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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Tim Woodhouse</td>
<td>6th May 2017</td>
<td>Initial draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>A Agyepong</td>
<td>6 July 2017</td>
<td>Comments for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>T Woodhouse</td>
<td>6 July 17</td>
<td>Typos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Tim Woodhouse</td>
<td>7th July 2017</td>
<td>Updated following AA’s comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Could this policy, procedure, project or service, or any proposed changes to it, affect this group less favourably than others in Kent? YES/NO If yes how?</td>
<td>Assessment of potential impact</td>
<td>Provide details: a) Is internal action required? If yes what? b) Is further assessment required? If yes, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our 2016 visitor satisfaction survey sampled 639 people, 64% of whom were female.

We will conduct more accurate research into the demographic profile of our park users by capturing data through visitor surveys and at the time of purchasing formal products such as season tickets. We will take appropriate action where possible to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.

If the research supports a gap in provision for a specific gender then new or alternative provision or marketing can be explored to achieve gender related equal opportunities.

---

Our 2016 visitor satisfaction survey sampled 639 people, 97% described their ethnicity as “white-British”.

We will conduct more accurate research into the demographic profile of our park users by capturing data through visitor surveys and at the time of purchasing formal products such as season tickets. We will take appropriate action where possible to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.

The analysis of this research will be done on a park by park basis to ensure that the demographics of the local community are taken into account.

If the research supports a gap in provision for a specific race then new or alternative provision or marketing can be explored to achieve race related equal opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion or belief</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>We will conduct more accurate research into the demographic profile of our park users by capturing data through visitor surveys and at the time of purchasing formal products such as season tickets. We will take appropriate action where possible to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups. The analysis of this research will be done on a park by park basis to ensure that the demographics of the local community are taken into account.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>If the research supports a gap in provision or marketing for a specific religion or belief group then new or alternative provision can be explored to achieve religious or belief group equal opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer's responsibilities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1: INITIAL SCREENING

Proportionality - Based on the answers in the above screening grid what RISK weighting would you ascribe to this function – see Risk Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.</td>
<td>Medium relevance or Insufficient information/evidence to make a judgement.</td>
<td>High relevance to equality, /likely to have adverse impact on protected groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State rating & reasons

I would rate the Country Parks Strategy as **Low**. We have identified a need to collect better equality and diversity data however there is no indication that the Strategy will have an adverse impact on protected groups.

Context

There are approximately 1.6 million visits to the KCC Country Parks every year. Most of these are individuals, couples or families who turn up, pay for parking and enjoy the parks in an informal manner. The vast majority do not hold season tickets. This informal and fluid customer base has historically mads accurate data capture for equality and diversity monitoring purposes difficult. However, during 2016 we identified that need to improve our understanding about who is using our parks and have already improved our data capture for our more formal products (ie when customers book birthday parties, buy a season ticket or book a formal education visit. Further data capture for other products is also planned for later in the year).

The 2016 Visitor Satisfaction Survey also gives us a flavour of who is using the parks as it surveyed 639 park users and collected demographic data from them. However this was a random sample and shouldn’t necessarily be taken as representative.

Our lack of data, and our desire to ensure our parks are enjoyed by all sectors of society is why Objective 6 of the draft strategy commits us to “undertake research and action to ensure that visitors to our parks reflect the diverse population of Kent.

Aims and Objectives

The strategy has three aims

1) Provide a network of high quality and biodiverse country parks
2) Increase visitor numbers to the country parks
3) Ensure the service is as financially self-sustaining as possible.

Beneficiaries

Kent residents and visitors

Information and Data used to carry out your assessment

- The 2016 Country Parks Visitor Satisfaction Survey
Observations from the Country Parks team

Going forward we intend to gather more specific data including that around protected characteristics by capturing data through visitor surveys and at the time of purchasing formal products such as season tickets. We will take appropriate action where possible to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.

We will conduct more accurate research into the demographic profile of our park users and take appropriate action to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.

The analysis of this research will be done on a park by park basis to ensure that the demographics of the local community are taken into account along with the individual facilities and resources that are available at each park.

Who have you involved and engaged with

There will be a full public consultation regarding the Country Parks Strategy in 2017. By utilizing contacts that the KCC Consultations team has gathered over recent years, a wide range of groups representing people with the protected characteristics will be invited to take part.

Potential Impact

One aim of the Strategy is to increase visitor numbers to the parks where capacity exists and it contains a specific objective to ensure that the parks are enjoyed by all sectors of the community.

Adverse Impact and how can these adverse impacts be mitigated

At this stage no adverse impacts have been identified in implementing the Country Parks Strategy.

JUDGEMENT

Set out below the implications you have found from your assessment for the relevant diversity groups. If any negative impacts can be justified please clearly explain why.

Option 2 – Internal Action Required YES

Although there is no indication that the strategy will have an adverse equality impact on any of the protected characteristics the strategy is due to go out to full public consultation. If any concerns are raised as part of that, or as part of the planned research, then Actions will be taken to mitigate the impact or change the strategy in order to be compliant with the Equality Act 2010.
A lack of quality data means that more accurate research into the demographic profile of park users is needed; followed by appropriate action to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.

(Check the Action Plan at the end of this document)

Monitoring and Review

This EQIA forms part of the public consultation regarding the Strategy which closes 11th Sept 2017. It will be reviewed by the Service and the Cabinet Committee (Oct and Nov 2017) in the light of consultation responses.

Sign Off

I have noted the content of the equality impact assessment and agree the actions to mitigate the adverse impact(s) that have been identified.

Senior Officer

Signed: Stephanie Holt
Name: Stephanie Holt
Job Title: Head of Countryside, Leisure and Sport
Date: 10/07/17

DMT Member

Signed:                                      Name:
Please forward a final signed electronic copy to the Equality Team by emailing

diversityinfo@kent.gov.uk

The original signed hard copy and electronic copy should be kept with your team for audit purposes.
### Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Issues identified</th>
<th>Action to be taken</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Cost implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>A lack of consultation and user voice</td>
<td>A full public consultation into the Country Parks Strategy 2017-2021</td>
<td>A better understanding of the needs of individuals and groups representing the protected characteristics</td>
<td>Tim Woodhouse, Country Parks Manager</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Yes – the cost of the public consultation (printed materials, survey design and analysis etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>A lack of accurate equality and diversity data</td>
<td>We will conduct more accurate research into the demographic profile of our park users by capturing data through visitor surveys and at the time of purchasing formal products such as season tickets. We will take appropriate action where possible to encourage increased or alternative usage from under-represented groups.</td>
<td>A better understanding of park users and the identification of under-represented groups</td>
<td>Tim Woodhouse, Country Parks Manager</td>
<td>By March 2018</td>
<td>Yes – the cost (yet to be determined) the research and any appropriate actions to encourage more usage from under-represented groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>