#### **City of York Council**

# **Equalities Impact Assessment**

## Who is submitting the proposal?

| Directorate:               |  | City Development        |                             |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Service Area:              |  | Parking                 |                             |
| Name of the proposa        | al:                                    | Review of Parking Charg | es                          |
| Lead officer:              |  | Garry Taylor            |                             |
| Date assessment completed: |  | 28 / 05 / 2025          |                             |
| Names of those who         | contributed to the assessi             | ment:                   |                             |
| Name                       | Job title                              | Organisation            | Area of expertise           |
| Helene Vergereau           | Head of Highway Access and Development | CYC                     | Highways and transport      |
| Darren Hobson              | Traffic Management Team Leader         |                         | Highways and transport      |
| Jav Safder                 | Parking Services Manager               | CYC                     | Parking`                    |
| Claire Foale               | Chief Strategy Officer                 | CYC                     | Strategy / City Development |

#### Step 1 – Aims and intended outcomes

#### 1.1 What is the purpose of the proposal?

Please explain your proposal in Plain English avoiding acronyms and jargon.

- The Local Transport Strategy was adopted by Executive in July 2024. The recently adopted Local Transport Strategy was based on extensive consultation about transport. During the consultation, residents told us the rhythm of their lives is dictated by the roads and networks that dominate our city, that congestion was a significant issue for many people and they supported reducing the number of car miles driven in the city with a target of reducing driven miles by 20% by 2030.
- Recognising this, Executive made several recommendations to Full Council for the Budget to change carparking charging, to reflect the public consultation on both the budget and Local Transport Strategy. These recommendations were informed by the extensive evidence base on parking charges as a tool to reduce traffic congestion.
- Since the new car parking charges have been implemented, their impact has caused concern to a range of communities and therefore Executive has asked for an opportunity to review these charges.
- Petitions have been received about the changes in parking prices at Bishopthorpe Road and East Parade. A letter has been received calling for a review of parking charges at Bishopthorpe Road under the Statutory Guidance - Right to challenge parking policies, Traffic Management Act 2004: Network Management Duty Guidance. This report details how this review will be managed (para 66).
- The parking pricing model that was approved as part of budget for City of York Council set a consistent parking price for parking across the city centre, with the aim of reducing congestion by making travel by bus, cycle and walking a more attractive option that driving into the city, and reducing congestion associated with searching for the cheapest parking places.
- As part of the budget for 2025/26, car parking prices across the centre of York were increased by an average of around 50% for the first and second hour, with the increase tapering off for subsequent

hours. This was designed to incentivise bus travel by making the first two hours of parking slightly more expensive that the cost of a family bus ticket. Assuming a short-term parking elasticity of -0.3, the anticipation was that the price increase would lead to a drop in demand of 10 to 15% and a potential reduction in traffic volumes of around 2%.

- For some areas of York, the new parking pricing model resulted in a very significant percentage increase in price, with the most extreme being at Bishopthorpe Road car park, one of very few areas near the city centre with anomalously low parking rates of under £1 an hour. This car park previously charged 80p for one hour, but under the new charges moved to £4.85 for the first hour: a 500% increase. Similarly, some on-street locations had anomalously low prices previously, making the new prices a significant rise. Independent traders and residents have raised concerns about the impact of such an increase on footfall and trade.
- Some adaptations to the parking price model have been developed in response to concerns that have been raised, providing a more graduated approach to the rise in parking prices in community shopping areas outside of the inner ring road, whilst being careful not to undermine the goals of the Local Transport Strategy.
- The proposed Parking Services charges changes are:
  - a) approve an increase in the discount for the Minster Badge to 30% of the standard parking charge, from the current 24%.
  - b) maintain existing on-street parking charges on and inside the inner ring road, with the following exception at (c);
  - c) to approve the adjusting of charges in the Micklegate and Priory Street area to the 'outside the inner ring road' on-street parking rate, rather than its existing higher city centre rate. This will be reviewed in the future. City centre evening parking rates for this area will still apply.

