

Equality Impact Assessment Completion Form

1. What is the name of the service, policy, procedure or project to be assessed?

This assessment looks at the replacement of the pay and display parking system with pay on foot on the Recreation Road South and Churchfields Multi Storey car parks.

2. Briefly describe the aim of the service, policy, procedure or project. What needs or duties is it designed to meet?

The aim of the change of parking system is to provide a more customer focused system which is easy to use and which does not rely on enforcement to force drivers to comply.

3. List your customers/ stakeholders

All car park users.
Drivers who do not currently use the car parks.

4. How do you know who they are?

All car park users – they use the car parks.
Drivers who do not currently use the car parks – we don't, although there is anecdotal evidence from many residents who state they do not use the car parks.

5. Do any of your customers/ stakeholders come from the following Equality Groups?

Equality Group	Yes	No	Further Evidence Needed
Race / Minority Ethnic Groups	√		
Disability	√		
Gender (Male/ Female)	√		
Gender Re-assignment (Trans-sexual)	√		
Marital Status	√		
Sexual Orientation	√		
Religion/ Belief	√		
Age	√		
Income group	√		
Rural/Urban mix	√		
None of these			

6. What activities have you undertaken to establish the information to answer questions 4 and 5?

We haven't. Common sense would tell us that customers who have driven on to the car parks are our customers, and the anecdotal feedback from others who do not use the car parks would suggest that there is a larger number who do not due to the system employed.

Who have you consulted and what methods have you used?

The Older Peoples Forum has submitted information gained from their consultation exercise following the withdrawal of concessionary permits. This included information from many drivers with a disability. There were several hundred responses which I could only look through a number of. However, the same points were raised repeatedly and a pattern emerged. These points were;

1. The pay and display machines were difficult to use
2. Entering the registration details on the machines is difficult
3. The information on the machine is difficult to read
4. It is difficult to walk to another machine when the nearest one is broken
5. There are not enough machines

All these comments would be addressed by the pay on foot system.

There were other comments relating to the reintroduction of concessionary permits and free parking for drivers with a disability. However the Council has made it clear that it will not be doing this.

The secretary of the Forum was generally welcoming of the proposal to replace pay and display with pay on foot simply because of the ease of use of the new equipment. It was felt that this would address a number of concerns that the group had. The meeting took place at 10.00 am on 04/08/2009 between Steve Martin and Carol Tipping.

The Disabled User Group met in Bromsgrove at 10.00 am on 07/08/2009 and was presented with a brief outline of the proposal. Feedback from the group relating to the proposal was that;

1. The additional hour for blue badge holders was not widely used and would need to be publicised when implementing the new system
2. There was concern from one member of the group that transferring tickets between two car parks with different systems would not be possible
3. There was concern from two members of the group that the pre-registration of blue badge holders to use the extra hour would disadvantage those who use several different vehicles – this can occur when a Blue Badge holder is not a driver but can be driven by other people. The Blue Badge application process asks for two mainly used car registration numbers which would be used for enforcement purposes. To ask for a longer list of vehicles which may be used would be impractical.
4. One member of the group queried how they would reach the ticket from the machine
5. There was a question regarding the position of the paystations in one group and whether these could be moved to another pedestrian exit

In answer to those points raised;

1. The Council agreed that ways of publicising the additional hour were required, and further feedback from the group would be welcomed.
2. The Council would attempt to minimise this effect by charging solely for the amount of time used to the nearest 5 or 10 minutes on pay on foot car parks. In this way a driver using one hour and five minutes would pay for just that. At most operators, such as those operating at Redditch, the one hour and five minutes would trip the customer over into the two hour time band and cost more.
3. The Council has to balance the need to redress the needs of the mobility impaired with the requirement to operate a robust system with reduced risk of abuse. Feedback from most Shopmobility customers is that generally only one driver is used most of the time, and therefore it is reasonable for the Council to only register one vehicle.
4. The system can be set up so that some vehicles are recognised and the barriers would be raised automatically with payment taking place later. Again, this will require a robust system to be set up and generally only drivers without the use of one arm or hand should be considered for this option.
5. The cost of providing data cabling may prohibit this as the business case is based on the location specified to the group. In addition, the simplicity of having all the paystations in one place has added benefits for staff, customers and security arrangements. However, the Council agreed to look at this option.

The Disabled Users Group generally agreed that the proposed Pay on Foot system is much better than the current Pay and Display system even though there are a few issues to iron out. The Council will bring back detailed proposals about the size and location of shelters and paystations, and site visits were offered to the group should they wish to see the equipment in operation.

The Transport and Engineering Officer and Civil Enforcement Officer 22 also spoke to three permit holders leaving the multi storey car park through the vehicular exit. All permit holders were female. In the event that pay on foot is installed, it may be necessary to ensure that pedestrians cannot enter or leave in this manner because of the danger caused by barriers opening and closing.

All three permit holders were supportive of this measure because they felt that security would be improved. This was surprising to the officers as this would force them to walk all the way around the supermarket to gain access to their place of work. In the past this would be seen as a significant inconvenience and caused adverse comment.

7. Is there evidence that any groups are being treated unfairly, directly or indirectly?

Equality Group	Yes	No	Further Evidence Needed
Race / Minority Ethnic Groups		√	
Disability*			√
Gender (Male/ Female)		√	
Gender Re-assignment (Trans-sexual)		√	
Marital Status		√	
Sexual Orientation		√	
Religion/ Belief		√	
Age		√	
Income group		√	
Rural/Urban mix		√	
None of these			

*The fact that drivers will not be able to transfer tickets from pay and display car parks to pay on foot systems has been raised as an issue. There is an extremely low need for this facility, and further information regarding this is being sought from national organisations. Should the proposal be implemented this will be monitored generally during operation of the new system.

8. Please detail the information you have gathered to support the answers to question 7.

Equality Group	Evidence gathered
Race / Minority Ethnic Groups	N/a
Disability	Feedback from Shopmobility customers, Disabled User Group, and the Older Peoples Forum.
Gender (Male/ Female)	Anecdotal feedback from permit holders in Churchfields Multi Storey (all female).
Gender Re-assignment (Trans-sexual)	N/a
Marital Status	N/a
Sexual Orientation	N/a
Religion/ Belief	N/a
Age	N/a
Income group	N/a
Rural/Urban mix	N/a
None of these	N/a

9. Is there any justification for any unfairness identified in question 7 - for example, disproportionate cost? Describe the supporting evidence.

N/a

10. If you have identified any area of unfairness that cannot be justified, how will you eliminate or minimize this?

N/a

11. The results of your research and any justifications must be easily available to the public. When, where and how will you publish this information?

This assessment will be made available at the Cabinet meeting considering Pay on Foot. It is also intended that it will be made available from the Council web site.

- 12. In support of the Inclusive Equalities Scheme, you are required to regularly monitor all policies and services for fairness. What plans do you have to monitor this particular service, policy, procedure or project?**

The satisfaction levels with the project will be monitored before and after the proposal is installed.

- 13. Your findings now need to be managed through your Departmental 3 Year Rolling Equality Action Plan. Please complete the final section of this form.**

Action Required	By Whom	By When	Signed when completed	Priority	How has this Promoted Equality?

Equality Impact Assessment undertaken by (Signed)

Full name (in capitals please) Steve Martin

Position in the council Transport and Engineering Officer

Date 14/08/2009

When you have completed this form, please retain a copy and give a copy to your Equalities Champion, so that they can report to the Head of Service and the Equality Officer in Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services.



EQUALITY
FRAMEWORK
FOR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT
ACHIEVING

DRAFT