

Equality Impact Assessment [version 2.12]



Title: Parks Catering Fees and charges	
<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: Management of Place	Lead Officer name: Sharon Radnedge
Service Area: Parks & Green Spaces	Lead Officer role: Sharon Radnedge

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.

To agree delegated authority to increase average prices across cafes and kiosks by 10% from December 2023 in BCC Parks Cafes and Kiosks:

This is following a consultancy review by Ernst & Young where they have assessed that an annual increase will provide critical income for the service. All income must be retained in the service to mitigate pressures given an existing income target and no general fund is taken for the service. Price increases may have impacts on the affordability for those on the lowest incomes, however they are necessary for the sustainability of the service.

The City Council operates eight cafés in the locations listed below:

Destination Parks

Hengrove Park Beach Hut Café, Hengrove Play Park
The Courtyard Cafe at Ashton Court, Ashton Court
The Golf Cafe at Ashton Court, Ashton Court
Oldbury Court Kiosk, Oldbury Court
Blaise Castle Estate Café, Blaise Castle

Local Parks

The Bake Box at St George Park, St George Park
Canford Park Kiosk, Canford Park

Retail Site

The Plant Cafe at Blaise Plant Nursery, Blaise Plant Nursery

The sites that are indicated as Destination Parks and Retail Site serve all the citizens of Bristol who are live within the vicinity of the area and those that wish to travel to the park/retail site from across the city and beyond. The locations here provide parking facilities for those travelling to site from beyond the area.

The budget for Bristol City Council as agreed in February 2023, which included a cross-cutting saving item to deliver £500,000 through a review of fees and charges increases above the base level of inflationary approval within the budget.

During 2022/23 an initial opportunity review was undertaken by consultants to establish the potential scope to the council of assessing fees and charges in context of the budget gap presented in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy at that time.

The review undertaken was a high-level benchmarking exercise based on comparison to publicly available national data relating to fees and charges to identify where there was potential for income generation and focused on several themes:

- Identifying where charges are not currently made.
- Identifying where cost recovery is not currently achieved.
- Review of existing charges against comparator charges

A total of eight areas were shortlisted as opportunities for further due diligence and validation. Parks Catering are one of the eight areas selected.

1.2 Who will the proposal have the potential to affect?

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

1.3 Will the proposal have an equality impact?

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

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

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

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

Step 2: What information do we have?

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

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

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

Outline whether there is any over or under representation of equality groups within relevant services - don't forget to benchmark to the local population where appropriate. Links to available data and reports are here [Data, statistics and intelligence \(sharepoint.com\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/data-statistics-intelligence). See also: [Bristol Open Data \(Quality of Life, Census etc.\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/open-data); [Joint Strategic Needs Assessment \(JSNA\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/joint-strategic-needs-assessment); [Ward Statistical Profiles](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/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 \(sharepoint.com\)](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/hr-analytics-power-bi-reports) 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](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/employee-staff-survey-report) and [Stress Risk Assessment](https://www.bristol.gov.uk/stress-risk-assessment)

Data / Evidence Source [Include a reference where known]	Summary of what this tells us
Quality of Life 2022/23 Final Report (pdf, 864 KB)	<p>% satisfied with quality of Parks & Green Spaces</p> <p>-Citywide 73% Deprived 46%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White minority Ethnic 66% • Disabled 59.6% • Rented from Council 58.9% • Single Parents 58.8% • All Carers 68.5% • Full-time Carers 58.8% • No qualifications 63.4% • Non degree qualifications 65.1% <p>% who visit parks once per week</p> <p>-Citywide 56% deprived 40%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic 44.1% • Black/Black British 20.3% • Disabled 33.8% • 50yrs and older 43.6% • 65yrs and older 39.8% • Christian 47.5% • Rented from Council 27.9% • Rented from Housing Association 44.4% • All Carers 48.3% • Full time Carers 36.9% • No Qualifications 27.5% • Non degree qualified 43.8% <p>% who find it difficult to manage financially</p>

	<p>-Citywide 10% deprived 18%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic 22.3% • Asian/Asian British 19.7% • Black/Black British 27% • Mixed Multiple ethnic groups 20% • Disabled 25.7% • 16 to 24 yrs. 18.5% • Other Religion 19.5% • Rented from Council 25.9% • Rented from Housing Association 21.3% • Trans 32.5% • Single Parents 23% • All Carers 15.7% • Full time Carers 21.2% • Non-Degree qualifications 14.2% <p>This data shows the people who are below or above the city average and thus may face disproportionate impacts by this change</p>
<p>Additional comments: Historically the service has regularly reviewed its prices and has adjusted the prices in line with the changes to the cost of wholesale products being purchased for trading. This is also undertaken bearing in mind the position in the market – to maintain revenue and market share.</p>	

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.

