

**GO  
SEStran**

South East of Scotland  
Transport Partnership



---

# REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

**Equalities Duties Summary Report**

October 2021

In partnership with:  **Stantec**

## Document Control Sheet

**Project Name:** SEStran Regional Transport Strategy

**Project Ref:** 50429

**Report Title:** Equalities Duties Report

**Doc Ref:** EqIA-03i1

**Date:** October 2021

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Thomas Reiskin	Graduate Consultant	TR	October 2021
	Liam Gleeson	Consultant	LG	October 2021
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Duncan Smart	Associate Planner	DS	October 2021
	Alec Knox	Associate Transport Planner	AK	
<b>Approved by:</b>	Scott Leitham	Director – Transport Planning	SL	
<b>For and on behalf of Stantec UK Limited</b>				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved

This report has been prepared by Stantec UK Limited ('Stantec') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which Stantec was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e., parties other than the Client). Stantec accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

**Contents**

**1 Introduction..... 1**

    1.1 Overview..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

    1.2 Purpose and Objectives ..... 2

    1.3 Report Structure ..... 2

**2 Approach to Equalities Duties ..... 3**

    2.2 Equalities Assessment Framework ..... 3

    2.3 How has this EqIA informed the RTS? ..... 4

**3 Assessment ..... 6**

    3.1 Key Equalities Issues ..... 6

    3.2 Strategic Objectives..... 11

    3.3 RTS Regional Mobility Themes ..... 13

    3.4 RTS Regional Spatial Strategy ..... 18

**4 Next Steps ..... 20**

**Bibliography ..... 21**

**Tables**

Table 1: Key Equalities Issues identified in Section 3 of the draft RTS ..... 9

Table 2: Compatibility of proposed RTS strategy objectives..... 12

Table 3: Compatibility of RTS regional mobility themes..... 15

Table 4: Compatibility of the RTS spatial strategy themes ..... 19

This page is intentionally blank

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Stantec UK Ltd has been commissioned by the South East of Scotland ('SEStran') Regional Transport Partnership to support the preparation of a new RTS for the South East of Scotland. Once finalised and approved, the RTS will set out a new long-term vision for transport across the region together with a clear framework for how transport and mobility will be provided, developed, and improved in the region to meet the aspirations for a sustainable and economically active growth area over the next 10 years and beyond.
- 1.1.2 This Equalities Duties Summary Report has been prepared to accompany the Draft SEStran Regional Transport Strategy ('the Draft RTS') for consultation. The Draft RTS is the product of an iterative process, building on a Case for Change Report (June 2021) and a Main Issues Report (June 2020). At each stage, SEStran sought input and views from stakeholders on the type and level of change needed on the transport system in south east Scotland.
- 1.1.3 This report provides a summary of how relevant 'equalities duties' (defined below) have been considered in the preparation of the Draft SEStran RTS ('the Draft RTS'). The report is accompanied by individual 'template' reports which detail how each applicable duty has been applied.

## 1.2 The EqIA Process

### Overview

- 1.2.1 Equalities issues are becoming increasingly prevalent in transport planning. Policy needs to recognise the different ways people interface with and experience the transport network. This trend towards a greater focus on inclusion is best articulated by the Scottish Government's National Transport Strategy 2 (2020), which targets reducing inequalities as one of the four central priorities which now underpin national transport policy.
- 1.2.2 An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) process has therefore been undertaken to apply relevant equalities duties throughout and identify likely equalities impacts arising from the draft RTS. This EqIA was undertaken in tandem with the development of the draft RTS to allow assessment findings to influence the content of the RTS on an iterative basis.
- 1.2.3 Relevant equalities duties were used as tools to inform and embed key equalities issues within the draft RTS from the outset. Acting together with the SEA being carried out for the draft RTS, this integrated approach allows the environmental, social, and economic implications of all strategy components to be tested at the earliest opportunity and for any uncertainties or issues identified during impact assessment processes to be addressed during RTS preparation.

### Relevant Equalities Duties

- 1.2.4 The only equalities duty applicable to SEStran on a statutory basis is the public sector equality duty. This EqIA will however also address the Fairer Scotland and Child Rights and Wellbeing duties insofar as relevant to the RTS as good practice, as these relate to issues affecting the transport system and apply on a statutory basis to SEStran's constituent local authorities and NHS health boards.
- 1.2.5 In March 2021 an Equalities Duties Assessment Framing Note was prepared to identify an evidence-based suite of key equalities issues which should be considered in the draft RTS and taken account of in the EqIA process. A framework was also set out explain how each of the applicable equalities duties would be applied and reported against throughout the development of the RTS in a way which helps to address the identified key equalities issues.



- 1.2.6 In June 2021 an Equalities Impact Assessment of the RTS Case for Change was prepared to provide a proportionate assessment of the coverage of key equalities issues within the emerging substantive components and thus their likely equalities impacts.

### 1.3 Purpose and Objectives

- 1.3.1 This report has been prepared by Stantec to assess the extent to which the draft RTS addresses relevant equalities considerations. This informs the formal reporting which discharges relevant statutory equalities duties in the draft RTS.
- 1.3.2 The objectives of this report are to:
- i. Assess the coverage of key equalities issues, as identified through the undertaking of relevant equalities duties, in the 'key issues' identified within the draft RTS. The key equalities issues include those previously consulted upon through the **RTS EqIA Assessment Framing Note** (Stantec, 2021);
  - ii. Assess the extent to which the proposed RTS strategy objectives, regional mobility themes, policies and spatial strategy themes address identified key equalities issues. This includes testing the compatibility of each of these with the requirements of applicable equalities duty through applying an assessment framework of associated guide questions;
  - iii. Recommend any changes which should be incorporated into the draft RTS to improve the coverage of equalities issues and to enhance the ability of the document to tackle such issues; and, in doing so contribute to the on-going implementation of applicable equalities duties.