- d) maintain existing charging at all city centre car parks with the exception of Bishopthorpe Road, which it's proposed is moved in line with charges approved for community car parks at East Parade and Rowntree Park in the council's 2025-26 Budget.
- e) approve a standard lower rate <u>outside</u> the inner ring road to apply to on-street parking, matching rates at Bishopthorpe Road, East Parade and Rowntree Park Car Parks.
- f) approve that East Parade Car Park should remain matched to the 'outer' on-street local parking rate
- g) to remove the proposed charges for dedicated motorcycle bays.
- h) increase the discount for Low Emission vehicle permits to 20%, from the current 16% discount
- i) approve that Contract Parking permits are no longer linked to Season Tickets, and will be set at last year's prices, plus circa 5% increase, with a 20% discount for low emission vehicles.
- j) should Executive approve a change to the amount paid for the low vehicle emission discount, Contract, Season and ResPark permits holders will be refunded the difference.
- k) To note that, if approved, the new charges will need to be advertised in accordance with legislation, meaning those charges implemented will be subject to a pending review under the Traffic Management Act 2004 Right to Challenge Parking Policies.
- I) Accept the challenge to review parking charges under the Traffic Management Act 2004 in respect of Bishopthorpe Road and initiate the review.
- m) To approve that a further report will be brought back to Executive upon the conclusion of the review.
- n) To approve that the parking income budget is not changed at this time, whilst recognising the impact of the proposed changes could be in the region of £115k.

| o) To request that updates on parking usage and income is included in quarterly finance and      |  |
|--|--|
| performance monitoring reports and any variances are considered within the whole council budget. |  |

| 1.2 | Are there any external considerations? (Legislation/government directive/codes of practice etc.)                            |
|-----|---|
|     | Local authorities have the power to charge for on-street and off-street parking under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. |

| 1.3 | Who are the stakeholders and what are their interests?   |
|-----|--|
|     | On-street and off-street parking users (residents, visitors, etc), including those with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 Businesses and other services and premises (including medical centres, pharmacies, places of worship, etc), whose customers, suppliers, and visitors use CYC on-street and off-street parking to park their vehicle. |

| 1.4 | What results/outcomes do we want to achieve and for whom? This section should explain what  |
|-----|---|
|     | outcomes you want to achieve for service users, staff and/or the wider community. Demonstrate how the   |
|     | proposal links to the Council Plan (2019- 2023) and other corporate strategies and plans.   |
|     | <ul> <li>By changing how we move around the city, residents will benefit from a healthier, more sustainable and<br/>better-connected city. By reducing vehicle traffic, York will be an even better place to live, attracting<br/>investment and employment and helping residents live longer, happier, healthier lives.</li> </ul> |

- To be effective and reliable, and a viable option for residents, commuters and visitors, buses need to move through the city without being hindered by traffic congestion.
- The recently adopted Local Transport Strategy was based on extensive consultation about transport.
  During the consultation, residents told us the rhythm of their lives is dictated by the roads and networks
  that dominate our city, that congestion was a significant issue for many people and they supported
  reducing the number of car miles driven in the city with a target of reducing driven miles by 20% by
  2030.
- To review parking charges in respect of Bishopthorpe Road and bring a report back to Executive upon conclusion of the review

## **Step 2 – Gathering the information and feedback**

| 2.1                  | impact of the proposal on equality rights and human rights? Please consider a range of sources, including: consultation exercises, surveys, feedback from staff, stakeholders, participants, research repetite views of equality groups, as well your own experience of working in this area etc. |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Source               | of  | Reason for using   |
| data/su<br>evidenc   | pporting<br>e   |  |
| Budget               | consultation  | Starting back in May 2024, the council has undertaken a comprehensive budget consultation which concluded in December 2024. This is summarised from Paragraph 38 here: <a href="https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s181127/Executive%20Financial%20Strategy.pdf">https://democracy.york.gov.uk/documents/s181127/Executive%20Financial%20Strategy.pdf</a> Data from the consultation is available here: <a href="https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/aedff60d-99e5-4d67-ba8e-13dc0b6cf931/budget-consultation">https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/aedff60d-99e5-4d67-ba8e-13dc0b6cf931/budget-consultation</a> |
| Econom               | ic assessment   | The council has commissioned independent economic data about spend and transactions, together with collating footfall data. Although this will share information about the impact of the charges on the economy, it doesn't share information about the impact on communities, or specific community groups.   |
| Petitions<br>feedbac | s / business<br>k   | The council has received two petitions about the charges, with signatories expressing concern about the increased charges. In addition, residents and the business community have set out their concerns.  |
| Media c              | overage   | Residents and businesses have expressed their concerns and shared the impact of the increased charges with the local media, both in print and on the radio, and also via social media.   |
| Review               |   | The review will continue to collate the economic assessment information, together with feedback from residents and the business community to understand the impact.  |