<p>Due to the nature of the service data on the characteristics of visitors to parks is not collated. This means that the accuracy of the impacts on certain demographics cannot be guaranteed.</p>

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

You will nearly always need to involve and consult with internal and external stakeholders during your assessment. The extent of the engagement will depend on the nature of the proposal or change. This should usually include

individuals and groups representing different relevant protected characteristics. Please include details of any completed engagement and consultation and how representative this had been of Bristol’s diverse communities.

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

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

Cabinet approval is being sought to implement the changes. The service monitors the activities of service users and considers this when regularly reviewing prices.

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 groups.

Through data on customer activity and feedback from customers via complaints/feedback process and face to face interaction. This will be considered in reviewing prices.

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 groups that you are aware of and are seeking to address or mitigate through this proposal. See detailed guidance documents for advice on identifying potential impacts etc. [Equality Impact Assessments \(EqIA\) \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

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

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

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

GENERAL COMMENTS (highlight any potential issues that might impact all or many groups)	
PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS	
Age: Young People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	18% aged 16 to 24 find it difficult to manage financially , price increases may mean they are no longer able to visit the cafes/kiosks
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options
Age: Older People	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	39.8% of people 65 yrs. older are not satisfied with the quality of Parks and Green Spaces. The price increase may mean their satisfaction decreases further
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options. Communicate that income from Cafes/Kiosks supports the maintenance and improvement of Parks.
Disability	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	As per the quality-of-life survey data 33.8% of Disabled people are not satisfied with the quality of Parks & Green Spaces, Disabled people are less likely to visit parks and higher than average proportion of Disabled people find it difficult to manage financially. The

	price increase may impact on these stats negatively , decreasing satisfaction and the number of Disabled people visiting the parks and cafes/kiosks
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options. Communicate that income from Cafes/Kiosks supports the maintenance and improvement of Parks.
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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Pregnancy / Maternity	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	
Gender reassignment	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	32% of Trans community find it difficult to manage financially
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options
Race	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	A lower than average number of Black, Asian and minority Ethnic groups are satisfied with the quality of Parks and Green Spaces. A lower than average number of White Minority Ethnic people visit Parks. A higher than average % of Black Asian and Minority Ethnic people find it difficult to manage financially
Mitigations:	Review of prices and range of food options regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options. Communicate that income from Cafes/Kiosks supports the maintenance and improvement of Parks.
Religion or Belief	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	As per the data within the Quality of Life Survey A higher than average number of People with Christian Faith are not satisfied with Parks & Green Spaces. A higher than average number of People with Other religion find it difficult to manage financially.
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options
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:	<p>The fees in relation to Parks Catering is likely to have an impact that would be low, across all protected characteristics.</p> <p>The fee increase may impact on those already under financial pressure, especially those on benefits, The parks cafes can be used by all as there are no restriction for entry to use the cafes and associated amenities.</p> <p>An additional impact may be that people are not able to afford the goods and likely to look for alternative/less costly options – such as own supplied – however we also ensure we provide products at the lower cost point to ensure there is provision for all.</p>
Mitigations:	We have seen a reduction in visitors to cafes in the last year relating to the cost-of-living impact. The visitors are still coming to site, they are bringing their food/drink to mitigate the cost of the visit to the park. And offer of lower cost options. Prices are reviewed regularly; customer activity and feedback is considered in the review

Carers	Does your analysis indicate a disproportionate impact? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Potential impacts:	A higher than average number of carers are not satisfied with the quality of Parks & Green Spaces. A lower than average number of carers visit parks. A higher than average number of carers find it difficult to manager financially
Mitigations:	Review of prices regularly to ensure not over pricing. Offer lower cost options. Communicate that income from Cafes/Kiosks supports the maintenance and improvement of Parks.
Other groups [Please add additional rows below to detail the impact for any other relevant groups as appropriate e.g., asylum seekers and refugees; care experienced; homelessness; armed forces personnel and veterans]	
Potential impacts:	
Mitigations:	

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

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

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

Bristol Parks and green spaces are free to use for all citizens of Bristol. They are key to health and well-being, enabling people to socialise and communities to gather. The income generated from the cafes and kiosks supports the service financially enabling it to sustain the running and management of parks.

Price increases in Cafes and kiosks are necessary to ensure that they can meet rising inflation costs and remain open.

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:

Increasing costs will have an effect for all particularly those from lower socio economic groups

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

Parks are key to health and well-being, the income raised through its cafes and kiosks is invested directly back into the maintenance and management of Bristol Parks. Increase in prices ensure the sustainability of the cafes & kiosks

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
Cabinet approval and regular review of prices	Sharon Radnedge	Ad hoc reviews Cabinet – Dec 23


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.

Approved by cabinet & actions to regularly review prices and adjust if necessary does not negatively impact the quality of life stats.

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: 28/11/2023	Date: 28 Nov 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.