

EIA Title	Review of Charges for Parking In Countryside Estate Car Parks			
Did you use the EIA Screening Tool? (Please tick or specify)	Yes (Please attach upon submission)		No	X

# 1. Explaining the matter being assessed

What policy, function or service change are you assessing?	The Council is considering removing charges for parking at 15 countryside car parks because the charging regime no longer aligns with the council's heath & well-being strategy, its Greener Futures programme or the findings of the national review of national parks and AONBs (The Glover Review)			
Why does this EIA need to be completed?	The current policy of charging visitors to park at 15 Countryside Estate car parks has been identified as a potential reason for key groups e.g. families with children and low-income households from visiting the countryside			
Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?	All visitors to Surrey Countryside Estate land (residents and non-residents.			
How does your service proposal support the outcomes in the Community Vision for Surrey 2030?	Everyone lives healthy, active and fulfilling lives, and makes good choices about their well-being  Residents live in clean, safe and green communities, where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities.			
	County Wide	X	Runnymede	
Are there any specific	Elmbridge		Spelthorne	
geographies in Surrey where	Epsom and Ewell		Surrey Heath	
this will make an impact?	Guildford		Tandridge	
(Please tick or specify)	Mole Valley		Waverley	
	Reigate and Banstead		Woking	
	Not Applicable			
	County Divisions (please	specif	y if appropriate):	
Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals?	The Caring for the Countryside Survey (October – November 2018) identified the following:  40% of respondees wanted to see free car parking			
	33% of respondees stated that parking charges were a barrier to access to the countryside			



## 2. Service Users / Residents

There are 10 protected characteristics to consider in your proposal. These are:

- 1. Age including younger and older people
- 2. Disability
- 3. Gender reassignment
- 4. Pregnancy and maternity
- 5. Race including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality
- 6. Religion or belief including lack of belief
- 7. Sex
- 8. Sexual orientation
- 9. Marriage/civil partnerships
- 10. Carers protected by association

Though not included in the Equality Act 2010, Surrey County Council recognises that socio-economic disadvantage is a significant contributor to inequality across the County and therefore regards this as an additional factor.

Therefore, if relevant, you will need to include information on this. Please refer to the EIA guidance if you are unclear as to what this is.



#### **AGE**

What information (data) do you have on affected service users/residents with this characteristic?

Age Low income households Families with children

Impacts (Please tick or specify)	Positive	x	N	egative		Both	
Impacts identi	fied	Supporting evide	nce	How will yo positive/minimpacts?	u maximise nimise negative	When will this be implemented by?	()Wnor
	15 countryside July 2018. Surrey reduce he initial post- period. Visitor improved but are ed to achieve the	Consultation surve identified the cost parking as a barrie accessing the cou	of er to	parking in coparks will relaccess.  Free parking encourage in the countrys	nore visitors to	1 April 2020	Surrey CC in partnership with Surrey Wildlife Trust

What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of

If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.

Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why

Identifies negative impacts that can't be mitigated, together with evidence.

You will need to repeat the box below (copy and paste) for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted.

## 3. Staff

#### AGE

What information do you have on the affected staff with this characteristic?

### Not Applicable

Impacts	Positive		Negative		Both	
Impacts ident	ified	Supporting evidence		ou maximise nimise negative	When will this be implemented by?	Owner
What impacts had Add more rows	ave you identified? if you need to	What are you basing this on?	Actions to mi	itigate or enhance	Due date	Who is responsible for this?

What other changes is the council planning that may affect the same groups of staff? Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of

If so, please detail your awareness of whether this will exacerbate impacts for those with protected characteristics and the mitigating actions that will be taken to limit the cumulative impacts of these changes.



Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why

Identifies negative impacts that can't be mitigated, together with evidence.

You will need to repeat the box below (copy and paste) for each of the protected characteristics likely to be impacted

# 4. Amendments to the proposals

CHANGE	REASON FOR CHANGE
What changes have you made as a result of this EIA?	Why have these changes been made?
None	Not Applicable

## 5. Recommendation

Based your assessment, please indicate which course of action you are recommending to decision makers. You should explain your recommendation in the in the blank box below.

Outcome Number	Description	Tick
Outcome One	No major change to the policy/service/function required. This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken	X
Outcome Two	Adjust the policy/service/function to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?	
Outcome Three	Continue the policy/service/function despite potential for negative impact or missed opportunities to advance equality identified. You will need to make sure the EIA clearly sets out the justifications for continuing with it. You need to consider whether there are:  • Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact • Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact.	
Outcome Four	Stop and rethink the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination (For guidance on what is unlawful discrimination, refer to the Equality and Human Rights Commission's guidance and Codes of Practice on the Equality Act concerning employment, goods and services and equal pay, available <a href="here">here</a> ).	
Please use the box on the right to explain the rationale for your recommendation		



### **6a. Version Control**

Version Number	Purpose/Change	Author	Date
V1	Final Draft	Alan Bowley	12/11/19

The above provides historical data about each update made to the Equality Impact Assessment. Please do include the name of the author, date and notes about changes made – so that you are able to refer back to what changes have been made throughout this iterative process. For further information, please see the EIA Guidance document on version control.

## 6b. Approval

	Name	Date approved
	Gillian Steward, Executive Director of Highways, Transport and Environment	14/11/19
Approved by*		

EIA Author	Alan Bowley
------------	-------------

<sup>\*</sup>Secure approval from the appropriate level of management based on nature of issue and scale of change being assessed.

### 6c. EIA Team

Name	Job Title	Organisation	Team Role

If you would like this information in large print, Braille, on CD or in another language please contact us on:

Tel: 03456 009 009

Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 03456 009 009

SMS: 07860 053 465

Email: contact.centre@surreycc.gov.uk