## **Step 3 – Gaps in data and knowledge**

| 3.1                 | What are the main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your proposal? Please indicate how any gaps will be dealt with. |   |  |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Gaps in             | data or knowledge  | Action to deal with this  |  |
| Very lim<br>parking | ited data on current car park and on-street<br>use   | Some counters are due to be repaired with exploration about place/gsi data being explored with York BID - but data will continue to be limited for now unless surveys are commissioned. |  |
|                     | iled consultation undertaken for users and areas<br>the car parks considered here  | Monitor feedback once the decision has been taken and once the changes are implemented  |  |

#### **Step 4 – Analysing the impacts or effects.**

| 4.1 | Please consider what the evidence tells you about the likely impact (positive or negative) on people |
|-----|--|
|     | sharing a protected characteristic, i.e. how significant could the impacts be if we did not make any |
|     | adjustments? Remember the duty is also positive – so please identify where the proposal offers       |
|     | opportunities to promote equality and/or foster good relations.                                      |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Age                               | Blue Badge holders will continue to park free of charge. The negative impact of increased charges will be mainly on older people who may have difficulties walking or cycling but are not Blue Badge holders (including older people who may have more modest incomes). | Negative                                    | Medium                            |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts   | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
|                                   | The charges will also have a negative impact on young people/families who may not be able to use other modes of transport and use the car to access parks and other services. Budget Consultation responses: "Some residents did mention, however, that not every York resident has the option to avoid the city centre car parks, and this may disproportionately affect those without the ability to use public transport e.g. those with health issues". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report  Some areas, for example Bishopthorpe Road shops and services, are not well served by public transport, reducing the range of alternative modes of transport available. A review is taking place specifically focused on the Bishopthorpe Road area. |   |                                   |
|                                   | The increase in the discount for the Minster Badge to 30% of the standard parking charge, from the current 24%. may also have a negative impact on families with young children and young people living in Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMOs). Budget consultation response: "However, other residents did not think all multicar households were wealthy, and worried about the impact on larger families and houses of multiple occupancy (e.g. shared house)". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report   |   |                                   |

| Blue Badge holders will continue to park free of charge. The charge increases may however have a negative impact on Blue Badge holders who will need to purchase a permit or ticket for their vehicle if they need their Blue Badge to travel in a different vehicle.  Parking charge increases will have a negative impact on disabled people who do not hold a Blue Badge. This is   | Equality Groups and Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts   | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| reflected in the Budget Consultation responses: "Some residents did mention, however, that not every York resident has the option to avoid the city centre car parks, and this may disproportionately affect those without the ability to use public transport e.g. those with health issues". Source:  Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report  The increase in the discount for the Minster Badge to 30% of the standard parking charge, from the current 24%. may also have a negative impact on disabled people who do not hold a Blue Badge. This is reflected in the Budget Consultation responses: "Residents also expressed worries that it would disproportionately affect people who relied on cars for mobility and had to park outside their homes for this reason". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report | Disability                        | The charge increases may however have a negative impact on Blue Badge holders who will need to purchase a permit or ticket for their vehicle if they need their Blue Badge to travel in a different vehicle.  Parking charge increases will have a negative impact on disabled people who do not hold a Blue Badge. This is reflected in the Budget Consultation responses: "Some residents did mention, however, that not every York resident has the option to avoid the city centre car parks, and this may disproportionately affect those without the ability to use public transport e.g. those with health issues". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report  The increase in the discount for the Minster Badge to 30% of the standard parking charge, from the current 24%. may also have a negative impact on disabled people who do not hold a Blue Badge. This is reflected in the Budget Consultation responses: "Residents also expressed worries that it would disproportionately affect people who relied on cars for mobility and had to park outside their homes for this reason". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – | Negative                                    | Medium                            |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|                                   | Some areas, for example Bishopthorpe Road shops and services, are not well served by public transport, reducing the range of alternative modes of transport available.  |   |                                   |
|                                   | The reduction in the discount available for parking permits in ResPark areas for low emission cars (increase the discount for Low Emission vehicle permits to 20%, from the current 16% discount may have a negative impact on Blue Badge holders.  |   |                                   |
|                                   | This is because although Blue Badge holders can generally park free of charge in residential parking areas and CYC car parks when they display their Blue Badge in the parked vehicle, they will need to purchase a permit or ticket for their vehicle if they need their Blue Badge to travel in a different vehicle.  Adapted cars purchased through specialist schemes such as Motability are often low emission vehicles and therefore Blue Badge holders are likely to benefit from the low emission car |   |                                   |
|                                   | discounts. This was noted in the Budget Consultation responses: "A notable objection to this came from disabled residents, who often get hybrid cars as part of their Personal Independence Payments. They pointed out that it is not always wealthy residents who have low emission vehicles, and that they are  |   |                                   |

