

Annex 3

|  |  |   |    |  |
|--|--|---|----|--|
| <b>EIA Title</b>   | Parking Strategy Update                |   |    |  |
| <b>Did you use the EIA Screening Tool?</b><br>(Please tick or specify) | Yes<br>(Please attach upon submission) | X | No |  |

## 1. Explaining the matter being assessed

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>What policy, function or service change are you assessing?</b>   | <i>On Street Parking Management and Regulation.</i>   |
| <b>Why does this EIA need to be completed?</b>  | <i>For evaluation of impact before Cabinet approval of new policy</i>   |
| <b>Who is affected by the proposals outlined above?</b>   | <i>Surrey residents and all highway users. The proposals may have a specific impact on old, young, disabled residents or those with a socio-economic disadvantage.</i>  |
| <b>How does your service proposal support the outcomes in <a href="#">the Community Vision for Surrey 2030</a>?</b> | <p><b>Residents live in clean, safe and green communities where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities.</b> The proposals in this report include changes to resident permits that will encourage the use of off street parking thus freeing up road space. Setting increasing charges for multiple permit applications could encourage few multi vehicle applications from a single household. Other proposals include ways of improving safety outside schools and reducing antisocial pavement parking.</p> <p><b>Businesses in Surrey thrive.</b> Regular parking reviews help keep pace with changes to the wider built environment and the introduction of improved limited waiting facilities near shops and businesses will improve access to them for customers and deliveries.</p> <p><b>Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable and safer.</b> Regular parking reviews can keep on top of obstructive parking issues and new powers to introduce red routes and camera enforcement can help improve traffic flow and safety.</p> |



|   |   |   |              |  |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|
|   | <p><b>By 2030 we want Surrey to be a uniquely special place where everyone has a great start to life, people live healthy and fulfilling lives, are able to achieve their full potential and contribute to their community and no one is left behind.</b> The provision of disabled parking bays, medical permits, carers permits for no charge to the applicant will help improve the mobility of disabled residents as well as access to more vulnerable residents who are in need of care by medical staff or relatives.</p> |   |              |  |
| <p><b>Are there any specific geographies in Surrey where this will make an impact?</b><br/>(Please tick or specify)</p> | County Wide   | X | Runnymede    |  |
|   | Elmbridge   |   | Spelthorne   |  |
|   | Epsom and Ewell   |   | Surrey Heath |  |
|   | Guildford   |   | Tandridge    |  |
|   | Mole Valley   |   | Waverley     |  |
|   | Reigate and Banstead  |   | Woking       |  |
|   | Not Applicable  |   |              |  |
|   | County Divisions (please specify if appropriate):   |   |              |  |
| <p><b>Briefly list what evidence you have gathered on the impact of your proposals?</b></p>                             | <p><i>Consultation with district and borough enforcement teams</i></p>  |   |              |  |

## 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, Disability and Carers protected by association

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

*Older people drive and use parking related services like everyone else however they are more likely to be in need of carers permits.*

*Younger people may need childcare at home by a paid carer. We are planning to provide childcare permits to cater for this.*

| Impacts<br>(Please tick or specify)                                    | Positive           | x | Negative  |   | Both                              |                      |
|--|--------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
|  | Impacts identified |   | Supporting evidence   | How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts? | When will this be implemented by? | Owner                |
| <i>Carers permits will be provided free of charge (instead of £10)</i> |                    |   | <i>Reduced cost means more likelihood of uptake/less impact</i> | <i>Web page info</i>                                      | <i>April 2020</i>                 | <i>D&amp;B Teams</i> |
| Childcare permits will be provided which were not previously available |                    |   | Child carers more able to park near property                    | Web Page info   | April 2020                        | D&B Teams            |
|  |                    |   |   |   |                                   |                      |

**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**

*None identified*

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

*None identified*

## Socio-Economic Impact

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

*The policy review includes proposed increases to the cost of parking permits for residents and visitors. This will make the cost of running a car more expensive if it is to be parked on the road in a permit scheme. This could impact car owners on low income.*

| Impacts<br>(Please tick or specify)   | Positive   |  | Negative |   | Both                              | X                           |
|---|--|--|----------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Impacts identified  | Supporting evidence  |  |          | How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?   | When will this be implemented by? | Owner                       |
| <p><i>Additional costs – £30 per year for first permit and £25 for second, £55 for third permit</i></p> | <p><i>Running a vehicle can be expensive, costs (insurance, servicing, repairs, VED) can be £150 per month not including fuel and purchase/lease costs.<br/>Total costs could be £400 per month.<br/>An annual on street parking permit currently costs £50 per year (£4.16 per month) and will rise to £80 (£6.67 per month).<br/>Second and subsequent permits currently cost £75 per year (or £6.25 per month) and will rise to</i></p> |  |          | <p><i>Cost increases are not considered significant compared to the overall cost of running a vehicle compared to the benefit of being able to park more conveniently closer to home.<br/>The increasing cost of purchasing multiple permits is intentional and planned to deter this behaviour so as to share available road space more evenly between households in a permit scheme (whilst accepting there are households that need this facility)</i></p> | <p><i>April 2020</i></p>          | <p><i>D&amp;B Teams</i></p> |

