

Decision Report

Committee: The Leader of the Council

Meeting or Proposed Decision Date –

07/10/2026

Key Decision – Yes



Celebration Mile – Report on outcomes of public consultation

Chair of Committee: Cllr Bill Revans – Leader, Somerset Council

Executive Member(s): Cllr Richard Wilkins Lead Member for Transport and Waste Services

Local Member(s) and Division(s) affected: Bridgwater North & Central. Cllr Leigh Redman and Cllr Hilary Bruce

Executive Director: Chris Hall Executive Director for Climate, Place and Economy.

Executive Summary

Following comments from residents, businesses and councillors about the traffic implications of the Celebration Mile scheme at Eastover in Bridgwater, Somerset Council commissioned a review to understand how the Celebration Mile is working and to test whether different traffic arrangements could perform better. The Executive meeting of 3rd June 2026 considered a technical assessment of the impacts of the scheme, potential options for change, and views from initial stakeholder engagement. The technical assessment concluded that there is no evidence that the regeneration scheme that opened in November 2025 is causing acute congestion in Bridgwater; and noted that options to change the layout had a range of implications. Aside from the congestion concerns, there was no clear consensus about the nature of the problems in the area that further changes would seek to address, and no clear consensus on a preferred option. Executive therefore requested a public consultation to better understand the issues from various user groups and businesses, together with community preferences. This report summarises the information gained from the public consultation and recommends next steps.

Recommendations

The Leader is recommended to:

1. **Consider** and make a decision on the principle of re-instating of two-way traffic flow on Salmon Parade and East Quay noting the officer advice, and community and local business preference; together with any associated mitigation measures required to support the revised traffic arrangement, subject to the outcome of the legal processes required to implement the revised layout to be funded by up to £160,000 from Town Deal Grant, and up to £400,000 from DfT Highways Accessibility Grant funding.
2. **Note** the technical evidence that implementing this road layout is unlikely to significantly reduce traffic delay and congestion across the Bridgwater road network which was the key community concern about the current scheme.

3. **Note** the risks and impacts arising from this decision that have been identified in this report, and that this decision has been informed by the outcome of the public consultation, which demonstrated a clear community preference for Consultation Option B, as summarised in Appendix 1.

Reasons for Proposals

The review was commissioned following a motion that was agreed by Full Council on 17th December 2025.

The Leader will determine this matter, and use of special urgency has been approved to ensure the matter is determined within the published timetable. The Leader considers that it would be contrary to the Council's interests to defer the decision to a later meeting as this would introduce delay into the programme timetable, with consequential impacts on delivery planning, resource deployment, the timely achievement of intended outcomes and that stakeholders have a legitimate expectation of a decision within the published Executive timetable.

The technical review has not identified a clear evidence-based case for changing the current arrangement, which continues to perform broadly in line with the objectives of improving public realm, reducing vehicle dominance, providing dedicated active travel routes and reducing conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. Nevertheless, the consultation has demonstrated a clear and significant community preference for reinstating two-way traffic flow, with 72% of the 1311 respondents expressing that view.

Feedback from businesses in the Eastover area supports the community preference for re-instating two-way traffic flow on East Quay and Salmon Parade.

Report Author: Mike O'Dowd-Jones. Service Director for Infrastructure and Transport
Contact Details: 01823 356238. mike.odowdjones@somerset.gov.uk