| Equality Groups<br>and<br>Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|   | grateful for the current discount". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report   |   |                                   |
| Gender                                  | Increased parking charges are likely to have a negative impact on people who may decide to use a private car to travel for safety and security reasons as they will have to pay more to park in CYC car parks and on street parking.  This may apply, for example, to women who may need to access a workplace or services early in the morning or late in the evening when bus services are inexistent or less frequent and do not feel safe cycling or walking to and from their destination. | Negative                                    | Medium                            |
| Gender<br>Reassignment                  | The same impacts identified under "Gender" apply here.  | Negative                                    | Medium                            |
| Marriage and civil partnership          | No differential impact identified   | n/a   | n/a                               |
| Pregnancy and maternity                 | Negative impact on people who are pregnant or travelling with babies and young children and may struggle to walk or cycle to access shops, services, parks, etc but do not have a Blue Badge.   | Negative                                    | Medium                            |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights. | Key Findings/Impacts   | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
|                                   | The charges will have a negative impact on young people/families who may not be able to use other modes of transport and use the car to access parks and other services. Budget Consultation responses: "Some residents did mention, however, that not every York resident has the option to avoid the city centre car parks, and this may disproportionately affect those without the ability to use public transport e.g. those with health issues". Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report  Some areas, for example Bishopthorpe Road shops and services, are not well served by public transport, reducing the range of alternative modes of transport available. |   |                                   |
| Race                              | The same impacts identified under "Gender" apply here.   | Negative                                    | Medium                            |
| Religion and belief               | nd belief  used to offer free parking on Sundays to support access to main religious services.   |   | Medium                            |
|                                   | The same impacts identified under "Gender" may also apply here.  |   |                                   |
| Sexual orientation                | The same impacts identified under "Gender" apply here.   | Negative                                    | Medium                            |

| Equality Groups<br>and<br>Human Rights.       |   |          | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|---|---|----------|-----------------------------------|
| Other Socio-<br>economic groups<br>including: | Could other socio-economic groups be affected e.g. carers, ex-offenders, low incomes?   |          |                                   |
| Carer   | Impacts on carers are similar to impacts identified under the "Age" and "Disability" categories.  Where charges make it more expensive to access shops (such as Bishopthorpe Road and East Parade), this may have a negative impact on carers shopping or picking up prescriptions for the people they care for.  This is reflected in the Budget Consultation responses where carers were significantly more likely to oppose the increase in parking charges (41%), compared to non-carers (29%). Source: Budget Consultation 2025/26 (Winter) – Report | Negative | Medium                            |
| Low income groups                             | Although the objective of the changes is to encourage the use of public transport and sustainable modes of transport, increases in charges are likely to have a negative impact on low-income groups who may not be able to continue accessing shops, services, parks, etc by car and may not be able to use alternative modes of transport.  | Negative | Medium                            |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights.                       | Key Findings/Impacts              | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Veterans, Armed Forces Community Other                  | No differential impact identified | n/a   | n/a                               |
| Impact on human rights: List any human rights impacted. | No human rights impact identified |   |                                   |

#### **Step 5 - Mitigating adverse impacts and maximising positive impacts**

Based on your findings, explain ways you plan to mitigate any unlawful prohibited conduct or unwanted adverse impact. Where positive impacts have been identified, what is been done to optimise opportunities to advance equality or foster good relations?

Blue Badge holders will continue to be able to park free of charge in car parks, on street and in Resident parking areas.

