

Appendix 1 - Responses to EBC on-street pay and display charges consultation

Support for On Street Pay and Display Emissions based charging

There are 28 comments that are in favour of the proposal

Support	Theme	Consultation Submission	RBC Response
1	Support	Agree the proposal	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
2	Support Affordability	Although this seems sensible in principle it does not take into account those people who have older cars are more likely not to be in a position to purchase a less polluting vehicle.	Noted, in relation to older cars, we would highlight that there are many older cars that would be below the threshold or in the lowest band as the bands start above 150g of Co2 per KM. We anticipate that around 50% of cars will see no increase in charges for emissions with a further 25% expected to fall into the first band.
3	Support	An excellent idea	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
4	Support	As long as people are given reasonable notice, this proposal seems sensible and I approve of it. It is a practical incentive based way of improving air quality in our town.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
5	Support	Great idea. Will only work if you commit to the resources to enforce it	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
6	Support	I agree that high polluting cars should pay more and should be discouraged. The price should be proportionate to the effort. There is no point to increase the price if the behaviour is not going to change. It is important to use other regulatory means, such as ban big vehicles to use the oxford road.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
7	Support Affordability	I agree with the idea of pollution based charging for higher polluting vehicles for those coming in to the centre. However I feel it's unfair for those living in the area (residents permits). I have an old car because I cannot afford a new one. I	Your support is noted In relation to older cars, we would highlight that there are many older cars that would be below the threshold or in the lowest band as

		<p>use it rarely and cycle to most places. However I keep my car for long distances, where I can't cycle or walk.</p> <p>The new policy will cost me, but won't change my behaviours. I already use active travel as much as I can. I also think this will encourage people upgrade to new SUVs which, while electric and have less pollution, are completely incompatible with central Reading's roads. We need to encourage smaller cars, access can already be blocked by bigger vehicles and these new policies will only make that worse. There's also a worry that new (less polluting) vehicles are owned by richer members of society. Those who, like me, cannot afford a new car will be financially punished, pushing financial penalties onto those already struggling is unfair.</p> <p>Those who live in Central Reading are not rich! This proposal needs to consider residents and those coming into the town separately. It is not fair having these groups in the same consultation.</p>	<p>the bands start above 150g of Co2 per KM. We anticipate that around 50% of cars will see no increase in charges for emissions with a further 25% expected to fall into the first band</p> <p>We are aware of the issues around size and weight. The technology is not in place at the moment to base a charging regime on these elements. We are aware of development work being carried out on this and will consider the application of such a system as and when it becomes available.</p>
8	Support	<p>I am in support. The short sightedness of not tackling climate change and listening to near sighted views of immediate cost implications will only ensure greater harm. For the health of our children and our grandchildren, we must tackle air quality.</p>	<p>Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted</p>
9	Support	<p>I approve of the theory of emissions-based charges, but overall the charge level is too high. If you lowered the standard charges then more people would visit Reading and you'd make more money in parking charges overall plus more money in business rates as less shops would be vacant.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support and your suggestions around Pricing, these will be shared with councillors for consideration before a final decision is made.</p> <p>Pricing of parking has shown to be an effective method of controlling parking and by extension traffic movements overall.</p> <p>Lowering charges would be counter to the stated aim of the council to be net zero by 2030.</p>

10	<p>Support</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>Affordability</p> <p>Access to charging</p>	<p>I broadly support the proposed policy to introduce emission-based parking charges in Reading. Targeting roads in and around the town centre- particularly those identified as air pollution hotspots- should be a priority.</p> <p>Increasing charges for on-street parking in these areas, especially near sensitive locations such as the Royal Berkshire Hospital, could help encourage modal shift away from private car use and towards more sustainable transport options.</p> <p>However, for this policy to be effective, it must be accompanied by a robust and attractive public transport offer. I welcome the council's initiative to offer £1.50 bus fares from central Caversham, which is a positive step. Nevertheless, many people who drive into Reading for leisure purposes are families, for whom public transport is often less convenient and more expensive than parking.</p> <p>To address this, I urge the council to consider introducing affordable 'family tickets' for bus travel - e.g. £5.50 for two adults and two children- on selected routes as part of a 12-month trial. This would make public transport a more viable and appealing alternative to driving, especially when compared to the cost of parking in town-centre locations such as the Oracle, which currently charges around £6 for 2–3 hours.</p> <p>The council should also recognise that while zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) significantly reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx/NO₂) emissions, they do not eliminate all forms of air pollution. Fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), which poses a greater risk to human health, will continue to be emitted - particularly from tyre and brake wear, as well as road surface abrasion. This underscores the importance of investing in and promoting a stronger public transport offer, as reducing overall vehicle use remains essential for improving air quality and protecting public health.</p>	<p>There are approximately 10,000 permits in circulation at any time in the borough. The results of the informal consultation on this proposal, carried out in March 2025 revealed that approximately 20% of respondents would consider changing their behaviour if an emission based scheme was introduced. Potentially, that could mean 2,000 people changing their habits in favour of more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Your suggestion regarding public transport and family tickets is beyond the reach of this consultation. However your comments will be passed onto councillors for consideration before a decision is made.</p> <p>Reading has an extensive bus network with the third highest number of bus passenger journeys per head of population in England (outside of London), and had an 11% increase in bus passenger journeys to 19.5m in 2023/24. The Council has secured external grant funding of over £30m over the past few years to invest in improving bus services, which included the Reading All-Bus ticket discount scheme which saved passengers more than £5million in fares.</p> <p>We recognise that all vehicles, including EVs will produce particulates from brakes and tires, but are recognising that Internal Combustion engine vehicles will also produce exhaust emissions and the proposals are there in part</p>
----	---	---	---

		<p>I do not support the introduction of emission-based charges for residential parking permits. The aim of this policy should be to reduce unnecessary car travel into the town centre, not to penalise residents who have no alternative but to park on the street near their homes. ZEVs still significantly more expensive than internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles, many residents cannot afford to switch at this time.</p> <p>Furthermore, a large proportion of homes with on-street parking lack access to private EV chargepoints, making the transition even more difficult. I recommend that the council reconsider this aspect of the policy and instead review it closer to 2035, when all new cars and vans are expected to be zero-emission at the tailpipe. This would allow more time for the market to mature and for residents to make the transition more equitably. As an interim measure, the council could consider applying emission-based residential permit charges only to streets identified as air pollution hotspots, rather than implementing a blanket approach across all residential areas.</p>	<p>to encourage modal shift and future choices in vehicle purchase.</p> <p>In relation to permits we would highlight that there are many petrol and diesel cars that would be below the threshold or in the lowest band as the bands start above 150g of Co2 per KM. We anticipate that around 50% of cars will see no increase in charges for emissions, obtaining a permit for the same cost as an EV car, with a further 25% falling into the first band.</p> <p>Investment in public transport has been on-going and is continuing. The council are in the process of procuring C1500 EV charge points to be installed throughout the borough. It is beyond the councils remit to offer incentives for residents to switch to more environmentally friendly vehicles. However, the Government has recently launched a number of schemes to encourage motorists to move from ICE to EV and will continue to do so.</p>
12	Support	I support the Council proposal for an emission-based parking charges scheme	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
13	Support	I support the proposals.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
14	Support	I support this	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
15	Support	I support this initiative as an attempt to reduce vehicle emissions is Reading.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
16	Support	think it is a great idea.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted

17	Support	I think it is a really good idea. Car are polluting, so anything which discourages car use is welcome. Owners of large, highly polluting vehicles which have become a status symbol, need reminding that these vehicles have a negative impact on others. This is a way of nudging people as well as collecting a bigger parking charge from people with more expensive vehicles.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
18	Support	I think it's a good idea to charge owners of vehicles with higher emissions more for parking in Reading, for obvious reasons: it will encourage people to buy cars that are more environmentally friendly, and it may encourage people to use public transport or walk, if the parking charges are high enough!!	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
19	Support	I think that charging more for polluting cars is a great idea and would extend it to car parks where possible too - otherwise people will just change where they park and not change their car or their choice of transport into town.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted
20	Support	It would be nice for this policy to not be all stick but to also provide some carrot. How about a 0-50 range which has a slight discount? This makes it easier to the public to swallow and loves away from the 'government taxes people' argument. Reward good behaviour; don't just punish bad ones. Otherwise I think that this is very reasonable and workable, I am very supportive.	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted and will be provided to councillors before a final decision is made.
21	Support	Of course charge polluting vehicles more but also enforce the idling bylaw. Extend no-parking zones around all schools to 1km with permits for drop-off zones for those unable to walk and patrol schools at 3pm-4pm and fine those who break the bylaw.	Your comments will be contained in the report put before councillors prior to a decision being made.
22 (Part)	Support Affordability	This is a good idea in principal, but sometimes people have no choice but to drive and park their car and not everyone can afford to upgrade their car to a newer, less emitting vehicle. The proposal will penalise those who can least afford to pay the extra cost. I say this as someone who never drives into town (we live in	The charging does not start until 150g, which means that approximately 50% of residents will see no change in their permit costs.

		<p>Caversham and it takes us about 20 minutes to reach the town centre) and we have a modern 2023 car, so even if we did drive, we would be on a low tariff, but I feel for those who are already struggling to make ends meet. If the council is that concerned about emissions around the town centre, why not ban all but buses and those car whose drivers have a disabled permit? I would far more happily agree to that than to charging extra to those who can least afford to upgrade their car.</p>	<p>Your comments and suggestions will be contained in the report put before councillors prior to a decision being made.</p>
23	Support	<p>This seems quite lenient The higher levels of emissions should pay more. Will the similar CO2 increased ratings apply to residents Parking permits?</p>	<p>Permit charges will follow the same format as pay and display parking and the same surcharges will apply.</p> <p>Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted.</p>
24	Support	<p>Whilst I do broadly agree with the proposals, I believe RBC is far away from the reality. The reality is there are very limited charge points across Reading, with only a handful of streets having charge points for lower emitting electric vehicles. With a large proportion of the Borough parking on road, it is therefore extremely difficult to move to an electric vehicle as there just aren't enough charge points locally to home.</p> <p>I'd like to see a move to introduce more on road recharge points, similar to the lamppost charging points on St Bartholomew's Road. Until more charge points are introduced, people will be hesitant to move across and this therefore feels disingenuous of the council to introduce higher charges for higher emission vehicles when it knows that for the majority of its constituents, it isn't practical or possible to move to a lower emitting vehicle.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and support. We would highlight that the council are in the process of procuring C1500 additional electric vehicle charging points which will start to be installed from next April onwards.</p>
25	Support	<p>Reading roads are treated as places for high speed racing, and the associated cars will likely have higher emissions, so anything that can change this is of value. Suggest car size is also a used for variable parking fees.</p>	<p>Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments and suggestions are noted</p>

26	Support	<p>The lack of available public space seriously hinders the council's efforts to combat the climate emergency. As there is no space for wider pavements and bike lanes sustainable transport is developing far too slowly. A lack of space for trees and plants means it will be difficult to combat the urban heat island effect as the climate warms. This all means public space is a very valuable resource and should be priced accordingly.</p> <p>I am convinced that this proposal (and the council's approach to charging motorists) does not go nearly far enough.</p> <p>1) Large vehicles (like SUVs) take up more space, obstruct emergency vehicles and general traffic, and limit visibility. They are also more harmful to other road users in a crash, especially children. The size of the vehicle should therefore also be a factor in setting fees.</p> <p>2) Much higher fees, especially for the largest and most polluting vehicle, are necessary. The current fees are already far below the value of public space. It is therefore another subsidy to the most wasteful and harmful form of transport.</p> <p>3) Parking fees should cover the whole borough. There is no reason the council should simply hand over precious space for free anywhere in the borough.</p> <p>4) The council should implement a congestion charge so motorists who park on a private driveway also contribute.</p>	<p>We are aware of the issues around size and weight. The technology is no in place at the moment to base a charging regime on these elements. We are aware of development work being carried out and will consider the application of such a system as and when it becomes available.</p> <p>The council must balance the needs of all sectors of the community. To increase parking prices too much would be detrimental to the retailers in the town. Network Management carry out regular reviews of parking restrictions and make recommendations to change/add to the existing restrictions.</p> <p>Your suggestions related to congestion charging will be contained in the report put before councillors prior to a decision being made.</p>
27	Partial Support	<p>With the advent of Climate Change and the devastating effects that will have on the world you should absolutely be aiming to drive change in behaviour. Increasing the charge for petrol and diesel vehicles by only 20% will not change anything. There should be a commitment to reduce the amount of on street</p>	<p>Your comments and suggestions will be contained in the report put before councillors prior to a decision being made.</p>

		parking, There is way too much space dedicated to cars in central Reading. Replace on street parking with bike lanes and bike parking.	
28	Support	Yes I agree	Thank you for participating in the consultation and your comments are noted

Note- those comments highlighted in yellow are in reference to the EBC proposals for permit schemes

There are 56 **OBJECTIONS** to Pay and Display Emissions-based charging

Count	Theme	Consultation Submission	RBC Response
1	Affordability Cycling network	<p>Generally, emissions-based parking charges might lead to slightly better air quality but they will also price out smaller (older) vehicles and reward electric & hybrid cars which are cleaner to drive (though not to produce; neither is the energy they need) but are also bigger and heavier and thus impact traffic and space a lot - many are really too big for a single parking space.</p> <p>This is hardly the measure needed to reduce traffic and particularly the ever growing number of big vehicles!</p> <p>Air quality would improve with more Low-Traffic-Zones, a cycling path NETWORK, reduction of parking space and support of smaller cars with weight-size-based parking charges.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to permits we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>Size and weight of vehicles is a growing concern and is an issue that will be addressed in time. Unfortunately, the technology is not in place for the council to be able to employ such restrictions Effectively now.</p>