Main report and supporting information



Background and purpose of report

1. The Celebration Mile project is a longstanding element of the Bridgwater Vision, a core placemaking and regeneration strategy for the town. The project has been part of the formally adopted vision and plans for the town since 2009 and is a pedestrian priority route from the rail station to the docks, delivering high-quality public realm, seeking to integrate parts of the town with the town centre, promoting active travel and reducing traffic flow in the area to create a pleasant and attractive area which should benefit residents and businesses.
2. The Celebration Mile concept and the Eastover elements (which opened in November 2025) had been through several stages of consultation in 2009 (Bridgwater Vision) 2011 (Core Strategy), 2014 (Feasibility Study), 2020 (trial scheme), 2022 (prior to planning application), and 2023 (TRO consultation).
3. The Eastover scheme comprised public realm enhancements, creation of improved pedestrian and cycle routes, one-way streets seeking to reduce the volume of traffic in the area to improve the environment for people and integrate Eastover better with the town centre, and a reduction in on-street parking originally intended to facilitate further public realm on Salmon Parade.
4. Concerns were raised upon the completion of the scheme by local members, the MP and social media including a petition which was considered at Full Council on 17th December 2025. Key concerns included:
 - The scheme reduces traffic in the area, and that some car journeys are now longer, having to route round the outside of the area via A38 Boadway and Cross Rifles Junction.
 - Concerns about impact on traffic congestion.
 - Concerns about impact on economic performance of the retail area.
5. A motion was agreed at Full Council on 17th December 2025 as follows:

Council has heard the frustration of many Bridgwater residents concerning the Salmon Parade and East Quay elements of the Celebration Mile project. Somerset Council agrees to review this element of the project, recognising the core objective being pedestrian safety throughout the town centre and supporting the viability of town centre businesses by improving residents experience of town centre shopping. After listening to local members and the Bridgwater Town Deal board, Council agrees to a review that considers:

- *reinstating parking on Salmon Parade at the earliest opportunity*
 - *Reviewing the direction of one-way traffic on both Salmon Parade and East Quay*
 - *While prioritising pedestrian safety at the Eastover Town Bridge junction.*
- Outcomes of this review to be based on evidence and engagement with stakeholders, and to return to Council within 4 months with a report and a timetable for implementation.*

6. Following the motion, consultants Stantec were commissioned to undertake an options assessment, considering options discussed with the Town Deal Board on 16th December 2025.
7. Bridgwater Town Council considered the matter at their 19 January 2026 town development forum and agreed a motion calling for a review.
8. Parking was re-instated on Salmon Parade on 18th/19th May 2026 under an experimental traffic order with an intention to make this permanent at the earliest opportunity.
9. Journey time monitoring on key routes was undertaken between November 2025 and April 2026 using traffic data from the one.network system concluding that the Celebration Mile scheme was not causing acute traffic congestion in Bridgwater.
10. A technical report tested four options for changes in direction of traffic flow:
 - Existing: Retain one-way system as-is and introduce additional parking.
 - Option A: Reversal of Salmon Parade.
 - Option B: 2-way traffic on Salmon Parade and East Quay.
 - Option C: 1-way traffic southbound on both Salmon Parade and East Quay.
 - Option D: 1-way traffic northbound on Salmon Parade, and 1-way traffic southbound on East Quay resulting in all traffic from Eastover, Salmon Parade and East Quay being routed over the town bridge.
11. The technical report concluded that none of the options are likely to deliver a significant reduction in traffic delay across the Bridgwater network, however:
 - Option A (reversing Salmon Parade) has some benefit to journey times northwards along Broadway in the morning peak but increases traffic and journey times back out through the town centre (Binford Place) and would remove the dedicated cycle connection from the station when heading into the town centre.
 - Option B (two-way traffic on East Quay and Salmon Parade) is most effective at reducing traffic delay and would reduce journey times on several routes in the morning with smaller benefits in the evening peaks but would increase vehicle dominance in the area that the scheme aimed to improve; re-introducing people/ vehicle conflicts by the town bridge and undermining the place making benefits and integration with the town centre. Option B would also require removing the cycle infrastructure on East Quay and Salmon Parade entirely and would likely require mitigation such as pedestrian crossings to manage the conflict point.
 - Options C and D are relatively neutral and don't appear to have significant technical benefits.
12. Public consultation was undertaken over 6 weeks between 30 June and 11 August 2026. People could take part online through the council's consultation platform, Citizen Space, through paper copies of the survey available at Bridgwater Library and Bridgwater Town Council, and through supported completion events held at the local library. The consultation outcomes report is attached as Appendix 1. A comprehensive survey aimed to capture detailed insights into how various user groups and businesses use the area and what they would like to see change and why. An opportunity was given to express a preference for each of the options for change or to suggest alternatives.
13. The consultation was widely advertised in the media and on social media and advertised within local business who were able to display information on how

to access the consultation. Drop-in sessions were held to support people with filling in the survey responses where they may otherwise have found this difficult.

