

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.12]



Title: Promote Sustainable Transport through Parking Policy	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input type="checkbox"/> Other [please state]	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Growth and Regeneration – Management of Place	Lead Officer name:
Service Area: Traffic & Highways Maintenance	Lead Officer role: Sarah Clark

Step 1: What do we want to do?

The purpose of an Equality Impact Assessment is to assist decision makers in understanding the impact of proposals as part of their duties under the Equality Act 2010. Detailed guidance to support completion can be found here [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](https://sharepoint.com).

This assessment should be started at the beginning of the process by someone with a good knowledge of the proposal and service area, and sufficient influence over the proposal. It is good practice to take a team approach to completing the equality impact assessment. Please contact the Equality and Inclusion Team early for advice and feedback.

1.1 What are the aims and objectives/purpose of this proposal?

Briefly explain the purpose of the proposal and why it is needed. Describe who it is aimed at and the intended aims / outcomes. Where known also summarise the key actions you plan to undertake. Please use plain English, avoiding jargon and acronyms. Equality Impact Assessments are viewed by a wide range of people including decision-makers and the wider public.

Within the context of Bristol’s Transport Policy we are proposing a range of initiatives to make more efficient use of on and off street, public car parking spaces, while considering how the management of these spaces can help drive behaviour change towards sustainable modes of travel; maximise the use of kerb space (given increasing demands for car clubs, cycle hangars, scooter parking and EV charging) and further improve air quality. These proposals are:

Inflationary increase to pay & display charges across all on and off street locations. This would increase the hourly pay and display parking rate in RPS from £1.50 to £2 to reflect the impact of inflation since the last price increase. Additionally, there is a recommendation that the rate should increase to £2.50 per hour in Clifton Village RPS, Kingsdown RPS and Clifton East RPS.

Discounted Parking Tariff at Temple Gate & West End Car Parks. As both these Car Parks are on the outskirts of the City Centre, an early bird offer at these underutilised locations could encourage customers to park on the outskirts of the city and complete their journeys on foot. West End has the additional advantage for customers of being outside the Clean Air Zone.

Linear Parking Charges. We believe there could be benefits in reviewing the overall tariff structure to simplify and improve the customer experience. A linear structure where the same hourly rate applies all day would still encourage turnover, support the retail and leisure economy whilst continuing to deter long stay parking as longer stays would be more expensive.

The potential equality impact of linked proposals relating to Residents Parking Schemes (RPS), and District Car Park Charging which have previously been approved by Cabinet but not yet implemented, are considered in a separate EqIA.

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input type="checkbox"/> Bristol City Council workforce	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service users	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The wider community
<input type="checkbox"/> Commissioned services	<input type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Could the proposal affect access levels of representation or participation in a service, or does it have the potential to change e.g. quality of life: health, education, or standard of living etc.?

If 'No' explain why you are sure there will be no equality impact, then skip steps 2-4 and request review by Equality and Inclusion Team.

If 'Yes' complete the rest of this assessment, or if you plan to complete the assessment at a later stage please state this clearly here and request review by the Equality and Inclusion Team.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[please select]
---	-----------------------------	-----------------

--

Step 2: What information do we have?

2.1 What data or evidence is there which tells us who is, or could be affected?

Please use this section to demonstrate an understanding of who could be affected by the proposal. Include general population data where appropriate, and information about people who will be affected with particular reference to protected and other relevant characteristics: [How we measure equality and diversity \(bristol.gov.uk\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/equality)

Use one row for each evidence source and say which characteristic(s) it relates to. You can include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data e.g. from national or local research, available data or previous consultations and engagement activities.

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/data). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](#); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](#); [Ward Statistical Profiles](#).

