

**City of York Council**  
**Equalities Impact Assessment**

|   |  |                     |                          |
|---|--|---------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Directorate:</b>                                       | Place  |                     |                          |
| <b>Service Area:</b>                                      | Transport  |                     |                          |
| <b>Name of the proposal :</b>                             | Consideration of changes to the City Centre Traffic regulation order<br>Removal of exemptions for city centre access during the pedestrian hours and introduction of dedicated blue badge parking bays on selected streets |                     |                          |
| <b>Lead officer:</b>                                      | Helene Vergereau / Darren Hobson   |                     |                          |
| <b>Date assessment completed:</b>                         | 03/11/2021   |                     |                          |
| <b>Names of those who contributed to the assessment :</b> |  |                     |                          |
| <b>Name</b>   | <b>Job title</b>   | <b>Organisation</b> | <b>Area of expertise</b> |
| Helene Vergereau  | Traffic and Highway Development Manager  | CYC                 | Transport                |
| Darren Hobson   | Traffic Management Team Leader   | CYC                 | Transport                |
| David Atkinson  | Head of Highways and Transport   | CYC                 | Transport                |
| Heidi Lehane  | Senior Solicitor   | CYC                 | Legal                    |
|   |  |                     |                          |

## Step 1 – Aims and intended outcomes

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| <b>1.1</b> | <b>What is the purpose of the proposal?</b><br>Please explain your proposal in Plain English avoiding acronyms and jargon.   |
|            | <p>In November 2020, the Executive took the decision to initiate the process to permanently remove Blue Badge access exemptions from some city centre streets (listed below), and delegated the authority to make decisions on the final proposals, mitigations and process to the Executive Member for Transport.</p> <p>The decision to advertise the proposal to amend the exemptions included in the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for York's city centre area was made in June 2021. The statutory consultation for the amendment of the TRO was advertised on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021, with an original end date of 6<sup>th</sup> August 2021, which was extended until 13<sup>th</sup> August 2021.</p> <p>The current permanent TRO prohibits vehicles from accessing the footstreets between 10.30am and 5pm every day, with an exemption for vehicles with a Blue Badge on the streets listed below. Other exemptions apply for emergency vehicles and where access has been permitted by the Highway Authority (waivers).</p> <p>The aim of the proposal is to remove the access exemption for vehicles with a Blue Badge for the streets listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Blake Street</li><li>• Church Street</li><li>• Colliergate</li><li>• Goodramgate (between Deangate and King's Square)</li><li>• King's Square</li><li>• Lendal</li><li>• St Helen's Square</li></ul> <p>The proposal also includes improvements to Blue Badge parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area, proposing to introduce dedicated Blue Badge parking bays on Carmelite Street, Deangate, Duncombe Place, Dundas Street, St Andrewgate and St Saviourgate, a shared Blue Badge parking/loading bay on Duncombe Place, and a 'No Loading' at any time restriction on Aldwark.</p> <p>The proposal in the body of the report form part of a wider review of the future of the City Centre and as part of this there has been over 18 months of public engagement with residents, businesses and interest groups including disability groups. The format of this</p> |

engagement was co-designed with York Disability Rights Forum who were consulted on how to run accessible workshops and had British sign language interpreters.

This EIA considers the proposed removal of blue badge exemptions permitting access to footstreets during pedestrianised hours (as listed above and excluding Castlegate), proposed improvements to Blue Badge parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area (as listed above), and the proposals through the Active Travel Fund bid, to improve disabled access routes into and around the city centre (or equivalent funding should the bid be unsuccessful). A separate EIA considers the proposed changes to footstreet hours.

The proposal considered here aims to:

- Increase public safety and avoid danger to persons in areas of high footfall, recognising the Council's duty to protect the public from terrorism. The removal of the exemption will support the implementation of hostile vehicle mitigation measures to reduce the risk of a vehicle as a weapon attack. Reducing the number of vehicles accessing the streets listed above will enable the delivery of physical measures to restrict vehicular access during footstreet hours to protect these areas;
- Reduce the number of vehicles accessing the streets listed above, reducing the level of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, particularly in busy periods;
- Enable the use of some areas of the carriageway or footways as pavement café areas during footstreet hours, improving the amenities of the footstreet area;
- Improve Blue Badge parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area and improve disabled access routes into and around the city centre.

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| <b>1.2</b> | <b>Are there any external considerations?</b> (Legislation/government directive/codes of practice etc.)  |
|            | <p>Temporary arrangements currently in place - Under the City's Economic Recovery Plan and the Government's Safer Public Place Guidance, published in response to the Covid 19 pandemic, a Transport and Place Strategy was introduced for the City. Within this strategy, some temporary changes were made to the city centre footstreets to allow social distancing and to allow businesses to continue to operate during the pandemic. The footstreet hours were temporarily extended from 5pm to 8pm and access exemptions for Blue Badge holders were temporarily suspended in the streets listed above. These measures are currently planned to remain in place until September 2022 (in line with the Government's extension of the temporary pavement café licence process under the Business and Planning Act 2020).</p> <p>This proposal – Relevant legislation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated regulations relating to TROs, under which local traffic authorities in England and Wales (outside London) may make permanent orders for the following purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or to prevent the likelihood of any such danger arising;</li> <li>○ To prevent damage to the road or to any building on or near the road;</li> <li>○ To facilitate the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians);</li> <li>○ To prevent the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property;</li> <li>○ To preserve the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons (...) on foot;</li> <li>○ To preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs; or</li> <li>○ To preserve or improve local air quality.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Equality Act 2010, which aims to protect people from discrimination in the workplace and in wider society. The Act includes a Public Sector Equality Duty, which requires public bodies to consider how their decisions and policies affect people with protected characteristics. The public body also should have evidence to show how it has done this It also requires that public bodies have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. The Equality Act 2010 covers the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusive Mobility Guidance (Department for Transport 2005)</li> <li>• Protect Duty consultation documents (<a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/protect-duty">www.gov.uk/government/consultations/protect-duty</a>)</li> <li>• Hostile Vehicle Mitigation guidance (<a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/crowded-places-guidance/hostile-vehicle-mitigation-hvm#vehicle-as-a-weapon-vaw">www.gov.uk/government/publications/crowded-places-guidance/hostile-vehicle-mitigation-hvm#vehicle-as-a-weapon-vaw</a>)</li> <li>• The Blue Badge scheme: rights and responsibilities in England (<a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-blue-badge-scheme-rights-and-responsibilities-in-england">www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-blue-badge-scheme-rights-and-responsibilities-in-england</a>)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| <b>1.3</b> | <b>Who are the stakeholders and what are their interests?</b>  |
|            | <p>Key stakeholders for this proposal are Blue Badge holders who were able to access and park in the streets listed above during footstreet hours before the temporary changes were made to the access exemptions. Blue Badge holders' key interests include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate access to the pedestrianised area's shops and services for those living with a disability, impairment or reduced mobility;</li> <li>• Safety; and</li> <li>• Services and amenities available in the footstreets and their accessibility.</li> </ul> <p>Other stakeholders include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other groups visiting the pedestrian area and accessing its shops and services; and</li> <li>• City centre businesses and service providers (e.g. deliveries, trades, etc).</li> </ul> <p>Their interests are wide ranging and include suitable access by a range of transport modes (private car, taxi/private hire, deliveries, cycling, walking), safety, and services and amenities available in the footstreet area.</p> |

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>1.4</b> | <b>What results/outcomes do we want to achieve and for whom?</b> 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.   |
|            | <p>The proposal aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase public safety and avoid danger to persons in areas of high footfall. The removal of the exemption will support the implementation of hostile vehicle mitigation measures to reduce the risk of a vehicle as a weapon attack. Reducing the number of vehicles accessing the streets listed above will enable the delivery of physical measures to restrict vehicular access during footstreet hours to protect these areas;</li> <li>• Reduce the level of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, particularly in busy periods;</li> <li>• Enable the use of some areas of the carriageway or footways as pavement café areas during footstreet hours, improving the amenities of the footstreet area;</li> <li>• Improve Blue Badge parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area and improve disabled access routes into and around the city centre.</li> </ul> |