### 1.4 Report Structure

- 1.4.1 This report is structured as follows:
- **Section 2 – Approach to Equalities Duties:** provides an overview of how applicable statutory equalities duties have been addressed in the development of the draft RTS, including how the EqIA process has informed this;
  - **Section 3 – Assessment:** assesses the coverage of key equalities issues and defined 'Equalities Objectives' within the Transport Planning Objectives, RTS Objectives, Regional Mobility Themes, and the options generation matrix set out within the draft strategy; and,
  - **Section 4 – Next Steps:** outlines the next steps leading to the finalisation of the new RTS.
- 1.4.2 This report should be read in conjunction with the individual 'template' reports which detail how each applicable duty has been applied.



## 2 Approach to Equalities Duties

- 2.1.1 This section outlines the requirements of the three relevant equalities duties and details the revised set of criteria which will be used to iteratively assess all substantive components of the draft RTS. Taken together, these criteria comprise an Equalities Assessment Framework which will be used to test, refine, and assess all substantive components of the Draft RTS in relation to likely equalities impacts.

### 2.2 Equalities Assessment Framework

#### Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.2.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 sets out a 'public sector equality duty'. This requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between those with a protected characteristic and those without.
- 2.2.2 The following guide questions have been designed to allow for testing the implementation of the PSED. They provide a transparent framework to assess the extent to which draft RTS components promote equality of opportunity, including the removal of physical and cultural barriers to accessing and benefiting from the transport system.

#### Assessment Framework: Public Sector Equality Duty

*Will the draft RTS and its associated delivery mechanisms...*

- *Result in any likely different or disproportionate effects on persons with protected characteristics as specified in the Equality Act 2010?*
- *Promote social cohesion and integration between people with different protected characteristics?*
- *Advance the SEStran equalities outcomes?*
- *Provide equal access to employment opportunities, social and cultural activities, and public services and amenities for all?*
- *Promote public realm and design choices that provide a safe, secure, and accessible environment for all?*
- *Support the removal of barriers to travel and the improvement of equal access to travel?*

#### Fairer Scotland Duty

- 2.2.3 The Fairer Scotland Duty (FSD) places a legal responsibility on public bodies in Scotland to actively consider how they can reduce inequalities of outcome caused by socioeconomic disadvantage. This differs from the Public Sector Equality Duty which considers only reducing inequalities of opportunity.
- 2.2.4 However, the FSD identifies a need to consider both 'communities of place' and 'communities of interest' in terms of people who share an experience and are particularly impacted by socio-economic disadvantage (Scottish Government, 2018). Demographic groups who share one or more of the protected characteristics listed in Section 4 of the Equality Act 2010 can be considered 'communities of interest', meaning there is a direct link between the Fairer Scotland Duty and the Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 2.2.5 The following criteria have been applied to testing the performance of the Draft RTS in relation to implementing the FSD. This provides a transparent framework to assess the extent to which draft RTS components reduce inequalities of outcome resulting from low income, low wealth, and multiple deprivation.



#### Assessment Framework: Fairer Scotland Duty

*Will the draft RTS and its associated delivery mechanisms...*

- *Help to reduce levels of absolute and relative income poverty, inequality in the distribution of household wealth, and levels of multiple deprivation affecting communities?*
- *Reduce cost related barriers to accessing and use of all transport modes?*
- *Provide equal access to employment opportunities, social and cultural activities, and public services and amenities for all?*
- *Improve accessibility to open spaces, and sports facilities for physical recreation, in particular for those facing socio-economic disadvantage?*
- *Promote good local access to existing facilities, services, and employment, in particular for those facing socio-economic disadvantage?*

### Child Rights and Wellbeing Duties

- 2.2.6 The Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 requires public bodies to consider whether existing and emerging legislation, policy, and guidance have an impact on children and young people and to assess what further action is required to ensure compliance with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC).
- 2.2.7 The following criteria have been applied to test and confirm the implementation of relevant Scottish Ministers' duties under the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014 and the UNCRC in the Draft RTS. They have been formulated with reference to the approach recommended within the Scottish Government's Child Rights and Wellbeing Impact Assessment Guidance (Scottish Government, 2019).

#### Assessment Framework: Child Rights and Wellbeing Duties

- *How does the intervention relate to, promote, or inhibit the provisions of the UNCRC, other relevant international treaties and standards, or domestic law?*
- *Have children and young people been consulted on the intervention?*
- *Will the rights of one group of children in particular be affected, and to what extent?*
- *Are there competing interests between the groups of children, or between children and other groups, who would be affected by the intervention?*
- *Will the intervention protect and enhance access to high quality community facilities, public services and key amenities for children and young people?*
- *Will the intervention improve access using active travel and public transport to educational, social, and economic opportunities for children and young people?*
- *Which UNCRC Articles are relevant to the RTS?*
- *How will the RTS support or otherwise affect the implementation of relevant UNCRC Articles?*

## 2.3 How has this EqlA informed the RTS?

- 2.3.1 In June 2021, a proportionate EqlA was carried out to assess the Case for Change. This focused on assessing the coverage of identified key equalities issues within all substantive elements of the Case for Change and the extent to which proposed RTS Objectives address these issues and are compatible with applicable equalities duties. The findings of the assessment are documented in the *Case for Change Equalities Duties Report* (Stantec, 2021).
- 2.3.2 Preparing equalities duties reporting and the Case for Change concurrently allowed emerging EqlA findings to inform the final Case for Change Report as published for consultation. In





summary, the following main recommendations were identified through the assessment and subsequently incorporated within the Case for Change:

