

Equality Impact Analysis

This equality impact analysis establishes the likely effects both positive and negative and potential unintended consequences that decisions, policies, projects and practices can have on people at risk of discrimination, harassment and victimisation. The analysis considers documentary evidence, data and information from stakeholder engagement/consultation to manage risk and to understand the actual or potential effect of activity, including both positive and adverse impacts, on those affected by the activity being considered.

To support completion of this analysis tool, please refer to the equality impact analysis guidance.

Section 1 – Analysis Details (Page 5 of the guidance document)

Name of Policy/Project/Decision	Change to charges for Resident and Visitor Parking Permits
Lead Officer (SRO or Assistant Director/Director)	Peter Stokes / Paul Lakin
Department/Team	Highways
Proposed Implementation Date	After July cabinet sign off
Author of the EqlA	Helen Corbishley
Date of the EqlA	20 June 2025

1.1 What is the main purpose of the proposed policy/project/decision and intended outcomes?	
1.	Resident Parking Schemes operate in streets close to town centres, around hospitals and near to Metrolink stops. They allow people who live in these streets to park close to their homes by restricting parking to permit holders only. Residents can apply for permits for their own vehicles and for visitors. Permits are also available for businesses located within Resident Parking Scheme zones.
2.	Residents apply to create parking scheme zones in their local areas, the permit fees are used to cover the costs of enforcement of the schemes and associated administration eg printing of permits with holographic security
3.	There is an annual charge of £35 for a resident parking permit and the council issues approximately 1,500 permits a year. In addition to this, residents can apply for up to two visitor permits. Bury does not charge for the first visitor permit, the second visitor permit is charged at £35. We issue 5,000 first and 2,300 second visitor permits annually.

4. We have reviewed how other Councils charge, and we are looking to review how we manage and issue visitor permits. This will generate additional income which will help support our financial pressures. It will also bring us into line with other councils when it comes to visitor permits:
5. We propose to uplift the permit cost for residents from £35 to £45 per annum. The proposed uplift in cost would still be lower than two other councils in Greater Manchester.
6. We plan to introduce a new charge for 1st visitor permits of £25 per annum. The proposed charge would be in line with other councils across the country.
7. Should the proposal not proceed following the outcome of the consultation the loss of forecast income would need to be offset by either other savings projects or an additional contribution from reserves in 2025/26 and the MTFS updated accordingly for later years. This would cause additional financial pressures on the current budget proposals.

Section 2 – Impact Assessment (Pages 6 to 10 of the guidance document)

2.1 Who could the proposed policy/project/decision likely have an impact on?

Employees: **Yes – if they live in Bury within a parking scheme**

Community/Residents: **Yes - if they live in Bury within a parking scheme**

Third parties such as suppliers, providers and voluntary organisations: **Yes – if they operate within a Bury parking scheme**

If the answer to all three questions is 'no' there is no need to continue with this analysis.

2.2 Evidence to support the analysis. Include documentary evidence, data and stakeholder information/consultation

Documentary Evidence:

We do not hold information of the actual number of employees who live within a parking scheme.

There are approximately 1500 resident permits issued annually

There are approximately 5000 first and second visitor passes issued annually

There are approximately 1500 business parking permits issued annually

Data:

Stakeholder information/consultation: A consultation was launched in February for a 6 week duration to consult on the changes. There were 286 responses – 58% of these were current users of resident, visitor or business permits. Suggestions and concerns from respondents were as follows:

- Install more pay and display machines for visitor parking
- Ensure enforcement of permits already being used
- Vulnerability of residents due to limited visiting
- Increased wardens during events such as football matches
- Disparity between those living in in permit and non permit zones and how the proposals are impacting unfairly
- Widen the permit zone and keep the charge the same
- Particularly in Prestwich there was concern about discouraging people from using local businesses as parking is already difficult but also support for use of permits around Prestwich to ensure residents are able to park near their homes

2.3 Consider the following questions in terms of who the policy/project/decision could potentially have an impact on. Detail these in the impact assessment table (2.4) and the potential impact this could have.

- Could the proposal prevent the promotion of equality of opportunity or good relations between different equality groups?
- Could the proposal create barriers to accessing a service or obtaining employment because of a protected characteristic?
- Could the proposal affect the usage or experience of a service because of a protected characteristic?
- Could a protected characteristic be disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged by the proposal?
- Could the proposal make it more or less likely that a protected characteristic will be at risk of harassment or victimisation?
- Could the proposal affect public attitudes towards a protected characteristic (e.g. by increasing or reducing their presence in the community)?
- Could the proposal prevent or limit a protected characteristic contributing to the democratic running of the council?

2.4 Characteristic	Potential Impacts	Evidence (from 2.2) to demonstrate this impact	Mitigations to reduce negative impact	Impact level with mitigations Positive, Neutral, Negative
Age	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Disability	Yes – positive and negative	<p>The consultation analysis showed concerns around the impact on those who are disabled and have health issues and the ability to park vehicles within close proximity due to the affordability of increase in charge.</p> <p>Charging for a visitor permit where these have</p>	An exemption process could be considered for individual circumstances with regards to health and disability	Negative

		previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		
Gender Reassignment	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Pregnancy and Maternity	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Race	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity		Positive

		around usage of visitor permits.		
Religion and Belief	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Sex	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Sexual Orientation	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		
Carers	Yes – positive and negative	The consultation analysis showed concerns around increasing vulnerability and isolation if visiting to homes reduced due to the affordability of the increase in charge.	An exemption process could be considered for individual circumstances with regards to health and disability	Negative

		Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		
Looked After Children and Care Leavers	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		Positive
Socio-economically vulnerable	Yes – positive and negative	<p>The consultation analysis showed concerns around increasing vulnerability and isolation if visiting to homes reduced due to the affordability of the increase in charge.</p> <p>Charging for a visitor permit where these have previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.</p>	<p>An exemption process could be considered for individual circumstances with regards to health and disability</p> <p>A discounted rate could be considered for those residents claiming certain benefits</p>	Negative
Veterans	Yes - positive	Charging for a visitor permit where these have		Positive

		previously been produced for free is expected to reduce fraudulent activity around usage of visitor permits.		
--	--	--	--	--

Actions required to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts or to complete the analysis

2.5 Characteristics	Action	Action Owner	Completion Date
Disability	Review of possible exemption or price reduction criteria	Head of Engineering and Street Scene	At launch of policy
Carers			
Socio-economically vulnerable			
All	Ensure enforcement activity continues and is prioritised to focus on new changes should they be approved – ie the visitor permit charge	Head of Engineering and Street Scene	At launch of policy

Section 3 - Impact Risk

Establish the level of risk to people and organisations arising from identified impacts, with additional actions completed to mitigate/reduce/eliminate negative impacts.

3.1 Identifying risk level (Pages 10 - 12 of the guidance document)

Impact x Likelihood = Score	Likelihood			
	1	2	3	4

			Unlikely	Possible	Likely	Very likely
Impact	4	Very High	4	8	12	16
	3	High	3	6	9	12
	2	Medium	2	4	6	8
	1	Low	1	2	3	4
	0	Positive / No impact	0	0	0	0

Risk Level	No Risk = 0	Low Risk = 1 - 4	Medium Risk = 5 – 7	High Risk = 8 - 16
------------	-------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------

3.2 Level of risk identified	Medium Risk
3.3 Reasons for risk level calculation	<p>Calculating the likelihood/impact including mitigation – $3 \times 2 = 6$</p> <p>It is likely that these risks will occur with the implementation of the policy however the impact will potentially be to a minimal number of residents – further analysis of equality characteristics of permit holders would be required to understand the impact in more detail.</p>

Section 4 - Analysis Decision (Page 11 of the guidance document)

4.1 Analysis Decision	X	Reasons for This Decision
There is no negative impact therefore the activity will proceed		
There are low impacts or risks identified which can be mitigated or managed to reduce the risks and activity will proceed		
There are medium to high risks identified which cannot be mitigated following careful and thorough consideration. The activity will proceed	x	Consideration of a exemption policy may help reduce the impacts – currently no policy is in place

with caution and this risk recorded on the risk register, ensuring continual review		
---	--	--

Section 5 – Sign Off and Revisions (Page 11 of the guidance document)

5.1 Sign Off	Name	Date	Comments
Lead Officer/SRO/Project Manager			
Responsible Asst. Director/Director			
EDI			

EqlA Revision Log

5.2 Revision Date	Revision By	Revision Details