

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.10]



Title: Reduction in the Parks Capital Maintenance Programme	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget Proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Already exists / review <input type="checkbox"/> Changing
Directorate: Management of Place	Lead Officer name: Jon James
Service Area: Natural and Marine Environment	Lead Officer role: Head of Service for Natural and Marine Environment

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

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.

As part of the budget review for 23/24 financial year it has been proposed to reduce the capital maintenance programme by £1m.

The scale of the parks service assets is significant and is one of the largest of all the council assets. The parks infrastructure is variable, with paths, walls, benches, car parks, play areas etc requiring maintenance to meet the demands of the visiting public and to allow us to maintain accessibility to sites. The Council's Parks and green space have over 25 million visitors each year and it was recognised that to enable us to maintain the sites to a required standard we required a capital investment.

The council has a statutory responsibility to ensure it meets its health and safety obligations so that when people access a park they can do so without exposing themselves to risk. As a result of a series of budget reductions the parks service has been unable to address all maintenance works which have been highlighted through the asset inspections and it has to prioritise works.

Because of the continued financial pressures and infrastructure becoming more and more challenge to maintain, the service secured a Parks Capital Maintenance programme (capital budget of £2.5m) so that it could address high priority infrastructure works which would take pressure away from revenue budgets and reduce the likelihood of incidents and insurance claims.

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> City partners / Stakeholder organisations	
Additional comments:		

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

Yes **No** [please select]

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.

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 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](http://bristol.gov.uk)

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 \(sharepoint.com\)](http://sharepoint.com). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](http://bristol.gov.uk); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](http://bristol.gov.uk); [Ward Statistical Profiles](http://bristol.gov.uk).

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 \(sharepoint.com\)](http://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](http://bristol.gov.uk) and [Stress Risk Assessment Form](http://bristol.gov.uk)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Census 2011 and Census 2021 2011 Census Key Statistics About Equalities Communities	The Census details the demographic profile of Bristol. We have had initial data on the population of Bristol by age, ethnic group, national identity, language, and religion, but are still awaiting more detailed results and multivariate data, so demographic data is still largely informed by 2011 census and other population related documents (listed below)
The population of Bristol Bristol Key Facts 2022	Updated annually. The report brings together statistics on the current estimated population of Bristol, recent trends in population, future projections and looks at the key characteristics of the people living in Bristol.
Ward profile data (bristol.gov.uk)	The Ward Profiles provide a range of data-sets, including population, life expectancy, health and education disparities etc. for each of Bristol's electoral wards.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment reports on the health and wellbeing needs of the people of Bristol. It brings together detailed information on local health and wellbeing needs and looks ahead at emerging challenges and projected future needs. The JSNA is used to provide a comprehensive picture of the health and wellbeing needs of Bristol (now and in the future); to inform decisions about how we design, commission and deliver services, and also about how the urban environment is planned and managed; to improve and protect health and wellbeing outcomes across the city while reducing health inequalities; and to provide partner organisations with information on the changing health and wellbeing needs of Bristol, at a local level, to support better service delivery.

HR Analytics: Power BI reports (sharepoint.com) [internal link only]

Equality and Inclusion annual progress report 2021-22 (bristol.gov.uk)

Appendix – Workforce Diversity Data – summary analysis

Additional sources of useful workforce evidence include the Employee Staff Survey Report and Stress Risk Assessment Form completed by individuals and teams [internal links only]

The Workforce Diversity Report shows Bristol City Council Workforce Diversity statistics for Headcount, Sickness, Starters and Leavers data. The report is updated once a month with data as at the end of the previous month. It excludes data for locally managed schools/nurseries, councillors, casual, seasonal and external agency employees. The report is based on the sensitive information that staff add to Employee Self Service on iTrent (ESS).

