

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration (EDCI) screening

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being or has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

Directorate: Communities, Housing and Environment	Service area: Climate , Energy and Green Spaces
Lead person: Claire Hern	Contact number: 3786002

1. Title: Car Park Charges Golden Acre Park, Middleton Park, Otley Chevin, Roundhay Park and Temple Newsam

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

If other, please specify

2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The introduction of charges for car parking at the following parks: Golden Acre, Middleton, Otley Chevin, Roundhay and Temple Newsam.

The aim of doing this is to raise funds to facilitate necessary maintenance and improvement works to the car parks at those sites and encourage visitors to travel to parks on foot, bike and public transport to help reduce the impact of driving on the climate emergency and air pollution in the city.

3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies and policies, service and functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater or lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Also those areas that impact on or relate to equality: tackling poverty and improving health and well-being.

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	x	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?	x	
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		x
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		x
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment • Advancing equality of opportunity • Fostering good relations 	x	

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration? (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

The consultation for Golden Acre and Otley Chevin commenced on Wednesday 11 October and ended on Sunday 5 November. Posters were displayed at both sites containing details of how to respond with paper copies made available at the café at Golden Acre and at local libraries and links to the survey widely shared on social media. Overall, 4,493 people completed the survey for Golden Acre Park and 2,964 for Otley Chevin Forest Park.

The consultation for Middleton Park, Roundhay Park and Temple Newsam commenced on Friday 22 December and ended on Sunday 21 January. Posters were displayed at each site containing details of how to respond with paper copies made available on site and links to the survey widely shared on social media. Overall, 6,585 responses were received for Middleton Park, 3,126 for Roundhay Park and 2,398 for Temple Newsam.

EDI analysis undertaken in relation to the car parking charges demonstrated that:

- Older people are less likely to use the car parks and less likely to disagree
- Disabled people are no more likely to use the car parks than others and less likely to disagree
- Carers are slightly more likely to use the car parks and slightly more likely to disagree
- Females are slightly more likely to use the car parks and more likely to disagree
- Although there were some differences within different ethnic groups, none were statistically significant.

Analysis of Census deprivation data, which is a classification of four types of deprivation; employment, education, health and disability, and household overcrowding, suggests that the following wards in Leeds have the highest proportion of deprivation affected by at least two of these factors; Gipton & Harehills, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Killingbeck & Seacroft, Middleton Park and Armley Park. See the comparison table below showing the proportion of households in these wards who do not have access to a car or van.

Ward	Most deprived (affected by at least of the above factors)	Proportion of households who do not have access to a car or van
Gipton & Harehills	31.3%	47.6%
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	29.7%	52%

Killingbeck & Seacroft	29.4%	37.1%
Middleton Park	26.7%	35.3%
Armley	25.5%	42.3%

As the percentage of those who do not have access to a car is higher than the percentage of most deprived in each area, it is reasonable to determine that those living in greatest deprivation do not own a car and will therefore not be the ones impacted by the introduction of car parking charges.

Encouraging people to use public transport or to walk or cycle to our city parks will provide air quality benefits. From the Environment Agency’s State of the Environment, Sep 2020 report: Longterm exposure to air pollution has been associated with dementia, heart disease, stroke and some cancers. Particulate matter and NO2 alone have been estimated to have health costs of around £22.6 billion every year. Poor health associated with, or exacerbated by, air pollution leads to time off work and reduced productivity. Illness associated with air pollution affects children’s education and can lead to fewer employment options in adult life. Inequalities in environmental quality and accessibility all contribute to health inequalities in England. The poorest people often live and work in the most polluted environments. They also have higher rates of underlying health conditions that may make them more vulnerable to the effects of pollution.

Internet research shows there is no conclusion or steer from the Government over the use and acceptance of cash other than it is not a legal right to protect the use of cash, however from a Parking perspective it is still in legislation that a penalty charge notice (PCN (parking fine)) has to have a system in place to allow for the customer to pay for their PCN via cash. The national audit office produced a report on the 18th September 2020 titled ‘The production and distribution of cash’ that showed there is a significant decline in cash where the opening line into the conclusion of the report was “The declining use of cash is placing increasing pressure on the sustainability of the infrastructure for producing and distributing cash.”

The increasing costs of handling cash needs to be considered alongside access to bank cards and smart phones. According to figures from the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) published in August 2023, 2.1% of the country’s adult population do not have access to a bank account. 4% of people do not have a smart phone. It is proposed that the parking machines will not accept cash payments, due to the risk of vandalism occurring to the machines. A recent study of how payments are made to other LCC machines across the city shows that only 15% of users chose to pay with cash, even though in some cases cash is cheaper than paying by card or app.

