service's catchment area who don't have access to another direct service to a local centre by other means (e.g. commercial bus or rail service) and who aren't within reasonable walking distance (880m) of a local centre
- Journey purposes served (must be more than 20% of passenger journeys to qualify)

Work has been carried out to ensure that all of the required data is in place for when these reviews are required. This includes information from bus operators, as well as location data.

Data on journey purpose is based on information from operators supplemented by information from surveys on subsidised services. These surveys provide a snapshot, and will be carried out when required going forward.

Once services have been identified as being at risk of closure, consultation and engagement will be carried out with services users and communities which will allow the service to increase their understanding of the impacts of change on target groups and design services with these in mind.

When considering who is affected by this proposed policy, it is important to think about consulting with and involving a range of service users, staff or other stakeholders who may be affected as part of the proposal.

17.	Based on the gaps identified either in the EHRIA Screening or independently of this process, *how* have you further consulted with those affected on the likely impact and *what* does this consultation tell you about each of the diverse groups?

A full public consultation was carried out between 21 March and 13 June 2018. Consultation materials were available online, and hard copies were also available on

supported bus services. A telephone number and dedicated email address were also provided for people to ask questions or request hard copies of consultation materials to be provided to them.

928 responses were received to the formal consultation. 88% of these responses came from users of the current subsidised services which will potentially be affected by this policy change. 32 organisations provided responses to the public consultation.

There were also 285 general responses received to the dedicated email address and through post. This included comments from 30 organisations.

Five public events were held across the county, which were advertised for people to attend should they wish to hear more about the proposed changes, ask questions, or give their views. These were attended by 92 people.

Consultation responses showed the following about users of subsidised services:

Age group	15-24	4.56%
	25-34	2.89%
	35-44	6.53%
	45-54	13.22%
	55-64	14.13%
	65-74	34.04%
	75-84	20.36%
	85+	4.26%
Gender identity	Male	34.49%
	Female	65.22%
	Other (e.g. pangender, non-binary etc.)	0.29%
Long-standing illness, disability or infirmity	Yes	36.79%
	No	63.21%
Ethnic group	Asian or Asian British	2.15%
	Black or Black British	0.15%
	White	96.47%
	Other ethnic group	0.46%
	Mixed	0.77%
Sexual orientation	Bi-sexual	2.34%
	Gay	1.37%
	Heterosexual/straight	93.75%
	Other	2.54%
Employment status	Employee in full-time job	16.08%
	Employee in part-time job	9.80%
	Self-employed full or part time	4.09%
	Full-time education at school, college or university	2.92%
	Unemployed and available for work	1.02%
	Wholly retired from work	56.14%
	Looking after the whole	2.49%

	Permanently sick/disabled	4.09%
	Doing something else	3.36%
Number of vehicles available for use	None	35.80%
	One	43.50%
	Two	16.47%
	Three	2.42%
	Four or more	1.66%
	Don't know	0.15%
Religion	No religion	26.43%
	Christian (all denominations)	70.02%
	Hindu	1.55%
	Jewish	0.15%
	Any other religion	1.70%
	Buddhist	0.15%

18.	Is any further consultation required to fill any gaps in your understanding of the potential or known effects of the policy on target groups?
	Further consultation and engagement will be carried out with communities where services are at risk of closure. This will ensure that there is understanding of all the potential impacts on the policy on target groups, and will allow for alternative services to be designed which meet priority needs. A high value is placed on this change in terms of a greater focus being given to consultation and engagement with communities in order to build an accurate picture of impact and need, and design services with communities. As a result, two additional posts are being recommended to lead on this work to ensure that sufficient time and resource is allocated to this. Bus surveys may also be carried out on services which are at risk of closure to ensure that information regarding factors such as journey purposes is available. The Leicestershire Equalities Challenge Group (LECG) will continue to be involved through the implementation of the revised PTPS to ensure equalities considerations remain at the heart of putting the PTPS into practice.

Section 3 **B: Recognised Impact**	
19.	Based on any evidence and findings, use the table below to specify if any individuals or community groups who identify with any 'protected characteristics' are *likely* to be affected by this policy. Describe any positive and negative impacts, including what barriers these individuals or groups may face.

		Comments
	Age	Based on consultation responses, 59% of current subsidised bus service users are 65

		and over. There is therefore the potential for service reductions as a result of this policy change to disproportionately affect older people.
		However, this has been recognised. Under the new policy, older people will be considered a priority group. This means that where services are being used by a significant number of older people, they will score more highly against the scoring criteria and are therefore likely to have a stronger case for support. Even where services are proposed to be reduced, a period of consultation and engagement with communities will identify need in the local area, including need for older people. Where assessed to be necessary, alternative services will then be designed which meet the level of essential need, with older people again considered as a priority group.
		81% of consultation responses agreed with the priority groups identified.
		Some comments were received based on younger people not being identified as a priority group. However, priority groups have been identified based on significant usage of current services, and the importance of provision for those who would otherwise be unable to access essential services (such as food shopping and primary healthcare).
	Disability	Based on consultation responses, 37% of current subsidised bus service users consider themselves to have a long-standing illness. Disability or infirmity. There is the potential for service reductions to disproportionately impact on these people, as they may struggle to access services without support in terms of transport.
		This has been considered under the new policy, as people with a disability are also considered a priority group. As above, this means that where services are being used by people with disabilities, they will score more highly against the scoring criteria and are therefore likely to have a stronger case for support. Even where services are proposed to be reduced, a period of consultation and engagement with communities will identify need in the local area, including need for people with disabilities. Where assessed to be necessary, alternative services will then be designed which meet the level of essential

		need, with people with disabilities again considered as a priority group. 81% of consultation responses agreed with the priority groups identified. There are various potential travel options for disabled people across the county ranging from the commercial and County Council supported bus networks to Community Transport and Demand Responsive Transport etc. We will seek to ensure that disabled people are aware of the range of travel options that are available to them and what of these options the County Council is able to cost effectively provide within the resources available.
	Gender Reassignment	N/A
	Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A
	Pregnancy and Maternity	N/A
	Race	N/A
	Religion or Belief	N/A
	Sex	Based on consultation responses, 65% of current subsidised bus service users are female.
	Sexual Orientation	N/A
	Other groups **e.g. rural isolation, deprivation, health inequality, carers, asylum seeker and refugee communities, looked after children, deprived or disadvantaged communities**	In reviewing services under the new policy, areas which are isolated and employment-deprived will be considered a priority. This means that where services are in isolated or employment-deprived areas, they will score more highly against the scoring criteria and are therefore likely to have a stronger case for support. Even where services are proposed to be reduced, a period of consultation and engagement with communities will identify need in the local area. This will take into account isolation and employment-deprived areas. 81% of consultation responses agreed with the priority groups identified.

	Community Cohesion	N/A

20.	Based on any evidence and findings, use the table below to specify if any particular Articles in the Human Rights Act are *likely* to apply to the policy. Are the human rights of any individuals or community groups affected by this proposal? Is there an impact on human rights for any of the protected characteristics?

	Comments
Part 1: The Convention- Rights and Freedoms	
Article 2: Right to life	N/A
Article 3: Right not to be tortured or treated in an inhuman or degrading way	N/A
Article 4: Right not to be subjected to slavery/ forced labour	N/A
Article 5: Right to liberty and security	N/A
Article 6: Right to a fair trial	N/A
Article 7: No punishment without law	N/A
Article 8: Right to respect for private and family life	N/A
Article 9: Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion	N/A
Article 10: Right to freedom of expression	N/A
Article 11: Right to freedom of assembly and association	N/A
Article 12: Right to marry	N/A
Article 14: Right not to be discriminated against	N/A
Part 2: The First Protocol	
Article 1: Protection of property/ peaceful enjoyment	N/A
Article 2: Right to education	N/A

	Article 3: Right to free elections	N/A

Section 3
C: Mitigating and Assessing the Impact
Taking into account the research, data, consultation and information you have reviewed and/ or carried out as part of this EHRIA, it is now essential to assess the impact of the policy.

21.	If you consider there to be actual or potential adverse impact or discrimination, please outline this below. State whether it is justifiable or legitimate and give reasons.

Under this policy, it is likely that some existing subsidised bus services will no longer be supported and will therefore cease to operate. As a result, individuals who use these services will be negatively impacted as they will no longer receive the services they currently use. As noted above, there is the potential for this to disproportionately impact older people, people with disabilities, and people who live in isolated or employment-deprived areas.

However, priority is given to services which support older people, people with disabilities, and people who live in isolated or employment-deprived areas. These services will score more highly against the proposed assessment criteria, and are therefore likely to have a stronger case for support.

It is felt that this is legitimate, as Leicestershire County Council does not have a statutory duty to provide or support passenger transport. The only statutory duty is the LCC to identify public transport requirements which would not otherwise be met, and consider what would be appropriate services to meet those needs. It would be justifiable to remove services which do not provide value for money and meet essential need.

However, it is not being proposed that where these services are removed, individuals and communities should have no available transport provision. Where services are at risk of closure, consultation and engagement will be carried out with affected communities to develop an understanding of the essential needs in the area in terms of accessing essential services. Where this consultation identifies essential need, alternative provision will be designed in further consultation with communities – including older people, people with disabilities, and people who live in isolated or employment-deprived areas. This will result in value for money services, designed with the needs of communities and service users in mind to ensure flexibility and convenience.

The Leicestershire Equalities Challenge Group (LECG) will continue to be involved through the implementation of the revised PTPS to ensure equalities considerations remain at the heart of putting the PTPS into practice.

NB:

i) If you have identified adverse impact or discrimination that is *illegal*, you are required to take action to remedy this immediately.

ii) If you have identified adverse impact or discrimination that is *justifiable or legitimate*, you will need to consider what actions can be taken to mitigate its effect on those groups of people.

22.	Where there are potential barriers, negative impacts identified and/ or barriers or impacts are unknown, please outline how you propose to minimise all negative impact or discrimination.
	a) include any relevant research and consultation findings which highlight the best way in which to minimise negative impact or discrimination
	b) consider what barriers you can remove, whether reasonable adjustments may be necessary and how any unmet needs that you have identified can be addressed
	c) if you are not addressing any negative impacts (including human rights) or potential barriers identified for a particular group, please explain why

77% of responses to the consultation indicated a view that the new policy would make it harder for them to access essential services. This relates to the potential closure of a number of current subsidised bus services.

However, the aim is to minimise negative impacts or the risk of discrimination by giving priority to services which meet the needs of those with protected characteristics. The priority groups are:
- older people
- people with disabilities
- isolated or employment-deprived areas.

It is therefore anticipated that services which support people with these characteristics will score more highly against the assessment criteria, and are therefore likely to have a stronger case for support.

However, it is anticipated that a number of subsidised services will no longer be supported under the new policy. This would have the impact that a number of current service users would face barriers to accessing essential services, such as food shopping, primary healthcare, and employment and training opportunities. As a result, consultation and engagement will be carried out with affected communities to identify essential need. Where there is sufficient essential need to justify alternative service provision, there will be further engagement with communities to design services which meet this need. This will therefore ensure that future services meet the needs of local communities, meaning that they should be more widely used and therefore more cost-effective for LCC.

Decisions on future services will be made with due regard to priority groups, and priority journey purposes. Information gathered from the consultation supports the priorities identified:

- 81% of consultation respondents supported the proposed priority groupings identified (older people, people with disabilities, people in isolated or employment-deprived areas)
- 80% of consultation respondents supported the proposed priority journey purposes (food shopping, primary healthcare, employment and training opportunities)
- 74% of consultation respondents supported the core operating times identified

(Monday to Friday 07.00-19.00 and Saturday 08.00-18.00)
* 62% agreed with the aim of the new policy in focusing on essential needs in a cost-effective way

It is therefore felt that due regard will be given under the new policy to minimising negative impacts for those with protected characteristics. It is hoped that mitigations will be in place to minimise barriers for people to access essential services.

| **Section 3** |
| **D: Making a decision** |

| 23. | Summarise your findings and give an overview as to whether the policy will meet Leicestershire County Council's responsibilities in relation to equality, diversity, community cohesion and human rights. |

It is felt that this policy will meet Leicestershire County Council's responsibilities in relation to equality, diversity, community cohesion and human rights. Whilst there is the potential for negative impacts on those with protected characteristics in terms of service reductions, mitigations have been proposed. Services which provide transport for a number of people with protected characteristics should score more highly against the assessment criteria as a result of priority groups being identified.