For workforce / management of change proposals you will need to look at the diversity of the affected teams using available evidence such as [HR Analytics: Power BI Reports \(sharepoint.com\)](#) which shows the diversity profile of council teams and service areas. Identify any over or under-representation compared with Bristol economically active citizens for different characteristics. Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the [Employee Staff Survey Report](#) and [Stress Risk Assessment](#)

Data / Evidence Source	Summary of what this tells us
[Include a reference where known]	
Census Data 2021 Bristol Key Facts November 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Census Data tells us about the overall demographic make-up up of the city including where particular groups are over or under-represented. – 74% of Bristolians feel that traffic congestion is a problem in their area, and 70% think air quality and traffic pollution is a problem locally (down from 75% last year) – Bristol has the highest level of car availability of all the core cities in England. 74% of households have at least one car or van

available (E&W 77%), up from 71% in 2011. 26% of households in Bristol have no car or van (E&W 23%).

- Levels of car availability vary widely across the city - the proportion of households with no car range from 5% in parts of Henleaze to as high as 74% in parts of the city centre.
- The top actions that Bristol residents feel would improve their overall quality of life are: Better and more affordable public transport and more reliable buses
- Of Bristolians who travelled to work in 2022, 32% did this via “active travel”, down from 39% the year before. Of these, 14% cycled to work, (down 4%), and 18% walked to work, (down 3%). Categories that increased were getting the bus to work (+3%), driving (+2%), and riding an e-scooter (+2%; new for 2022) (QoL 2022/23)
- 25% of Bristolians ride a bike at least once a week, 17% in the most deprived areas. Usage of e-scooters - in 2022, there were 4,398,900 rides taken covering 10,933,200 km
- Despite increased numbers of people using public transport, walking or cycling, continued level of vehicle use mean that reported air pollution levels of nitrogen dioxide still exceed the UK and EU air quality limits

[New wards: data profiles](#)

[Ward Profiles - Power BI tool](#)

The Ward Profiles provide a range of datasets, including Population, Life Expectancy, health and education disparities etc. for each of Bristol’s electoral wards.

Bristol Quality of Life Survey [Microsoft Power BI](#)

Quality of Life 2023-24 Indicator:	% for whom lack of transport options prevents them from leaving their home when they want to
Group	Percentage
Bristol Average	22.4
10% most deprived	26.2
16 to 24 years	35.5
50 years and older	19.3
Disabled	33.1
Asian/Asian British	35.1
Black/Black British	19.8
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	30.7
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	31.1
White Minority Ethnic	24.8
White British	20.6
Female	24.0
Male	20.5
LGB+	34.3
Trans	36.4
Christian	20.9
Other religion	25.8
No religion or faith	22.4
Rented from housing association	23.5
Rented from private landlord	27.3
Rented from the council	24.4
All carers	28.1

Single parents	22.7
No qualifications	23.5
Quality of Life 2023-24	
Indicator:	% who drive to work
Group	Percentage
Bristol Average	36.7
10% most deprived	41.7
16 to 24 years	26.8
50 years and older	40.6
Disabled	25.8
Asian/Asian British	36.1
Black/Black British	32.8
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	29.0
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	34.5
White Minority Ethnic	30.4
White British	38.3
Female	35.7
Male	38.0
LGB+	28.2
Trans	11.9
Christian	44.4
Other religion	36.5
No religion or faith	32.6
Rented from housing association	30.7
Rented from private landlord	26.8
Rented from the council	30.0
All carers	43.5
Single parents	50.5
No qualifications	30.8
Quality of Life 2023-24	
Indicator:	% who drive to work
Group	Percentage
Bristol Average	36.7
10% most deprived	41.7
16 to 24 years	26.8
50 years and older	40.6
Disabled	25.8
Asian/Asian British	36.1
Black/Black British	32.8
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	29.0
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic	34.5
White Minority Ethnic	30.4
White British	38.3
Female	35.7
Male	38.0
LGB+	28.2
Trans	11.9

	Christian	44.4
	Other religion	36.5
	No religion or faith	32.6
	Rented from housing association	30.7
	Rented from private landlord	26.8
	Rented from the council	30.0
	All carers	43.5
	Single parents	50.5
	No qualifications	30.8

2.2 Do you currently monitor relevant activity by the following protected characteristics?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Gender Reassignment
<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage and Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Race
<input type="checkbox"/> Religion or Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sexual Orientation

2.3 Are there any gaps in the evidence base?

Where there are gaps in the evidence, or you don't have enough information about some equality groups, include an equality action to find out in section 4.2 below. This doesn't mean that you can't complete the assessment without the information, but you need to follow up the action and if necessary, review the assessment later. If you are unable to fill in the gaps, then state this clearly with a justification.