Summary of Bristol City Council workforce diversity

	BCC headcount % (31 Oct 2022)	Bristol Working Age Population (16-64)
Age 16-29	12.2%	39.0%
Age 30-39	22.0%	24.0%
Age 40-49	24.4%	16.0%
Age 50-64	41.4%	21.0%
Age 65+	3.4%	-
Disabled	9.0%	12%
Asian / Asian British	2.9%	5.8%
Black / Black British	5.1%	5.3%
Mixed ethnicity	3.6%	2.9%
Other ethnic groups	0.4%	1.0%
White	79.8%	85.0%
Female	60.1%	49.0%
Male	39.3%	51.0%
Use another gender term	0.2%	-
Christian	25.9%	43.5%
Other religion/belief	6.6%	7.3%
No religion/belief	41.9%	41.5%
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	5.9%	9.1%
Trans	0.1%	-

Workforce: Parks service currently overrepresented by males; aged 50+; White British. May be less likely to have access to ICT

for updates. Older employees more likely to have unpaid caring responsibilities, and less formal qualifications.

Quality of Life Survey 2021-22

The Quality of Life (QoL) survey is an annual randomised sample survey of the Bristol population, mailed to 33,000 households (with online & paper options), and some additional targeting to boost numbers from low responding groups. In brief, the most recent QoL survey indicated that inequality and deprivation continue to affect people's experience in almost every element measured by the survey.

The service measures performance through the Quality of Life Survey through two indicators:

1) Increase the percentage of residents visiting a park or open space at least once a week (QoL)

Table 1: QoL 2021-22 survey results - % who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week by characteristic

Quality of Life Indicator	% who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week
Characteristic	% Percentage
Bristol Average	59
No qualifications	25.4
Rented from the council	29.8
Disabled	33
Black/Black British	33.5
Rented from housing association	41.4
Most Deprived 10%	42.2
65 years and older	43.3
Asian/Asian British	44.7
Full-time carer	46
50 years and older	49
Non degree qualifications	49.4
16 to 24 years	49.9
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	51.2
Christian	52.1
Other religion	54
Carer (All)	55.6
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	58.5
Part-time carer	58.6
Female	58.7
Rented from private landlord	59.1
Male	59.4
White British	59.6
White	59.7
Single parent	59.8
White Minority Ethnic	60.5
Owner Occupier	62.2
No religion or faith	62.8

Degree qualifications	67
Parents (All)	72.3
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	73.6
Two parent	74.2

Table 2: QoL 2021-22 survey results - % who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week by ward

Quality of Life Indicator	% who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week
Ward	% Percentage
Bristol Average	59
Stockwood	35.8
Hartcliffe and Withywood	35.9
Brislington East	43.3
St George Central	45.6
Southmead	46.1
Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston	47.2
Bishopsworth	47.4
Hengrove and Whitchurch Park	48.6
Lawrence Hill	51
Hillfields	51.1
Frome Vale	52.3
Filwood	52.5
Horfield	53.4
Central	53.8
Brislington West	54
Bedminster	55.6
Lockleaze	57.1
St George Troopers Hill	62.3
Henbury and Brentry	63.6
Redland	64.1
Knowle	64.4
Hotwells and Harbourside	64.8
Southville	68.7
Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze	69.1
Stoke Bishop	69.5
Easton	70.7
Bishopston and Ashley Down	70.8
Ashley	71
St George West	71.4
Clifton	71.5
Eastville	71.6
Clifton Down	75.2
Cotham	79.2
Windmill Hill	81.1

2) **Improve the percentage of residents satisfied with parks and open spaces (QoL)**

Table 3: QoL 2021-22 survey results - % satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces by characteristic

Quality of Life Indicator	% satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces
Characteristic	% Percentage
Bristol Average	74.9
Most Deprived 10%	52.5
Rented from the council	56.9
Full-time carer	61
Disabled	63.6
No qualifications	64.5
Rented from housing association	65.2
Single parent	65.9
Non degree qualifications	66.4
Carer (All)	68.8
Parents (All)	69.9
Two parent	70.4
Part-time carer	71.2
Black/Black British	71.8
White Minority Ethnic	72.5
50 years and older	72.9
Christian	73.2
65 years and older	74.2
Female	74.5
Asian/Asian British	74.8
White	75.1
Male	75.2
Black, Asian and minority ethnic	75.3
White British	75.6
Other religion	76
16 to 24 years	76.2
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	76.2
No religion or faith	76.3
Owner Occupier	76.4
Rented from private landlord	78
Degree qualifications	79.4
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	79.8

