

## Appendix 3 - EIA Panel Review



<b>EIA being reviewed</b>	Public Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (PEVIS)	
<b>Reference Number</b>	300	
<b>EIA presented by</b>	Francesca Powell Richard Barnes	
<b>Date</b>	19 October 2023	
<b>Panel members present</b>	Sophie Bradfield Jon Cockeram Gill Parke Vicky Edmonds	
Aspect	RAG Rating	Comments
<b>Timeliness</b> Is this EIA timely? i.e. considered before any decisions have been made		
<b>Proportionate</b> Is this EIA proportionate to the decision? i.e. is a full action plan needed?		
<b>Is it clear what is being reviewed?</b>		
<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b> Has engagement/consultation been undertaken with stakeholders? Has this fed into the proposal?		Good use of data collected as part of the stakeholder consultation and how the results have been fed into the proposal.  Need to ensure all concerns from the consultation been addressed.  Explicitly mention all equality issues raised as part of the consultation and how we are responding to them.
<b>Needs and experiences</b> Have all the protected groups been considered?		This section needs to be reworked. There is a great deal of information included which is not equality focussed. This dilutes all the good work that has been

		carried out to identify equalities issues.
<b>Positive Benefits &amp; Impacts</b> Have all the protected characteristics been considered?		See comment above.
<b>Negative Impacts</b> Have all the protected characteristics been considered?		<p>Seem to have addressed all negative impacts with mitigating actions but hard to follow as scattered throughout the EIA.</p> <p>The panel was unclear whether users charging their cars would also need to pay the car parking charge. This may have an impact on those people within a lower socio-economic group.</p> <p>During the presentation it was mentioned that there may be a loss of disabled spaces going forward. It would be helpful to consider some mitigating actions at this stage to show how this will be addressed.</p>
<b>Evidence</b> Has evidence been used to draw conclusions?		<p>Really good use of data to evidence the EIA and have set the scene well with the context.</p> <p>It would be good to compare the breakdown of the consultation responses to the <a href="#">overall profile of the BCP</a> area to see if it is representative and where it isn't have consideration of this. E.g., the gender split.</p>
<b>Mitigating Actions</b> Where necessary, have reasonable adjustments been proposed?		<p>The mitigating actions need to be matched to their negative impact to show that they have all been addressed.</p> <p>The panel appreciates that at this stage consideration has been given to potential sites and reasons why they should be rejected but consideration should also be given to the impact on existing facilities or</p>

		infrastructure (e.g., loss of disabled spaces).
<b>Summary</b> Does the summary provide the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overview of equality considerations both positive and negative</li> <li>• The rationale for drawing these conclusions</li> <li>• Detail required mitigating actions.</li> </ul>		Sets out the story well.  Needs to draw out identified positive and negative equality impacts and mitigating actions. It currently doesn't seem to cover everything mentioned in the EIA. Ensure the summary is equality focused.
<b>Overall rating</b>		This EIA has used data and evidence well and considered the outcomes of the project and the implementation. The panel were encouraged to see they had been included in the tender specification.  Equality considerations have been built into the EIA however, they are lost in the detail.  To strengthen the equality points made consider putting the background info into an appendix. Otherwise at risk of diluting the equality focus and can read at times like more of a business case.

**Please Note:** All EIA's will be published on the Website. It is important that revisions are made if you receive an Amber rating, please can you send a copy of your revised EIA to the [Policy Team](#)

#### For reference

- **Green** – good to go/approved, providing sufficient evidence the public sector equality duty has been met.
- **Amber** – good to go subject to minor changes or mitigating actions being put in place and followed through in the development of the project/service/policy/procedure or practice.
- **Red** – inadequate, needs to be reworked before the decision goes forward, where it is evident the public sector equality duty has not been met or continuing with the project or proposal will lead to direct or indirect unlawful discrimination that cannot legitimately be justified.