

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.9]



Title: Fees and Charges in Excess of Inflation – Parking in Parks	
<input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Function <input checked="" 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	Lead Officer name: Jon James
Service Area: Parks and Green Spaces	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.

This proposal aims to raise car parking charges at Ashton Court Estate, Blaise Estate and Oldbury Court Estate to generate additional income for the maintenance of the parks, and to align the prices with those of other BCC car parks in the city.

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	

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: <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																														
<p>The Bristol Quality of Life Survey gives us a useful insight into the way that different equalities groups visit and feel about parks and green spaces:</p> <p>% satisfied with the quality of parks and green spaces</p>	<p>Older people in Bristol are slightly less satisfied with parks and green spaces than average but tend to visit them much less often.</p>																														
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 1249 671 1294">Equalities group</th> <th data-bbox="671 1249 831 1294">statistic</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1294 671 1339">Mixed Ethnicity</td> <td data-bbox="671 1294 831 1339">83.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1339 671 1384">White British</td> <td data-bbox="671 1339 831 1384">79.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1384 671 1429">Female</td> <td data-bbox="671 1384 831 1429">79.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1429 671 1473">Bristol Average</td> <td data-bbox="671 1429 831 1473">78.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1473 671 1518">Male</td> <td data-bbox="671 1473 831 1518">78.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1518 671 1563">White Minority Ethnic</td> <td data-bbox="671 1518 831 1563">78.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1563 671 1608">16 to 24 years</td> <td data-bbox="671 1563 831 1608">77.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1608 671 1653">65 years and older</td> <td data-bbox="671 1608 831 1653">76.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1653 671 1697">50 years and older</td> <td data-bbox="671 1653 831 1697">75.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1697 671 1742">Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic</td> <td data-bbox="671 1697 831 1742">75.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1742 671 1787">Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual</td> <td data-bbox="671 1742 831 1787">74.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1787 671 1832">Asian/Asian British</td> <td data-bbox="671 1787 831 1832">73.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1832 671 1877">Black/Black British</td> <td data-bbox="671 1832 831 1877">62.50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 1877 671 1892">Disabled</td> <td data-bbox="671 1877 831 1892">62.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Equalities group	statistic	Mixed Ethnicity	83.20%	White British	79.50%	Female	79.30%	Bristol Average	78.80%	Male	78.60%	White Minority Ethnic	78.10%	16 to 24 years	77.20%	65 years and older	76.30%	50 years and older	75.90%	Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic	75.10%	Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	74.30%	Asian/Asian British	73.20%	Black/Black British	62.50%	Disabled	62.00%	<p>There are only small differences between men and women in Bristol with regard how frequently they visit parks and green spaces and satisfaction with their quality.</p> <p>Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic communities in Bristol visit parks and green spaces less regularly and are less satisfied with them than average.</p> <p>White minority ethnic people in Bristol are more likely than average to regularly visit Bristol parks and green spaces.</p> <p>Disabled people in Bristol are much less likely to visit parks and green spaces often and are significantly less satisfied with them than average.</p>
Equalities group	statistic																														
Mixed Ethnicity	83.20%																														
White British	79.50%																														
Female	79.30%																														
Bristol Average	78.80%																														
Male	78.60%																														
White Minority Ethnic	78.10%																														
16 to 24 years	77.20%																														
65 years and older	76.30%																														
50 years and older	75.90%																														
Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic	75.10%																														
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	74.30%																														
Asian/Asian British	73.20%																														
Black/Black British	62.50%																														
Disabled	62.00%																														
<p>% who visit Bristol's parks and green spaces at least once a week</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="97 1989 671 2033">Equalities group</th> <th data-bbox="671 1989 831 2033">statistic</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 2033 671 2078">Mixed Ethnicity</td> <td data-bbox="671 2033 831 2078">69.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="97 2078 671 2116">White Minority Ethnic</td> <td data-bbox="671 2078 831 2116">66.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Equalities group	statistic	Mixed Ethnicity	69.40%	White Minority Ethnic	66.70%	<p>People living in the most deprived areas of Bristol are significantly less likely to visit parks regularly or be satisfied with their quality.</p> <p>Overall satisfaction with the quality of Bristol parks and green spaces has significantly increased over</p>																								
Equalities group	statistic																														
Mixed Ethnicity	69.40%																														
White Minority Ethnic	66.70%																														