Table 4: QoL 2021-22 survey results - % satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces by ward

Quality of Life Indicator	% satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces
Ward	% Percentage
Bristol Average	74.9
Hengrove and Whitchurch Park	37.9
Hartcliffe and Withywood	47

Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston	52.5
Lawrence Hill	55.3
Bishopsworth	60.1
Southmead	60.3
Filwood	61.1
Henbury and Brentry	62.7
Brislington East	66.1
Stockwood	66.6
Horfield	72.5
Lockleaze	74.7
Hotwells and Harbourside	74.8
Ashley	75.8
Central	75.8
Brislington West	76.4
Southville	77.1
Bedminster	77.2
St George Central	79.2
Hillfields	79.5
St George Troopers Hill	81.3
Easton	82.4
Stoke Bishop	83.4
St George West	84.7
Cotham	88.2
Clifton	88.4
Frome Vale	88.6
Eastville	90.4
Knowle	90.5
Windmill Hill	90.5
Bishopston and Ashley Down	91.1
Redland	91.8
Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze	93.6
Clifton Down	95.4

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

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

Although our corporate approach is to collect diversity monitoring for all relevant characteristics, there are gaps in the available local diversity data for some characteristics, especially where this has not always historically been included in census and statutory reporting e.g. for sexual orientation. We also know there are some under-reporting gaps in our workforce diversity information - where personal and confidential information is voluntarily requested from staff.

The Parks Service does not currently collect demographic data from park users due to the open access and citywide nature of the service.

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 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.

We launched a public consultation on our budget proposals between Friday 11 November and Friday 23 December. This consultation set out all the savings proposals we had identified to produce a balanced budget in the context of reduced available funding and increasing financial pressures.

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 reduction in the capital programme did not form part of the Budget Consultation. However, through this consultation it was concluded that the parks service should not be subject to a budget reduction. Following the setting of the overall budget there should be extensive engagement, consultation and co-design with affected communities on particular proposals which will inform future decision making prior to implementation. Our approach to public engagement and consultation will proactively target under-represented respondents to increase the participation of people from equality groups and their local representative organisations. This will help ensure that our services and actions are informed by the views and needs of all our citizens.

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)

This proposal will create additional budget pressures on the parks revenue budget, as this will be the only other route we can use to address high priority maintenance requirements.

With the combination of employing both capital and revenue budgets the council is still exposed to risk as there is insufficient funds and resources to address all maintenance and repair requirements. This has resulted in the councils' risk and insurance team placing a risk on the council's risk register.

The impact on service users, and whether this is adverse in relation to protected characteristics, isn't fully understood at this stage as this is dependent on the type and frequency of repair and maintenance item that cannot be remedied due to a lack of funding. However there are some general assumptions we might make:

- The maintenance programme for high priority items on footpaths, cycle paths and hard surfaces will be reduced.
- The type of other assets and infrastructure potentially affected by a lack of repairs - resulting in a tolerance of higher risk, a reduction in accessibility, a closure of facilities, a change to access routes or a reduction in quality includes:
 - Walls, fences and railings.
 - Park access points and gates.
 - Play equipment including children's play areas, wheels parks and MUGAs.
 - Ornamental features such as lakes, ponds, monuments and public art.
 - Engineered structures such as weirs, drains, pumps, bridges and retaining walls.
 - Public buildings including toilets, sports facilities, cafes.
 - Seating, bins, signage, bollards and picnic benches.

