

Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment – Initial Screening

Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment – Initial Screening

Title of Policy, Procedure or Function: Car Parking Policy	
School/Department: Estates	
Author/Position: Travel Plan Co-ordinator	Date created: 30/03/11

1. Aims and purpose of Policy, Procedure or Function:

To effectively manage the University's car parking resources and apply consistent procedures for car park users.

2. Stakeholders:

Staff
Students
Visitors
Contractors

3. Consultation/Involvement

Organisation/ person consulted or involved	Date, method and by whom	Location of consultation records
Staff	April 2008 – Open response survey	http://www.abdn.ac.uk/estates/ environment/transport/docume nts/ConsultationReportv1.0.doc
Staff	February 2009 – Multiple response survey	http://www.abdn.ac.uk/estates/ environment/transport/docume nts/ConsultationReport2009v1. 0.doc

a) Brief summary of results of consultation indicating how this has affected the Policy, Procedure or Function

University wide consultations were carried out in 2008 and 2009 to gather opinions on car parking charges and the practicalities of implementation. These consultations confirmed that charging for car parking was not welcomed by the majority of staff but that, if it was essential, daily and annual parking options would be required (39% supported annual, 46% supported daily). It also identified that a small majority (52%) supported a fixed charging rate for all staff but with a significant proportion (39%) supporting variable charging based on a wide variety of personal circumstances. Of those who supported variable charging there were large divisions over what circumstances should be given preference and so it was clear that a fixed charge was preferential over any specific criteria. It was also clear from the consultations that enforcement of car parks was strongly desired with 72.8% supporting measures to protect car parks for authorised users.

More>

>Cont.

The University Management Group recognised that consideration would need to be given to lower paid and part-time staff groups to ensure that the charging system implemented was as fair as possible. Efforts to exclude lower paid staff from charging proved unfeasible and so a universally low charging rate was selected. Some part-time staff (those who work full days but less than five per week) would be accommodated by the availability of daily parking vouchers. This would also accommodate those who work unusual patterns. Some other part-time staff would be accommodated by the relatively short hours of operation (10am-4pm) which are in keeping with local authority controlled parking times in the area. However there is a group of part-time staff (those who work part days) who cannot be easily accommodated. This is a fundamental problem with daily charging since the charge applies to the day or any part thereof. Options to mitigate this impact were considered. These were based around methods to charge for part of a day (per hour). The two main methods of charging per hour are pay-and-display and ANPR (automatic number plate recognition). A business case for pay-and-display was investigated but proved too expensive and would have resulted in increased costs to the end user to cover capital costs (machines) and operational costs (maintenance, cash collection, consumables). In addition it would be very difficult to monitor given the geographical spread of small car parks at the University. ANPR, although attractive for regular users, is not capable of accommodating visitor, delivery or hire vehicles that the University hosts on a daily basis. It was also a very costly option and would have had similar increased costs to the end user.

It is intended to continue to allow blue disabled badge holders to park free of charge within University car parks and to accommodate temporary disability through student support and occupational health, for students and staff respectively, as currently occurs.

Policy, Procedure or Function (delete as appropriate)	Relevance to promotion of equality of opportunity, elimination of discrimination and promotion of good relations between people of different minority groups						
Equality	Race	Disability	Gender	Age	Sexual Orientation	Religion or Belief	Gender Reassignment
1. Does the policy, procedure or function impact directly on the public or (for internal issues) students/staff regarding:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Is there any evidence or reason to believe that someone could be affected differently (either individually or as a group) on his or her race, ethnic origin, religion, age, gender, disability, sexual orientation or gender reassignment regarding:	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
3. Is there evidence that the above mentioned groups are being affected differently regarding:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Is there public/political concern that the policy, procedure or function is operated in a discriminatory manner regarding:	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
5. Does this policy, procedure or function involve the use or discretionary use of statutory powers or authority regarding:	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
6. Does this policy, procedure or function present opportunity to improve community relations regarding:	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
7. Does this policy, procedure or function concern equality of opportunity for students/staff regarding:	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Impact on individual equality strands i.e. Race, Religion etc.: Score - High (7-5), Medium (4-3), Low (2-1), N/A (0)		3	4	0	0	0	0

Note – Completion of the template requires each strand to be examined individually. The final relevance score is obtained by totalling vertically the number of equality questions that are answered yes in each strand. The highest relevance score will determine the impact of the policy, procedure or function irrespective of diversity strand.

4. Impact of policy, procedure or function on equality

High	<input type="checkbox"/>	Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

5. Publication

a) Provide details of arrangements to publish initial screening:

Online publication with the associated consultation reports and previous policy.

6. Review Date: September 2013 (2 Years)

Author (Name and Position): Christopher Osbeck, Travel Plan Co-ordinator

Authors signature:

Equality and Diversity Advisor (Name):

Equality and Diversity Advisor signature:

7. Date of submission to Advisory Group on Equality and Diversity:

Approval Yes No