Links to Council Plan and Medium-Term Financial Plan

14. The review links to the Council Plan vision for a fairer, better future and is most strongly associated with our mission to help people and communities stay connected, however a decision to re-introduce two-way traffic to Salmon Parade and East Quay would not align with The Council's stated aim to make it easier and safer to move around Somerset on foot, by bike, by train and by bus, and would not align with the Local Transport Plan outcomes which the Department for Transport use to measure our performance.
15. There is no specific link to the current medium term financial plan other than that options for change will need to be delivered within existing capital grants and scheme costings are currently being prepared.

Other options considered

16. The review considers the available options. Options that include removing the recently completed hard infrastructure public realm elements have been excluded since removing those elements may risk defaulting on the commitments associated with the grant funding used to build the scheme.

Key considerations for the Council

Scrutiny comments / recommendations:

17. The material has not been considered by a Scrutiny Committee as it relates to a very localised area.

Consultation and feedback

18. The consultation report is included as Appendix 1.
19. There were 1311 responses with about 85% coming from people who visit the Eastover area, 75% coming from Bridgwater residents living outside Eastover and about 5% from businesses; mostly businesses outside Eastover.
20. Most respondents were aged 35-79. 49.5% identified as women, 43% as men, 0.15% identified in some other way. 16% considered themselves to have disabilities.
21. Of the 65 businesses who responded 11 noted that trade had decreased following the change to the Eastover area, 7 said their customers were staying for less time than before, 3 said customers were staying about the same amount of time and 1 said customers were staying for longer.
22. Most respondents reported travelling by private car (about 75%), with about 32% walking, just over 7% by trade vehicle, just under 8% by cycle, and just under 3% by bus. (Respondents had the option to select more than one mode).

23. About 77% said the area is less pleasant than before the changes, with 92% saying they thought fewer people were visiting, and were visiting less often.
24. Responses highlighted a mixed view of the current layout. Some felt it had created a safer, more attractive environment for walking and cycling, with wider pavements, improved crossings, dedicated cycle facilities and enhanced public spaces. However, most respondents believed the current arrangements have negatively affected traffic flow, accessibility and convenience, citing increased congestion, longer journeys, reduced access to shops and services, loss of parking and concerns about impacts on local businesses. Traffic congestion, parking provision and accessibility were the most frequently raised areas for improvement, alongside some concerns about safety and conflicts between different road users.
25. About 3% said they were older, disabled or had additional needs to get around. Respondents who identified additional needs frequently highlighted the importance of convenient access to shops, services and community facilities within the Eastover area and wider town centre. Key themes included the availability of disabled parking, short-stay parking and suitable drop-off locations, which many respondents felt were essential for maintaining independence and accessing services.
26. About 92% did not say what they specifically required from the future design of the area.
27. Preferences for the options for changing the road layout were as follows:

1.8%		Existing Layout.
4.5%	Option A	Reversal of Salmon Parade
71.8%	Option B	2-way traffic on Salmon Parade and East Quay
1.2%	Option C	1-way traffic southbound on Salmon Parade and East Quay.
1.5%	Option D	1-way traffic northbound on Salmon Parade, and 1-way traffic southbound on East Quay
13.2%	Something else	Most of these respondents advocated for a return to the previous road layout, including two-way traffic on Eastover, Salmon Parade and East Quay

28. Respondents most commonly selected their preferred option because they believed it would improve traffic flow, reduce congestion and shorten journey times across Bridgwater. Many felt it would provide easier access to the town centre, Eastover and local businesses, while reducing pressure on key congestion points such as Cross Rifles Roundabout, Broadway and Monmouth Street. Many respondents also viewed their preferred option as the closest to the former road layout, which they felt worked effectively and provided greater route choice.
29. A smaller number of respondents opposed Option B, typically because they felt it would reduce pedestrian and cycling benefits, increase traffic near the town bridge, or undermine the original aims of the Celebration Mile scheme. However, these views were considerably less common than support for the proposal.

