

# Equality Analysis (EA)

Financial Year  
**2015/16**

See Appendix  
**A**

Current decision  
rating



## Section 1 – General Information (Aims and Objectives)

Name of the proposal including aims, objectives and purpose

*(Please note – for the purpose of this doc, 'proposal' refers to a policy, function, strategy or project)*

### Fees and charges - Parking

In setting Parking fees and charges, consideration has been taken of the need to ensure that:

- Value for money is provided
- Demand can be controlled and managed effectively
- Where appropriate, the cost of providing the services are recovered
- The Council's transport and environment strategies are supported

It is unlawful to set parking charges for the purpose of raising revenue, as has been reinforced by two judicial reviews (Cran v Camden 1998 and Attfield v Barnet 2013).

The purposes behind setting parking charges are:

- To control and manage parking demand.
- To ensure road safety in the borough.
- To regulate traffic flow and reduce congestion.
- To cover the cost of providing the service, as the Government strongly recommends that any shortfall in operations should not be funded through the General Fund.

### Conclusion - To be completed at the end of the Equality Analysis process

*(the exec summary will provide an update on the findings of the EA and what outcome there has been as a result. For example, based on the findings of the EA, the proposal was rejected as the impact on a particular group was unreasonable and did not give due regard. Or, based on the EA, the proposal was amended and alternative steps taken)*

**Name:** Mirsad Bakalovic  
(signed off by)

**Date signed off:** 19/12/14  
(approved)

Service area:  
Public Realm

Team name:  
Parking and Mobility Services

Service manager:  
Mirsad Bakalovic

Name and role of the officer completing the EA:  
Pratham Chaturvedi, Parking Business Manager

## **Section 2 – Evidence (Consideration of Data and Information)**

What initial evidence do we have which may help us think about the impacts or likely impacts on service users or staff?

The following has informed the proposal:

- The current service take-up (Appendix 1)
- The current occupancy rate of parking bays in the borough – 98%
  - Best practice as advised by London Councils is 85% as this maximises parking availability while reducing the amount of traffic driving around looking for spaces.
- Benchmark data of parking permit products in London boroughs (Appendix 2)
- RPI – 2.4%

Appendix 1 shows each proposed charge's rationale, the numbers of users in 2013/14 and whether the increase is in line with RPI or more. The following proposals are related to resident users:

- Resident Permits
- Visitor Scratch Card Permits

In 2013-14, 7,700 6-month and 22,500 12-month Resident Permits were issued. The charge for Residents permits is proposed to increase only in line with RPI.

In 2013-14, 32,000 Visitor Scratch Cards Permits (books of 10) were sold. The proposal is to increase the charge to £5 per book with each scratch card lasting 6 hours, rather than 5 hours. As Appendix 2 shows, the charge increase of Visitor Scratch Card permits will bring the charge in line with other authorities. Scratch card charges are still exceptionally inexpensive (33p/hr) when compared to pay and display charges. It is considered that the impact of this change on the users is limited.

### Pay and Display

It is proposed that the Pay and Display charge increase by 30-40 pence per hour. Through this proposal, it is expected to achieve the following aims:

- To control and manage parking demand.
- To ensure road safety in the borough.
- To regulate traffic flow and reduce congestion.

Current charges are between £3 and £4 per hour depending on location. Benchmarking indicates that the proposed charges are similar to those in comparable areas of London Boroughs. For example, in 2014/15, the highest tariff for pay and display parking in Camden was £6.25, Southwark £5, and Islington and Lambeth £4.80.

The Pay and Display charge increase will affect car users universally. However, it should be noted that the following will not be affected by this change:

- Blue Badge holders
- Those visiting residents in the borough
- Scratch Card for daily carers

Blue Badge holders can use casual parking places (Pay and Display) without payment or limitation to duration of parking. All residents are able to purchase up to 24 books of visitor parking Scratch cards per year. Residents over 60 are entitled to receive free 24 books of visitor scratch cards per year. Visitors to a Borough resident can use scratch cards purchased by the resident regardless of the purpose of their visit. As above, scratch card charges are still exceptionally inexpensive when compared to pay and display charges, and are issued free of charge to residents aged 60 and over and those who need a carer on a daily basis.

The following changes will affect businesses:

- Business/Public Service/Contractor/Doctor Permits Pay and Display
- Market Trader Permit
- Bay Suspension Charges
- Dispensation Charges
- Bay Suspension Administration Charge
- Dispensation Administration Charge
- Skip Licenses.

#### Business/Public Service/Contractor/Doctor Permits Pay and Display and Market Trader Permit

A charge increase in line with RPI plus 5% of the Business/ Public Service/ Contractor/ Doctor Permits Pay and Display and Market Trader Permit is proposed. Benchmarking (Appendix 2) indicates that the borough's existing charge of the Business permits is comparatively inexpensive compared to other comparative London boroughs. Market Trader permit charges have been frozen at the 2008 level when other permit charges have increased substantially. This proposal will therefore allow us to control demand for Market Trader Permits in a similar fashion to other permits and services that the Council supplies.

#### Bay Suspension Charges, Dispensation Charges and Skip Licenses

A charge increase in line with RPI with the introduction of a single flat rate across the borough of the Bay Suspension Charges, Dispensation Charges and Skip Licenses is proposed. The increase is limited but the introduction of a single flat rate means that the actual increase at locations across the borough will vary.

#### Bay Suspension Administration Charge and Dispensation Administration Charge

A charge increase in line with RPI and that reflects the current cost to the service is proposed for Bay Suspension Administration Charge and Dispensation Administration Charge.

Businesses in the borough may be owned by people in different equality strands from those who operate the business premises in the Borough. The technical implications of developing an equalities strand of the Council's business database have been reviewed by D&R which has corporate lead responsibility for Business related data.

The following are proposed as new charges, introducing a single flat rate across the borough. This aims to cover the cost of providing the service. The Government strongly recommends that any shortfall in operations should not be funded through the General Fund:

- Resident Permits (£6 per electric/Band A vehicle)

- Business/Public Service/Contractor/Doctor Permits Pay and Display (£6 per electric vehicle)
- Bay Suspension (administration charge)
- Dispensation (administration charge)
- Skip Licenses Administration Charge.

### **Section 3 – Assessing the Impacts on the 9 Groups**

Please refer to the guidance notes below and evidence how you're proposal impact upon the nine Protected Characteristics in the table on page 3?

**For the nine protected characteristics detailed in the table below please consider:-**

- **What is the equality profile of service users or beneficiaries that will or are likely to be affected?**

Use the Council's approved diversity monitoring categories and provide data by target group of users or beneficiaries to determine whether the service user profile reflects the local population or relevant target group or if there is over or under representation of these groups

- **What qualitative or quantitative data do we have?**

List all examples of quantitative and qualitative data available  
(include information where appropriate from other directorates, Census 2001 etc)

- *Data trends – how does current practice ensure equality*

- **Equalities profile of staff?**

Indicate profile by target groups and assess relevance to policy aims and objectives e.g. Workforce to Reflect the Community. Identify staff responsible for delivering the service including where they are not directly employed by the council.

- **Barriers?**

What are the potential or known barriers to participation for the different equality target groups? Eg- communication, access, locality etc.

- **Recent consultation exercises carried out?**

Detail consultation with relevant interest groups, other public bodies, voluntary organisations, community groups, trade unions, focus groups and other groups, surveys and questionnaires undertaken etc. Focus in particular on the findings of views expressed by the equality target groups. Such consultation exercises should be appropriate and proportionate and may range from assembling focus groups to a one to one meeting.

- **Additional factors which may influence disproportionate or adverse impact?**

Management Arrangements - How is the Service managed, are there any management arrangements which may have a disproportionate impact on the equality target groups

- **The Process of Service Delivery?**

In particular look at the arrangements for the service being provided including opening times, custom and practice, awareness of the service to local people, communication

Please also consider how the proposal will impact upon the 3 One Tower Hamlets objectives:-

- Reduce inequalities
- Ensure strong community cohesion
- Strengthen community leadership.

#### **Please Note -**

Reports/stats/data can be added as Appendix

Target Groups	Impact – Positive or Adverse	Reason(s)
	What impact will the proposal have on specific groups of service users or staff?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add a narrative to justify your claims around impacts and,</li> <li>• Please describe the analysis and interpretation of evidence to support your conclusion as this will inform decision making</li> </ul> <p>Please also how the proposal will promote the three One Tower Hamlets objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reducing inequalities</li> <li>-Ensuring strong community cohesion</li> <li>-Strengthening community leadership</li> </ul>
Race	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Disability	Neutral	<p>This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.</p> <p>Blue Badge holders will not be unduly affected by this proposal. Visitor Scratch Card permits are issued free of charge to residents aged 60 and over, and those who need a carer on a daily basis.</p>
Gender	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Gender Reassignment	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Sexual Orientation	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Religion or Belief	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Age	Neutral	<p>This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.</p> <p>Visitor Scratch Card permits will continue to be issued free of charge to residents aged 60 and over, and those who need a carer on a daily basis.</p>
Marriage and Civil Partnerships.	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Neutral	This group will not be unduly affected by this proposal.
Other Socio-economic Carers		

## Section 4 – Mitigating Impacts and Alternative Options

From the analysis and interpretation of evidence in section 2 and 3 - Is there any evidence or view that suggests that different equality or other protected groups (inc' staff) could be adversely and/or disproportionately impacted by the proposal?

**No**

If yes, please detail below how evidence influenced and formed the proposal? For example, why parts of the proposal were added / removed?

*(Please note – a key part of the EA process is to show that we have made reasonable and informed attempts to mitigate any negative impacts. An EA is a service improvement tool and as such you may wish to consider a number of alternative options or mitigation in terms of the proposal.)*

*Where you believe the proposal discriminates but not unlawfully, you must set out below your objective justification for continuing with the proposal, without mitigating action.*

## Section 5 – Quality Assurance and Monitoring

Have monitoring systems been put in place to check the implementation of the proposal and recommendations?

**Yes**

How will the monitoring systems further assess the impact on the equality target groups?

The service will continue monitoring the service take-up and complaints. .

Does the policy/function comply with equalities legislation?

(Please consider the [OTH objectives](#) and [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) criteria)

**Yes**

If there are gaps in information or areas for further improvement, please list them below:

How will the results of this Equality Analysis feed into the performance planning process?

The service will continue monitoring the service take-up and complaints.




## Section 6 - Action Plan

*As a result of these conclusions and recommendations what actions (if any) **will** be included in your business planning and wider review processes (team plan)? Please consider any gaps or areas needing further attention in the table below.*

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Key activity</b>	<b>Progress milestones including target dates for either completion or progress</b>	<b>Officer responsible</b>	<b>Progress</b>
Non-discriminatory behaviour	Regular awareness at staff meetings. Train staff in specialist courses	Raise awareness at one staff meeting a month.	NR	
Monitor complains and complements	Analyse trends and record any lessons learnt	Ongoing trend analysis Lessons learnt register	NR	

## Appendix A

### (Sample) Equality Assessment Criteria

Decision	Action	Risk
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . It is recommended that the use of the policy be suspended until further work or analysis is performed.	<b>Suspend – Further Work Required</b>	Red 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination exists (direct, indirect, unintentional or otherwise) to one or more of the nine groups of people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> . However, a genuine determining reason may exist that could legitimise or justify the use of this policy.	<b>Further (specialist) advice should be taken</b>	Red Amber 
As a result of performing the analysis, it is evident that a risk of discrimination (as described above) exists and this risk may be removed or reduced by implementing the actions detailed within the <i>Action Planning</i> section of this document.	<b>Proceed pending agreement of mitigating action</b>	Amber 
As a result of performing the analysis, the policy, project or function does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i> and no further actions are recommended at this stage.	<b>Proceed with implementation</b>	Green: 