			This measure is designed to encourage drivers to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for short journeys.
2	<p>Affordability</p> <p>Unfair</p> <p>Will not impact those on higher incomes</p> <p>Lack of EV charging infrastructure.</p> <p>Public transport</p> <p>Alternative approaches</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to respond to the consultation on the proposed changes to on-street parking and residents' parking permits, which would introduce higher charges for vehicles with emissions of 151g/km and above. While I understand the need to address air quality, I must oppose the proposals as currently framed, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Unfair burden on ordinary residents Many people in Reading rely on their vehicles for work, caring duties, and daily life. The proposed charges would increase financial pressure at a time when the cost of living is already rising.</p> <p>2. Higher-income households largely unaffected More affluent households often have private driveways and do not need on-street permits. They are also more likely to afford new electric cars such as Teslas. As a result, the scheme risks penalising lower and middle-income residents who must rely on older vehicles and on-street parking.</p> <p>3. Double-charging for emissions Vehicle owners already pay road tax (vehicle excise duty), which is linked to a car's emissions. Introducing additional emissions-based parking charges effectively penalises residents twice for the same vehicle.</p> <p>4. No real support for going electric The policy pushes residents toward electric vehicles, but the Council has not provided sufficient infrastructure. Charging stations or on-street charging docks are limited, particularly for residents without driveways. Asking residents to run power leads from their homes to their cars is impractical, unsafe, and unacceptable. Adequate charging infrastructure must be in place before expecting residents to switch.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations. We accept that that the private car is a necessity for many people and have attempted to balance the cost against improving air quality.</p> <p>1 Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to permits we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>We are duty bound to take positive steps to improve air quality and by extension, the health of all. Poor air quality costs many lives each year and while we do not expect this measure alone to resolve this problem, it is a step in the right direction.</p> <p>2 As stated above, the level at which increased charges are introduced has been set at the higher end of the DVLA emissions scale and would apply to all vehicles using the councils pay and display spaces.</p>

		<p>5. Public transport is not always a viable alternative Public transport, cycling, and walking are not feasible for all. Bus and train services are expensive, especially for low-income families, and may not cover all routes reliably. Cycling is further limited by unsafe, poorly maintained, or extremely limited cycle lanes. Penalising car use without improving these options is unfair.</p> <p>6. Better approaches exist Rather than imposing punitive charges, the Council should: - Invest in reliable, affordable public transport - Expand and maintain safe cycling infrastructure - Install sufficient EV charging stations - Offer incentives for switching to low-emission vehicles These steps would more fairly and effectively support environmental goals without disproportionately burdening residents who have no practical alternatives.</p> <p>For these reasons, I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and focus first on providing the infrastructure and support residents need to make sustainable transport choices. Yours faithfully, Maria</p>	<p>3 The Vehicle Excise Duty (VED or more commonly known as road tax) is levied by Government and not by the local authority. The increase in the tariff is not a tax but a change in the way parking charges are calculated. Emissions based charges will only apply to on-street parking bays and not car parks.</p> <p>4 The Highways team are investigating methods of enabling residents to charge EV at home from their domestic supply. Additionally, the council are in the process of procuring C1500 additional electric vehicle charging points which will start to be installed from next April onwards.</p> <p>5 Reading buses are in the process of upgrading much of their fleet to new electric vehicles which will be cleaner and more efficient to use. Fares have been capped by Government to encourage the public to use public transport.</p> <p>The Borough operates park and ride sites from the outskirts of the town providing a cost effective and efficient means of commuting into the town centre.</p> <p>6 Investment in public transport has been on-going and is continuing. As stated above, the council are in the process of procuring C1500 EV charge points to be installed throughout the borough.</p>
--	--	---	---

			The Government has recently launched a number of schemes to encourage motorists to move from ICE to EV and will continue to do so.
3	<p>Competition from other centres</p> <p>Duplication of cost.</p>	<p>The proposed charges are commercially inept. (As a blue badge holder with a low emissions hybrid car then I would not be affected anyway.) Shopping in Reading is open to competition from surrounding towns and has a significant number of vacant premises in the Oracle and Broad Street while Friar Street continues to decline in quality. For anyone living on the S or E side of Reading, it is easier to visit a John Lewis store at High Wycombe with its free parking than to try driving into the centre of Reading. Once there, the higher quality retail offerings in Marlow and Henley-on-Thames provide great temptation. Similarly, M&S in Camberley is the best store in the area and those wanting more 'high street multiples' can get to Bracknell and park more easily and cheaply.</p> <p>Higher emissions vehicles are already subjected to additional charges and higher contributions via fuel duty and the proposed charges are needless duplication.</p>	<p>We are aware that there are some commercial risks with this proposed introduction of emissions based charging, however the charges do not apply to car parks only on-street parking bays.</p> <p>The authority has a duty to take positive steps to improve air quality and by extension, the health of all. Poor air quality affects many lives each year and damages the health of the vulnerable, especially the young and the elderly. While we do not expect this measure alone to resolve this problem, it is a step in the right direction.</p> <p>The retail offering is not an area the council has any control over. While it can support and encourage retailers to invest in the town, ultimately it is a commercial decision.</p> <p>Fuel duty and vehicle excise duty (VED or commonly referred to as road tax) are levied by central Government. The proposed scheme is more localised and seeks to address issues of air quality at a local level.</p>
4	Affordability	The proposed policy targets less well off people who drive older cars because they can't afford new ones. The council already makes a profit from parking charges so this is just austerity targeting poorer people. It will also encourage people with vehicles paying the	Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives,

		<p>higher charges to use them more to obtain value for money because when they are parked their emissions are zero but that is when their owners are charged. At the very least this plan needs an accompanying scrappage scheme.</p>	<p>alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The policy is not structured to minimise older vehicles, only those that are the most polluting. Any surplus generated by parking services is reinvested in transport and highways related projects as defined in the 1984 Road Traffic regulation Act.</p> <p>The objective is to encourage a change in driver behaviour not penalise those who are least able to afford it. It is accepted any behaviour change will take place over an extended period of time.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
5	Affordability	<p>I feel that you didn't get your way in relation to a congestion charge so now you are trying to get the funds a different way. I have an older car so I am writing in respect of those people who, like me, will probably get penalised more in this scheme. You are coming over as desperate to get extra cash any way you can and it is awful. The people who are running cars, with probably more emissions, are those who cannot afford big luxury cars. Therefore those who can afford to pay get away with everything and the poor have to pay even more.</p> <p>This scheme would be so unfair on every level possible. The reason why Reading's emissions are so high are because the council has</p>	<p>Whilst council finances are always an area of concern. Under the Road Traffic Act Regulation 1984, council are restricted in how they use the revenue generated from parking. Revenue from on street parking can only be used for transport related projects or to maintain the environment. The councils general fund will not benefit from any surplus generated by this proposal.</p>

		<p>blocked a lot of rat runs in order to force more traffic on to the main roads. It is simply Reading's fault the emissions are so high. If the rat runs were limited to peak hours only, this would let the traffic flow better. It is that simple! Reading seems to be causing a problem and then expecting the public to pay the penalty. It does not make sense to me whatsoever.</p>	<p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. We estimate that 50% of vehicles owners will see no change.</p> <p>As the Highway Authority for Reading the council has a duty to maintain the smooth and efficient flow of traffic through the network, improve air quality and road safety. To that end, the closure or 'rat runs' delivers those objectives.</p> <p>Many of the traffic problems alluded to in your response are a result of there being too many vehicles using roads that were not designed for the number of vehicles using them.</p>
6	Affordability	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed policy, parking charges should not depend on vehicle emissions, this policy would unfairly penalise those who are unable to afford prohibitively expensive low emissions vehicles and reward those wealthy enough to afford them.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
7	Difference in pollutants	<p>I think the proposal is very poorly conceived. CO2 emissions are completely independent of respiratory pollutants which mainly comprise NOx and particulates. Diesel vehicles, being more fuel efficient, emit less CO2, but are well known to emit far more NOx and particulates. These pollutants are controlled by the Euro emission standards in which it is notable that diesel vehicles in each class are permitted higher levels of pollutants than petrol. The proposal parking regulations will have the reverse effect to that intended, as, as well as the above some newer Euro 6 vehicles which are less polluting may well emit more CO2 than older Euro 4 and 5 vehicles. For example: I own a 2024 Jaguar XF petrol which</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is based on the CO2 emissions provided by DVLA and are the same as the Vehicle Excise Duty (commonly known as road tax) and in large measure, replicate that structure.</p>

		<p>is Euro 6 (NOx 60mg/km, particulates 0.005 g/km: and has a particulate filter) and emits 178gm/km CO2,; and a 2009 Ford Focus 1.8 petrol which is Euro 4 (NOx 80mg/km, particulates - no limit) and emits 167gm/km CO2. So your proposed regulation would prefer me to use the more polluting Focus. Unless this is just a revenue gathering exercise, surely it would be more logical to base the parking charges on the vehicles' Euro emissions class, as used in ULEZ schemes here and on the continent.</p>	<p>DVLA do not record the level NOx emitted, only the level of CO2. As the DVLA system does hold the NOx levels we are not able to use this as a measure to base charges on.</p> <p>The policy is not designed to specifically target older vehicles. The aim is to encourage those who have vehicles emitting high levels of pollutants at the tail pipe to consider other modes of transport.</p> <p>In acknowledgement of the higher levels of NOx levels the surcharge on diesel vehicles has been proposed at the higher level of 25% against petrol which is proposed at 20%.</p>
8	<p>Flawed, regressive. Dulwich JR.</p> <p>Absence of evidence.</p> <p>Affordability .</p> <p>Affordability</p> <p>Narrow focus</p> <p>Damaging to local economy.</p>	<p>I strongly object to and reject the proposed emissions-based parking charges policy in its entirety. (My rationale is below. Where indicated I have included relevant citations within the text with the link to the content in citation included as a footnote.) This scheme is fundamentally flawed, regressive, and unsupported by any credible evidence from Reading Borough Council, which has failed to provide baseline emissions data, projected reductions in CO2 or NOx, or measurable success criteria—rendering it speculative and potentially unlawful under fair consultation standards. Proceeding despite 70% opposition(citation 1) where 193 out of 275 survey responses opposed the plan in the March 2025 informal consultation, where respondents labelled it a "financial burden on lower-income residents" and a "money-making scheme" rather than an environmental measure, demonstrates a disregard for public input, akin to the failures highlighted in West Dulwich Action Group v London Borough of Lambeth [2025] EWHC 1085 (Admin) (citation 2) . demand the council abandon this proposal immediately and provide transparent evidence if reconsidering any similar policy in</p>	<p>The informal consultation was undertaken to gauge public opinion and inform the development of the emissions based charging proposals. In considering the feedback, the Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The reference to West Dulwich Action Group v London Borough of Lambeth is noted. However, the circumstances in that case differ materially. Lambeth's scheme involved two Experimental traffic orders which purpose was to prevent vehicular traffic from entering, passing through or waiting within a significant area of Dulwich.</p>