Where services are at risk of closure, consultation and engagement will be carried out with communities to identify essential need. Where appropriate, alternative service provision will be designed in consultation with communities to meet this need. Again, priority will be given to those groups with protected characteristics. Two new posts have been recommended to support with this work.

The Leicestershire Equalities Challenge Group (LECG) will continue to be involved through the implementation of the revised PTPS to ensure equalities considerations remain at the heart of putting the PTPS into practice.

| **Section 3** |
| **E: Monitoring, evaluation & review of the policy** |

| 24. | Are there processes in place to review the findings of this EHRIA and make appropriate changes? In particular, how will you monitor potential barriers and any positive/ negative impact?

Services would be reviewed on a case by case basis, taking into account impacts on service users and communities. Where services are likely to close, consultation and engagement with communities will highlight potential barriers and any negative impacts which suggest that alternative provision is required. The service will work closely with communities during implementation to ensure that decisions are evidence-based and all impacts are understood and taken into account.

An operational handbook is being developed which will provide guidance into the new processes which will be required should the policy be approved. This will include details around how potential barriers should be monitored to identify negative impacts and mitigated. |
| 25. | How will the recommendations of this assessment be built into wider planning and |

	review processes? *e.g. policy reviews, annual plans and use of performance management systems* Equalities considerations will inform the process guidance in the operational handbook which is being developed to support the service in implementation of the new policy should it be approved. These priority groups, based around protected characteristics and groups which are at risk of being disproportionately negatively impacted, will be used in all future service reviews.

Section 3:
F: Equality and human rights improvement plan

Please list all the equality objectives, actions and targets that result from the Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) (continue on separate sheets as necessary). These now need to be included in the relevant service plan for mainstreaming and performance management purposes.

Equality Objective	Action	Target	Officer Responsible	By when
Older people are unable to access essential services as a result of closures to current subsidised services	Ensure that priority groups are taken into account during service reviews	Ensure older people are able to access essential services	Team Manager – Safe & Sustainable Travel Team	June 2019 (or subsequent closure of any subsidised service)
People with disabilities are unable to access essential services as a result of closures to current subsidised services	Ensure that priority groups are taken into account during consultation and engagement period following decision to close service	Ensure people with disabilities are able to access essential services	Team Manager – Safe & Sustainable Travel Team	June 2019 (or subsequent closure of any subsidised service)
Isolated people are unable to access essential services as a result of closures to current subsidised services	Ensure that priority groups are taken into account during period of service redesign with communities (if assessed to be required	Ensure isolated people are able to access essential services	Team Manager – Safe & Sustainable Travel Team	June 2019 (or subsequent closure of any subsidised service)
People in employment-deprived areas are unable to access essential services as a		Ensure people in employment-deprived areas are able to access essential services	Team Manager – Safe & Sustainable Travel Team	June 2019 (or subsequent closure of any subsidised service)

result of closures to current subsidised services				

Section 4: Sign off and scrutiny

Upon completion, the Lead Officer completing this assessment is required to sign the document in the section below.

It is required that this Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment (EHRIA) is scrutinised by your Departmental Equalities Group and signed off by the Chair of the Group.

Once scrutiny and sign off has taken place, a depersonalised version of this EHRIA should be published on Leicestershire County Council's website. Please send a copy of this form to the Digital Services Team via web@leics.gov.uk for publishing.

Section 4
A: Sign Off and Scrutiny

Confirm, as appropriate, which elements of the EHRIA have been completed and are required for sign off and scrutiny.

Equality and Human Rights Assessment Screening ☐

Equality and Human Rights Assessment Report ☒ x

1st Authorised Signature (EHRIA Lead Officer): ………………Holly Morrall

Date: …19th September 2018……………………….

2nd Authorised Signature (DEG Chair): ………Ian Vears………………….

Date: ……21st September 2018………………………

This page is intentionally left blank