|   |   |               |            |           |
|---|---|---------------|------------|-----------|
|   | £100 (£8.33 per month) or £130 (£10.83 per month)   |               |            |           |
| Additional costs<br><br>Resident Visitor permits could increase to £3 (from £2) per day in larger town centres.   | Addition £1 (from £2 to £3) cost of all day parking for visitors could impact some however this is off set by the introduction of a £1 3 hour permit. Many residents have visitors for a few hours so in some circumstances costs may reduce. | Web Page info | April 2020 | D&B Teams |
| <p><b>What other changes is the council planning/already in place that may affect the same groups of residents?<br/>Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of</b></p> <p><i>None identified</i></p> <p><b>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</b></p> <p><i>None identified</i></p> |   |               |            |           |

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

## 3. Staff

| AGE   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>What information do you have on the affected staff with this characteristic?</b>   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| N/A   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| <b>Impacts</b>  | Positive                            |  | Negative   | Both                                     |                                     |
| <b>Impacts identified</b>   | <b>Supporting evidence</b>          |  | <b>How will you maximise positive/minimise negative impacts?</b> | <b>When will this be implemented by?</b> | <b>Owner</b>                        |
| <i>What impacts have you identified?<br/>Add more rows if you need to</i>   | <i>What are you basing this on?</i> |  | <i>Actions to mitigate or enhance impacts</i>                    | <i>Due date</i>                          | <i>Who is responsible for this?</i> |
|   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
|   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| <b>What other changes is the council planning that may affect the same groups of staff?<br/>Are there any dependencies decisions makers need to be aware of</b>   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| <i>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.</i> |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| <b>Any negative impacts that cannot be mitigated? Please identify impact and explain why</b>  |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |
| <i>Identifies negative impacts that can't be mitigated, together with evidence.</i>   |                                     |  |  |  |                                     |

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                                       |
|--|---|
| <i>What changes have you made as a result of this EIA?</i>   | <i>Why have these changes been made?</i>                |
| We have considered increasing permit charges by smaller, more frequent increments in the future. This will be included as part of the statutory process to implement agreed changes to permit charges. | To reduce the financial impact on users of this service |
|  |   |

## 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 |
|---|--|------|
| <b>Outcome One</b>  | <b>No major change to the policy/service/function required.</b><br>This EIA has not identified any potential for discrimination or negative impact, and all opportunities to promote equality have been undertaken   | x    |
| <b>Outcome Two</b>  | <b>Adjust the policy/service/function</b> to remove barriers identified by the EIA or better advance equality. Are you satisfied that the proposed adjustments will remove the barriers you identified?  |      |
| <b>Outcome Three</b>  | <b>Continue the policy/service/function</b> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient plans to stop or minimise the negative impact</li> <li>• Mitigating actions for any remaining negative impacts plans to monitor the actual impact.</li> </ul> |      |
| <b>Outcome Four</b>   | <b>Stop and rethink</b> the policy when the EIA shows actual or potential unlawful discrimination<br>(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</a> ).   |      |
| <i>Please use the box on the right to explain the rationale for your recommendation</i> | Although permit charges are planned to increase they still represent a small portion of the cost of running a motor vehicle and are good value compared to providing an off street parking space in a car park or new driveway.<br>Changes to carer and visitor permits will make them more flexible offer lower costs for many.   |      |





## 6a. Version Control

| Version Number | Purpose/Change | Author     | Date             |
|----------------|----------------|------------|------------------|
| 1              |                | David Curl | 11 December 2019 |
|                |                |            |                  |

*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 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Approved by*</b> | <i>Head of Service</i>            | 13/01/20      |
|                     | <i>Executive Director</i>         | 13/01/20      |
|                     | <i>Cabinet Member</i>             | 13/01/20      |
|                     | <i>Directorate Equality Group</i> | 13/01/20      |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>EIA Author</b> |  |
|-------------------|--|

*\*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 |
|------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|
| David Curl | Parking Manager  | SCC          | Leader    |
| Rikki Hill | Projects Manager | SCC          | Analyst   |

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: [contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk)