



Edinburgh Napier University

Car Parking Policy

Updated Equality Impact Assessment

March 2015

**Please complete and return by email to Mohammed Hameed, Diversity Partner**  
**m.hameed@napier.ac.uk**

Faculty/Service Area <b>Property and Facilities</b>	Date of Assessment 10/3/15	Name of the proposal to be assessed Revised Car Parking Policy 2015	Person responsible for the assessment Alison Smith
Who was present at the EIA? Mohammed Hameed	Is this a <b>new</b> or <b>existing</b> proposal?  <b>Revision of an existing policy</b>		When will this proposal be reviewed?  <b>August 2016</b>
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To ensure that car parking permits are issued in accordance with a uniform policy that is supported and understood by all users</li> <li>- To ensure that the allocation of car parking permits is undertaken in a non-discriminatory manner.</li> </ul>	
2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?		All staff and students eligible to apply for a car parking permit	
3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear policy and understanding on the allocation of car park permits</li> <li>- Clear understanding of what constitutes an infringement that results in enforcement action being taken</li> </ul>	

4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	There should be no reason why the desired outcomes cannot be realised as the introduction of a third party enforcement agency should eliminate unauthorised parking by non-permit holders and those not eligible to park within University core hours		
5. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		N	Please explain Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic
6. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	N	Please explain  A survey of staff who were unable to park at Merchiston Campus over a 3 month period had previously proved inconclusive and although parking generally remains an issue at Merchiston there have been no gender-specific issues brought to the attention of the Diversity Partner.  There may however be a potential disadvantage for pregnant women who may have mobility difficulties but who do not qualify for a permit.

7. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	<p>Please explain</p> <p>Disabled staff and students in possession of a Council-issued Blue Badge do not pay for parking permits and designated spaces are available at each campus. However, at Merchiston there may be occasions when the number of disabled spaces close to university premises is insufficient (there are currently 2 spaces which can be used by University 'blue badge' holders or Council Blue Badge holders). Those in possession of a Council Blue Badge also have the option of parking in spaces provided by the Council which is an option not available to those holding an University badge. This may add pressure on the spaces adjacent to Mardale Crescent.</p> <p>At present, only one University 'blue badge' has been issued to an individual. However, there is no way of knowing how many more may need to be issued in future and given that there are just two spaces it would only take one successful application to bring the availability of these spaces to maximum occupancy. This scenario does not take into account staff/students who may travel into Merchiston from another campus</p>
8. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to sexual orientation? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	N	<p>Please explain</p> <p>Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic</p>
9. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their age? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	N	<p>Please explain</p> <p>Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic</p>
10. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their religious belief (or none)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	N	<p>Please explain</p> <p>Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic</p>

11. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people with dependants/caring responsibilities? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		<b>N</b>	<p>Please explain</p> <p>As mentioned at bullet 6, concerns were raised that those with caring responsibilities may be adversely affected due to school run commitments by arriving later on campus. These concerns assumed that women were the ones more likely to be disadvantaged but no evidence could be found for this. These concerns were raised some considerable time ago but should however be kept under review.</p>
12. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		<b>N</b>	<p>Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic</p>
13. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their marital or civil partnership status? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		<b>N</b>	<p>Permits are allocated on a first come first served basis and are based on qualifying criteria and not any other irrelevant criteria or characteristic</p>

<p>14. Describe how this proposal will help the University to meet its Public Sector Equality Duty obligations.</p>			<p>The University had a legal obligation to implement a fee scheme as part of the Craiglockhart planning permission. Other considerations that have been taken into account in creating a scheme included, <i>inter alia</i>, the need to have a clear system for the allocation of car park permits, the need to introduce a controlled parking environment at all University car parks and the need to create a revenue stream that could be used for improvements and maintaining the associated car parking facilities. In addition to this, 10% of income generated was committed to environmental initiatives aimed at reducing car usage and the promotion of alternative means of transport.</p> <p>In addition to the above the University also has duties under the Equality Act 2010 to demonstrate that it is not discriminating against persons or groups who have a protected characteristic. In the sections above, this assessment has sought to identify where inadvertent discrimination may take place and the anticipatory steps the University has taken to minimise or eradicate this potential. A number of additional clarifications were sought from the responsible department where the policy was silent or where the wording was unclear. These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy states that the charging period is 0800 to 1700. Does this mean that staff/students can park without a permit out-with these hours? Also, are Merchiston residents allowed to use the spaces overnight and if so will they need to be alerted to this.</li> <li>- <i>Yes it does mean you can park out with those times for staff/student and community.</i></li> <li>- There is mention of “clearly marked car parking space”. Does this mean that cars must only be parked in these spaces? Staff at Merchiston often utilise the space in between regulation spaces and the trees for example.</li> <li>- <i>Yes – cars can only be parked in designated spaces – if not owners will be fined and possibly towed away. Spaces have been clearly marked at all campuses in preparation for the implementation.</i></li> <li>- Are there plans to erect new signs informing staff/students of</li> </ul>
---	--	--	--

			<p>these changes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Yes the new company will ensure that signage is clear and will erect new signage.</i></li> <li>- Will the removal of cars causing potential risks, such as blocking fire exits, also include cars parked in disabled bays without displaying a Council/internal blue badge?</li> <li>- <i>Any car without a ENU permit will be fined and or towed away</i></li> <li>- Are there any plans to institute an appeals process? Would the University have a 'veto' in these cases?</li> <li>- <i>Yes. The process is outlined in the Policy</i></li> <li>- Will Council Blue Badges holders be able to park in any available space?</li> <li>- <i>No only those issued with internal ENU permits</i></li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

## Recommendations

From an equality perspective this revised policy contains much that should be commended. For example, the introduction of fines for illegal parking should deter inconsiderate car owners from leaving their cars in disabled parking spaces. However, it is also recommended that consideration should be given to the following:

a/ All blue badge holders, whether Council or internal, should be allowed to park in any available space without detriment (including visitors). This need not be at all campuses but should at least be at Merchiston due to the paucity of on-campus disabled parking spaces

b/ There should be a formal provision in the Policy allowing pregnant staff or students with mobility difficulties to park close to University buildings without detriment

Mohammed Hameed  
Diversity Partner  
10<sup>th</sup> March 2015