Risk Implications

Risks associated with introducing 2-way traffic flow on East Quay and Salmon Parade:

Risk Level	Risk Description	Inherent Score (LxI)	Current Score (LxI)	Target Score (LxI)	Mitigation/ Management
Tactical	Increase of adverse traffic and environmental impacts in the town centre	4x4=16	N/A	4x4=16	None likely to be possible in the context of this decision since the decision is to re-introduce traffic into the town centre area.
Tactical	Risk of harm at the vehicle/ pedestrian conflict point by town bridge	4x4=16	N/A	2x4=8	Mitigation such as pedestrian crossings to be designed and agreed.
Tactical	Loss of dedicated cycle facilities between key parts of the town increasing risk of collision for cyclists.	4x4=16	N/A	4x4=16	None likely to be possible in the context of this decision since the decision is to take out the dedicated facilities.
Tactical	Risk of town deal funding clawback due to removing grant funded infrastructure.	3x3=9	N/A	2x3=6	Enter dialogue with funding bodies to set out rationale and focus on strength of community views
Strategic	Adverse impact on Active Travel England's assessment of Somerset Council's active travel delivery.	4x3=12	N/A	3x3=9	Enter dialogue with funding bodies to set out rationale and focus on strength of community views and lack of objection from active travel groups.
Strategic	Adverse impact on level of active travel grant funding awarded to Somerset Council	4x3=12	N/A	3x3=9	Enter dialogue with funding bodies to set out rationale and focus on strength of community views and lack of objection from active travel groups.
Strategic	Risk that Active Travel grant funds will need to be redirected from other schemes to fund mitigation works and undermine the outcomes we are measured against by DfT	3x2=6	N/A	3x2=6	Aim to utilise existing celebration mile and maintenance scheme funds to deliver most of the works and minimise need to re-allocate funds from other grants.
Strategic	Risk to delivery of future Council place-shaping ambitions and ability to achieve transformational improvements which impact on car journeys.	4x4=16	N/A	4x4=16	None likely as sets a clear precedent.

Financial Implications

30. The Celebration Mile Project has Bridgwater Town Deal grant funding remaining of £210,000 upon opening of the Eastover section of the programme, allocated by the Town Deal Board. Work undertaken to date to design and test the revisions to the road layout, re-introduce the parking bays on Salmon Parade, undertake consultation and design/ cost the potential revised road layouts have cost approximately £50,000 (subject to final invoices received) to be paid from this remaining allocation.
31. For phase one, the re-introducing of two-way traffic flow to Salmon Parade and East Quay (the revised road layout), it is proposed that these works would be delivered as part of a planned resurfacing scheme with the cost of the legal processes, signs and lines, and additional areas of non-structural surfacing for the new layout covered by the Department for Transport (DfT) highways grant which meets the funding criteria. Unallocated funding is available during 2026/27 for these standard works.
32. The second phase, to mitigate the resulting conflict point between vehicles and pedestrians at the Town Bridge has been estimated to cost of the order of £112,000 to £225,000 subject to further detailed design work. It is proposed for this to be funded from the remaining town deal grant, with any residual costs met from the £500,000 highways accessibility budget (allocated from 2026/2027 DfT highways grant). This funding is already in place to deliver accessibility improvements across Somerset, and currently has sufficient headroom of approximately £400,000 to accommodate this. It is therefore considered that no additional funding is being sought to enable this scheme to proceed.