Whilst as a matter of course we will continue to prioritise works which are essential for public safety and promote increased accessibility, we might assume that a reduction in overall budgets for repairs and maintenance could result in the following outcomes that would affect park users and may disproportionately affect adversely some equalities communities:

- That access to park facilities would be reduced or removed for some communities in those parks affected.
- That a lack of conspicuous care may generate secondary impacts such as increased vandalism and anti-social behaviour – and a risk that overall neighbourhood quality would be lowered.
- There will be an increased risk of on-site hazards that are not able to be remedied.
- There will need to be a priority and hierarchy set for which assets and infrastructure types, and which sites, repair and maintenance funding will be made available. This has the potential for there to be a disproportionate impact on some parts of the city and some communities.
- There would be a further and more pronounced decline in some facilities and assets.

Even when we plan to consult in more detail on specific service delivery proposals at a later time, we must ensure that any budget setting decisions that are likely to affect future services are informed by sufficient consultation and proper analysis. This is so that decision makers can have due regard to any likely disproportionate or negative impact on the basis of their protected and other relevant characteristics at the time the budget is approved – not afterwards¹.

Decision makers will have the ability to make changes to the individual spending plans following further consultation as appropriate and detailed evaluation of the impact of specific proposals. Within the

proposed budget envelope there will be financial mitigation put aside for any non-delivery or amendments to proposals which may occur due to future consideration of equalities issues or other factors.

As well as identifying whether budget changes will have a disproportionate impact on particular groups (e.g., because they are over-represented in a particular cohort), we need to pay particular attention to the risk of indirect discrimination: when an apparently neutral decision puts members of a given group at a particular disadvantage compared with other people because of their different needs and circumstances.

We are also aware of existing structural inequalities and particular considerations, issues, and disparities for people in Bristol based on their characteristics, which we will take into account. We must factor the needs of people with particular protected characteristics into short term repair and maintenance decision-making.

PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the capital repair and maintenance budgets reduced, revenue budgets may be redirected depending on an assessment of risk. If funds are redirected from facilities such as play areas, wheels parks and multi-use-games-areas, this may have an adverse impact on children and young people in terms of their capacity to use and enjoy parks and green spaces. As set out in general comments above, there is the risk of a reduction in services being disproportionate by area. • Young people access parks and green spaces in a number of ways, for example to use specific play facilities, to meet and socialise with others in an open environment, to take part in sport and physical activity, to spend time with family and to access cultural events. Green space is particularly important to young people because access is free unless attending a ticketed event. • Children and young people in Bristol are considerably more ethnically diverse than the overall population of Bristol. • Children and young people from the most deprived areas of Bristol have the poorest outcomes in health and education in terms of health, education and future employment etc. • Young people in Bristol are more likely to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ have poor emotional health and wellbeing ○ find inaccessible public transport prevents them from leaving their home when they want to.
Mitigations:	See general comments above.
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older people visit green spaces less frequently than other populations but their satisfaction with quality is close to the city average. • Older people in Bristol are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ more reliant on public and community transport ○ more likely to be an unpaid carer ○ more likely to help out or volunteer in their community • Bristol Ageing Better estimated at least 11,000 older people are experiencing isolation in the city. We might expect that if a reduction in parks maintenance affects older people’s willingness to visit green spaces then this could be an important factor. • We can expect that a decrease in access would adversely affect older people, particularly as a greater proportion of older people consider themselves to be disabled. • A reduction in repair budgets, particularly for hard surface repairs and toilet facilities, could have an impact on accessibility, which could subsequently have an impact on some older people and those with low mobility. • Older people, whether or not they are also disabled people, may have reduced mobility, require more frequent rest stops when walking, or be more susceptible