For workforce related proposals all relevant characteristics may not be included in HR diversity reporting (e.g. pregnancy/maternity). For smaller teams diversity data may be redacted. A high proportion of not known/not disclosed may require an action to address under-reporting.

We do not hold information on the protected characteristics of these groups in respect to car ownership, and usage of car parks however, we do have specific ward data on the protected characteristics identified above

2.4 How have you involved communities and groups that could be affected?

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol's diverse communities.

Include the main findings of any engagement and consultation in Section 2.1 above.

If you are managing a workforce change process or restructure please refer to [Managing a change process or restructure \(sharepoint.com\)](#) for advice on consulting with employees etc. Relevant stakeholders for engagement about workforce changes may include e.g. staff-led groups and trades unions as well as affected staff.

The approach will be agreed through the decision pathway process but initial process to determine which, if any, proposals to progress would potentially be based on: Review with local councillors/committee

2.5 How will engagement with stakeholders continue?

Explain how you will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the course of planning and delivery. Please describe where more engagement and consultation is required and set out how you intend to undertake it. Include any targeted work to seek the views of under-represented groups. If you do not intend to undertake it, please set out your justification. You can ask the Equality and Inclusion Team for help in targeting particular groups.

The approach will be agreed through the decision pathway process but initial process to determine which, if any, proposals to progress would potentially be based on:

- Review with Local Councillors

The final proposals will be subject to statutory consultation as part of the Traffic Regulation Order making process

Step 3: Who might the proposal impact?

Analysis of impacts must be rigorous. Please demonstrate your analysis of any impacts of the proposal in this section, referring to evidence you have gathered above, and the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. Also include details of existing issues for particular groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

3.1 Does the proposal have any potentially adverse impacts on people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Consider sub-categories and how people with combined characteristics (e.g. young women) might have particular needs or experience particular kinds of disadvantage.

Where mitigations indicate a follow-on action, include this in the 'Action Plan' Section 4.2 below.

GENERAL COMMENTS (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)	
<p>The increase in parking charges will affect all users as they will have to pay more for their parking, however those who are more dependent on having their own vehicle or on fixed or low incomes would be disproportionately impacted by additional costs.</p> <p>Access to disabled parking facilities will not be reduced. There will be no parking charge or time limit for vehicles displaying a valid Blue Badge.</p> <p>There may be a potential negative impact for local businesses and traders if there if car parking charges lead to a reduction in shopping etc. and dependent on the location there may be a higher proportion of Black and minoritised ethnic led businesses affected.</p> <p>However other elements of the proposals may provide partial mitigation for these potential issues such as Increased turnover of parking spaces; Improved transparency of parking tariffs; increased desirability of sustainable transport modes; and enhance ability to adapt to climate change through reallocation of road space.</p>	
PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<p>Bristol has a younger age profile in comparison to the national average (This is partly due to the large number of students living in Bristol during term time who are counted as part of the usually resident population). Some areas of Bristol e.g. Central, Clifton have significantly higher proportion of young people, however car ownership is likely to be lower.</p> <p>Young people in Bristol are more likely to find inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to</p> <p>Children in the most deprived areas are over five times (5.25) more likely to be injured in motor traffic collisions than those in the least deprived areas</p>
Mitigations:	See general comments
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Some older people who are less mobile and less able to walk significant distances may be disproportionately impacted by additional costs. Older people are more reliant on public and community transport, and more likely to be an unpaid carer
Mitigations:	See general comments
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Some Disabled people with impairments which mean they are more dependent on a motor vehicle as a driver or passenger may be disproportionately impacted by additional costs
Mitigations:	Blue Badge holders will be able to park for free as they currently do.
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Women are more likely to have unpaid caring responsibilities for children and older adults and this may mean they are more reliant on having their own transport and parking.