Legal Implications

33. Town Deal funding has been secured for a number of projects including the Celebration Mile project, as evidenced by the Heads of Term between MHCLG and the Council dated 8 June 2021 that:
 - In relation to the Celebration Mile project requires compliance with the following conditions:
 - Creation of new flexible public amenity and market spaces within the town centre; and
 - Footfall increase
 - Requires that all funding be “spent”, i.e., contractually committed by 31 March 2027 subject to further revisions to that date as approved by MHCLG; and
 - Includes a requirement for the Council to consult with the Towns Hub where it is intended to alter the projects being developed, change them for other projects, or otherwise depart from the conditions placed on the projects above.
34. Subject to compliance with “spend by dates” as approved in advance by MHCLG, The Local Regeneration Fund: technical guidance published 2 September 2025, (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-regeneration-fund/local-regeneration-fund-technical-guidance>) is relevant as it

supersedes and replaces some of the former Town Deal conditions of funding. In particular, at Para 2.3 the Guidance confirms that: “.... *In the small number of cases where projects are no longer viable, we expect that councils will use the funding available to invest in the area that originally stood to benefit, so local residents can feel the improvements to their everyday lives that they have been promised. We strongly encourage local authorities to consult with key stakeholders, including MPs in their local areas on any proposed changes and in particular changes to the location or projects and/or intended beneficiaries.*”

35. The same Guidance also confirms that MHCLG no longer require local authorities to seek approval from MHCLG for any changes to project activities and/or spend profiles as long as the following conditions are met:

- (i) all MHCLG funding is spent within such timescales as MHCLG agree;
- (ii) all project activity contributes to one or more Government Missions, and in particular economic growth outputs and outcomes;
- (iii) consideration is given to the areas and communities that originally stood to benefit from the funding;
- (iv) the portfolio of projects continues to offer VFM - the S.151 Officer (or equivalent) must confirm this is the case;
- (v) MHCLG spend is on activity that falls entirely within the administrative boundaries of the local authority.

36. The making and amending of TMOs are underpinned by statutory powers and procedural requirements set out in the RTRA 1984 and associated regulations, ensuring that traffic authorities fulfil their duties to manage road networks effectively and safely while considering public input and statutory obligations. Any changes to the direction of traffic flow need to be taken forward under a new permanent traffic regulation order (TRO) which has an established legal process. By statute this involves a period of consultation and an opportunity for people to object to the proposed scheme. Officers have considered the option of delivering the revised layout through an experimental traffic order but such an approach is not legally deliverable due to the intention that the new layout is a permanent change.

37. If there is significant objection to the TRO, a further report may need to be presented to The Executive for further decision.

38. Legal advice and approval will be sought in connection with the finalisation of the legal arrangements required to implement the approved scheme.

Procurement Implications

39. Any changes can be delivered within existing highways contracts. The planned resurfacing scheme would provide a suitable opportunity to implement any agreed amended road markings and signage following the TRO process. It is strongly recommended that no changes are implemented

before the resurfacing scheme takes place in order to minimise disruption and abortive works, and to avoid multiple versions of previous road markings being visible in the highway.

40. The broad programme for the re-introduction of two-way traffic to Salmon Parade and East Quay (as phase 1) would be as follows with work forecast to be complete by the end of March 2027, noting that a delay may be incurred should there be significant objection to the proposals that require Executive to determine the TRO.
41. Draft programme to be reviewed and finalised:

Stage	High-level deliverable	Lead	Start	Finish	Timing / route
Governance & mobilisation	Confirm preferred option, governance, funding, legal route and design commission	Sponsor / Project Board	15-Sep-26	14-Oct-26	Sep–Oct 2026
Surveys, design & assurance	Complete surveys, multidisciplinary design, road-safety assurance and construction-ready package	Design Lead / Stantec	05-Oct-26	20-Nov-26	Oct–Nov 2026
Traffic order consultation	Prepare legal documents, obtain authority and undertake statutory consultation	Traffic Orders / Legal	15-Sep-26	04-Nov-26	Sep–Nov 2026
Objections gateway	Assess representations and determine whether objections are manageable or require Executive determination	Traffic Orders / Sponsor	04-Nov-26	02-Jan-27	Nov 2026–Jan 2027
Standard decision route	If objections are manageable, make/seal the order and confirm the operative date through the standard route	Decision maker / Legal	02-Jan-27	09-Jan-27	Standard route
Executive escalation route	If significant objections remain, prepare an Executive report and obtain determination	Sponsor / Executive	02-Jan-27	TBC	Significant delay possible
Procurement & readiness	Secure contractors, materials, permits, traffic management, communications and readiness approval	Project Manager / Contractors	05-Nov-26	30-Jan-27	Oct 2026–Jan 2027
Enabling & carriageway works	Complete surfacing, East Quay treatment and any interim safe markings	Highway Contractors	23-Jan-27	12-Mar-27	Jan-Mar 2027
Implementation & opening	Install lighting, signs and final lining; inspect, switch traffic management and open two-way operation	Project Manager / Highways	15-Feb-27	12-Mar-27	Jan-Mar 2027
Monitoring & closeout	Monitor operation, complete Stage 3 audit, correct defects and update asset records	Project Manager / RSA Team	15-Mar-27	31-Mar-27	Jan-Mar 2027

