

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)	Controlled Parking Zone & Parking Policy Review
Directorate / Service	Communities, Localities and Culture / Parking, Mobility & Transport Services
Lead Officer	Colin Sims
Signed Off By (inc date)	Mirsad Bakalovic
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: center;"> <div style="width: 20px; height: 20px; background-color: green; margin-right: 10px;"></div> <div> <p>Proceed with implementation</p> <p>As a result of performing the QA checklist and the attached equalities analysis, the policy does not appear to have any adverse effects on people who share <i>Protected Characteristics</i>.</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	<p>Parking & Mobility Services has conducted a full review of all existing policies in order to ensure that services provided are open, transparent, fair and consistent, and that they support the Mayor's and Council's transport priorities and plans.</p> <p>The review has raised a number of issues that require decisions being taken at Cabinet. The decision making body</p>

			<p>is asked to consider and agree the following 12 recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of the number of free bays available for domestic bay suspensions from three to two 2. Amendment of the Penalty Charge Notice ('PCN') cancellation criteria for vehicles in contravention that are displaying valid Blue Badges 3. Amendment of the terms and conditions for all permit types 4. Amendment of the removals priority list 5. Recommencing enforcement against vehicles parked across a demarcation line between two individual parking bays 6. Reintroducing pay & display charges for vehicles parking at weekends in market areas 7. Introducing an all-zone multi-purpose permit type for the use of car club companies 8. Introducing a maximum limit of three permits per household and to introduce surcharges for second and third permits, with concessions for Blue Badge holders 9. Considering the introduction of an all-day visitor's voucher at the full pay and display rate 10. Introducing a petition scheme framework and assessment criteria for the implementation of parking restrictions 11. Engaging the market with respect to electric vehicle charging point bays and to implement 12. Consulting residents about amending the restricted parking times.
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 affected?	Yes	The EA identifies that the impact of these proposals on the groups are mostly neutral. It also shows that the proposals will promote equality and cohesion in the borough and make the service more open and transparent.

2 Monitoring / Collecting Evidence / Data and Consultation			
a	Is there reliable qualitative and quantitative data to support claims made about impacts?	Yes	<p>The following evidence has been examined to think about the likely impacts on service users:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service user levels • Benchmarking from neighbouring and similar London local authorities • LBTH demographics • Complaints. <p>In 2015-16, 1,649 Penalty Charge Notices were cancelled automatically under the first cancellation policy. Equalities data of Persistent Evaders are unavailable.</p>
	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	As above.
c	Is there clear evidence of consultation with stakeholders and users from groups affected by the proposal?	Yes	The service will consult stakeholders if any options that require consultation are agreed by the executive.
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	Each policy option includes the analysis of the current practice/situation, potential impact and proposed options, where applicable.
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 the attached EA.
4 Mitigation and Improvement Action Plan			
a	Is there an agreed action plan?	Yes	Identified action is included in the EA.
b	Have alternative options been explored	Yes	Do nothing option was considered

5	Quality Assurance and Monitoring		
a	Are there arrangements in place to review or audit the implementation of the proposal?	Yes	The service collects information on the uptake of services by users. They will be able to monitor any changes through these processes. Also, the service is planning to develop a system to monitor the impact of the proposals on the different groups.
b	Is it clear how the progress will be monitored to track impact across the protected characteristics?	Yes	As above.
6	Reporting Outcomes and Action Plan		
a	Does the executive summary contain sufficient information on the key findings arising from the assessment?	Yes	The main body of the report contains necessary information.