## Step 2 – Gathering the information and feedback

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>2.1</b></p>   | <p><b>What sources of data, evidence and consultation feedback do we have to help us understand the impact of the proposal on equality rights and human rights?</b> Please consider a range of sources, including: consultation exercises, surveys, feedback from staff, stakeholders, participants, research reports, the views of equality groups, as well your own experience of working in this area etc.</p>   |
| <p><b>Source of data/<br/>supporting<br/>evidence</b></p> | <p><b>Reason for using</b></p>  |
| <p>Public consultation</p>                                | <p><b>My City centre engagement</b> – this is an ongoing engagement with residents, businesses and special interest groups. This was an open discussion around what the city centre could look like in the future and was the foundation for the November 2020 Executive report. The format of this engagement was co-designed with York Disability Rights Forum who were consulted on how to run accessible workshops and had British sign language interpreters.</p> <p><b>City Centre Access Project</b> - The extent of the footstreet area has been subject to ongoing discussions for a number of years as part of the City Centre Access project in response to the threat of terrorism, and particularly the use of hostile vehicles as a potential mode of attack. This had led to the approval of a first phase of hostile vehicle mitigation measures for the existing permanent footstreet area, but with potential future phases to expand the area of protection.</p> <p><b>Temporary Covid measures</b> – When the temporary Covid measures were introduced, the Council engaged with approx. 450 individuals as well as advocacy groups representing thousands of people with disabilities and/or reduced mobility across the city. An open community brief detailed the main themes and challenges which these changes sought to address, and the summary of conversations with the city’s businesses and representative groups. The principles of the footstreets extension was broadly supported by a majority of respondents to the citywide survey, which was also reflected in the support from residents identifying themselves as disabled. There are tangible benefits for many, in particular blind and partially sighted people, children, and older people. However, the desire from many for footstreets and spaces to be vehicle free is in contrast to Blue Badge holders’ request for</p> |

vehicular access to the pedestrianised area. These objections were articulated in a petition signed by 1,093 people, including 501 York residents, calling for the reversal of the changes.

**Additional consultation undertaken for this proposal** – A consultation took place to review available Blue Badge Parking on the outskirts of the city centre in April 2021. This took the form of an online questionnaire and two online workshops on 22 April 2021, one during the working day and one in the evening, to allow those working in disability organisations and professional advocates to attend, while also offering an out of office hours opportunity for those who may want to take part but are at work or unavailable during the day. This is an approach I discussed with members of the York Disability Rights Forum prior to scheduling, with the 5pm time reflecting the timing of their own forum meetings. This consultation was promoted through the media, on social media (tagging disability organisations), and to the following organisations: Alan Bott Charity, York Disability Rights Forum, York Human Rights City, York Programme for UN International Day of People with Disabilities, Jorvik Deaf Connections, Lollipop, York People First, MS Society, Older Citizens Advocacy York, Wilberforce Trust, Healthwatch York, My Sight York, York Carers Centre, York Carers Forum, York Parent Carer Forum, Age UK York, Converge (York St John), Mind, York Advocacy (Mind), Learning Disability Self Advocates Forum, York Self Advocacy Forum, York Inspirational Kids, York Access and Mobility Club Facebook Group, York Older People's Assembly, York Dementia Action Alliance, CVS, York Wheels, Dial and Ride, Shopmobility, Inclusive Engagement, Individuals from CCA Exercise, Labour Women's Officer, York Cycle Campaign, Get Cycling, Sight Loss Council, York Accessibility Action, Action on Hearing Loss, British Deaf Association, York Disability Week, York ME Community, Blueberry Academy, and York Alzheimers.

The engagement followed an open conversation approach, both online and offline, including direct conversations with individuals and advocacy groups. This allowed detailed discussions to take place with those who wished to engage in depth, and captured general views through an online survey, which was distributed to nearby residents, city centre businesses, and paper based questionnaires distributed across the city as requested. In total there were 540 survey responses completed, of the completed surveys 270 were completed by residents who are Blue Badge holders, 65 by residents who are not Blue Badge holders, 69 by carers of a Blue Badge holder, 7 from businesses (including taxi drivers) and 129 skipped the question.

**Statutory consultation for this proposal** - The statutory consultation for the amendment of the TROs was advertised on 9th July 2021, with an original end date of 6th August 2021, which was extended until 13th August

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | 2021. 206 representations were received on the proposal to remove Blue Badge access exemptions, 5 in support and 201 against the proposal.   |
| <b>Research report</b> | <p>For the August 2019 Executive report, approving the permanent changes to the Traffic Regulation Order to deliver the Phase 1 Hostile Vehicle Mitigation proposals in the city centre, an independent review of Blue Badge Parking Access was also commissioned from Parking Perspectives a consultancy specialising in parking.</p> <p>In addition, Disabled Motoring UK, a charity and advocacy group for disabled people, were commissioned to produce an independent review of York's disabled access offer (see <a href="#">Annex XX</a>).</p> <p>The November 2020 Executive also commissioned a Strategic Review Of City Centre Access in order to identify potential improvements to city centre access (see <a href="#">Annex XX</a>).</p>  |
| <b>Surveys</b>         | <p><b>City Centre Access project</b> - As part of this work, parking surveys were undertaken in the streets listed above in May 2019. This shows 86 parking events/day in the Goodramgate corridor, of which 80 vehicles displayed a Blue Badge. 86 parking events/day were also recorded on the Blake Street corridor, of which 49 vehicles displayed a Blue Badge.</p> <p><b>Traffic surveys undertaken in 2018 and 2021</b> – Traffic surveys in the listed streets were undertaken as part of the City Centre Access project in 2018 and repeated in 2021. This shows the following number of vehicles accessing the streets listed below between 10.30am and 5pm (pedestrianised hours):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blake Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Weekday: 139 motorised vehicles in 2018, 12 in 2021</li> <li>○ Saturday: 100 motorised vehicles in 2018, 4 in 2021</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lendal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Weekday: 161 motorised vehicles in 2018, 30 in 2021</li> <li>○ Saturday: 106 motorised vehicles in 2018, 23 in 2021</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Colliergate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Weekday: 80 motorised vehicles in 2018, 39 in 2021</li> <li>○ Saturday: 106 motorised vehicles in 2018, 27 in 2021</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Goodramgate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Weekday: 2018 data unavailable, 11 in 2021</li> <li>○ Saturday: 106 motorised vehicles in 2018, 4 in 2021</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

### Step 3 – Gaps in data and knowledge

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 3.1  | <b>What are the main gaps in information and understanding of the impact of your proposal? Please indicate how any gaps will be dealt with.</b>   |  |
| <b>Gaps in data or knowledge</b>   | <b>Action to deal with this</b>   |  |
| Further feasibility work required for some of the proposed mitigation measures | Further feasibility work, consultation and detailed design will be required for some of the proposals included in the Active Travel Fund bid, which aims to secure funding to improve disabled access routes into and around the city centre.   |  |
| Medium and long term impact on stakeholders                                    | <p>Continuous monitoring and engagement with stakeholders to understand the medium and long term impacts of the changes and identify further changes and potential adjustments.</p> <p>Review of terror threat levels and consideration of adjustment to restrictions if threat level allows.</p> <p>Review of new and emerging technology solutions which could potentially enable a review of restrictions or offer different access solutions in the future.</p> |  |

