Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

Deciding what needs to be assessed

In theory all policies, decisions, services, projects and programmes should be impact assessed. The most practical approach is to assess as the proposal is being developed or as processes, services and policies come up for review making the EQIA part of the development process. Do not be put off by the list below, it does not mean that long and detailed assessments are required every time you are engaged in one of the activities. However, it does mean that you should always consider the equalities implications of your proposals.

Policy

- New policy development
- Substantial revision of an existing policy or process
- Any change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Decision

- Key decision
- Decision for management board/cabinet
- Budget change decision

Service

- New service
- Service review, including the decommissioning of services
- Any service change which may have a disproportionate impact on a particular group

Projects and programmes

- All, at planning stage

Further information: [Equality Impact Assessments - a user's guide](#)

Section one

No.	Question	Response
1.1	**Name of policy/decision/service/ project/programme being assessed**	Wholescale replacement of SBC-owned car-parking payment machines / equipment.
1.2	**Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/decision/service/ project/programme**	This proposal is to replace existing and obsolete car-parking payment machines (in MSCPs, at surface-level car-parks, along on-street parking spaces and at country parks) with new equipment that offers a choice of cashless payment methods. The benefits of this replacement programme to SBC and the public include: - the ability to offer a more modern, efficient and effective parking service; - improvements to the customer experience by allowing contactless card payments without the need for the exact change; - a reduction in parking operational and enforcement costs; - a carbon footprint reduction through less travel miles for cash collections / repairs; - an infrastructure that can support more innovative and complex tariffs (including electric vehicle solutions); - improved data reporting; and - support for town centre regeneration.
1.3	**Who is affected by the policy/decision/service/ project/programme?** (For example, employees/service users/supplier/contractor)	Residents of, and visitors (including commuters) to the borough of Swindon.

1.4	**What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this proposal?** (For example, with relevant groups and stakeholders)	Via the SBC Parking Operations website portal, Swindon's car-park users continue to be very vocal about the poor state of repair and reliability of the existing car-parking payment equipment. Additional complaints centre around the need for SBC to 'move with the times' and to offer contactless card payment options; this is especially the case when making a challenge or representation against a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). Conversely, some users make a case for the retention of a cash payment option for the car-parking machines on the grounds that not all people feel comfortable using a credit / debit card in such circumstances, or do not own a (sufficiently sophisticated) mobile phone to access the 'pay-by-phone' options. However, SBC's experiences with cash car-parking payment machines have been very unfavourable; they are regularly vandalised and put out of use, thus fuelling the unreliability argument. Maintenance costs are, thus, disproportionately high for these machines. SBC Parking Operations has reviewed this situation with the equalities leads to ensure that an inclusive approach as possible has been reached, but nevertheless without the inclusion of a cash option for the replacement programme.
1.5	**What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?**	The number of payment transactions made via the cashless system. The on-going monitoring of, and responses to comments received via the SBC Parking Operations website portal.

Section two – protected characteristics

Protected characteristic group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact? Is the impact neutral?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (for example, adjustment to the proposal)
Disability	Neutral / Positive		Many new payment machines include language options and voice commands to make user instructions more easily understood.
Gender reassignment	Neutral		
Marriage or civil partnership	Neutral		
Pregnancy and maternity	Neutral		
Race	Neutral		
Religion or belief	Neutral		
Sexual orientation	Neutral		
Sex (gender)	Neutral		
Age	Positive & Negative	A greater variety of payment methods incorporated into the machines accords with	Mitigation includes clear and concise step-by-step instructions on the

| | | comments to the SBC Parking Operations website portal, the 'wider world' experience and the expectations of most of the age generations.

Conversely, there is a potential adverse impact on the elderly due to the proposed technology upgrade to the payment machines. This group, arguably, has less access to credit / debit cards and (sufficiently sophisticated) mobile phones to access the cashless payment options. | machines on how to complete cashless payments. |
| Children in care and care leavers | Neutral | | |

Section three – evaluation

No.	Question	Explanation/justification
3.1	**Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?**	As explained in Section 1.4 above, renewal of the car-parking payment machines could, potentially, disadvantage the elderly due to the cashless technology being proposed. However, the counter argument to this is the consideration of on-going vandalism, down-time and maintenance costs associated with the use of machines that include cash payments. Also, many comments to the SBC Parking Operations website portal are encouraging of more options for cashless payment. Thus, on balance, the procurement of cashless car-parking payment machines is considered appropriate and justified.

No.	Final Decision	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1	No barriers identified, therefore activity will proceed.		
2	Stop at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups.		
3	Adapt or change the event in a way which you think will eliminate the bias.		
4	Barriers and impact have been identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (for example, in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore, proceed with caution with this knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.	✔	As explained above.

Section four – record keeping

Question	Response
Will this EqIA be published* (*EqIA's should be published alongside relevant event paperwork including cabinet papers):	Yes
Date completed	14/01/2026

Review date (if applicable)	N/A

Change log

Name	Date	Version	Change made

Responsibilities

Question	Response	Date completed
Name of person leading this EqIA	Lawrence Murphy	14/01/2026

Question	Response
Names and roles of people involved in the consideration of impact	Lawrence Murphy – Transport Project Manager Michelle King – Localities Supervisor: Parking Management Kevin Aitken – Interim Service Lead: Parking Management Simon Anthony – Director of Operations

Question	Response	Date signed
Name of Director signing EqIA	Simon Anthony	02/02/2026