		<p>the future. Any future proposal should also be subject to a new and in-depth consultation process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blatant Disregard for Overwhelming Public Rejection and Procedural Fairness: The informal consultation yielded 275 survey responses plus 28 direct emails, with 70% explicitly disagreeing with linking charges to emissions. Key opposition themes included the policy's unfair targeting of lower-income households unable to afford cleaner vehicles, the disconnect between parked cars and actual emissions, and inequities for residents versus non-residents driving through Reading. Despite this, the council advanced to statutory consultation without modifications or addressing these concerns, violating Gunning principle 4 (conscientious consideration). This mirrors Lambeth's unlawful omission of a 53-page objection in Dulwich, risking judicial review here. The council's own report admits no changes were made, the machines to enable this policy have already been purchased and installed (citation 3) , thereby exposing a predetermined outcome. 2. Complete Absence of Evidence for Emissions Reduction or Air Quality Gains: The council provides zero empirical data, modelling, or projections showing how these charges will cut emissions—e.g., no baseline CO2 levels in Reading parking areas, no targeted reductions (like a 10-20% drop in NOx), and no success metrics to evaluate post-implementation. UK evidence reviews confirm such schemes have limited impact without complementary measures: a 2023 ClimateXChange (citation 4) study found parking pricing reduces car kilometers by just 0.3-3% at €1-3/day rates, and up to 6-16% only when paired with capacity cuts or public transport upgrades—not present here. In Bath & North East Somerset's similar scheme (citation 5) , no direct evidence linked charges to air quality improvements, yet 68% of 1,692 	<p>The High Court found that Lambeth had failed to consider a 53 page presentation submitted in response to the consultation that was submitted outside of the consultation time frame, which contained highly relevant objections. This omission constituted a breach of Gunning principle 4 ('conscientious consideration' must be given to the consultation responses before a decision is made), rendering the decision unlawful.</p> <p>In contrast, Reading's proposals relate to emissions based charging for on-street pay and display and parking permits, with the changes to the on street pay and display charging scheme being made via a variation of existing traffic regulation orders and the parking permits being progressed as a change to policy. The permit charging aspect does not require statutory consultation akin to those required when making traffic regulation orders under current legislation. Nonetheless, the Council has chosen to engage with residents and stakeholders extensively to ensure transparency.</p> <p>Legal advice was obtained in relation to all objections, including specific advice on your representation, which was reviewed by officers to ensure all relevant considerations were addressed. The Council's policy is to give due regard to all objections, as reflected in committee reports. Details of both consultations were presented to the Transport Management Sub-Committee on 11 June</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>respondents opposed it as ineffective. Westminster's diesel surcharge yielded a mere 16% drop in diesel use, reliant on existing ULEZ—not replicated in Reading (citation 6) . This policy is doomed to fail without proof, wasting resources on a "speculative" measure.</p> <p>3. Regressive and Discriminatory Impact on Low-Income and Vulnerable Groups: This scheme hammers lower-income households, who own 70-80% of older, higher-emission vehicles due to affordability barriers, leading to 20-25% charge hikes that exacerbate inequality (citation 7) . OECD analysis labels such pricing "vertically regressive," hitting low-income drivers 2-3 times harder relative to income, as seen in UK cities like London where congestion charges reduced family visits more for the poor (citation 8) . Reading's Equality Impact Assessment concedes potential "decreases or increases" but offers no mitigations, ignoring Blue Badge holders, elderly, and disabled who face barriers to EVs (e.g., no driveway charging) (citation 9) . In Bath, critics called it a "tax on the poor," with similar opposition from minimum-wage workers and carers (citation 10).</p> <p>4. Narrow Focus Ignores Broader Pollutants and Viable Alternatives: Targeting CO₂ over 151g/km overlooks NO_x and particulates—widely understood as the real health threats, causing 40,000 UK deaths annually at £20bn cost (citation 11) . Evidence shows pricing alone yields "modest" reductions; comprehensive public transport investments (e.g., Oslo's free buses cut pollution 10-15%) and EV initiatives are far superior. Reading's proposal lacks these—e.g., no expanded EV incentives or bus frequency boosts or discounting —making the policy punitive, not enabling.</p>	<p>2025, again at Policy Committee on 17 November 2025 and the decision to proceed was made following full consideration of the feedback received. This demonstrates the Council's commitment to conscientious consideration, in line with Gunning Principle 4, and stands in contrast to the approach in Lambeth, where key submissions were not addressed.</p> <p>Evidence Base and Environmental Impact</p> <p>The scheme is part of Reading Borough Council's wider strategy to improve air quality and promote sustainable travel. While precise projections are not available at this stage, air quality is monitored continuously across the borough.</p> <p>The focus on CO₂ emissions is consistent with the Vehicle Excise Duty banding system used nationally. While NO_x and particulates are also critical pollutants, CO₂ remains a key indicator of vehicle environmental impact.</p> <p>Equity and Impact on Vulnerable Groups</p> <p>The Council recognises concerns about the impact on lower income households. However, analysis shows that 50% of residents will see no change in permit costs, and 25% will fall into the first band, incurring an increase as little as £9.60 per year (18p per week). This suggests that the majority of residents,</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>5. Economic Damage to Businesses and Community Without Benefits: Higher charges could slash footfall by 10-20%, harming retail as in Brighton or Bristol schemes, labelled "cash-guzzling" by critics (citation 12) . With limited public transport, it stifles trade; studies show restrictive parking cuts business efficiency without proven emission gains (citation 13). This evidence-void, virtue-signalling, inequitable policy must be scrapped. Pursuing it invites legal challenge for ignoring consultation duties. Instead, invest in proven alternatives like transport upgrades and incentivised parking schemes to encourage traffic flow to re-invigorate the town. Links to citations included in my reponse above: 1.</p> <p>https://media.reading.gov.uk/news/public-consultation-launched-into-emission-based-parking-charges 2.</p> <p>https://www.readingchronicle.co.uk/news/25244992.reading-neighbours-blast-emissions-based-parking-charges/ 3.</p> <p>https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c89pzv2n1p5o 4.</p> <p>https://www.climateexchange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/CXC-Reducing-car-use-through-parking-policies-August-2023.pdf 5.</p> <p>https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Emission-based-car-park-charges-consultation-outcomes-report-v1.0-Final.pdf 6.</p> <p>https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6473478/ 7.</p> <p>https://www.climateexchange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/CXC-Reducing-car-use-through-parking-policies-August-2023.pdf 8.</p> <p>https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2023/03/distributional-effects-of-urban-transport-policies-to-discourage-car-use_f275b131/8bf57103-en.pdf 9.</p> <p>https://economy2030.resolutionfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Where-rubber-hits-the-road.pdf 10.</p> <p>https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Emission-based-car-park-charges-consultation-outcomes-report-v1.0-Final.pdf 11.</p> <p>https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Emission-based-car-park-charges-consultation-outcomes-report-v1.0-Final.pdf 12.</p> <p>https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=5894 13.</p>	<p>including many on lower incomes, will see little or no financial impact.</p> <p>An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken and reviewed in light of responses received. The policy treats all residents and visitors equally and does not discriminate against those with protected characteristics. The Council is also exploring mitigation measures, including investment in EV infrastructure. 1,500 new charging points are currently being procured. This investment aims to make cleaner transport options more accessible and affordable in the long term, which may particularly benefit lower income households as the market for used EVs grows and running costs decrease.</p> <p>We understand your concerns about the fairness of targeting parked vehicles and the impact on residents versus non-residents. However, without taking local action now, the Council would have limited effective ways to address urgent transport and air quality issues. While parking charges are not a perfect solution, they are currently one of the few practical tools available to encourage cleaner vehicle use and improve local conditions, until broader national measures are introduced.</p> <p>Machine Upgrade</p> <p>The previous stock of pay and display machines had been in service for many years and had exceeded their operational life</p>
--	---	---

		https://www.britishparking.co.uk/write/documents/re-thinking_car_parking.pdf	<p>expectancy. These machines relied on 3G connectivity, which is scheduled for deactivation in the near future. Once 3G is switched off, the machines would no longer be able to communicate with the back-office system, meaning officers would have no remote visibility of machine status and would be forced to carry out manual checks to identify faults.</p> <p>In addition, the legacy machines lacked the capability to process card payments, offering only cash or via a payment app, which incurred a convenience fee for users. The introduction of card enabled machines has provided a fee free cashless alternative, and uptake has been significant, reflecting public demand for more flexible payment options.</p> <p>The new machines are digitally integrated with the enforcement system, eliminating the need for paper tickets in most cases. This not only reduces operational costs and environmental waste, but also simplifies the user experience as drivers no longer need to return to their vehicle to display a ticket.</p> <p>Furthermore, the absence of reliable financial data from the old machines would have compromised the Council's ability to audit income and banking records, posing a risk to financial transparency and accountability.</p> <p>New software upgrades will be required and the relevant service providers/authorised</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>agents will be contacted to initiate updates to the permit management and parking systems to ensure compatibility with the revised banding structure and pricing. This will only happen after the committee's decision. This approach further demonstrates that the Council is responding to feedback rather than any form of predetermination.</p> <p>The emissions based parking charges policy is a lawful, proportionate and evidence informed measure aimed at improving air quality and encouraging sustainable travel. It forms part of a broader strategy and will be subject to ongoing monitoring and review.</p> <p>We thank you again for your contribution to the consultation process.</p>
9	<p>Affordability</p> <p>Size of vehicles.</p>	<p>It would be completely unfair and unjustified. Oldest cars, whilst having slightly higher emissions, are far better for the environment. This is because making a new car requires lots of energy and materials. Often new cars are not run for long enough to offset the massive damage caused to the environment with their production. If anything, new cars should have to pay more, as they are the ones that are ruining the world by requiring new materials to be mined and produced. If everyone drove old cars, and maintained them, there would be less harm caused to the environment. Multiple studies support this.</p> <p>New cars are also more likely to be SUVs or 4x4s, which are completely unnecessary in the town and are more dangerous for other road users if involved in collisions. Finally, to effectively tax old cars more, you are indirectly creating a poverty tax. Lots of residents require a car for work or caring responsibilities, and if they</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The policy is not designed to specifically target older vehicles. The aim is to encourage those who have vehicles emitting high levels of pollutants at the tail pipe to consider other modes of transport.</p> <p>DVLA base the Road Fund Licence (Commonly known as car tax) on CO2 emissions. This is the system that other</p>

		<p>cannot afford a new car they drive an old car. If you then make them pay more than new car owners, you are targeting those that cannot afford to upgrade to a new car, or do not want to enter into costly and unsustainable hire purchase agreements.</p> <p>To tax the road users who are in old cars creates a poverty tax, it encourages buying cars on finance, and it pushes those who cannot afford it into debt. It would be completely unfair and unjustified, and is not an effective way of reducing pollution in the town, particularly when it applies to residents parking to. Why not require large or heavy cars to pay more for parking? it is these cars that caused greater wear on the road and greater harm to other road users.</p> <p>Why not tax non residents who use reading as a cut through and don't stop in the town? Why not tax journeys into the town centre irrespective of car type, where there are always other options like bus train cycle or walking? If anything, old car ownership should be encouraged as a more sustainable way of living. The council risks introducing unfair and discriminatory policies that only serve those with money or those willing to risk debt for a flashy new car, which in most cases is not necessary.</p>	<p>authorities have used as a base for emissions-based charging.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
10	Affordability	<p>Re different parking charges for different engined vehicles. I think such charges should not be introduced. Motorists are already over-victimised by RBC and government in general. Having to scan umpteen different charge scales for different vehicles would make parking more difficult. It would also drive visitors and shoppers away from Reading, which traders would not like, and maybe RBC would not like too - a town centre of charity shops and vape shops and take aways would not be good for Reading's image, and i think the council has a swollen head about its image.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>There is no requirement for individuals to have any understanding of how the system works past inputting the vehicle registration, which users are required to do. The machine will automatically calculate the cost of parking</p>

			<p>based on the vehicles registration and data held by DVLA.</p> <p>Car parks are excluded from this proposal</p>
11	Affordability	<p>The proposed policy will impact poorer families who have no option other than to run an older car. At least remove the parking permit from this emissions limit.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The proposal is not designed to target older vehicles, it is aimed at higher polluting vehicles. EU standards have reduced the level of emission consistently since their introduction.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
12	Affordability	<p>The proposed policy targets less well off people who drive older cars because they can't afford new ones. The council already makes a profit from parking charges so this is just austerity targeting poorer people. It will also encourage people with vehicles paying the higher charges to use them more to obtain value for money because when they are parked their emissions are zero but that is when their owners are charged. At the very least this plan needs an accompanying scrappage scheme.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band</p>

			<p>where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>The use of revenue generated by parking is laid down in the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act. Before any consideration could be given to any form of scrappage scheme, Legal opinion would be required to determine if the proposal fell within the permitted definition.</p>
13	Affordability	<p>This is another badly thought out tax on the motorist. We already pay a heavy tax on emissions to the government in VED, at the pump and now to actually park the car? Some of us actually have to use a heavy car as part of our social life or for work. Its surely better to allow these cars to park for LESS/FREE outside the town and charge the EVs more for onstreet charging. Remember, these vehicles are only polluting when they are actually running therefore charging them to be stopped is a bit backwards?</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>The rationale is that the vehicle had to be driven to get to the parking space and will be driven again when it leaves.</p> <p>The policy is designed to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for shorter journeys.</p>
14	Affordability	<p>This policy amounts to a tax on the poor. It targets people who already have to pay higher road tax, in the area they live, often pay to withdraw cash and higher fees on groceries. Yes, there are a few Range Rover sports over 151g/km but nobody who can afford a Rolls Royce phantom is parking it on the road. Instead this policy will disproportionately target people who can't afford to upgrade their 2009 Ford Focus or Vauxhall Astra or Peugeot 308 to a car that meets modern emissions standards.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>

			<p>For the permit proposal we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>Ford Focus emissions of 184g or 118g, depending on the model Vauxhall Astra emissions of 156g or 119g for an Astra 1.7 cdti Peugeot 308 emissions of 119g.</p>
15	Affordability	This policy penalises the people who keep older cars which are in good condition and which cause less pollution than making a brand new E-Car	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
16	Affordability	This proposal unfairly targets those least able to pay. Poorer families and individuals who rely on older cars for essential travel will be hit hardest while exempting those who can afford expensive electric vehicles. This is completely unfair to those who are already struggling.	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
17	Affordability	This proposal will punish the less well off who can't afford to purchase a newer vehicle with lower emissions	The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate

			<p>objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
18	Affordability	<p>This will disproportionately impact lower income residents who cannot afford to purchase a newer car. The council should be helping this group transition to less polluting vehicles not penalising them even further for not being able to do so. This proposal will only widen that inequality further and make it even harder for lower income families to catch up.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Government have introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to make transitioning to an EV easier, through the main dealer network of motor manufacturers.</p>
19	Affordability	<p>you are punishing people who cannot afford to buy newer model cars that produce less emissions</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
20	Affordability	<p>I am strongly against this proposed further blanket additional cost to motorists. Air improvement would be better achieved by taking steps to avoid the stop start progression caused by poorly phased traffic measures.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p>

			Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.
21	Affordability	I think this will be detrimental to people who cannot afford to purchase a vehicle that meets the required emission standards. I purchased a new vehicle in 2014 which met the emission standards at the time but now doesn't. I would not want to spend more money and change it again.	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Government have introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to make transitioning to an EV easier, through the main dealer network of motor manufacturers.</p>
22	Totally opposed.	What a load a nut zero nonsense. I am totally opposed to this.	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The council has a duty under the Clean Air (Miscellaneous Provisions) (England) Regulations 2014 monitor and improve air quality. As transport is one of the largest contributors to poor air quality, the council is taking action to encourage drivers to consider other modes of more sustainable transport. It is not anticipated that these changes will make an immediate difference to behaviour but will have an impact over time.</p>
23	Affordability	Yet again paying people pay again in Reading!! Just so your aware as someone making these decisions are obviously clueless , parked cars do not produce emissions and if they did you obviously think car parks are magically removing the emissions as they are	It is accepted that parked vehicles do not produce emissions, however, vehicles have to be driven to and from a parking place.

		<p>exempt!!! It's just another way of taking yet more money. Why not focus on the real problems this joke of a town has.</p> <p>Yahoo Mail: Search, organise, conquer</p>	<p>Car parks have been excluded from this policy to encourage use of off-street parking facilities. The reduction of demand for on-street parking may, over time, release on-street parking bays for other uses, such as cycle lanes or cycle storage or community spaces.</p>
24	<p>Unfit for purpose.</p> <p>Not based on actual emissions.</p>	<p>The issue I have with Emission-based charges is that they are, in my opinion, unfit for purpose. They are based on theoretical maximums for a group of vehicles and not actual emissions which may be a lot lower. A well-maintained nominally higher emissions vehicle may very well be producing a great deal less pollution than a poorly maintained vehicle from a nominally lower polluting model group. The proposed emission-based scheme effectively penalises the owner of the well-maintained vehicle.</p> <p>Unless an emission-based scheme is based on actual emissions, which obviously isn't realistic, it is basically a scam so far as I am concerned. Reading Borough Council should find a way to penalise owners of the vehicles that are actually giving out the greatest emissions, not the owners who just fall foul of a theoretical maximum figure for the car they drive although their vehicle is far 'cleaner' in practice.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The system relies on DVLA CO2 emissions. It is highly likely that there will be vehicles in use which are well maintained and do emit lower emissions, however, the same can be said for a good number of other vehicles that are not well maintained.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. We do not regard the level at which the additional charges commence as being punitive. In some authorities the charge has been more than double that proposed here.</p>
25	Not legitimate	<p>I am completely against these proposals As is usual they proposals are not legitimate. So called pollutants namely nitrogen oxides which are claimed to have all sorts of dire effects are not carbon emissions yet u seem to tax them on the same way . By your own admission pollution I has already come down significantly</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p>