## Step 4 – Analysing the impacts or effects.

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>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?</b> 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)                    |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Age</b>                       | <p>The proposals have been identified as having a <b>mixed impact</b> on older people.</p> <p><b>Positive impacts</b> – As evidenced by the consultation responses, some older people support the proposed changes and would benefit from the reduction in the number of vehicles accessing the footstreet area, which means that those who are slower or unsure on their feet benefit from a safer, mainly car free, environment. Younger people, especially young children and families are also likely to benefit from the reduced number of motorised vehicles in the streets listed above.</p> <p><b>Negative impacts</b> – Older people are more likely to hold a Blue Badge and to have used the streets listed above for access and to park in the city centre. Removing the ability to drive and park in these streets will increase the distance people with reduced mobility have to travel on foot or using a wheelchair or mobility scooter, making shops and services in the footstreet area less accessible during footstreet hours. This is also applicable to families with young children where a family member is a Blue Badge holder. For example, for a Blue Badge holder accessing the St Sampson’s Centre for the over 60s on Church Street, parking on Goodramgate would require travelling just over 110m without a car. Parking on Deangate, where disabled bays are proposed as part of the measures presented in the main report, will increase this distance to just under 350m.</p> | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive and<br/>Negative</b> | <b>Negative –<br/>High<br/>Positive –<br/>Medium</b> |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights | Key Findings/Impacts   | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L)                    |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                  | The Dial a Ride vehicle will continue to benefit from an exemption, guaranteeing access to the St Sampson's Centre.  |   |  |
| <b>Disability</b>                | <p>The proposals have been identified as having a <b>mixed impact</b> on people living with a disability/mobility impairment.</p> <p><b>Positive impacts (medium)</b> – As evidenced by the consultation responses, some people living with a disability support the proposed changes and would benefit from the reduction in the number of vehicles accessing the footstreet area, making it a safer, mainly car free, environment for all users.</p> <p>The majority of people who identified themselves as disabled and responded to 'Our Big Conversation' were in favour of the changes to the footstreets (60%), and more respondents agreed with the safety principles behind the footstreets than disagreed. Responses to the statutory consultation on the removal of the Blue badge access exemption were however overwhelmingly against the proposal (201 out of a total of 206 representations received on this aspect of the proposal).</p> <p>Before the statutory consultation process, in depth discussions with disabled people and advocacy groups have reflected that some people with disabilities and/ or impaired mobility have benefited from the changes to the footstreets. This is particularly the case for those with visual impairments and others who identify as disabled or live with mobility issues, but do not rely on a car and Blue Badge parking. These users have generally noted the positive impact of the reduction in vehicles in the streets, reducing the risk of conflict and enabling them to use the carriageway to travel along the streets, often providing a more even, wider area, compared to using the narrow footways available in many parts of the city centre.</p> | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive and<br/>Negative</b> | <b>Negative –<br/>High<br/>Positive –<br/>Medium</b> |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|                                  | <p>Some disabled people have also noted that pavement cafes have, in some cases, improved access to services, for example where hospitality venues without step-free access now offer tables and chairs outside. It was however noted that pavement cafes can also reduce accessibility where they block a footpath, do not have adequate barriers, or reduce access to a dropped kerb.</p> <p><b>Negative impacts (high)</b> – People living with a disability/impairment are more likely to hold a Blue Badge and to have used the streets listed above for access to and to park in the city centre. Removing the ability to drive and park in these streets will increase the distance disabled people have to travel on foot or using a wheelchair or mobility scooter, making shops and services in the footstreet area less accessible during footstreet hours. Many respondents to the statutory consultation and many workshop participants stated that the removal of Blue Badge parking and vehicular access from the streets listed above would preclude them entirely from accessing the city centre during footstreets hours. They noted that this would mean that they wouldn't be able to access the services available in the city centre and would need to travel to different locations to access the services they require and sometimes have been accessing for a long time.</p> <p>The proposed changes would result in the loss of on street parking for approx. 30 Blue Badge vehicles across the streets listed above. The proposed Blue Badge parking measures on the outskirts of the footstreet area do not fully offset this, as additional capacity is limited and the distance people will have to walk or use a mobility aid to access the most central areas of the footstreets will increase significantly.</p> <p>For example, for a Blue Badge holder accessing the Post Office on Coney Street, parking on Lendal would require just over 200m without a car. Parking on Duncombe Place,</p> |   |                                   |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights      | Key Findings/Impacts   | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L)                    |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                       | <p>where disabled bays are proposed as part of the Blue Badge parking measures presented in the main report, will increase this distance to 425m.</p> <p>For those who are not able to walk these distances, and are not able to use alternative solutions, the removal of the ability to park in those streets has had and will continue to have a significant impact, and could reduce the prospects of them visiting the city centre. As expressed through the consultation, they remain strongly of the view that Blue Badge access should be reinstated immediately.</p>  |   |  |
| <b>Gender</b>                         | No differential impact anticipated.  | <b>Neutral</b>                              |  |
| <b>Gender reassignment</b>            | No differential impact anticipated.  | <b>Neutral</b>                              |  |
| <b>Marriage and civil partnership</b> | No differential impact anticipated.  | <b>Neutral</b>                              |  |
| <b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>        | <p>The proposals have been identified as having a <b>mixed impact</b> on pregnancy and maternity when considering the potential impact on women who may experience pregnancy related mobility impairments, especially in later stages of pregnancy, as they may be eligible for a Blue Badge.</p> <p><b>Positive impacts</b> – As evidenced by the consultation responses, some people living with a disability support the proposed changes and would benefit from the reduction in the number of vehicles accessing the footstreet area, making it a safer environment for all users. The change would also benefit mothers, fathers and carers of young children as</p> | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive and<br/>Negative</b> | <b>Negative –<br/>High<br/>Positive –<br/>Medium</b> |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights               | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|  | <p>the streets listed above would benefit from a significant reduction in motorised traffic during pedestrianised hours, providing a safer environment for young children.</p> <p><b>Negative impacts</b> – As noted above, women living with pregnancy related mobility impairments may hold a Blue Badge and would have been able to park in the streets listed above to access the city centre. Removing the ability to drive and park in these streets will increase the distance people living with disabilities/impairments have to travel on foot or using a wheelchair or mobility scooter, making shops and services in the footstreet area less accessible during footstreet hours.</p> |   |                                   |
| <b>Race and minority ethnic groups</b>         | No differential impact anticipated.   | <b>Neutral</b>                              |                                   |
| <b>Religion and/or belief</b>                  | <p>The proposals have been identified as having a <b>mixed impact</b> on access to places of worship in the footstreet area for people who live with reduced mobility or a disability and have a Blue Badge.</p> <p>The key considerations (both positive and negative) are as those described above for older people and people living with a disability and apply to access to the St Sampson's Centre (Church Street), The Holy Trinity Church (Goodramgate), St Helen's Church (Stonegate), and St Martin le Grand (Coney Street).</p>  | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive and<br/>Negative</b> | <b>Medium</b>                     |
| <b>Sexual orientation</b>                      |   | <b>Neutral</b>                              |                                   |
| <b>Other socio-economic groups including :</b> | <b>Could other socio-economic groups be affected e.g. carers, ex-offenders, low incomes?</b>  |   |                                   |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0)                                 | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L)                    |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Carer                            | The impact on carers, considering carers who may care for an adult or child living with a disability or impairment and eligible for a Blue Badge, reflects the impacts (both positive and negative) on those living with disabilities, as described above.  | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive and<br/>Negative</b>                                 | <b>Negative –<br/>High<br/>Positive –<br/>Medium</b> |
| Low income groups                | No differential impact anticipated.   | <b>Neutral</b>  |  |
| Veterans, Armed Forces Community | No differential impact anticipated.   | <b>Neutral</b>  |  |
| Other                            | Not applicable  | <b>n/a</b>  | <b>n/a</b>   |
| <b>Impact on human rights:</b>   |   |   |  |
| List any human rights impacted   | <p>The Convention rights applicable are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article 2 - protects the right to life. In this case, its applicability relates to the requirement placed on the Government to take appropriate measures to safeguard life by making laws to protect people. Public authorities should also consider the right to life when making decisions that might put people in danger or that affect their life expectancy.</li> <li>• Article 8 - protects the right of the individual to respect for their private and family life, their home and their correspondence. The private life part of this right covers</li> </ul> | <b>Mixed:<br/>Positive<br/>(Article 2)<br/>and Negative<br/>(Article 8)</b> | <b>Medium</b>  |

