**Additional Evidence: Application of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Disabled People (CRDP) in the UK**

Having attended last week’s Inclusion London workshop on 17 January 2021 and contributed my views on employment and participation in political life, I wanted to make the following points there was insufficient time to raise in that workshop.

**1. Accessibility, non-discrimination**

**1.1 ‘Casual’ prejudice**

This continues to run rife in British society and appears to have been exacerbated by the pandemic. During the so-called vulnerable person shopping half hour at the local branch of what is generally considered to be the most upmarket general supermarket chain in the UK - where consumers generally pay for customer service, etc. - I suffered casual prejudice as per the two attached documents.

As far as I am concerned, whilst I might have what is usually termed a hidden disability, I should not need to justify it and I am nevertheless a ‘normal’ person’. I did not get any satisfactory recognition that I had been subjected to prejudice and inappropriate treatment either within the local branch or from the national customer services of the supermarket concerned.

**1.2 Public sector sanctioned exclusion of disabled people**

The implementation of so-called ‘colourful crossings’ on pedestrian crossings around the UK has been accelerated as regional and borough authorities believe they will attract reluctant consumers back into urban centres to shop and to patronise hospitality destinations.

Unfortunately, these crossings pose severe accessibility concerns for and effectively exclude certain individuals amongst various groups of people, including those with visual impairments, impaired proprioception, people with various cognitive impairments including dementia and learning difficulties, people who are neurodiverse and people who suffer from photosensitive epilepsy.

Despite these issues being brought to the attention of local authorities, some have proceeded to implement these crossings, albeit in mitigated form in some cases, e.g. the City of London largely funded by Bloomberg Philanthropy as part of its Asphalt Art Project. Further meetings within the City to discuss the future of these interventions are imminent, but the results will not be known by the time this call for evidence closes today.

The London Mayor’s Office promoted the implementation of these crossings by local authorities as part of the scheme called [Let’s Do London](https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/lets-do-london-autumn-season-launch) and only agreed to issue a moratorium upon the installation of them upon Transport for London (TfL) controlled routes after [vigorous campaigning by disabled People’s organisations including Transport for London (TfA)](https://www.transportforall.org.uk/campaign/colourful-crossings/) and further research evidence being brought to the Mayor’s attention. See [here](https://www.transportforall.org.uk/news/success-as-mayor-of-london-agrees-to-pause-installation-of-new-colourful-crossings/) for Mayoral capitulation to TfA. He also requested local authorities to similarly impose a moratorium upon installation of the crossings upon routes within their control pending the development of guidance by TfA working in collaboration with TfL.

Despite this partial success at London regional level, in response to [campaigning by the Access Association](https://accessassociation.co.uk/2021/09/06/colourful-pedestrian-crossings-letter-to-ministers/), the central UK government Department for Transport has refused to take responsibility for issuing advice on colourful Crossings, instead [shirking responsibility by claiming](https://accessassociation.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/DFT-20211004.pdf) that it is a devolved responsibility for local boroughs (beyond advising that no non-zebra crossing should be striped so as to avoid giving the wrongful impression of pedestrian priority at any such crossing). The Scottish Government takes [a broadly similar approach](https://accessassociation.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Trans-Scot-20211005.pdf), although is accepting responsibility insofar as it is developing inclusive design guidance on the issue.

**2. Health and right to life**

**2.1 Breast cancer screening**

Standard mammograms which involve squashing the breast between two plates are widely acknowledged to be extremely uncomfortable for all women. What isn’t widely acknowledged that they can also cause injury to people with certain medical conditions. This is because not only is the breast tissue squashed, resulting in bruising and potential damage, but because the person being scanned has to twist their torso at a very uncomfortable angle, which can lead to muscle damage and even joint subluxation or dislocation in people suffering conditions such as Hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome (hEDS).

While certain initiatives do appear to be underway to develop alternatives for use by the NHS, these appear to be at a very low level pilot stage in certain localities and certainly no imminent national rollout appears to be planned in the UK. Please see [here](https://eu.knoxnews.com/story/news/health/2018/05/16/mammograms-without-squishing-squeezing-compression-breast-cancer-symptoms/614947002/) for an alternative CT scan already regulated in the US, [here](https://www.nibib.nih.gov/news-events/newsroom/light-based-15-second-scan-aims-replace-painful-mammograms) for a photo acoustic scan being trialled in the US and [here](https://www.acoustics.co.uk/2017/07/06/innovative-new-breast-screening-unit/) for details of a Bristol based ultrasound trial.

Whilst this situation continues to pertain, the health of people with certain medical conditions will continue to be put at risk by the lack of urgency and innovation in UK public health services. In light of the serious pain and even injury which can be caused to disabled people in particular, far more urgency needs to be given to UK initiatives to develop an alternative to traditional mammography.
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