

# Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.9]



Title– Parking Tariff Review 2022-23 Controlled Parking Zone (City Centre) & Off Street Car Parks - GR11	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input type="checkbox"/> Service <input type="checkbox"/> Other [please state]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Growth and Regeneration – Management of Place	Lead Officer name: David Bunting
Service Area: Traffic & Highways Maintenance	Lead Officer role: Head of Service

## 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.

The proposal is to increase parking charges in the Central Controlled Parking Zone and its off street car parks. These charges are set in line with local transport policy. This aims to reduce congestion and improve air quality by promoting public transport and active travel over private car journeys wherever possible. Long stay parking is particularly discouraged, short stay parking which supports the local economy is encouraged. In order to ensure that the parking tariffs continue to discourage long term parking usage it is important that they are periodically increased in line with inflation which is what this proposal aims to do.

### 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]
---	-----------------------------	-----------------

These increases will apply to all users of Pay & Display bays in the CPZ and for those using the Bristol City Council or Off Street car parks.

Because of these increased costs, there is a potential for citizens and/or businesses to be affected by this proposal.

## 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: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/measuring-equalities-success>.

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 \(sharepoint.com\)](#). 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 Form](#)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
ONS 2011 Census Crown Copyright 2012.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We know the make-up of Bristol residents from the 2011 census and although this data is old, it does give us some indication.</li> </ul>
Quality of Life Survey 2020  % of people who think Public Transport is inaccessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bristol average is 9.4%</li> <li>- Disabled people 16.4%</li> <li>- LGBT people 12.9%</li> <li>- Other religions 12.9%</li> </ul> <p>We have a high percentage of people who think public transport is inaccessible</p>
Quality of Life Survey 2020  % of people who think congestion is a problem locally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bristol average is 70%</li> <li>- LGBT 76% think that congestion is a problem locally</li> </ul>
<b>Additional comments: see below</b>	

Age	Number	%	England & Wales %
0-17 years	87,503	20.4	21.3
18-64 years	284,859	66.5	62.2
65 years and over	55,872	13.0	16.4
Total population	428,234	100.0	100.0
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	213,071	49.8	49.2
Female	215,163	50.2	50.8
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
White British	333,432	77.9	80.5
Other White	26,160	6.1	5.5
Black and minority ethnic group	68,642	16.0	14.0
<b>Religion</b>			
Yes	233,234	54.5	67.7
No	160,218	37.4	25.1
Not stated	34,782	8.1	7.2
<b>Disability</b>			
Day-to-day activities limited	71,724	16.7	17.9
Day-to-day activities not limited	356,510	83.3	82.1
<b>Sexual orientation [1]</b>			
LGBT			6%

Sources:  
ONS 2011 Census Crown Copyright 2012  
[1] Stonewall Index - national data only

However, people who park in Bristol are not necessarily residents and may travel in from neighbouring authorities or further afield reflecting Bristol's status as a tourist destination.

We do not collect equalities data on parking users.

## 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 have data on customers' status in terms of gender reassignment, marital status, pregnancy or maternity or whether they are from a low income household.

## 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. See <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/equalities-groups>.

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 change 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.

Tariff revisions in the past go through a process which involves full statutory consultation with the whole public which includes notices on and off street and advertisements in local newspapers. These processes have never previously identified any material equality impacts.

The proposed changes in the Parking Tariff Report 2021/22 are minor increases based on inflation and will consist of notices on street advising the public that use the parking facilities that the charges will be increased.

## 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.

Any future reviews of the CPZ and off street car parks (and which would include public consultation) would consider any broader or scheme specific changes to the way the CPZ operates. The change at this time is simply to increase all charges in line with inflation. .

## 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 (different kinds of disability, ethnic background etc.) 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)

The proposal will increase the cost of pay & display parking and will therefore affect all groups, although those on fixed or low incomes will be disproportionately affected.

#### PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS

**Age: Young People** Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes  No

Potential impacts:

Mitigations:

**Age: Older People** Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes  No

Potential impacts:	Some older people who are less mobile and less able to walk significant distances may be disproportionately impacted by additional costs
Mitigations:	See above
<b>Disability</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	No adverse impacts have been identified due to disability as those with Blue Badges can park for free and without time limit in all Council Pay & Display parking locations on and off street.
Mitigations:	See above
<b>Sex</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>Pregnancy / Maternity</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	There is some potential for pregnant women and new parents to be adversely affected due to their limited mobility if they are more likely to use a car than public transport or active travel during this time
Mitigations:	See above
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>Race</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>Religion or Belief</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
<b>OTHER RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	
<b>Socio-Economic (deprivation)</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	There is some potential for those living in low income households to be adversely affected by any increase in parking charges.
Mitigations:	
<b>Carers</b>	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	As above
<b>Other groups</b> [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for other relevant groups as appropriate e.g. Asylums and Refugees; Looked after Children / Care Leavers; Homelessness]	
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.

For residents in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) there are resident's parking permits which are very reasonably priced at £50 or less per annum.

Pay & Display parking in the RPS is currently just c£1 per hour which also makes it a reasonable alternative to city centre parking for those that can walk part of their journey.

The parking charge also needs to be taken in the local context. A day ticket for bus travel in the Bristol area costs £5, a Park & Ride tickets costs £5. The proposed parking charges mean that customers can generally park for 3 hours for £5. It would undermine the Council's transport policies if parking in the city centre were so cheap that it deterred people from making more sustainable travel choices.

3.3 Does the proposal create any benefits for people with protected characteristics?

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 such as the close of Bristol Bridge to cars.

## 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:

The Council is currently under a legal direction to improve Air Quality in the City Centre. The Council has a duty to deliver on its transport policy and cannot do this if charges become so low as to undermine policy. It is therefore important that inflation is applied to parking prices in order to maintain their 'relative' cost.

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

### 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
A full and detailed review of parking charges is scheduled to begin in 2022-23 which will include full public consultation as part of the formal legal process to change a Traffic Regulation Order.		
We currently have a number of designated disabled parking bays in our off street car parks. We could also consider the addition of		

Improvement / action required	Responsible Officer	Timescale
'parent & child' bays for pregnant women and parents of young children – as convenience and access are often a more significant issue than price.		

### 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.

Through ongoing measures assessing walking, cycling & bus usage.

### 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 Director<sup>1</sup>.

<b>Equality and Inclusion Team Review:</b> Reviewed by the Equality and Inclusion Team	<b>Director Sign-Off:</b> 
Date: 29 December 2021	Date: 5 January 2022

<sup>1</sup> 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.