- Key findings

(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)

- Charging for car parking could negatively impact on people with disabilities who are reliant on cars for travel

- An initial assessment of existing car parking facilities has been made and some car parking provision is currently unmarked, poorly surfaced, lacks directional and information signage and often does not maximise use of the available space
- Disproportionate impact on residents on lower incomes who may feel unable to visit the specific parks if they have to pay for parking
- To avoid the problem of vandalism, the parking ticket machines will not have an option to purchase tickets using cash and will only accept payments using a bank card or a parking app. This could cause an issue for people who do not have access to a bank account or a compatible mobile phone. It has been flagged that there is a potential that this could disproportionately impact on the elderly.
- Female employees working within businesses that use the car parks and that operate after dark may choose to not use the car park due to the cost and therefore have to walk further and feel more vulnerable
- Evidence shows that poor air quality disproportionately impacts certain vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, people with underlying health conditions and pregnant women. Therefore, encouraging people to travel by alternative means to the car provides a positive impact to these groups.

- **Actions**

(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)

- A blanket charge for all users could negatively impact disabled people who rely on a car to access the sites so, as part of the proposed scheme, we intend to ensure sufficient disabled parking bays are available in each car park and exempt blue badge holders from the proposed charges.
- Investment into the car parks will help to make them more welcoming, safer and more accessible for all, especially disabled and elderly visitors and families with young children through better signage, more disabled spaces, clearer walking routes and more even/level surfaces. The planned investment in the car parks funded by the charges will enable us to bring them up to the British Standard BS 8300-1:2018 which covers the “Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment” and brings together elements of the current “Part M” building regulations and the Equality Act 2010 which now encompasses the Disability Discrimination Act, Sex discrimination and Race Relations Acts.
- The proposal could also potentially have a disproportionate impact on residents on lower incomes who may feel unable to visit the parks if they have to pay for parking. However, evidence suggests that people on the lowest incomes in society are unlikely to own and run a car so the charges would not impact them. In

addition, the charges proposed are very modest (and comparable to the cost of a return bus ticket in the city) to mitigate the potential problem of reducing access to the parks for people on lower incomes. It should also be noted that parking at local community parks with car parks is not part of this scheme and will remain free.

- Car park improvements will also include the addition of bike stands to encourage people to cycle to parks for the benefits of cycling for health and the environment. In addition, we will look into the possibility of linking the parks into the Beryl Bikes initiative for those who don't have access to their own bike as part of this scheme
- For members of the public who do not have a bank account, monthly and annual parking tickets will be available to purchase from park shops using cash (or a bank card). The parking tickets can then used at any of the parks' sites.
- It has been noted that mobile phone signal may fluctuate across the city depending on the network and area. We are in contact with network providers to try and improve the signal across the city and offer options to pay that do not require a mobile phone or signal, such as making payments at the nearest Paypoint location. Signal loss will not be accepted to appeal a PCN unless there are other extenuating circumstances. For example, mobility or breathing issues which may impact the customer's ability to reach Paypoint locations would be considered, however proof would be required when lodging an appeal.
- Lower income workers, especially females, in non-Council businesses based in parks (e.g. cafes) may avoid the car parks if charges are implemented to save on costs. This could lead to them having to walk through parks in the dark at times (e.g. in winter) to get to their cars which has raised concerns about safety. The charges will only apply up to 8pm. The charges are proposed to be set at affordable levels (£1 for 2 hours, £2.50 for up to 4 hours, £4 for all day and £80 for an annual permit, which is the equivalent of £1.50 per week) We will investigate allowing the relevant businesses to purchase passes that can be transferred between employees when at work to help mitigate this risk.
- Post implementation the service will continue to listen to feedback on the scheme, especially from those with protected characteristics.

5. If you are **not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you **will need to carry out an impact assessment.****

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:

Date to complete your impact assessment	
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	

6. Governance, ownership and approval		
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening		
Name	Job title	Date
Polly Cook	Chief Officer Climate, Energy and Green Spaces	13 May 2024
Date screening completed		

7. Publishing	
<p>Though all key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council only publishes those related to Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions or a Significant Operational Decision.</p> <p>A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council. • The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions. • A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk for record. <p>Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:</p>	
For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to Governance Services	Date sent:
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate Directorate	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk	Date sent: