

Appendix 7 – March 2025 consultation

Comments received directly to Parking Managers email address.

Hi Phil,

I wanted to reach out about the Emissions based charging consultation. I'm keen to find out if you or the powers above you are pushing this war on motorist for Reading. Soon you will want it to become an LTN or have you and the powers above you that you are worried to go against decided that already?

The council need to focus on real problems and not just using every small thing as a chance to royally mess about the people that live in Reading.

I am not sure why you have stated that the views of people that oppose will be listened to as it's quite obvious the council will go ahead with this anyway.

You and your colleagues are ruining Reading, listen to the citizens for once and stop the madness you are pushing.

Thanks,

Afternoon,

Are you exempting

1 Disabled drivers , who may not be able to change their vehicle due to modifications and cost to change their vehicle .

2. Those on a low income / benefits who may not be able to change their vehicle due to cost.

This type of charge hits the poor and vulnerable not the wealthy who can afford to pay higher charges or change their vehicle.

A better solution would be to put in a Northern park and ride and provide disabled bus passes for working disabled people that has no morning time constraints!

Regards

Hi

I am a Reading resident who lives in the town centre and has to drive due to disability and carrying a wheelchair around.

Do I assume I am going to have to pay more to park now when using buses etc is not an option for me.

Thanks

Hi

This is all wrong the guidelines for emissions on an MOT are set by government dvsa which are 0. 1 or 2 or 3 which is minuet

You can not keep putting all this extra cost on working people who are struggling and can not afford new cars just to get more money for less services by the council

Regards

I'm unsure if this is the correct forum to give my views on this consultation?

It is only today that I have become aware of this policy !

There seems to have been little or no advertising by the council on this matter!.

Presumably a consultation requires this ?

In any event I am against this policy, it's just another virtue signalling and money making venture policy !

Any so called pollution problems are caused by traffic entering the Reading road system which is not fit for purpose !

I don't believe there is any evidence that people living in neighbouring areas covered by parking permits are causing problems .

You are simply trying to extract more from motorists as they are easy targets .

Further more if pollution is such a great peril to the area ,get the 3rd Bridge built to remove much of the through traffic that causes so much congestion in the town

Dear Mr Grant,

I am opposed to this tiered pricing as, yet again, the poorer members of society are being targeted. Those with money to spare can afford EVs, others are not so fortunate.

Years ago we bought a diesel car as it was more fuel efficient and touted as better for the environment. Now, our car is considered to be worse than scrapping it and buying new, despite the carbon footprint of any new car bring far worse than keeping an old car going. This encouragement of scrapping old cars does not make sense environmentally and is unfair on the less well off.

Yours sincerely

Hi Phil,

MI have just completed the survey and the survey quality, I am sorry to say was not good.

The questions are badly written generally with mulitple questions requiring more than one answer but only one answer is possible.

Even worse I was forced to answer the question about commuting which I do not do. That question should be optional but it was not.

The questions are designed to give the answer that emission based charging is supported suggesting that this is not a consultation but a box ticking exercise.

Regards

Dear Mr. Grant,

I write to you to strongly object to the council's plans as I understand them, for the introduction of emissions based charging where these will be applied to permit parking, for the following reasons:

1. Many residencies in Reading do not have off-street parking and by their very nature these tend to be in the less expensive areas inhabited by people who are less able to pay such charges. If I understand the council's proposal, anyone affluent enough to have a larger house with a drive can have any car they choose and will not be penalised based on emissions.

2. To expect people limited to on-street parking to move to emissions reduced/emissions free vehicles is impractical for the following reasons:

a) I have seen no evidence of how the council or government will enable the many people who have to park on the street to cheaply trickle-charge their vehicles outside their homes, assuming they are lucky enough to find a parking space outside their house;

b) It will not be possible to have a charging station outside every house allotted to each address;

c) It will be impractical and dangerous to have cables trailing across pavements from house to car to facilitate trickle-charging. Therefore, if they wish to charge their only alternative will be to use public charging points which are currently extortionate.

3. The costs of PHEVs and EVs are too high for most people for the following reasons:

a) Insurance tends to be a lot more expensive;

b) Assuming most of the people you are targeting will purchase a second-hand vehicle, these are undesirable as the lifespan of the battery is affected by the rate at which the battery has been charged;

c) The purchaser has no knowledge of the extent to which the battery has degraded;

d) At the moment the motoring industry generally quotes the expected lifespan of a battery as around 10 years and the cost of replacing a battery was once quoted to me in the order of £10k.

In summary, people who have to park on the street are by definition less able to pay charges, can less afford to transition to PHEVs and EVs, and the current infrastructure cannot accommodate the transition to PHEVs and EVs. So, unless you intentionally wish to target the less affluent, the proposal should be abandoned. I understand the council's aim and believe a more effective means would be to charge people based on the engine size or maybe the curb-weight using ANPR technology. Below a certain size - the type of car less affluent people would typically drive - the charge is minimal and above that the charges increase exponentially.

Yours sincerely,

Hello

I have seen this proposal and it's very clearly just a money grab from the council. You guys should do your job and act in the best interests of the people you represent. Penalising people financially that can't afford the newest cars is going to put them further away from being able to afford a newer car.

Use some common sense, the people of Reading are not stupid and will see right through this stupid proposal.

Kind Regards

I think such a charge is unfair. Owners of vehicles already pay extra for higher emissions through Road Tax licensing. So you're proposing to tax them twice.

Dear Sirs,

- 1) Your proposals lack any detail. What concrete calculations have been put before our Council and will you share them with your constituents?
- 2) Does your proposal intend a meaningful drop in parking fees for vehicles emitting less than a fixed output, and an equal uplift in charges for those failing to comply?
- 3) Fact: We cannot offer our opinion until you publicise your real proposals on which you are expecting constructive observation?
- 4) Please get your experts to show factually, how parked vehicles with their engines off contribute to noxious carcinogenic hydro-carbon emissions?
- 5) If carcinogenic emissions are really your concern, please show how you are vectoring your efforts towards those causes your experts suggest are the teal problem.

Such as: Scarcely used restricted traffic lanes, forcing 90% of all traffic in a single lane, repeatedly stopping, starting and excellerating.

With out some detail, this tax increase will only affect residents who pay to park outside their homes. Non residents will be charged no more. RBC has already doubled its income on residents by halving the resident permit duration. Low hanging fruit again.

Isn't this just a plain tax increase? Unless of course your proposal promises to be tax neutral for residents? Please don't suggest further admin costs to implement the new 'green thinking policy'.

May I be constructive and point you to the real causes of saturated hydrocarbon emissions within your purview? Constriction of roads to allow a relatively few non tax paying cyclists, ebikes, escooters to cause saturation exhaust emissions when on constricted lanes. The phenomenal cost of implementing unnecessary traffic lights at specific road junctions. Where cars back up to a stop, and then all accelerate. You have the primary causes of emissions writ clear. A stationary parked vehicle it is not!

Resent parking emissions charges. I can only say I am so against these proposed further charges. I already pay resident's parking in order to park in a street nearby. I am not luckie enough to have off road parking so I am not exempt from these charges ☺ ☹

Dear Phil.

With respect to people who are already charged on the 'resident parking' scheme, I am against this proposed new cost to Reading Residents.

Many houses in Reading are Victorian and Edwardian terraces with no Facility for off road parking. Such residents already pay a substantial amount to be allowed the opportunity to park near their house.

Also, if your push is for this proposed scheme to lessen the pollution in the town, then possibly what you could do is all the other parts of the proposal but leave Resident Parking Permits out of it.

If however, you feel you must again hit your town's not so well off residents I.e. those living in terraced accommodation with no off street parking facilities, maybe you could delay that hit till they inform you of their car change? Also, if you wish to help the environment, then leave those with cars older than a certain age e.g. 25 years old alone. As these people are not significantly adding to the problem.

However, if your actions caused such owners to get rid of their old but trusted vehicle so as to replace it with a newer less emissions car, you may be defeating your objective.

Thankyou.

Hello Phil.

We received an email regarding the emissions based parking.

Unfortunately we think it isn't a helpful idea for most people. Particularly busy family people.

The overall traffic policies of the council seem to make life harder and more awkward for the residents or atleast anyone who wants to move around Reading in a car.

I drive a van for work all around Reading. My wife needs to move our young children around the town. Its not practical or safe to use the bus.

It would be nice to scrap all these policies which close roads, introduce bus lanes and carry out continuous road works all over the town. It's really not helping.

Not everyone can afford or wants an electric vehicle.

Hope you can consider alternative points of view.

I think the idea to pay a parking fee to park outside my house is just wrong. Just because I cannot park on a drive and like my neighbour can do with their 4x4 and so would not need to pay by meter. I live on a street of terraced houses in West Reading.

Hi there

Just some thoughts on this for residents parking - it seems very unfair to penalise people to park outside their own home and make some pay more than others. You will only be targeting residents on streets with permits, what about all the people that park on streets that do not have permits, or where they have a drive way? Is it ok for them to drive more polluting cars?

I assume the drive is towards electric cars, but how are you expecting people that have to park on the road near their house (where permits are required) to be able to charge their electric car? We can rarely park outside our house and so I wouldn't know how we could charge an electric car and so that will be the main consideration when we eventually have to replace our car.

I understand that you may want to discourage people from driving into town and parking and so would support the different tariffs in town car parks. Please consider however that electric cars are often SUVs and are larger than normal cars and so often I see these large electric cars badly parked taking up more than one space!

But I am against charging residents different amounts. Especially when electric cars are not financially viable for many and also not practical for people living on busy streets without guaranteed parking outside their home.

Thanks

Hi Phil

I have filled in the survey, but have had further thoughts.

Whilst I am in favour as a whole in the concept of what your "claim" you are doing, I question why you are targeting only on street parking and not actual car parks.

Here is why, people who have to park on street, might not have a choice in where they park, also might not have a choice to use public transport to this location, hence these people might also not be able to switch to a less polluting vehicle, so you could be hitting people who would find it hard to pay increase charges.

Whilst your car parks, are for people who shop or work, and normally are travelling into the centre so more public transport.

Okay to say I travel Tilehurst to get my haircut, this is a drive to location, you could park for free for 30 minutes in the local car park, but now must pay, there is free on street parking, people drive round looking for this, burning fuel, not very climate friendly.

As a member of the Green Liberal Democrats (and a LibDem Activist) I have many times had to explain that car parks do not maintain themselves, but the issue with your car parks is RBC do not pick up the cost of the App.

Hi Phil,

I am writing to you to as I wanted to make sure that it is taken into consideration that people who do not have a driveway and are therefore unable to have a charging point do not have the ability to charge their cars at home need to have fuel powered cars at the moment. People who have less money are less likely to have a driveway, it would therefore make charging more for permits for people with diesel/ petrol powered cars a tax on being poor.

Making public transport a lot more affordable would really help reduce the use of cars. My daughter would travel back from Theale Green school to just past Sainsbury's, this one journey would cost me over £5 as the school is not in the reading bus catchment. Now my children travel both ways to school, So my son is learning to drive because paying for a car, insurance, tax etc is cheaper than them catching the bus. It shouldn't be that way and we really should be encouraging our children to use public transport and try not to have cars at all.

I also feel that school uniforms need an overhaul to make it easier and safer to cycle (my son stopped cycling when he received a detention for wearing a hi vis cycling jacket and he was supposed to only wear black!) but that is a separate argument!

I really am passionate about greener issues and green travel. If I had loads of money I would use a lot more public transport but at the moment I simply can't afford to.

Dear Phil,

I own & drive a car.

Due to health reasons the public transport provision is not an option for me as it is inadequate to meet my needs. I use my car as a means to get to work but also to get from A to B as once again public transport does not make allowances for my health needs.

Your proposal will disadvantage those whose travel/health needs are not met by the provision you provide. The lack of investment in providing suitable & accessible bathroom facilities amplifies this. Just because one has health needs it does automatically mean they would qualify for a blue permit if this meant one might be exempt from such changes in your proposals. Although I have not applied for a blue permit myself as having my own car enables me to just about get by although still that can be very challenging at times.

Being penalised for having to use my own transport to enable myself to travel to work & get about with life activities & not having the financial resources to purchase a new more environmental friendly car I find hardly fair. This will result in those striving to work for a living despite having many challenges becoming worse off & making the option to work more costly.

Have you considered how the proposal might impact people who find themselves in a similar situation? Working may no longer be cost effective for some??

Please do let me know your thoughts.

Dear Sir.

I am against this proposal, because like the vast majority of Newtown, St Bartholomews Rd, Palmer Park Avenue etc. We reside in terraced houses, with no access to 'off road parking' and so are very likely to have petrol or diesel vehicles for practical reasons. Also, this proposal does not take into account the age of the car, and the council's stated aim to improve air quality, although laudable is fairly recent, so can I suggest that cars older than a certain age eg. 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years -YOUR CHOICE- be exempt, because these owners tend to be the less well off and so also tend to already be contributing less towards Carbon Emissions wrt nor needlessly buying a new car because they can. Thank-you and kind Regards

The council's proposal to add a further tax to the poorer residents in Reading ie the people who live in the terrace houses in Reading because having a more expensive houses with a driveway is immoral, you already have the permit money as an extra source of income , please rethink this proposal and stop picking on the poorer residence.

People need their cars it is not practical to use public transport as your main source of transport!

What is the point of going in to Reading if residents are subjected to high car parking charges. Already shops are suffering and shutting due to high business rates and pressure from online shopping. Is RBC looking to turn Reading into a ghost town like other cities and towns in England?

It's not easy for many residents to replace their petrol or diesel cars with hybrid or electric. That comes with high costs for the vehicle and additional costs for installation of a charging point. It will therefore **disproportionately affect low-income residents** who may not afford to upgrade to low-emission vehicles.

All very well RBC thinking, "Oh! We can raise more revenue by doing this". But discounting the fact that **local shops will be shuttered** which will mean loss of business rates revenue.

Other reasons for not doing this include the **cost of upgrading pay-and-display machines** and integrating them with vehicle emissions data. Apart from Reading Borough **residents backlash** such charging will **deter visitors coming to Reading** which will reduce the revenues spent in the town impacting shops and businesses alike. It will also **push drivers to park illegally**, creating enforcement challenges.

Dear Sirs

I've read the introductory material on this new proposed approach to parking charges. I have a couple of early questions:

1. You state "It has long been known that air quality is adversely affected by emissions from vehicles". While I am not disputing I would like to see the air quality measurement records to support this new proposal. I would like to see this broken down by postcode as I am not sure the air quality results are the same all over the town.
2. I note that the new charges will be paid by a phone app. Not everyone uses a smart phone and thus this approach is discriminatory unless you are proposing additional measures in addition to the phone app.

I look forward to your responses.

Hi Phil

I am concerned that the planned increase in parking charges and changes may encourage more residents to pave over their front or rear gardens to avoid paying higher fees. This practice can lead to negative environmental effects, such as increased surface water runoff, drainage issues, and loss of biodiversity.

... a completely ridiculous and desperate idea by this council when more and more is being squeezed out of the British public!

When you already have diesel engined Buses, coaches and Trains plus heavy goods vehicles which pollute far more than your average car then these commercial modes of transport being unfairly targeted as well? Yet again it's the British public and not businesses who the easiest target to plug holes in the Council's finances.

It's high time this Council's CEO and the Exec team are removed and fired from these grossly overpaid jobs.

A very frustrated citizen

Regarding your resident permit emissions based payment I have to say what a bit of a joke this seems! People that buy particular cars are generally because that's all they can afford and need for yet RBC think charging extra to park is going to somehow encourage us to find more money for a better car when everything is increasing in this god awful town and that's your answer to pollution , more like greed. Also parking In my particular zone is ridiculous due to non resident parking continually for long periods with no consequence or parking attendants to be seen !! Yet you want more money !! How about ticketing the offenders who do park illegally and get your blood money that way and for once leave the residents who do pay alone .

Dear Sir,

Whoever you are I hope that you will be in good health to your old age and never will need any help. I cannot say the same thing about myself. In the age of 77 I no longer can carry on any substantial weight like shopping I can't walk very far. Having cancer and other problem your "genius" plan will stop me going shopping in Reading. But this is your long-term plan. Stop people coming to Reading would mean no problems, street will be clean, nobody will trip on uneven payments, nobody will complain, list is endless. It would not matter to you if businesses will close, they are obstacle in your plan. No businesses no people problem solved, easy life for council. Do not forget people need the air to be alive and body produce emission. No people will help you quicker to achieve clean air. My only consolation is that I am old and will not have to deal with madness for much longer

Kind regards

Hello,

This is a great idea, in theory. But the reality is that people with lower incomes, who probably have a higher proportion of the higher emissions cars (being unable to afford a new one) will be the first to be penalised.

If you live in a house without a driveway, where there are resident permits for parking, these will go up even further. With the rise of everything else, it is becoming absolutely ludicrous.

The working man is barely able to live at the moment, and another increase in taxes is just too much.

This needs to be paused on resident permits, whilst the cost of living is becoming exponentially expensive.

Thank you,

Hi all

Prior to this evenings CAST forum Reading FOE have sent us a number of questions including the one below. I am expecting that this will just generate a discussion between the Councillors in the Forum and attendees but if you have anything to add

or share then please can you let me know? It might just be useful to have the timeframe for the consultation reporting and next steps, expected committees etc.. if this is known.

Thanks
James

2 Emissions – Based Charging for Pay and Display

There's assessment of expected revenue, but is there any assessment of expected impact on air quality, CO2 emissions, vehicle ownership, or vehicle mileage in Reading?

Are public likely to see it as 'fair' – especially to less well-off people with older vehicles who don't benefit from off street parking? Vehicles emit very little when parked will it provoke a public reaction like London LEZ introduction?

How do air quality impacts correlate with CO2 emissions (which surcharge is based on)?

Wouldn't an emissions-based charging for road users coming into Reading from outside be much more effective and acceptable to Reading residents, especially if it didn't apply to Reading residents for an initial period allowing them time to change their cars.

Good morning,

I understand that the consultation period for this proposal has closed, but I am hoping that my views, which are shared by a number of residents, will be passed to the relevant committee and taken into account.

I live on Wantage Road, and have done for more than 30 years. The majority of parking is on-road; resident permits used to be free of charge for the first permit with a reasonable charge for a second vehicle. In recent years residents have had to pay for the opportunity to park by or near our homes. On the whole this works reasonably well, though traffic wardens seem to be incentivised to catch out any visitor who hasn't replaced their scratchcard in time rather than address any of the actual problems residents experience with illegal parking (especially at the Oxford Road end).

Proposing to charge residents more to park on the road outside their homes is unacceptable, regardless of the vehicle type. We have no option to park off-road, and vandalism and theft from our vehicles is increasing. We would park elsewhere if we could.

I understand that this proposal is to "reduce the overall reliance on the private motor vehicle". Rather than penalise residents yet again, perhaps council leaders could encourage more people to use public transport by subsidising its use. The buses are good; the cost of travelling on them is far too expensive to coax anyone out of their cars.