		<p>Parked cars do not produce emissions of any kind !! car owners already pay tax on vehicle emissions to the DVLA . This simply a tax heaped on another !</p>	<p>The proposals have followed the legal process as laid down in the councils own standing orders and the appropriate legislation.</p> <p>The system relies on DVLA CO2 emission levels. We do not have access to data that provides NOx levels. Because diesels are a source of NOx emissions, the levy on diesels has been proposed at 25% and petrol vehicles at 20%.</p> <p>It is accepted that parked vehicles do not produce emissions, however, vehicles have to be driven to and from a parking place.</p>
26	Affordability	<p>Absolutely not. Penalising people who can't afford to buy an electric car or go by bike. This proposal is absolutely abhorrent.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
27	Use of resources Availability of EV charging points	<p>Although I may have an older car my office has closed since Covid and I no longer drive daily to work. We are a 1 car household and I use my car for shopping, trips to leisure centre facilities and weekends. The rest of the time it is merely parked and I use the bus.</p> <p>By having an older car the cost of building, buying and the disposal of cars every few years on the environment has been a saving but this is not accounted for in your scheme. Also living in a Victorian house there is no ability to hook up an electric car or even park outside my own property some times given that the Council are</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit proposal we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band</p>

		allowing properties with multiple occupants 4 cars in my experience.	<p>where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>The council are in the process of procuring C1500 additional electric vehicle charging points which will start to be installed from next April onwards. The programme will go some way towards alleviating the challenges for residents living in similar properties.</p>
28	Affordability	Although this seems sensible in principle it does not take into account those people who have older cars are more likely not to be in a position to purchase a less polluting vehicle.	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations. It is not necessarily the case that older vehicles pollute more than newer vehicles. EU standards on emissions have been in force for some years and have had a positive effect on lowering emissions overall.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
29	Affordability Opposed to net zero policies.	<p>Another despicable policy from Reading council aimed at persecuting motorists. Consider owners of larger 7 seat vehicles that necessarily have larger engines.</p> <p>Calculations of CO2 emissions should be based upon the number of seats/ passengers carried. A high powered 2 seater cannot be compared with a family people carrier.</p> <p>Net zero policies are complete insanity and will destroy the economy of this country. The council should focus on delivering key services rather than trying to address international issues.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The required systems are not available to create a charging regime that focuses on size and weight at the time of this consultation. We are aware that there is development work being carried out which may enable the considerations of size and weight into account.</p>

			Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.
30	Public transport. Affordability Clean vehicle subsidies	<p>Buses are unsafe, dirty and unpleasant (no air conditioning, very noisy). Cycling is not suitable in adverse weather (too hot or wet) or for longer/family journeys. I don't see how increasing parking charges addresses either of these.</p> <p>Targeting car use as the issue might increase quality of life by reducing emissions and noise, but at the expense of comfort, convenience and safety. Not everyone can afford new low emission vehicles.</p> <p>I agree we need to reduce traffic & emissions in town centre but unless there are viable alternatives to car travel it seems like it would just hurt the economy. Improve bus quality significantly. Provide much more car parking walking distance from shops and amenities (but outside centre). Clean vehicle subsidies. We need to make it easier for people to get into and out of town, not harder.</p>	<p>Reading buses are in the process of making a significant investment to upgrade their fleet to new electric vehicles which will make them cleaner, quieter and more efficient.</p> <p>Reading has an extensive bus network with the third highest number of bus passenger journeys per head of population in England (outside of London), and had an 11% increase in bus passenger journeys to 19.5m in 2023/24.</p> <p>The Council has secured external grant funding of over £30m over the past few years to invest in improving bus services, including the provision of 34 new electric buses. The Council has also secured external funding to invest in enhanced walking and cycling routes, including the newly introduced segregated cycle facility on Shinfield Road.</p> <p>Work is on-going to improve the choices for more environmentally friendly travel, such as walking and cycling.</p> <p>By increasing parking charges, we aim to encourage drivers to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for short journeys.</p> <p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to</p>

			improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.
31	Affordability Low traffic zones	<p>Generally, emissions-based parking charges might lead to slightly better air quality but they will also price out smaller (older) vehicles and reward electric & hybrid cars which are cleaner to drive (though not to produce; neither is the energy they need) but are also bigger and heavier and thus impact traffic and space a lot - many are really too big for a single parking space.</p> <p>This is hardly the measure needed to reduce traffic and particularly the ever growing number of big vehicles!</p> <p>Air quality would improve with more Low-Traffic-Zones, a cycling path NETWORK, reduction of parking space and support of smaller cars with weight-size-based parking charges.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Size and weight of vehicles is a growing concern and is an issue that will be addressed in time. Unfortunately, the technology is not in place for the council to be able to employ such restrictions effectively.</p> <p>This measure is designed to encourage drivers to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for short journeys.</p>
32	Complex for users. Congestion.	<p>Disagree with proposal. Overly complex, especially for elderly who also are unlikely to be able to change cars, cost of replacing pay machines, and proposal of only 151/kg is too low and will trap many modern well tuned petrol cars.</p> <p>Pollution in Reading is due to congestion, poor traffic management especially for goods vehicles passing north to south through town or to east on A4 but are trapped by the bus lanes into slow moving congested single lanes.</p> <p>Charging residents for on street parking, who already pay council tax and yet suffer from poor road maintenance, is unfair. People</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The system upon which the charging regime is based is complex by necessity. We have sought to avoid the one size fits all approach. Insofar as we are able, we have kept it as straight forward as possible.</p>

		<p>need cars, to travel out of Reading to work, visit family, and for medical reasons. EV/Hybrid is not an option for many in Reading who only have on street parking, often not outside their homes.</p>	<p>There is no requirement for individuals to have any understanding of how the system works past inputting the vehicle registration, which users are already required to do. The machine will automatically calculate the cost of parking based on the vehicles registration and data held by DVLA.</p> <p>The level of 151g is a mid-point in the DVLA emissions table.</p> <p>Previous machines had been in service for a considerable length of time and many were past economic repair. The cessation of 3G by Government was a major consideration in replacing the machines. The inclusion of the requirement for the vehicle registration to be entered was part of the package to enable digital enforcement of pay and display bays.</p> <p>The council has had a permit scheme for many years which is charged for. It is designed to prioritise residents and other eligible permit holders over other drivers to effectively manage available kerbside space, prevent overuse and to balance demand on the available on a finite resource. In order to protect residents, the permit scheme must be administered and enforced. The delivery of these services comes at a cost which is borne by the permit holders. We consider this is fair and proportionate method and follows a well-established model used throughout the country. The changes we are proposing relate to the level of CO2 emissions a car makes,</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>with a view to encourage, over time, either different transport choices or the choice of lower emitting vehicles.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
33	Affordability	<p>I think this will be detrimental to people who cannot afford to purchase a vehicle that meets the required emission standards. I purchased a new vehicle in 2014 which met the emission standards at the time but now doesn't. I would not want to spend more money and change it again.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p>
34	<p>Additional complication.</p> <p>Congestion.</p> <p>Change in permit structure.</p> <p>Cycle ways and cycle parking.</p>	<p>I disagree with the policy. Firstly it adds an extra layer of complication to the system. Secondly in a busy town we need to move towards an overall reduction in cars of all types rather than just encouraging a move to lower emissions cars which still cause congestion and are still dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists. I would therefore rather see increased charges for permits and no permits for second cars in streets with limited parking, alongside more cycle routes and secure cycle parking. The proposed policy may also unfairly penalise families with many children to need a larger vehicle and may already struggle financially and not be able to replace a vehicle.</p>	<p>The council do not expect this policy to bring about change immediately. It is designed to encourage motorists to consider other modes of transport especially for short journeys.</p> <p>The results of the informal consultation carried out in March 2025, showed that a policy of emissions based charging would encourage 20% of respondents to consider alternative modes of transport. If this figure is translated into trips, many of the problems associated with congestion, cycling and walking will be reduced significantly.</p> <p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate</p>