- **Additional baseline reporting:** the Case for Change now includes additional and more explicit equalities baseline information and cross-references to the literature review in the *RTS EqIA Assessment Framing Note* (Stantec, 2021);
- **More explicit references to existing inequalities in transport problems:** whilst initial drafts of the Case for Change identified problems disproportionately experienced by demographic groups, these inequalities were not explicitly stated. The RTS now clearly emphasises the particular demographic groups and protected characteristics which experience relevant inequalities. This aids the identification of likely differential impacts from options designed to address the problems identified;
- **Inequalities identified in principle reporting frameworks:** following EqIA recommendations, key equalities issues are now explicitly described in the frameworks themselves. This makes likely differential impacts clear to readers and policy makers who may only be referring to these summary outputs; and,
- **Differential impacts identified in strategic objectives:** following EqIA recommendations, the four RTS Strategic objectives defined within the RTS now include specific reference to social groups, protected characteristics and young people.

2.3.3 Owing to the iterative nature of the RTS development process these changes the Case for Change have been carried forward and have informed the preparation of the Draft RTS. As a result, strategic framework elements of the Draft RTS (vision, RTS objectives and TPOs) provides a strong platform to address identified key equalities issues.



## 3 Assessment

### 3.1 Key Equalities Issues

#### Equalities Evidence Base

- 3.1.1 This section provides a high-level overview of key equalities issues experienced on the SEStran transport network, drawing largely on secondary research and policy. Little of the secondary research focuses exclusively on the SEStran area, instead highlighting trends at a Scotland and UK level.
- 3.1.2 The evidence base is grouped by theme and reports discrimination experienced by people relating to individual protected characteristics. Yet it is important to remember that many people who use the transport network experience an intersection of multiple inequalities. Social identities and characteristics overlap, which can create a compounding experience of discrimination. Age-based discrimination, for example, will be experienced differently by an individual who has high material wealth and by an individual in poverty.
- 3.1.3 Related to this, wider inequalities in society mean that discrimination or other equalities impacts based on one characteristic or social identity may be more likely experienced by a particular social group. For example, the equalities impact of a reduction in fares will have a disproportionate impact on people with low incomes. As many ethnic minority groups in Scotland have lower than average incomes, a change in fares could indirectly result in a disproportionate impact on such ethnic minority groups.

#### Travel Behaviour and Differential Requirements

- 3.1.4 Different people use the transport network at different times, more or less frequently, and for different purposes. Some groups of people, such as people from ethnic minority groups, disabled people, young carers, young mothers, and care leavers, are less mobile and more reliant on public transport (Scottish Government 2017).
- 3.1.5 This may result in differential impacts of changes to service provision for a particular time of day or route. Recent literature has suggested several trends relating to the protected characteristics which should be considered in the EqIA process:

- **Sex:** in general, women engage in travel linked to domestic commitments and are more likely to travel with young people and the elderly (Duchene 2011; Sánchez de Madariaga 2013). This influences travel behaviour and women tend to travel shorter distances within a more restricted geographical area, make more multi-stop trips, and rely more on public transport.
- **Age:** elderly people also tend to travel relatively less often and for shorter distances than other adults (Fatima, et al. 2020). Without needing to commute, elderly people are more likely to travel between the hours of 9:00 and 15:00, with most trips for shopping (mostly undertaken by elderly women) (Su and Bell 2012).

According to Davis (2014), young people may have a more local focus than the population as a whole. This suggests that young people from deprived areas may look for jobs and training opportunities only in their local area and those easily accessible via public transport.

- **Disability:** an individual will generally use public transport less frequently if they experience a greater number of difficulties completing daily tasks (Yarde, et al. 2020). However, travel behaviour among this group varies widely as the behaviour of people with specific types of disabilities is often markedly different to each other (Clery, et al. 2017).



- **Race:** data at a Scotland-level is limited on different ethnic minority groups (Scottish Government 2015, 26) and any analysis of race-based discrimination must consider the differences in people's experiences and preferences both between and within different ethnic groups (Gentin 2011). Yet recent research suggests that black and ethnic minority individuals take relatively few active leisure trips such as walking or cycling (Colley and Irvine 2018). Potential explanations can include socio-economic disadvantage, fear of discrimination, and language barriers.

3.1.6 Policies around service provision and scheduling in the draft RTS are therefore likely to impact groups related to protected characteristics in different ways. This should be considered further in the emerging strategy and EqIA to ensure any likely differential impacts are identified.

#### **Income, Wealth, and Affordability**

3.1.7 The affordability and availability of transport to people facing socio-economic disadvantage through low incomes and wealth is a key equalities issue. This characteristic influences how people use and experience the transport network. Further, the transport network itself influences inequalities of opportunity and outcome related to income and wealth.

3.1.8 How a person interacts with the transport network is influenced by their income. Statistics published by Transport Scotland (2020, 185; 2019, 66) have repeatedly shown that people in lower income households are more likely to travel by bus, while people in higher income households are more likely to drive or take the train.

3.1.9 This is reinforced by research undertaken by the Glasgow Connectivity Commission (2019) found that, across Scotland, people in the lowest SIMD quintile make 58% fewer trips by car; 75% fewer trips by rail; 50% more trips by foot; and 206% more trips by bus and coach than those in the highest SIMD quintile.

3.1.10 There is also a spatial relationship between transport connectivity and material wealth. Areas of multiple deprivation tend to have poorer public transport links than areas with high material wealth, in terms of both service quality and the range of options available (Lucas, et al. 2011; Titheridge, et al. 2014)

3.1.11 'Transport poverty' where a lack of affordable travel options prohibits access to employment and essential services has been estimated to impact more than one million people across Scotland (Sustrans Scotland 2016).

3.1.12 This can lead to higher transport costs for people living in areas of high multiple deprivation, compounding inequalities of income. Low public transport accessibility can make car ownership a necessity for people to commute to work or access basic services – evidenced by a recent study of suburban areas around Glasgow (Curl, Clark and Kearns 2017).

3.1.13 'Forced car ownership' occurs in urban and suburban areas, but it is particularly a concern for low-income households in rural areas (Crisp, Gore and McCarthy 2017). This is compounded, and likely influenced by, higher fares for bus travel in rural areas across Scotland (Citizens Advice Bureau 2016).

3.1.14 Car-centric design itself has discriminatory impacts, with a relationship between less safe infrastructure and travel patterns and material wealth. Children in the 20% most deprived areas in Scotland are three times as likely to be in a collision with a car as children in the least deprived 20% of areas (Quayle 2019).

3.1.15 The transport network itself can have a potential impact in determining incomes. Affordable transport with a good service can promote equality of opportunity, enabling people to access jobs, education, and training (The Poverty and Inequality Commission 2019).



- 3.1.16 Owing to these relationships, policies in the draft RTS should seek to identify any differential impacts on different socio-economic groups (e.g., disaggregated by income, wealth, or social class). As mentioned above, differential impacts between such groups are likely to also be manifest within and between groups with other characteristics and social identities with disproportionate rates of poverty and low income and wealth.

### Other Barriers to Transport

#### Accessibility

- 3.1.17 Barriers to accessible travel can leave disabled people unable or unwilling to travel. While most disabled travellers in Scotland rely on public transport, many experience difficulties when travelling. Problems include poor service frequency, inadequate infrastructure between home and stop or station, and the most reported, difficulties physically accessing the transport (Disability Equality Scotland 2017).
- 3.1.18 The Scottish Government launched Going Further in 2016, an accessible travel framework aimed at eliminating barriers which prevent disabled people travelling. The Framework included commitments to disability training for transport staff, mechanisms for enabling onward travel should journeys be disrupted, and advice on ticketing and pricing (Scottish Government 2016).

#### Hate Crime

- 3.1.19 As well as being accessible, transport should be safe for individuals to use. Individuals should be free from hate crime, bullying and harassment when travelling. A hate crime is any criminal offence motivated by malice and ill-will towards a social group. Hate crime can be motivated by disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, race, religion, or faith.

### Coverage in the Strategy

- 3.1.20 Section 3 of the draft RTS is centred around 29 key 'problems' which the strategy seeks to respond to, grouped by mode. These specific transport issues were identified through extensive engagement, desk-based research, and statutory assessment activities during the development of the RTS.
- 3.1.21 Identified transport problems form the basis of 29 transport planning objectives (TPOs), which in turn informs four RTS Strategic Objectives and an options generation matrix which sets out high-level option types to implement the RTS Strategic Objectives.
- 3.1.22 Adequate recognition and coverage of identified key equalities issues in the suite of problems which are defined in Section 3 is therefore essential to ensure that all equalities impacts are appropriately considered. **Table 1** overleaf highlights the primary equalities issues relevant to each of the 29 problems.

Table 1: Key Equalities Issues identified in Section 3 of the draft RTS

Issue		Relevant Equalities Issues	
<b>All Modes</b>			
1	Those living in new developments or travelling to new developments can have long journeys and / or implied car use to undertake day to day activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forced car ownership, particularly among those with low incomes.</li> <li>Health and wellbeing.</li> <li>Air quality as a deterrent to active travel.</li> <li>Unequal access to services across urban and rural areas.</li> </ul>	
2	Use of the transport system brings the risk of collisions and personal injury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased risk of collision by socio-economic status.</li> </ul>	
<b>Active Travel</b>			
3	Many do not find cycling a realistic option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordability and its relationship to socio-economic status</li> <li>Gendered experiences of safety along pedestrian and walking routes.</li> </ul>	
4	Walking is not an attractive option for some short journeys		
<b>Public Transport</b>			
5	Peak period bus-based journey times can be much longer than off-peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disproportionate levels of bus travel by socio-economic status, age, and gender.</li> <li>Affordability and its relationship to socio-economic status.</li> <li>Disproportionate levels of low income and wealth among protected characteristics.</li> <li>Barriers to public transport use relating to disability including physical access barriers.</li> <li>Barriers to public transport use to persons relating to the protected characteristics of race, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, and religion such as hate crimes.</li> <li>An overlap between low accessibility and multiple deprivation means poor network coverage restricts education, employment, and leisure opportunities for those living in deprived areas.</li> </ul>	
6	Peak period bus-based journey times can be much more variable than off-peak		
7	Some direct public transport journey speeds are slow so journey times are long and not competitive with car		
8	Some travel by public transport requires interchange(s) – adding to journey times, access issues, inconvenience, and cost		
9	People can't get a seat on some public transport services		
10	Travel by bus or rail is unaffordable for some		
11	Some journeys cannot be made by public transport		
12	Physical access to, and use of the public transport network is a problem or not possible for some users		
13	Vulnerable groups not feeling safe on public transport		
14	People do not have full awareness of their public transport options		
<b>Mixed Mode</b>			
15	Combining cycling and public transport use is not possible		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributes to overreliance on the private car, with associated income, air quality, health, and access inequality impacts.</li> </ul>
16	Preferred P&R station cannot be used due to lack of parking during commuter (i) peak and (ii) inter peak		



Issue		Relevant Equalities Issues
<b>Freight</b>		
17	In places, peak period commercial vehicle-based journey times can routinely be much longer than off-peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contributes to overreliance on the road freight, with associated climate, air quality, and health inequality impacts.</li> </ul>
18	Peak period commercial vehicle-based journey times can be much more variable than off-peak	
19	Cost and practicality of rail freight prevents widespread use	
20	Commercial vehicle drivers have limited options for secure parking and rest	
21	Commercial vehicles are currently reliant on fossil fuels in the absence of viable / cost effective alternatives	
22	Direct sea-based international connectivity is poor	
<b>Car</b>		
23	In places, peak period car-based journey times can routinely be much longer than off-peak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Affordability impacts and relationship to socio-economic status.</li> </ul>
24	Peak period car-based journey times can be much more variable than off-peak	
25	High cost of town / city centre parking	
26	Lack of availability of parking is inconvenient	
27	Road-based travel on the regional road network, including some external links (including ports and airports) can be slow even when traffic volumes are relatively low	
28	Electric car operation and ownership not practical for all	
29	Cost of electric cars is higher than equivalent ICE cars and too expensive for many at present	



## **3.2 Strategic Objectives**

- 3.2.1 Section 4 of the draft RTS brings together the 29 transport problems and their associated TPOs to derive four proposed strategy objectives for the RTS:
- i. Transitioning to a sustainable, post-carbon transport system;
  - ii. Facilitating healthier travel options;
  - iii. Widening public transport connectivity and access across the region; and,
  - iv. Supporting safe, sustainable, and efficient movement of people and freight across the region.
- 3.2.2 Following an assessment against the TPOs, the RTS concludes that these strategy objectives should be taken forward and act as the foundation to underpin the development of all other, lower-level components (e.g., transport options) of the draft RTS.

### **Compatibility Assessment**

- 3.2.3 A visual summary of the compatibility of the proposed RTS strategy objectives with the equalities assessment framework is presented in Table 2 overleaf. Generally, the objectives perform well against the equalities assessment frameworks as they describe socio-economic issues which are likely to have an equalities impact, including air quality, health, and economic growth.
- 3.2.4 Each objective includes a specific reference to social groups, protected characteristics, and young people. This will help to ensure that the different needs of these groups would be considered through a future options appraisal process. Similarly, monitoring and evaluation frameworks should be designed so that differential impacts can be measured. Data which can be controlled for these characteristics should be collected to allow an evaluation of the equalities impacts of the strategy and its associated delivery mechanisms.

Table 2: Compatibility of proposed RTS strategy objectives

Outcomes	Public Sector Equality Duty	Fairer Scotland Duty	Child Rights & Wellbeing Duties	Commentary
<b>Strategy Objective 1: Transitioning to a sustainable, post-carbon transport system</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce emissions and energy use</li> <li>Improve air quality</li> </ul>	✓	✓	~	This objective has implicit compatibility with the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as it has the potential to alleviate inequalities in air quality. Poor air quality resulting from transport emissions can play an important role in physical health outcomes and inequalities – however recent research has shown there is no evident correlation with income deprivation in the Edinburgh TTWA (Bailey et al., 2018).
<b>Strategy Objective 2: Facilitating healthier travel options</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve health and well-being</li> <li>Reduce emissions</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	This objective has implicit compatibility with the PSED, FSD, and CRW assessment frameworks as there is a clear focus on health – a key area of inequality. This objective could be strengthened by using inclusive language to explicitly reference health inequalities, so the issues faced by disadvantage groups are prioritised through the RTS.
<b>Strategy Objective 3: Widening public transport connectivity and access across the region</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce inequality of opportunity and encourage more inclusive growth</li> <li>Reduce car dependency and forced car ownership and encourage modal shift</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This objective performs strongly against the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as there are explicit references to removing barriers to access and reducing inequalities of opportunity. It is implicitly compatible with the CRW framework as it references many inequalities experienced by young people, including in income and access to education and employment, but does not make an explicit reference to the group.
<b>Strategy Objective 4: Supporting safe, sustainable, and efficient movement of people and freight across the region</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliver economic growth and increased productivity through the efficient movement of people and goods</li> <li>Reduce personal injuries</li> </ul>	~	✓	~	This objective has implicit compatibility with the FSD assessment framework, given its focus on economic growth. The object could be strengthened through a discussion of inclusive growth, highlighting how interventions should ensure the benefits of growth are distributed fairly, and how economic development should work to reduce inequalities experienced by residents of the SEStran area.

**Key**

Explicit reference	✓✓	Incompatible	X
Implicit compatibility	✓	No clear relationship	~





- 3.2.5 The high-level assessment provided in **Table 2** demonstrates that in general the proposed RTS Objectives provide an appropriate high-level platform from which to develop specific schemes, policies and proposals to address identified key equalities issues. This indicates that the RTS Objectives are generally compliant with the requirements of applicable equalities duties.
- 3.2.6 However, the analysis also indicates as individual proposed RTS Strategic Objectives respond to specific TPOs they are likely to have differential relationships with applicable equalities duties and differential impacts on specific equalities issues, whilst the RTS Strategic Objectives are themselves not necessarily fully integrated. Each of the RTS Strategic Objectives will underpin the development of specific lower-level RTS components including individual options, so to avoid potential tensions, gaps or 'silo working' between the implementation of individual RTS Strategic Objectives (which could undermine the overall performance of the RTS in tackling a range of inequalities) it will be important for the RTS to include a holistic and visionary strategic framework.
- 3.2.7 The draft RTS would therefore benefit from the development of an over-arching holistic Vision and clearer linkages between Strategic Objectives to bring these together and from the outset clarify what the RTS seeks to achieve. This would ensure that any lower-level options developed mainly to address one RTS Strategy Objective either contribute to or at least avoid adverse effects on the other Strategic Objectives.
- 3.2.8 Going forward the equalities duties (and the SEA process) will be applied to test the relationship between the draft RTS Strategic Objectives and individual options in order to maximise likely significant beneficial effects and avoid or minimise adverse effects from the RTS when read and implemented as a whole.

### **3.3 RTS Regional Mobility Themes**

- 3.3.1 From the four strategy objectives, a set of 12 Regional Priorities have been defined which collate the options that have been demonstrated to contribute to the delivering of the objectives under a series of relevant headings.
- i. Shaping development and place
  - ii. Delivering safe active travel
  - iii. Enhancing access to public transport
  - iv. Enhancing and extending the bus service
  - v. Enhancing and extending the train service
  - vi. Reallocation of road-space on the regional network
  - vii. Improving integration between modes
  - viii. Decarbonising transport
  - ix. Facilitating efficient freight movement and passenger travel
  - x. Working toward zero road deaths and serious injuries
  - xi. Reducing car kilometres
  - xii. Responding to the post-Covid world



## Compatibility Assessment

- 3.3.2 A visual summary of the compatibility of the regional mobility themes with the equalities assessment framework is presented in **Table 3** overleaf. Like the strategy objectives, the themes perform well against the equalities assessment frameworks as they describe socio-economic issues which are likely to have an equalities impact, including air quality, health, and economic growth.

Table 3: Compatibility of RTS regional mobility themes

Outcomes	Public Sector Equality Duty	Fairer Scotland Duty	Child Rights & Wellbeing Duties	Commentary
<b>1: Shaping Development and Place</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve connectivity in neighbourhoods</li> <li>Introduction of shared mobility services</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This priority performs strongly against the PSED and FSD assessment frameworks due to explicit commitments to increase connections disproportionately relied upon by women and low-income groups to access key services in urban areas. There is specific language to encourage connectivity to services certain communities are currently deprived of (i.e. new health centres in health deprived communities). The aim to increase sustainable transport also encourages the usage of active travel and reduction of carbon output. This may decrease health inequalities due to increased uptake of cycling and walking, and improved air quality which has been shown to impact materially disadvantaged groups disproportionality (Wheeler & Ben-Shlomo, 2005). It may also reduce reliance on car ownership – through the policy of 20-minute neighbourhoods which may decrease income inequality.
<b>2: Delivering Safe Active Travel</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing integrated and high-quality routes for walking, wheeling, and cycling</li> <li>Designing safe and segregated active travel routes</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	This priority has clear compatibility for the PSED, FSD and CRWD assessment frameworks due to the focus of encouraging active travel. As a key determinant of health, this may lead to differential positive health outcomes. For example, recent research suggests that black and ethnic minority individuals take relatively few active leisure trips such as walking or cycling (Colley and Irvine 2018). There is an aim to ensure any new development is fully accessible, especially for disabled users which are a focus of the PSED framework. Under this priority, the RTS also considers the cost of purchasing a bike and promotes the use of bike sharing schemes, which may lead to a disproportionate impact among low-income users.
<b>3: Enhancing Access to Public Transport</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved accessibility to public transport</li> <li>Integrated ticketing between different transport modes</li> <li>Increased availability of information for planning journeys</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This priority performs strongly against the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as there are explicit references to removing barriers to access and reducing inequalities of opportunity. It is implicitly compatible with the CRW framework as it references many inequalities experienced by young people, including in income and transport-related access to education and employment (Public Health Scotland, 2021a; 2021b).



Outcomes	Public Sector Equality Duty	Fairer Scotland Duty	Child Rights & Wellbeing Duties	Commentary
<b>4: Enhancing and Extending the Bus Service</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More bus priority schemes to increase reliability</li> <li>Introduction of Bus Rapid Transport schemes</li> <li>Increased connectivity to essential services</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	This priority performs strongly against the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as there are explicit references to removing transport-related barriers to access and reducing inequalities of opportunity. It is implicitly compatible with the CRW framework as it references many inequalities experienced by young people, including in income and access to education and employment, but does not make an explicit reference to the group.
<b>5: Enhancing and Extending Train Service</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New stations and rail services</li> <li>Enhanced connectivity to essential services</li> <li>Improved capacity on key routes</li> <li>Affordable services for all</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This priority performs strongly against the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as there is an explicit aim to rationalise fares on all modes of transport. This will increase access for income deprived users, increasing accessibility and reducing inequalities of opportunity, as rail fares currently consume a larger proportion of income in income deprived households (Haney, Corley, & Forman, 2019). It is implicitly compatible with the CRW framework as it references many inequalities experienced by young people, including in income and access to education and employment, but does not make an explicit reference to the group.
<b>6: Relocation of Road-Space on the Regional Network</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction on the reliance of cars</li> <li>Higher uptake of active travel</li> </ul>	✓	✓	~	This priority has implicit compatibility with the PSED and FSD assessment framework as it explicitly mentions encouraging active travel, which is a key determinant of health. Health inequalities are considered under the PSED framework. The promotion of efficient freight movement may lead to improved economic development. However, this priority could be strengthened as there are no explicit references to how equitable growth will be achieved. Furthermore, the priority could be more specific about how access to active travel modes (such as a bike) will be widened as this is an existing inequality (Transport for London, 2011).
<b>7: Improving Integration Between Modes</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced connectivity between different modes of transport</li> <li>Increased mobility as a service opportunity</li> <li>Demand Response Transit opportunities in rural settings</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This priority explicitly meets the PSED and FSD assessment frameworks and has implicit compatibility with the CRWD assessment framework. The priority explicitly discusses increasing connectivity between modes of transport. Lower income users are more likely to use public transport (University College London, 2021), and by creating more connectivity, these users will have more access to goods and services. The discussion of Mobility as a Service (MaaS) satisfies the FSD framework as it could increase connectivity in rural areas, leading to increased economic activity and connectivity. This regional priority also satisfies the CRWD assessment as children are more likely to use public transport than adults (Chatterjee et. al, 2019), and by increasing connectivity, they will be able to access more opportunities.



Outcomes	Public Sector Equality Duty	Fairer Scotland Duty	Child Rights & Wellbeing Duties	Commentary
<b>8: Decarbonising Transport</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in CO2 emissions</li> <li>Increased charging stations to encourage uptake of Electric Vehicles</li> <li>Increased uptake of electric bikes</li> </ul>	✓	✓	~	This objective has implicit compatibility with the PSED and the FSD assessment frameworks as it has the potential to alleviate inequalities in air quality. Poor air quality resulting from transport emissions can play an important role in physical health outcomes and inequalities. The priority also explicitly discusses the inequality in purchasing power to buy an electric vehicle and sets out a method to alleviate income inequalities which would lead to differential impacts under the FSD.
<b>9: Facilitating Efficient Freight Movement and Passenger Travel</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced CO2 emissions due to targeted investment at current pinch points in the network</li> <li>More resilient infrastructure to protect the network from climate change</li> <li>Increased external connections</li> </ul>	~	✓	~	This priority has compatibility with the FSD assessment framework as it explicitly discusses economic growth from increasing capacity for freight routes. However, this priority does not suggest how it will improve deprived communities and could be strengthened. Furthermore, it only briefly mentions the effects of decarbonising freight movement and does not discuss any likely equalities implications.
<b>10: Working Towards Zero Road Deaths and Serious Injuries</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in road deaths</li> <li>Increased traffic calming measures</li> </ul>	~	✓	~	This priority has implicit compatibility with the FSD assessment framework as it promotes analysis and resolution of road collision hotspots. Road collisions are more likely to occur in area with a higher level of income, health and educational deprivation (Clarke, Ward, Truman, & Bartle, 2008). The regional priority could be stronger if it discussed if there was a difference in the number of collisions in deprived areas.
<b>11: Reducing Car Kilometres</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decreased CO2 emissions</li> <li>Improved health</li> </ul>	✓	✓	~	This priority has implicit compatibility with the PSED and FSD framework as it aims to reduce CO2 emissions through the reduction of car kilometres. This would increase health – a key inequality. There is also a discussion of ride sharing and car sharing which would increase access to a car and allow for more economic opportunities for those who are unable to afford a car.
<b>12: Responding to the Post-Covid World</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed understanding of future transport usage</li> <li>Potential for the promotion of active travel</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	This regional priority satisfies all the assessment frameworks. This is due to the fact the regional priority aims to encourage sustainable economic growth. However, the priority could be strengthened as it fails to set out how the change in travel patterns will be equitably assessed.

**Key**

Explicit reference	✓✓	Incompatible	X
Implicit compatibility	✓	No clear relationship	~



### **3.4 RTS Regional Spatial Strategy**

3.4.1 Further to the four strategic objectives and 12 mobility objectives, a spatial strategy has been developed to improve commuter and leisure movement throughout the SEStran area. Two key themes were identified:

- i. Reducing car-km and car mode share
- ii. Better connecting communities affected by deprivation to a wider range of opportunities

#### **Compatibility Assessment**

3.4.2 A visual summary of the compatibility of the spatial strategy with the equalities assessment framework is presented in the Table 4: Compatibility of the RTS overleaf. Like the strategy objectives and the regional priorities, the themes perform well against the equalities assessment frameworks as they describe socio-economic issues which are likely to have an equalities impact, including air quality, health, and economic growth.



Table 4: Compatibility of the RTS spatial strategy themes

Outcomes	Public Sector Equality Duty	Fairer Scotland Duty	Child Rights & Wellbeing Duties	Commentary
<b>Spatial Strategy Theme 1: Reducing Car-KM and Car Mode Share</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased connectivity for cross-Edinburgh and round Edinburgh journeys</li> <li>Reduction in CO2 emissions through a reduction in Congestion</li> </ul>	✓	✓	~	This spatial strategy theme has implicit compatibility with the PSE and FSD frameworks as it promotes the reduction of CO2 emissions and easier connectivity through promotion of public transit use. However, this theme fails to set out how this will be delivered equitably.
<b>Spatial Strategy Theme 2: Better Connecting Communities Affected by Deprivation</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased connectivity for deprived areas</li> </ul>	✓✓	✓✓	✓	This spatial strategy theme has explicit compatibility with the PSED and FSD frameworks and implicit compatibility with the CRWD framework as it explicitly discusses prioritising connecting deprived communities with services they are deprived of. Research has shown that increasing connectivity to services communities are deprived of (i.e., connecting an economically deprived community with employment opportunities) has reduced the overall level of deprivation (Titheridge, Christie, & al., 2014).

**Key**

Explicit reference	✓✓	Incompatible	X
Implicit compatibility	✓	No clear relationship	~



## **4 Next Steps**

- 4.1.1 This Equalities Duties Report is being published for consultation alongside the draft RTS which has been prepared by SEStran (with support from Stantec). This forms the final part of the multi-stage process to develop a new Draft RTS for consultation.
- 4.1.2 In accordance with best practice, relevant equalities duties have been applied from the outset and in tandem with the development of the RTS to allow key equalities issues to inform its content. All consultation received in respect of the Draft RTS and this Equalities Duties Report will be reviewed and used to inform the development of the final RTS which will then be submitted to the Scottish Ministers for approval.