16 to 24 years	62.90%	the last two years, rising 10.4% since 2018 to 78.8%.
Female	61.50%	
White British	60.50%	
Bristol Average	60.30%	
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	60.20%	
Male	59.50%	
Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic	52.30%	
Asian/Asian British	50.90%	
50 years and older	47.10%	
65 years and older	40.30%	
Disabled	35.60%	
Black/Black British	30.10%	

% who find it difficult to manage financially		The quality of life data also provides an indication of who might be more adversely affected by the introduction of fees to park – identifying people who find it more difficult to manage financially. This includes Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic communities, disabled people, young people and those likely to be on lower incomes.
Equalities group	statistic	
Black/Black British	23.70%	
Other Religions	23.30%	
Single Parent	22.70%	
Rented (Council)	20.40%	
Rented (HA)	19.60%	
Full Time Carer	16.90%	
Disabled	16.00%	
16 to 24 years	13.80%	
Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic	12.30%	
Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual	11.50%	
Rented (Private)	11.50%	
No Qualifications	10.30%	
Non-Degree Qualified	9.90%	
Mixed Ethnicity	9.80%	
Carer	8.90%	
Asian/Asian British	8.30%	
Parent (all)	7.80%	
Female	7.60%	
White Minority Ethnic	7.50%	
Bristol Average	6.80%	
Part Time Carer	6.30%	
No Religion or Faith	6.30%	
White	6.20%	
White British	6.00%	
Male	5.90%	
Two Parent	5.80%	
Christian Religion	5.70%	
50 years and older	5.50%	
Degree Qualified	5.10%	
65 years and older	3.70%	
Owner Occupier	3.40%	

Additional comments:

The Council carried out an engagement process on the principle of introducing car parking fees at a flat rate fee of £2 at both estates and provided details of on-street waiting restrictions specifically designed to protect local

residents from the impact of drivers avoiding the charges by parking on the street. This process attracted 102 people to respond regarding Blaise and 77 people to respond regarding Oldbury Court. Comments were generally not in favour of fees and a large number of suggestions were made.

The majority of objections for Blaise can broadly be categorised as follows:

- Imposing a fee at this site will deter people from using it.
- Charging will displace parking to nearby streets and impact on residents.
- Negative impact on health, wellbeing and social inclusion.
- Negative impact on low income families / too expensive.
- Negative impact on dog walkers / too expensive.
- Charging structure is not right e.g rates charged and/or charging period.
- Max stay is too low (should be increased beyond 5hrs).

The majority of objections for Oldbury Court can broadly be categorised as follows:

- Charging will displace visitor parking into nearby residential streets negatively impacting local residents.
- Negative impact on health, wellbeing and social inclusion. The council are supposed to be encouraging people to use green space, not putting up barriers.
- Negative impact on low income families / too expensive
- Negative impact on dog walkers / too expensive
- Imposing a fee at this site will deter people from using it.
- Object to a money-making scheme.
- Charging structure is not right e.g rates charged and/or charging period.

After this process the details of the proposals were amended and the resulting Orders subject to formal consultation. The consultation themes broadly mirrored those of the engagement process:

- Charges are too high.
- The maximum stay is not long enough (should be increased beyond 5hrs).
- Imposing a fee will deter people from using the car parks. Negative impact on low income families and dog walkers. Negative impact on health, wellbeing and social inclusion. The council are supposed to be encouraging people to use green space, not putting up barriers.
- Insufficient public transport. No alternative to get to the Estates other than by car.
- Charging will displace visitor parking into nearby residential streets negatively impacting local residents.

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.

The council does not hold visitor data on Ashton, Blaise or Oldbury estates.

It was not possible to identify differences between different equalities communities from the consultation data directly related to the on-street and off-street Order proposals.

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.

The council has carried out three citywide consultation processes in relation to the proposals and carried out an engagement process to inform proposals.

To enable vehicle waiting to be regulated on the public highway, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) must be made. The making of a TRO involves a statutory procedure which includes giving public notice of the proposal and consideration of any objections received. This comprises publication of a press notice and the posting of notices on site. The notices provide a brief outline of the proposal, state where further information may be obtained (Citizen Service Point, local public library and website) and explain how objections may be registered. Site notices are fixed to lighting columns or other street furniture in the vicinity of the proposal. They remain in place for three weeks.