City of York Council has adopted the Council's Local Transport Strategy which aims to improve the availability and quality of sustainable modes of transport. Measures included in the budget, in line with he Transport Strategy, aim to support the use of sustainable modes of transport. These measures include bus subsidies, investment in active and sustainable travel, and highway improvements which will support a greater range of people (including more people with protected characteristics) to choose to use sustainable modes of travel, improving health and wellbeing and helping to reduce car dependency.

The increased parking charges may have a positive impact (by helping to reduce traffic congestion, increasing the reliability of bus services, making the roads safer for walking and cycling). There is also the potential for positive impact in terms of improved air quality (due to reduced traffic congestion).

Regarding free parking previously provided for 5 places of worship, we will consult with the York Interfaith Group as to whether any of these places are a unique place of worship for that faith and how best to communicate on the parking charges. The proposed changes to the start times for Park and Ride in Summer 2025 are likely to have a positive impact for worshippers. By reducing the amount of increases from those originally approved at Full Council the impacts will be reduced. In terms of severity, but not completely mitigated.

The review of car parking at Bishopthorpe Road and ongoing assessment of economic impact will create an evidence base to inform future decisions.

## **Step 6 – Recommendations and conclusions of the assessment**

| 6.1     | Having considered the potential or actual impacts you should be in a position to make an informed judgement on what should be done. In all cases, document your reasoning that justifies your decision. There are four main options you can take: |   |  |
|---------|---|---|--|
| po      | tential for unlawful discr  | <b>Proposal</b> – the EIA demonstrates the proposal is robust. There is no rimination or adverse impact and you have taken all opportunities to er good relations, subject to continuing monitor and review.  |  |
| Option  | selected  | Conclusions/justification   |  |
| Continu | ue with the proposal  | City of York Council has adopted the Council's Local Transport Strategy which aims to improve the availability and quality of sustainable modes of transport. Measures included in the budget, in line with he Transport Strategy, aim to support the use of sustainable modes of transport. These measures include bus subsidies, investment in active and sustainable travel, and highway improvements which will support a greater range of people (including more people with protected characteristics) to choose to use sustainable modes of travel, improving health and wellbeing and helping to reduce car dependency. The proposed revised parking charges may have a positive impact (by helping to reduce traffic congestion, increasing the reliability of bus services, making the roads safer for walking and cycling). There is also the potential for positive impact in terms of improved air quality (due to reduced traffic congestion). Whether the policy of carparking charges to prompt modal shift can only be understood in "real time" as residents. Commuters and visitors make choices about travel into and around the city and the council gathers the transport, economic and impact data to understand the impact of these changes. This will need to alongside qualitative data to understand the impact on protected communities lived experience. |  |

## **Step 7 – Summary of agreed actions resulting from the assessment**

| 7.1 What action, by whom, will be undertaken as a result of the impact assessment.   |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Impact/issue   | Action to be taken  | Person   | Timescale   |  |
|  |   | responsible  |   |  |
| Monitor potential for negative impact on protected groups (as identified above)  | Monitoring impacts through parking, bus and economic data collection (where available) and feedback received by CYC (quantitative data) | Michael Howard, Head<br>of Highways and<br>Transport   | On-going once changes are implemented and to inform the review, and its consultation, for Executive consideration |  |
| Potential negative impact<br>for worshippers no longer<br>having access to free<br>parking on a Sunday<br>(unless Blue Badge<br>Holder). | Consult with York Interfaith Forum specifically on impact on changes to Sunday parking  | Laura Swiszczowski,<br>Head of Equity,<br>Diversity & Inclusion  | Summer 2025   |  |
| The impact of significant prices rises impacting on groups with protected characteristics  | As part of the review of the impact of charges, consult with different community groups (qualitative data)                              | Mike James Head of Communications and Engagement and Laura Swiszczowski, Head of Equity, Diversity & Inclusion | Summer 2025   |  |

# **Step 8 - Monitor, review and improve**

| 8. 1 | How will the impact of your proposal be monitored and improved upon going forward? Consider how will you identify the impact of activities on protected characteristics and other marginalised groups going forward? How will any learning and enhancements be capitalised on and embedded? |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|
|      | CYC will collate and review feedback following the decision to revise the charges and the implementation of the changes. This will be brought to Executive for subsequent consideration.  Charges are typically reviewed annually, with the impact monitored at 3,6 and 9 months.           |  |  |