| Equality Groups and Human Rights | Key Findings/Impacts  | Positive (+)<br>Negative (-)<br>Neutral (0) | High (H)<br>Medium (M)<br>Low (L) |
|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|                                  | <p>things like wellbeing, autonomy, forming relationships with others and taking part in our community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article 14 - protects the right to be free from discrimination when enjoying other rights, such as Article 8.</li> </ul> <p>It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a European Convention right (unless the authority could not have acted differently as a result of a statutory provision). An interference with a qualified right (e.g. the right to respect for private and family life) is not unlawful if the authority acts in accordance with the law to achieve a legitimate aim and the interference is necessary in a democratic society in the wider public interest. In addition, the law applies a proportionality test, including whether a fair balance has been struck between the rights of the individual and the interests of the wider community.</p> <p>Removal of some blue badge parking could have an impact on people's ability to live independently, attend appointments, see people who are important to them, and be part of their community.</p> <p>The removal of blue badge parking and access from the listed streets will enable the implementation of hostile vehicle mitigation measures which will reduce the risk of a terror attack using a vehicle as a weapon. The proposed measures aim to protect the right to life of the people working in and visiting York's pedestrianised area.</p> <p>The council has considered carefully the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest and whilst it is acknowledged that there could be interference with a Convention right, the decision is considered to be objectively and reasonably justified as it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.</p> |   |                                   |



**Use the following guidance to inform your responses:**

Indicate:

- Where you think that the proposal could have a POSITIVE impact on any of the equality groups like promoting equality and equal opportunities or improving relations within equality groups
- Where you think that the proposal could have a NEGATIVE impact on any of the equality groups, i.e. it could disadvantage them
- Where you think that this proposal has a NEUTRAL effect on any of the equality groups listed below i.e. it has no effect currently on equality groups.

It is important to remember that a proposal may be highly relevant to one aspect of equality and not relevant to another.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>High impact</b><br/>(The proposal or process is very equality relevant)</p>       | <p>There is significant potential for or evidence of adverse impact<br/>The proposal is institution wide or public facing<br/>The proposal has consequences for or affects significant numbers of people<br/>The proposal has the potential to make a significant contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights.</p>      |
| <p><b>Medium impact</b><br/>(The proposal or process is somewhat equality relevant)</p> | <p>There is some evidence to suggest potential for or evidence of adverse impact<br/>The proposal is institution wide or across services, but mainly internal<br/>The proposal has consequences for or affects some people<br/>The proposal has the potential to make a contribution to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p> |
| <p><b>Low impact</b><br/>(The proposal or process might be equality relevant)</p>       | <p>There is little evidence to suggest that the proposal could result in adverse impact<br/>The proposal operates in a limited way<br/>The proposal has consequences for or affects few people<br/>The proposal may have the potential to contribute to promoting equality and the exercise of human rights</p>                                 |

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

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 5.1 | <b>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?</b> |
|-----|---|

The initial changes to the footstreets in response to Covid-19 were brought in at pace, under emergency powers, in response to the pandemic. They were accompanied by a number of mitigations which were then reviewed following an in-depth engagement exercise during the summer and autumn of 2020. This has resulted in a number of mitigations being developed. These include:

- The mitigation measures proposed in the main report, focusing on improving the disabled parking offered in the vicinity of the footstreets;
- Continued exemption for access on Goodramgate for the Dial-a-Ride bus service providing access to the St Sampson's' Centre;
- Improved information on disabled parking and accessibility in York city centre (separate report);
- Reviews of existing parking and mobility aid provision as well as longer term developments of gold standard car parks and routes to the city centre (separate report); and
- A feasibility study considering the potential for an accessible city centre shuttle service (separate report).

The engagement undertaken to date is based on the "My" principles that have been developed in York as an open conversation approach, where the debate remains ongoing to make change together. The mitigations developed to date will continue to be considered and refined, whilst the strategic review of parking and access to the city will remain embedded in the engagement approach.

This report includes for the provision of dedicated disabled parking bays in the vicinity of the city centre and improvements to disabled access routes into and around the city centre, through the Active Travel Fund bid (or equivalent funding if the bid is unsuccessful). It is accepted however that these measures do not mitigate fully against the impacts of the removal of vehicular access into the footstreets area by Blue Badge holders.

## Step 6 – Recommendations and conclusions of the assessment

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 6.1  | <p><b>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:</b></p>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No major change to the proposal</b> – the EIA demonstrates the proposal is robust. There is no potential for unlawful discrimination or adverse impact and you have taken all opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitor and review.</li> <li>• <b>Adjust the proposal</b> – the EIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. This involves taking steps to remove any barriers, to better advance quality or to foster good relations.</li> <li>• <b>Continue with the proposal</b> (despite the potential for adverse impact) – you should clearly set out the justifications for doing this and how you believe the decision is compatible with our obligations under the duty.</li> <li>• <b>Stop and remove the proposal</b> – if there are adverse effects that are not justified and cannot be mitigated, you should consider stopping the proposal altogether. If a proposal leads to unlawful discrimination it should be removed or changed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Important:</b> If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason in the justification column.</p> |   |
| <b>Option selected</b>   | <b>Conclusions/justification</b>  |
| <b>Continue with the proposal</b>  | <p>The proposed changes are considered a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.</p> <p>As presented above and in the main report, the aims of the proposal are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase public safety and avoid danger to persons in areas of high footfall, supporting the implementation of hostile vehicle mitigation measures to reduce the risk of a vehicle as a weapon attack;</li> </ul> |

- Reduce the level of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians in the footstreets, particularly in busy periods;
- Enable the use of some areas of the carriageway or footways as pavement café areas during footstreet hours, improving the amenities of the footstreet area;
- Improve Blue Badge parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area and improve disabled access routes into and around the city centre.

The proposal also aims to mitigate some of the negative impact on Blue Badge holders by improving disabled parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area, recognising that this does not fully mitigate the negative impacts of the proposed vehicular access restrictions for Blue Badge holders. This will be implemented alongside other mitigation measures as listed below:

- Continued exemption for access on Goodramgate for the Dial-a-Ride bus service providing access to the St Sampson's' Centre;
- Improved information on disabled parking and accessibility in York city centre;
- Reviews of existing parking and mobility aid provision as well as longer term developments of gold standard car parks and routes to the city centre; and
- A feasibility study considering the potential for an accessible city centre shuttle service.

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

| <b>7.1 What action, by whom, will be undertaken as a result of the impact assessment.</b>      |  |                                  |   |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Impact/issue</b>  | <b>Action to be taken</b>  | <b>Person responsible</b>        | <b>Timescale</b>  |
| Disabled parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area                             | Detail design work to be completed and construction to improve disabled parking provision on the outskirts of the pedestrian area (as per main report) | Helene Vergereau / Darren Hobson | Before the permanent changes to the TRO are enacted (if the decision is taken to do so) |
| Accessibility information  | Provision of improved information on disabled parking and accessibility in York city centre  | Andy Kerr / Julian Ridge         | Dec 2021  |
| Quality and accessibility of parking (car parks), mobility aids, and routes to the city centre | Reviews of existing parking and mobility aid provision as well as longer term developments of gold standard car parks and routes to the city centre    | Andy Kerr / Julian Ridge         | Dec 2021  |
| Accessible city centre shuttle service   | Undertaking a feasibility study considering the potential for an accessible city centre shuttle service.   | Dave Atkinson                    | Dec 2021  |

## Step 8 - Monitor, review and improve

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| <b>8. 1</b> | <b>How will the impact of your proposal be monitored and improved upon going forward?</b><br>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?  |
|             | The impacts of the proposal will continue to be monitored through the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ongoing liaison with blue badge holders;</li><li>• Ongoing consultation and liaison with communities of interest;</li><li>• Continuous review of the impact of highway measures, changes to government guidance, and compliance with equalities; guidance, and implement the mitigations set out in the report;</li><li>• Ongoing Business Community Engagement.</li></ul> |