Any objections received are reported for the consideration of the Director: Economy of Place, who will decide how the matter is to be taken forward.

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.

No further engagement with stakeholders is expected throughout the course of planning and delivery of this proposal as the council has carried out three citywide consultation processes in relation to the proposals and carried out an engagement process to inform proposals.

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 consultation and engagement processes on the proposal to introduce charging have raised significant potential equalities issues, and the Quality of Life in Bristol Survey highlights disparities by protected characteristic in the extent to which people in the city are able manage financially, are reliant on cars, and access/experience parks and green spaces.

Likewise, we have identified significant potential adverse impacts from not achieving savings proposals through introducing car parking charges: Including the risk that some parks could be maintained by volunteers, but playgrounds would probably have to close as they could not be inspected/made safe if there was insufficient money for repairs. This would impact children and families, especially in homes where there is no access to outside space and play facilities. There may also be adverse impacts for e.g. disabled and older park users if the Council is overly reliant on alternative income generation activities such as ticketed events which conflict with accessibility priorities within parks, or for minoritised ethnic communities, and faith groups if alternative activities do not cater for all communities.

When the council closed its car parks in green spaces in the city due to the first Covid lockdown, complaints were received from disabled people about the closures, through a number of channels including social media and to elected members. This indicates a dependency on car parks for access to green space by some disabled people.

Other people who could be affected are young people, parents of babies and children, carers, older people, pregnant women – because they are likely to be dependent on using a car to access parks.

Ashton, Blaise and Oldbury Court Estates are Destination Parks - considered and managed as citywide visitor attractions. Therefore Data at a citywide scale is relevant.

PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Children, young people and families may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is accessible through investment in pathways and ensuring level access routes are maintained and that play equipment will be maintained and replaced when necessary. The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free. Visitors on foot or on bikes/scooters do not have to pay for access. The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street.
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Older people may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges. Older people who live close to the park may be affected by people parking on the street to avoid paying fees. Any reduction in the number of on-street available car parking spaces could impact older people more than the general population, because of age-related impairment of mobility.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is accessible through investment in pathways and ensuring level access routes are maintained. The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free. The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street. Driveway protection introduced as part of this scheme will ensure older residents who rely on their vehicle for mobility will not be prevented from doing so by vehicles blocking their property access.
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Disabled people may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges. Older people who live close to the park may be affected by people parking on the street to avoid paying fees. Any reduction in the number of on-street available car parking spaces could impact disabled people with a mobility impairment more than the general population.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is accessible through investment in pathways and ensuring level access routes are maintained.

	<p>For blue badge holders car parking is free and a minimum of 5% of the parking capacity will be designed specifically for disabled visitors (excluding overflow).</p> <p>Driveway protection introduced as part of this scheme will ensure disabled residents who rely on their vehicle for mobility will not be prevented from doing so by vehicles blocking their property access</p> <p>Blue badge holders are entitled to park on double yellow lines for up to three hours as long as they are not causing an obstruction.</p>
Sex	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Sexual orientation	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	LGBTQ+ people may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	<p>Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is welcoming to diverse communities, for example by ensuring that there is a good cultural mix of events within parks that cater to all communities.</p> <p>The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street.</p> <p>The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.</p>
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	<p>People who are pregnant may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.</p> <p>The impact of a reduction in the number of on-street parking spaces available upon pregnancy and parents/carers with babies or young children could be greater than on the general population, because of impaired mobility, prams / buggies etc.</p>
Mitigations:	<p>Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is accessible through investment in pathways and ensuring level access routes are maintained.</p> <p>The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street.</p> <p>The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.</p>
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	As above LGBTQ+ people may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	<p>Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is welcoming to this group by, for example, ensuring that there is a good cultural mix of events within parks that cater to all communities.</p> <p>The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street.</p> <p>The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.</p>
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Black, Asian and minoritised ethnic groups may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	<p>Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is welcoming to this group by, for example, ensuring that there is a good cultural mix of events within parks that cater to all communities.</p> <p>The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street.</p> <p>The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.</p>

Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	People from faith groups may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is welcoming to people from faith groups for example, ensuring that there is a good cultural mix of events within parks that cater to all communities. The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street. The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.
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:	People experiencing deprivation may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is well maintained and welcoming for all. The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street. The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free.
Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	Carers may be less inclined to visit Blaise or OCE due to the parking charges. Loss of on-street parking capacity could also impact on care plans as carers, district nurses or doctors making home visits might need to seek alternative parking, if travelling by car.
Mitigations:	Funding raised through the parking charges will help to ensure the park is accessible through investment in pathways and ensuring level access routes are maintained. For blue badge holders car parking is free and a minimum of 5% of the parking capacity will be designed specifically for disabled visitors (excluding overflow). The council manages many other parks and green spaces with play facilities, toilets and cafes that are free to access and parking is available on-site or on-street. The charging regime includes periods at the beginning and end of the day where car parking is free. Driveway protection introduced as part of this scheme will ensure residents who are carers that rely on their vehicle for work will not be prevented from doing so by vehicles blocking their property access.
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]	
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

The proposal will encourage a turnover of visitors so that the opportunity to have access to a parking space could improve. A lack of spaces is often an issue during holidays and good weather. For example in March 2021 the police were forced to close the car park at Blaise Estate to prevent traffic build-up on the roads while visitors searched for spaces.

The proposal will also raise funds to enable the Council to invest and maintain other free-to-access green spaces that all communities rely on for health and wellbeing.

As and when income is raised the service can consult with representative leaders and organisations of people with protected characteristics to identify specific access needs and subsequently design maintenance and improvement programmes that deliver these.

Disabled visitors to the locality, who are holders of a disabled person's badge, could find it easier to park, because they are entitled to park on double yellow lines for up to three hours as long as they are not causing an obstruction.

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:

This updated equality impact assessment makes it clear to decision makers that the proposal may have a disproportionate impact on some citizens because of existing disparities in the extent to which people in the city are able to manage financially, are reliant on cars, and access/experience parks and green spaces. However the assessment has not changed the recommendations as it believed the proposal provides the best way of raising income to maintain and improve green spaces across the city whilst enabling free to access to both estates for non-driving visitors, applying fees that are affordable and in the control of the user and encouraging access through turnover of visitors.

The charging proposal subject to a community engagement process was a £2 flat fee for access to parking facilities when open. Following this process the proposals were then amended to provide a free-to-access period before 9am and after 6am and a staggered charge starting at a lower £1 and moving to maximum of £3 for up to 5 hours. Blaise Castle Estate and Oldbury Court Estate will continue to be free to access for non-car users at all times.

The proposed fee regime is designed to offer low-cost short-stay parking at an affordable level. The charging period compares favourably with other council car parking facilities. There are other parks locally that are free.

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

The proposal may encourage people to access the sites by foot rather than driving which in itself will have positive impacts for the health and wellbeing of those people. This in turn has benefits for everyone as less car journeys = less harm to the environment.

The proposal will encourage a turnover of visitors so that the opportunity to have access to a parking space could improve. A lack of spaces is often an issue during holidays and good weather. For example in March 2021 the police were forced to close the car park at Blaise Estate to prevent traffic build-up on the roads while visitors searched for spaces.

The proposal will also raise funds to enable the Council to invest and maintain other free-to-access green spaces that all communities rely on for health and wellbeing.

As and when income is raised the service can consult with representative leaders and organisations of people with protected characteristics to identify specific access needs and subsequently design maintenance and improvement programmes that deliver these.

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
The service will as part of its review of its Parks and Green Space Strategy consult with representative leaders and organisations of people with protected characteristics to identify specific access needs and subsequently design maintenance and improvement programmes that deliver these.	Richard Fletcher	6 months
We will implement electronic counting to the access points to car parks to determine any change in visitor numbers over time.	Richard Fletcher	6 months

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.


The proposal to charge where currently access is free understandably met with objections. This is going to make it difficult to separate out the impact of the proposal detail from the principle of charging in any future consultation process.

We will implement electronic counting to the access points to car parks to determine any change in visitor numbers over time.

We will also analyse year-in-year changes to relevant Quality of Life survey indicators with regard to equalities groups and deprivation [Quality of Life 2020-21 — Open Data Bristol](#).

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: 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.