Mitigations:	
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	People who are dependent on a motor vehicle as a driver or passenger because they are pregnant or have young children may be disproportionately impacted by additional costs.
Mitigations:	
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Marriage & civil partnership	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS	
Socio-Economic (deprivation)	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	The introduction of Pay & Display charges may have a disproportionate impact on low income households.
Mitigations:	
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	People who are dependent on motor vehicles to provide care for others may be disproportionately impacted by additional costs. About 4 in 9 (45.3%) say caring responsibilities prevent them from leaving their home when they want to and almost 1 in 7 (14.3%) are prevented from getting involved in their community due to accessibility issues.
Mitigations:	
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for any other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. asylum seekers and refugees; care experienced; homelessness; armed forces personnel and veterans]	
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

3.2 Does the proposal create any benefits for people based on their protected or other relevant characteristics?

Outline any potential benefits of the proposal and how they can be maximised. Identify how the proposal will support our [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) to:

- ✓ Eliminate unlawful discrimination for a protected group
- ✓ Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't
- ✓ Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don't

--

Those in low or fixed income households may include some pensioners and those in receipt of disability payments. These groups are likely to already be in receipt of concessions such as free public transport or Blue Badges which partially mitigate any rise in parking charges.

Efficient transport policies which reduce congestion and improve public transport efficacy and air quality will improve the environment for all residents and visitors to the city.

The Council's policies are focussed on reducing the dependence on the private car and encouraging those who can, to use alternative, more sustainable means of transport. These policies improve the environment for everybody while also helping those unable to make different choices by reducing the overall demand which in turn improves the turnover of spaces and provides more opportunity & better services to those who need it.

The Council is actively promoting active travel through improved walking and cycling facilities and initiatives.

Step 4: Impact

4.1 How has the equality impact assessment informed or changed the proposal?

What are the main conclusions of this assessment? Use this section to provide an overview of your findings. This summary can be included in decision pathway reports etc.

If you have identified any significant negative impacts which cannot be mitigated, provide a justification showing how the proposal is proportionate, necessary, and appropriate despite this.

Summary of significant negative impacts and how they can be mitigated or justified:

Those in low or fixed income households may include some pensioners and those in receipt of disability payments. These groups are likely to already be in receipt of concessions such as free public transport or Blue Badges which mitigate any rise in parking charges. However, carers and those who are pregnant or have dependent children may be disproportionately impacted. Decision makers should have due regard to potential impacts when assessing whether they think the proposals are justified and proportionate in the context of overall city ambitions and the need to develop sustainable and affordable solutions.

Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:

The Council's policies are focussed on reducing the dependence on the private car and encouraging those who can, to use alternative, more sustainable means of transport. These policies aim to improve the environment for everybody while also helping those unable to make different choices by reducing the overall demand which in turn improves the turnover of spaces and provides more opportunity & better services to those who need it.

4.2 Action Plan

Use this section to set out any actions you have identified to improve data, mitigate issues, or maximise opportunities etc. If an action is to meet the needs of a particular protected group please specify this.

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale

4.3 How will the impact of your proposal and actions be measured?


How will you know if you have been successful? Once the activity has been implemented this equality impact assessment should be periodically reviewed to make sure your changes have been effective your approach is still appropriate.

•

- Review of relevant Quality of Life indicators by equalities group

Step 5: Review

The Equality and Inclusion Team need at least five working days to comment and feedback on your EqIA. EqIAs should only be marked as reviewed when they provide sufficient information for decision-makers on the equalities impact of the proposal. Please seek feedback and review from the [Equality and Inclusion Team](#) before requesting sign off from your Director¹.

Equality and Inclusion Team Review: <i>Reviewed by Equality and Inclusion Team</i>	Director Sign-Off: 
Date: 15/8/2024	Date: 15/08/2024

¹ Review by the Equality and Inclusion Team confirms there is sufficient analysis for decision makers to consider the likely equality impacts at this stage. This is not an endorsement or approval of the proposal.