

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 1. Topic of assessment

<b>EIA title:</b>	Pay & Conserve
-------------------	----------------

<b>EIA author:</b>	Keith McKain, Change Consultant
--------------------	---------------------------------

## 2. Approval

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date approved</b>
<b>Approved by<sup>1</sup></b>	Jason Russell, Deputy Director, Environment & Infrastructure	04.12.2017

## 3. Quality control

<b>Version number</b>	1.1	<b>EIA completed</b>	04.12.2017
<b>Date saved</b>		<b>EIA published</b>	

## 4. EIA team

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title (if applicable)</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Lisa Creaye-Griffin	Countryside Group Manager	SCC	Project Sponsor
Environment & Infrastructure Directorate Equalities Group		SCC	Scrutiny of impact assessments

## 5. Explaining the matter being assessed

<b>What policy, function or service is being introduced or reviewed?</b>	This assessment looks at the current use of 5 Countryside sites that are owned by Surrey County Council and managed on our behalf by Surrey Wildlife Trust. The assessment focuses on the access to the sites and in particular the potential equalities impacts should any charge be introduced for people to park at these sites.
<b>What proposals are you assessing?</b>	Proposals are to charge people to park at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chobham Common</li> <li>• Norbury Park</li> <li>• Rodborough Common</li> <li>• Whitmoor Common</li> <li>• Wisley &amp; Ockham Commons</li> </ul> <p>This proposals form part of the business plan to offset the current</p>

<sup>1</sup> Refer to earlier guidance for details on getting approval for your EIA.

## Annex 4

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

14

	operating cost of maintaining the Countryside Estate. With significant pressure on council budgets in general, including funding for the Countryside function it is necessary to find a sustainable way to fund the Estate.
<b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b>	The proposals will or may effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Site users, potential new site users and their carers</li><li>• The Surrey Wildlife Trust</li></ul>

## 6. Sources of information

<b>Engagement carried out</b>
A public consultation exercise was carried out for a period of 6 weeks. Significant communications activity was undertaken via printed, digital and social media to raise awareness of the consultation.  People could feed back using the SurreySays website, via letter, email or complete a hard copy of the survey.
<b>Data used</b>
Surreyi Census data, Family Resource Survey  Feedback from the public consultation, parish councils, user groups (such as angling groups) etc

## Annex 4

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

#### 7a. Impact of the proposals on residents and service users with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic <sup>2</sup>	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
Age	Income for investment in improved facilities such as improved trails and surfaces will provide benefits for people with mobility problems	Some people may not be able to afford to park and so would not get the health and wellbeing benefits	58 people responding to the consultation stated that the proposals would specifically impact people on low incomes.
Disability		Parking arrangements may disadvantage some groups, for example if payment is only available by phone.	124 people stated that access to the countryside is important for both physical and mental health and charging could impact on people's ability to gain those benefits from being outdoors
Gender reassignment	n/a	n/a	The proposals do not impact people's ability to access the sites based on them having these protected characteristics.
Pregnancy and maternity	n/a	n/a	
Race	n/a	n/a	
Religion and belief	n/a	n/a	
Sex	n/a	n/a	
Sexual orientation	n/a	n/a	
Marriage and civil partnerships	n/a	n/a	

<sup>2</sup> More information on the definitions of these groups can be found [here](#).

## Annex 4

### EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

<b>Carers<sup>3</sup></b>	See above for Age and Disability		
---------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--

#### 7b. Impact of the proposals on staff with protected characteristics

Protected characteristic	Potential positive impacts	Potential negative impacts	Evidence
<b>Age</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Disability</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Race</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Religion and belief</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Sex</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Marriage and civil partnerships</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a

<sup>3</sup> Carers are not a protected characteristic under the Public Sector Equality Duty, however we need to consider the potential impact on this group to ensure that there is no associative discrimination (i.e. discrimination against them because they are associated with people with protected characteristics). The definition of carers developed by Carers UK is that 'carers look after family, partners or friends in need of help because they are ill, frail or have a disability. The care they provide is unpaid. This includes adults looking after other adults, parent carers looking after disabled children and young carers under 18 years of age.'

**Annex 4**

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE**

<b>Carers</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------------	-----	-----	-----

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 8. Amendments to the proposals

Change	Reason for change
None	<p>Charging for parking may discourage people from using the site and therefore missing out on the health and wellbeing benefits of accessing the countryside. However, this would affect all site users, not just those with protected characteristics.</p> <p>On that basis specific impacts for each group cannot be identified. To do so would require us to be able to estimate the affordability for each group through 'means testing.'</p> <p>It is felt that parking charges by themselves would not disproportionately impact older or disabled people or their carers. This is on the basis that the parking charges should be set a reasonable level in comparison to other countryside sites. There would also be a season ticket available to bring the cost down for regular visitors. Blue Badge holders will be able to park for free when displaying their badge.</p> <p>Also, that the benefits of maintaining the site to allow it to continue to be used and enjoyed outweigh any potential disbenefit from having to pay for use. There is a need to consider parking arrangements to ensure that they do not disadvantage equalities groups.</p> <p>As well as this, a person's 'means' is not a protected characteristic and therefore cannot be considered as part of this impact assessment process</p>

## 9. Action plan

Potential impact (positive or negative)	Action needed to maximise positive impact or mitigate negative impact	By when	Owner
Impact of parking arrangements on specific groups, particularly the elderly who, for example, may not be comfortable paying by phone.	Recommended approach will include an option to pay by card.	As part of scheme implementation	Countryside Group

## EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## 10. Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated

Potential negative impact	Protected characteristic(s) that could be affected
Charging for parking may discourage people from using the site and therefore missing out on the health and wellbeing benefits of accessing the countryside. However, this would affect all site users, not just those with protected characteristics. On that basis specific impacts for each group cannot be identified. To do so would require us to be able to estimate the affordability for each group through 'means testing.'	All visitors, including those not from a protected group

## 11. Summary of key impacts and actions

Information and engagement underpinning equalities analysis	Public meetings, feedback from the public, stakeholders and interest groups.
Key impacts (positive and/or negative) on people with protected characteristics	Charging for parking may discourage people from using the site and therefore missing out on the health and wellbeing benefits of accessing the countryside but by not charging in all locations this provides an alternative for those who do not want to or cannot afford to pay. The elderly may be less likely to own a mobile phone. Investment in better infrastructure such as improved trails and surfaces will benefit people with mobility issues.
Changes you have made to the proposal as a result of the EIA	None
Key mitigating actions planned to address any outstanding negative impacts	N/A
Potential negative impacts that cannot be mitigated	The imposition of a charge, necessary for the financial sustainability of the site, may stop some people from visiting.

This page is intentionally left blank