42. The timetable for implementing the mitigation has yet to be determined but would take place at the earliest opportunity following the implementation of the new road layout.

HR / Workforce Implications

43. There are no direct workforce implications arising from the options presented, as these do not introduce changes to organisational structures, staffing levels or terms and conditions. Indirect impacts may arise through increased workload and stakeholder scrutiny during implementation, with potential implications for team capacity and employee wellbeing. These risks can be managed through appropriate workforce planning and oversight.

Equalities Implications

44. The proposed introduction of two-way traffic flow on Salmon Parade and East Quay will have negative impacts on movement for people with disabilities, older people, children and carers, and the scheme mitigation will need to consider appropriate mitigation for these road users within the design.

Community Safety Implications

45. The proposed introduction of two-way traffic flow on Salmon Parade and East Quay will significantly reduce pedestrian and cycle connections between the

area of town near the rail station and the docks, and connectivity between Eastover and the town centre. It will also introduce additional conflicts between pedestrians/ cyclists and cars particularly at Salmon Parade and East Quay, and safety mitigation measures will therefore be required as phase 2 or the works.

Climate Change and Sustainability Implications

46. The proposed introduction of two-way traffic flow on Salmon Parade and East Quay will remove dedicated cycle connections from the area of town near the rail station to the town centre; will result in loss of a connection to the National Cycle Network; and will adversely impact on any potential schemes to improve cycle connectivity to/ from the southeast of the town. This will significantly reduce pedestrian and cycle connections between key parts of the town, and connectivity between Eastover and the town centre which work against the promotion of sustainable forms of transport by prioritising car movement across the town centre area. This is likely to discourage people from choosing to make trips by cycling and walking.
47. The feasibility of widening the existing footway over Blake Bridge (and then onwards through Blake Gardens) to provide an alternative route for cyclists has been explored as potential mitigation for the loss of facilities on Salmon Parade. The existing footway on Blake Bridge is significantly narrower than the width recommended by LTN 1/20 for a safe shared pedestrian and cycle facility, and adapting it within the current bridge layout would either require major, costly bridge widening or the loss of a traffic lane, with unacceptable impacts on highway capacity. A sub-standard shared route could only achieve around 2m effective width, creating a moderate to high safety risk through increased pedestrian-cyclist conflict, reduced accessibility, and insufficient space for users to pass safely.

Health and Safety Implications

48. There are no implications for the health and safety of council employees or customers other than the wider road safety issues mentioned above.

Health and Wellbeing Implications

49. The proposed introduction of two-way traffic flow on Salmon Parade and East Quay will significantly reduce active travel connections between the area of town near the rail station and the docks, and connectivity between Eastover and the town centre which work against the promotion of more active forms of travel and associated health benefits. Re-introducing traffic into the town centre area will reduce air quality in that area and may have an associated adverse impact on public health.

Social Value

50. There are no implications as there will be no new procurement process.

Background Papers

51. Executive Report on Technical Assessment and Stakeholder Engagement 3 June 2026.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Celebration Mile Consultation Report August 2026

Report assurance

	Officer Name	Date Completed
Legal Implications	Dorothy O'Farrell	11/09/26
Finance & Procurement	Nicola Hix	29/09/26
Executive Director	Relevant Executive Director – Chris Hall	29/09/26
Executive Lead Member	Relevant Lead Member – Cllr Richard Wilkins	29/09/26
Consulted:	Councillor Name	
Local Division Members	Cllr Leigh Redman Cllr Hilary Bruce	29/09/26
Opposition Spokesperson(s)	Cllr Bob Filmer	29/09/26
Relevant Scrutiny Chair(s)	Cllr Gwil Wren	29/09/26

Somerset Equality Impact Assessment

Before completing this EIA please ensure you have read the EIA guidance notes – available www.somerset.gov.uk/impactassessment or contact eia@somerset.gov.uk

Once completed please send to eia@somerset.gov.uk for review, feedback and sign off.