	to injury from trip-hazards and falls. As above we will prioritise works which promote safety and accessibility.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17% of Bristol’s population are disabled people. There are more disabled women than men living in Bristol. • Disabled people are significantly less satisfied with the quality of green spaces than the average population in the city and visit them far less frequently. We might expect that a reduction in grounds maintenance services for example would exacerbate trend. • Disability increases with age: 4.1% of all children, for the working age population it increases to 12.3% and for people aged 65 and over it increases to 55.9%. • Disabled people on average have lower qualification levels than the population as a whole and a higher proportion of disabled people rent from a social provider (local authority or housing association). We know from quality of life surveys that people with no qualifications or non-degree qualifications are far less satisfied with the quality of Bristol’s parks and visit them less often and this is the same trend for people that rent from the council – with 57% of the latter being satisfied with the quality of green spaces in comparison to 75% of the population as a whole and only 30% of them visiting at least once a week in comparison to 59% of the population as a whole. • Disabled people have lower car ownership levels and will be more reliant on local green spaces or public transport to access better quality green spaces where applicable. • Budget setting needs to provide sufficient resource and flexibility to meet our legal duty to make anticipatory and responsive reasonable adjustments for disabled people including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ changing the way things are done e.g. opening / working times; ○ changes to overcome barriers created by the physical features of premises. ○ providing auxiliary aids e.g. extra equipment or a different or additional service. ○ is ‘anticipatory’ so we must think in advance and ongoing about what disabled people might reasonably need. • A reduction in repair budgets, particularly for hard surface repairs and toilet facilities, could have an impact on accessibility, which could subsequently have an impact on some disabled people and those with low mobility. • As above we will prioritise works which promote safety and accessibility.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to parks and green spaces is extremely important for mental health and wellbeing and for carrying out physical activity. A reduction in access or ability to access parks would have a significant adverse effect on this concerned. • Young women between the ages of 16 and 24 have higher risk of common mental health problems and higher rates of self-harm and post-traumatic stress disorder etc. • Female QoL respondents are less likely to say they feel safe outdoors both after dark and in the daytime, and 16% females say fear of crime prevents them from leaving their home when they want to (8.7% males) – as above there is a risk a lack of conspicuous care may lead to increased anti-social behaviour and make parks and green spaces less safe/feel less safe, particularly for women and girls • Men and boy’s health is in general poorer than that of women and girl’s • On average men in Bristol live 18 years in poor health, women live 22 years in poor health

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A higher proportion of boys have physical impairments and more boys than girls have diagnosed mental health disorders and learning difficulties. • Men in Bristol are more likely than women to have unhealthy lifestyle behaviours including being overweight and obese, smoking, alcohol and substance misuse.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to parks and green spaces is extremely important for mental health and wellbeing and for carrying out physical activity. A reduction in access or ability to access parks would have a significant adverse effect on this concerned. • Research has shown that LGBT+ people are more likely to be living with long-term health conditions, are more likely to smoke, and have higher rates of drug and alcohol use. • Half of LGBT+ people experienced depression in the last year
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in repair budgets, particularly for hard surface repairs and toilet facilities, could have an impact on accessibility, which could subsequently have an impact on women who are pregnant.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We know from the Council's quality of life surveys that both Black/Black British and Asian/Asian British populations are significantly less likely to visit green spaces frequently. • A reduction in repair budgets could have an impact on areas of the city with higher than average both Black/Black British and Asian/Asian British populations • We must factor the needs of people with protected characteristics into short term repair and maintenance decision-making.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are at least 45 religions represented in Bristol. Approximately 1 in 20 people in Bristol are Muslim, and Islam is the second religion in Bristol after Christianity • Budget proposals should take into account differing needs because of people's religion and belief (for example different requirements around diet, life events, and holidays).
Mitigations:	See general comments above
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:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfaction with the quality of green spaces and the frequency of visits to green spaces varies significantly by ward across the city. Wards where both are significantly lower than the average for Bristol include Hengrove and Whitchurch Park, Hartcliffe and Withywood, Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston, Lawrence Hill, Bishopsworth, Southmead, Filwood, Brislington East, Stockwood, Horfield and Lockleaze. • A consideration of the most deprived Lower Super Output Areas indicates a correlation between wards where satisfaction with parks is lower and deprivation