## Bibliography

- Bailey, N., Dong, G., Minton, J., & Gwilym, P. (2018). Reconsidering the Relationship between Air Pollution and Deprivation. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*.
- Chatterjee, K., Ricci, M., Cope, A., & Corner, D. (2019). *The Role of Transport in Supporting a Healthy Future for Young People*. Sustrans.
- Citizens Advice Bureau. (2016). *Round the Bend: A review of local bus provision*. Retrieved from [https://www.cas.org.uk/system/files/publications/round\\_the\\_bend\\_0.pdf](https://www.cas.org.uk/system/files/publications/round_the_bend_0.pdf)
- Clarke, D. D., Ward, P., Truman, W., & Bartle, C. (2008). *A Poor Way to Die: Social Deprivation and Road Traffic Fatalities*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Clery, E., Kiss, Z., Taylor, E., & Gill, V. (2017). *Disabled people's travel behaviour and attitudes to travel*. London: Department for Transport.
- Colley, K., & Irvine, K. N. (2018). *Investigating use of the outdoors across adult population groups in Scotland*. The James Hutton Institute.
- Crisp, R., Gore, T., & McCarthy, L. (2017). *Addressing transport barriers to work in low income neighbourhoods: a review of evidence and practice*. Sheffield Hallam University. Retrieved from <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/16162/>
- Curl, A., Clark, J., & Kearns, A. (2017). Household car adoption and financial distress in deprived urban communities over time: a case of 'forced car ownership'? *Transport Policy*, 61 - 71.
- Davis, A. (2014). *Addressing attitudes of young people aged 16-24 and young mothers towards sustainable travel modes, barriers to behaviour change, and channels to engage them in voluntary travel behaviour change*. Bristol: Wheels to Work West.
- Disability Equality Scotland. (2017, May). *National Baseline Results, May 2017*. Retrieved 2021, from <https://accessibletravel.scot/surveys/>
- Fatima, K., Moridpour, S., De Gruyter, C., & Saghapour, T. (2020). Elderly Sustainable Mobility: Scientific Paper Review. *Sustainability*.
- Gentin, S. (2011). Outdoor recreation and ethnicity in Europe - A review. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 153-161.
- Glasgow Connectivity Commission. (2019). *Connecting Glasgow*.
- Haney, E., Corley, T., & Forman, B. (2019). *Prioritizing Equitable Growth Through Fare Policy*. Boston, MA: Gateway Cities Innovation Institute.
- Public Health Scotland. (2021a, August 25). *Education*. Retrieved from Public Health Scotland: <http://www.healthscotland.scot/population-groups/children/education>
- Public Health Scotland. (2021b, January 14). *Employment inequality*. Retrieved from Public Health Scotland: <http://www.healthscotland.scot/health-inequalities/fundamental-causes/employment-inequality>
- Quayle, A. (2019). Investing in cycling to tackle transport poverty and promote equity. *Scottish Transport Applications Research*. Sustrans.
- Scottish Government. (2015). *Active Scotland Outcomes: Indicator Equality Analysis*.
- Scottish Government. (2016). *Going Further: Scotland's accessible travel framework*.
- Scottish Government. (2017). *The Life Chances of Young People in Scotland*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/independent-advisor-poverty-inequality-life-chances-young-people-scotland-report/>
- Scottish Government. (2018). *Fairer Scotland Duty: interim guidance for public bodies*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/fairer-scotland-duty-interim-guidance-public-bodies/>
- Scottish Government. (2019). *Children's rights and wellbeing impact assessments: guidance*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/childrens-rights-wellbeing-impact-assessments-crwia-guidance/>
- Stantec. (2021). *Case for Change Equalities Duties Report*. SEStran.
- Stantec. (2021). *SEStran RTS Equalities Impact Assessment Framing Note*. SEStran.
- Su, F., & Bell, M. G. (2012). Travel differences by gender for older people in London. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 35-38.
- Sustrans Scotland. (2016). *Transport Poverty in Scotland*. Retrieved from [https://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/file\\_content\\_type/transport\\_poverty\\_in\\_scotland\\_report\\_0.pdf](https://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/file_content_type/transport_poverty_in_scotland_report_0.pdf)
- The Poverty and Inequality Commission. (2019). *Transport and Poverty in Scotland*.
- Titheridge, H., Christie, N., & al., e. (2014). *Transport and Poverty: A Review of the Evidence*. London: University College London.



- Transport for London. (2011). *What are the barriers to cycling amongst ethnic minority groups and people from deprived backgrounds?*
- Transport Scotland. (2020). *National Transport Strategy 2*. Scottish Government.
- University College London. (2021). *People in deprived areas 3 times more likely to use public transport for essential travel*. Retrieved from <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2021/jan/people-deprived-areas-3-times-more-likely-use-public-transport-essential-travel>
- Wheeler, B. W., & Ben-Shlomo, Y. (2005). Environmental equity, air quality, socioeconomic status, and respiratory health: a linkage analysis of routine data from the Health Survey for England. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*.
- Yarde, J., Clery, E., Tipping, S., & Kiss, Z. (2020). *Capability, health and travel behaviour of older people*. Department for Transport. Retrieved from [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/935822/capability-health-and-travel-behaviour-of-older-people.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/935822/capability-health-and-travel-behaviour-of-older-people.pdf)