EIA Title	Celebration Mile Options Review	Version	1
EIA Reference		Date Completed	27/08/26

Description of what is being impact assessed

Introduction of two-way traffic on Salmon Parade and East Quay, Bridgwater.

Evidence

What data/information have you used to assess how this policy/service might impact on protected groups? Sources such as the [Office of National Statistics](#), [Somerset Intelligence Partnership](#), [Somerset's Joint Strategic Needs Analysis \(JSNA\)](#), Staff and/ or [area profiles](#), should be detailed here

Traffic data, modelling and assessment set out in the Stantec technical note.

Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups and what have they told you? If you have not consulted other people, please explain why?

Public consultation was responded to by the following protected groups:

- 49.5% identified as women, 0.15% identified in some other way.
- 16% considered themselves to have disabilities.
- 27.5% considered themselves to have care responsibilities.
- 0% respondents were younger people under 18. 22.7% were aged 65-79 and 2.9% over 79.

Analysis of impact on protected groups
The Public Sector Equality Duty requires us to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with protected groups. Consider how this policy/service will achieve these aims. In the table below, using the evidence outlined above and your own understanding, detail what considerations and potential impacts against each of the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty. Based on this information, make an assessment of the likely outcome, before you have implemented any mitigation.

Protected group	Summary of impact	Type of impact Select from list
Age	Introducing two-way traffic to the area will make it more difficult for older people and young children to cross the road and limit travel options for young people, limiting travel horizons.	Negative
Disability	Introducing two-way traffic to the area will make it more difficult for people with disabilities to cross the road.	Negative
Gender reassignment	None identified	Neutral
Marriage and civil partnership	None identified	Neutral
Pregnancy and maternity	None identified	Neutral
Race and ethnicity	None identified	Neutral
Religion or belief	None identified	Neutral
Sex	None identified	Neutral
Sexual orientation	None identified	Neutral

Additional Local Characteristics		
Armed Forces (including serving personnel, families and veterans)	None identified	Positive Neutral Negative
Carers	Introducing two-way traffic to the area will make it more difficult for carers supporting people to cross the road.	Negative
Low Income	None identified	Neutral
Care Experienced	None identified	Neutral

Negative outcomes action plan

Where you have ascertained that there will potentially be negative outcomes, you are required to mitigate the impact of these. Please detail below the actions that you intend to take.

Action taken/to be taken	Date	Role responsible	How will it be monitored?	Action complete
The TRO consultation will need to be advertised to affected groups.	Prior to any measures being made permanent	Traffic Engineering Team	Through TRO process	☐
Design of the any mitigation (phase 2 of the project) will need to engage affected groups	Prior to agreeing the design of the mitigation	Infrastructure Programmes Group	Post-construction observations.	☐
	Select date			☐
	Select date			☐

	Select date			☐
If negative impacts remain, please provide an explanation below.				
Key negative impacts will be at the conflict point between pedestrians and vehicles where East Quay and Salmon Parade and Eastover meet by the town bridge. The current scheme took away this conflict area and the proposed re-introduction of two way traffic flow on salmon parade and east quay will re-introduce this. Mitigation is therefore likely to be needed possible in the form of pedestrian crossings.				
Completed by:		Mike O'Dowd-Jones		
Date		27/08/26		
Signed off by:		Mike O'Dowd-Jones		
Date		27/08/26		
Equality sign off name:		Tom Rutland		
Equality sign off date:		29/09/26		
Future review date:		Post-Construction of any changes. 01/06/27		
To be reviewed by: (role title)		Head of Road Safety, Traffic Management and Parking		