	<p>is higher. This shows particularly for wards such Hartcliffe and Withywood, Avonmouth and Lawrence Weston, Lawrence Hill and Filwood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bristol has 41 areas in the most deprived 10% in England, including 3 in the most deprived 1%. The greatest levels of deprivation are in Hartcliffe & Withywood, Filwood and Lawrence Hill. • In Bristol 15% of residents - 70,800 people - live in the 10% most deprived areas in England, including 19,000 children and 7,800 older people. • 34.6% of people in Bristol are dissatisfied with the way the Council runs things, but this is 47.5% for people living in the most deprived areas of the city (QoL 2021-22). • The inequalities gap in life expectancy between the most and least deprived areas in Bristol is 9.9 years for men and 6.7 years for women. • It can be assumed that those living in properties without gardens may be most impacted by any changes that may make parks and green spaces less accessible for them as they may be more dependent on usage of them for things such as recreational, or health purposes. However, some of this accommodation will have related green space that would be maintained to the standard agreed with Housing and be unaffected. However local 'parks' could be affected. This will be considered in the service design, but at the scale required it would be unlikely this impact wouldn't be generated.
Mitigations:	See general comments above. We must factor into long term budgeting and asset repair works the needs of populations that live in the more deprived areas of the city and who are already less satisfied with parks services and use the less frequently.
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being a carer can be a huge barrier to accessing services and maintaining employment • We need to consider the timing/availability of services, events etc. to allow flexibility for carers. • As with Disability and Pregnancy and Maternity – policies which aim to restrict driving or parking can have a disproportionate impact on people who are reliant on having their own transport. • Studies show around 65% of adults have provided unpaid care for a loved one. • Women have a 50% likelihood of being an unpaid carer by the age of 46 (by age 57 for men) • Young carers are often hidden and may not recognise themselves as carers.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
Other groups [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]	
Full time Carer	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We know from the Council's Quality of Life 2021-22 survey that Full time Carers visit parks less frequently than other populations – with 46% visiting at least once a week in comparison with 59% of the general population – and are considerably less satisfied with the quality of green spaces than other populations – with 61% being satisfied in comparison with 75% of the general population. • This may be indicative of a reliance on local spaces due to a lack of recreational time and a proportionately greater number of those who need care in those wards where satisfaction is lower than the Bristol average. Facilities for those who need care may also be lacking in parks and green spaces and accessibility for those with impairments may be restricted. • Proposals that reduce or restrict access or reduce the quality of assets and infrastructure may have an adverse impact on full time carers and the people they care for.
Mitigations:	See general comments above
People who rent from the Council or rent from Housing Associations	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 57% of people who rent council accommodation are satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces in comparison with 75% of the general population and only 30% are likely to visit once a week in comparison with 59% of the general population. • Only 65% of people who rent from a Housing Association are satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces in comparison with 75% of the general population and only 41% are likely to visit once a week in comparison with 59% of the general population. • Proposals result in a reduction in quality of green space where there are concentrations of these types of accommodation may have an adverse impact on these populations.
Mitigations:	See general comments above

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

None are envisaged.

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:
Repair and maintenance budgets cover both planned and response works. For known health and safety works and/or planned items an impact assessment will need to be carried out to test whether failing to remedy some of these would adversely impact any of those equalities groups identified here as being potential adversely affected.
Summary of positive impacts / opportunities to promote the Public Sector Equality Duty:
No positive impacts identified

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
All relevant EqIAs will be published on the Council's website https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/council-budgets and continue to be updated as appropriate.	Jon James	TBC

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.

Our Equality and Inclusion Annual Progress Reports show what we have done to achieve the aims of our Equality and Inclusion policy and strategy, and the progress we have made including reporting on all relevant KPIs and workforce diversity [Equalities policy - bristol.gov.uk](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/equality-and-inclusion-policy)

- Increase the percentage of residents visiting a park or open space at least once a week (QoL)
- Improve the percentage of residents satisfied with parks and open spaces (QoL)

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: Patsy Mellor
Date: 27/1/2023	Date: 27/01/2023

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.