

Appendix 5 - EQUALITY ANALYSIS QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

Name of 'proposal' and how has it been implemented (proposal can be a policy, service, function, strategy, project, procedure, restructure/savings proposal)	Fish Island Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Experimental Order
Directorate / Service	CLC / Parking & Mobility Services
Lead Officer	Roy Ormsby, Service Head of Public Realm Mirsad Bakalovic, Head of Parking Services
Signed Off By (inc date)	
Summary – to be completed at the end of completing the QA (using Appendix A) (Please provide a summary of the findings of the Quality Assurance checklist. What has happened as a result of the QA? For example, based on the QA a Full EA will be undertaken or, based on the QA a Full EA will not be undertaken as due regard to the nine protected groups is embedded in the proposal and the proposal has low relevance to equalities)	<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: #008000; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div> <p>Proceed with making the CPZ permanent</p> <p>Two consultations were held and a Full Equality Analysis is now made available.</p> </div> </div>

Stage	Checklist Area / Question	Yes / No / Unsure	Comment (If the answer is no/unsure, please ask the question to the SPP Service Manager or nominated equality lead to clarify)
1	Overview of Proposal		
a	Are the outcomes of the proposals clear?	yes	This report proposes making the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Experimental scheme to a Permanent feature known as Fish Island B4 Mini Zone, originally introduced for the

			<p>2012 Olympic Games.</p> <p>The Mayor is recommended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the Council’s published proposal to make an Order under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in relation to Fish Island in the terms set out in the Notice attached as Appendix 1 2. Consider the objections received in response to the Notice set out in paragraph 3.17 3. Agree to make an Order under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in the terms attached at Appendix 1 namely parking controls and restrictions in the area identified for the times stipulated being Monday to Friday 8:30am – 9pm, Sat –Sun 11am – 9pm. <p>As the neighbouring London borough of Newham has introduced parking controls to manage parking generated by the Olympic Park within their borough, there is now an additional and significant risk of parking displacement into Fish Island if it remains free of parking controls.</p> <p>As the London Stadium has been the permanent home of West Ham Football Club since August 2016, there is a need to ensure availability of on-street parking for local residents and business in this area, maintain the free flow of traffic and manage road safety.</p> <p>Additional benefits of introducing these controls include the promotion of more sustainable travel options and subsequent benefits to air quality.</p>
b	Is it clear who will be or is likely to be affected by what is being proposed (inc service users and staff)? Is there information about the equality profile of those	Yes	The attached EA shows that this proposal will make neutral or positive impact on the protected characteristics.

	affected?		
2	Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation		
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Yes	This proposal is informed by the consultation results. There has been a consistent majority in favour of reintroduction of the CPZ in the latest consultation rounds and a clear acceptance from residents and businesses based on experience that there is now a need for it.
	Is there sufficient evidence of local/regional/national research that can inform the analysis?	Yes	See above.
b	Has a reasonable attempt been made to ensure relevant knowledge and expertise (people, teams and partners) have been involved in the analysis?	Yes	The formal consultation exercise was carried out during November – December 2014, which was supported by the informal consultation conducted during August – September 2014. Further consultation will be held once it is approved by Mayor in Cabinet.
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Yes	<p>As above, the informal consultation during August – September 2014 and the formal consultation during November - December 2014 were held.</p> <p>This initial consultation was carried out by hand delivered letter to all businesses and residents in the proposed zone. It included an invitation to visit a consultation stand at Stour Space on 14 August 2014 where staff were on hand to discuss the any issues or concerns.</p> <p>An invitation letter to the formal consultation was delivered to approximately 600 residents and 200 businesses who were likely to be affected by the proposals. An advertisement in East End Life, notices affixed to lamp columns of the roads affected and two road shows on 1 and 8 December 2014 at Foreman & Sons café/restaurant were also made available.</p> <p>Further consultation will be held once it is approved by Mayor in Cabinet.</p>
3	Assessing Impact and Analysis		

a	Are there clear links between the sources of evidence (information, data etc) and the interpretation of impact amongst the nine protected characteristics?	Yes	See the attached EA.
b	Is there a clear understanding of the way in which proposals applied in the same way can have unequal impact on different groups?	Yes	See above.
4	Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan		
a	Is there an agreed action plan?	yes	If approved, an order will be made under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in relation to Fish Island Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) experimental Order..
b	Have alternative options been explored	yes	The report includes three alternative options.
5	Quality Assurance and Monitoring		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?	yes	The service will continue monitoring the parking in the area.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics??	yes	The CPZ will be reviewed 6 months after implementation to ensure the bays are allocated correctly according to demand.
6	Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	yes	