			<p>objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
35	Affordability Availability of EV charging points	<p>I disagree with this policy of increased charges for older petrol vehicles. I can't afford to replace my car at present, when I do I will consider electric/hybrid but this policy does not make it easier to replace my car. You are increasing costs on top of all the other cost of living increases we are facing. There still is not enough electric charging points across the region and country in order to make changing to fully electric viable and convenient. I use buses where suitable/possible. This will negatively impact many local (Caversham) businesses as people won't be able to afford high parking costs.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The policy is not designed to specifically target older vehicles, it is aimed at those that are the most polluting. The aim is to encourage those who have vehicles emitting high levels of pollutants at the tail pipe to consider other modes of transport.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>The council is in the process of appointing a contractor to install C1500 charging units throughout the borough in the next few years.</p>
36	Resident focused. Charges should be based on weight and size.	<p>Hi - thanks for the opportunity to comment on this</p> <p>1) I don't understand why residents are being penalised for this - and not people who commute into reading for shopping and work - or people who just drive through reading - it seems a bizarre policy</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p>

		<p>2) Why is this only based on emissions ? Surely a charge based on dimensions and weight should be included as well ? This is what clogs the car parks and damages roads.</p> <p>I am strongly against this proposed further blanket additional cost to motorists. Air improvement would be better achieved by taking steps to avoid the stop start progression caused by poorly phased traffic measures.</p>	<p>We are limited in the application through the availability of data. The emission based charging scheme relies upon readily available data from DVLA. Data for the size and weight of vehicle is not available at this time. We are aware of development work being conducted into the feasibility of such a system but at the time of writing the technology is not available.</p> <p>The proposal only applies to on-street parking and does not apply to car parks.</p>
37	Affordability Traffic light sequencing, Road works	<p>I do not agree with the proposal. Emissions based charging is going to penalise less well off people as these are the ones most likely to have older cars with higher emissions. Maybe other options to reduce emissions would be to consider the ridiculous bus lane on the a4 out of reading that has led to traffic being at a standstill most of the time producing more emissions. Or the traffic lights on shinfield rise causing similar issues when the old roundabout let traffic run smoothly. Or the constant digging up of roads causing standstill traffic across reading.</p> <p>Maybe planning works in advance and getting all works done at the same time would help. Imposing further raxes on people in terms of parking is not the way forwards. Not convinced anyone will actually take feedback into account as for the shinfiled rise roundabout public opinion and commission reports were against it heavily but this was ignored and it was done anyway</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Issues such as the bus lane on the A4 or the sequencing of traffic lights are beyond the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>All relevant feedback is taken into account and shared with councillors before a decision is made.</p>
38	Affordability . Availability of EV	<p>I do not agree with the proposed policy (to note I have an EV)</p> <p>I do not agree with these proposals as they will adversely affect the poorer end of Reading residents as those are the people who can't afford to change their vehicles for the latest ones that have lower emissions. Also for a lot of residents it's simply not possible to have</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p>

	charge points.	electric vehicles as they can't charge them anywhere! Whilst the bus service is fantastic, not everyone lives or works on bus routes, so it's not a practical solution for a lot of people	<p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band. The proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>The council is in the process of appointing a contractor to install C1500 charging units throughout the borough in the next few years.</p>
39	Does not target the right socio-economic group. Affordability .	<p>I would like to express my disagreement with this proposal, particularly with the section related to resident parking. Highly polluting cars are typically owned by two groups of people. The first group consists of wealthy individuals who usually own large houses with driveways. These individuals — who should be the main target of such proposals — will not be affected, as they typically do not require resident permits. They are also the primary users of private car parks such as The Oracle, which again will not be impacted by this proposal. On the other hand, resident parking zones mostly apply to areas where middle- and low-income families live. In the consultation, the council stated that this measure is intended to influence people's decisions.</p> <p>However, with the current housing and overall cost of living crisis, the council must understand that the majority of people truly affected by these measures simply cannot afford to replace their vehicles — let alone switch to electric models, which are often three times more expensive than conventional cars. While I am a strong supporter of measures that protect the environment, I believe this particular proposal would unfairly punish middle- and low-income families and further increase inequality.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The council does not have the authority to impose terms and conditions upon private car parks as they are independent of the council regulations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>Government have introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to encourage motorists to take up electric vehicles.</p>

40	<p>Affordability Congestion Cost of replacing ICE with EV. Wear and tear on roads from heavier vehicles.</p>	<p>I would most like to understand what is being proposed on residents parking permits as it says the proposal is covering both (on street pay and display parking bays and permits, including residents permits). However I see no proposed new pricing for residents parking permits based on emissions. Will this be provided ahead of the consultation closing (the date being 12/09/25 this Friday or is that a separate round. I would like to see that. In terms of the emissions based proposal on parking charges in central reading and immediate outer zones, this will impact those families/individuals who are already struggling to make ends meet, especially if they have an older petrol/diesel vehicle, with no spare money to afford a new electric vehicle any time soon.</p> <p>They will potentially need to shop around for lower price than on street parking. Proposed Inner central tariff for Petrol car within 151-170 for 2 hrs = £7.20. They may choose to park in say Q park for 2 hrs at £4.60. It may mean more people use the public transport buses available but for some people the pricing is too much, especially if the short hop fare is the same as longer journey.</p> <p>Reading town centre has gone downhill (with the COVID pandemic not helping), as many big name retailers closed high street presence and moved on-line as better model for them. However whilst there is a march towards green policies the downside of these policies are Reading as a destination to visit for shopping, socialising, visiting in general is not attractive to people anymore - certainly not those coming from immediate out of town radius, nearby towns. Bus lanes - keep getting put in so effectively those roads are clogged up with cars - moving slower - and polluting more, add on the constant digging up of roads for one thing or the other some main roads just look like a car park.</p> <p>On the note of electric vehicles as the next car choice if needing to change the vehicle you have - they are not cheap, if you want to fit at least a family of four in it. One of the cheapest is Dacia Spring,</p>	<p>The proposal for residents permits, if adopted will follow the same format, with petrol and diesel powered vehicles attracting an additional surcharge if emissions are over the 151g threshold. A separate consultation is being held on this.</p> <p>On-street parking is generally used for short stops, often for less than 30 minutes and pricing reflects the convenience factor.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>In the event more people use public transport as an option, then the policy will have been effective.</p> <p>The council is in the process of appointing a contractor to install C1500 charging units throughout the borough in the next few years.</p> <p>Changes to high streets is not restricted to Reading as many other towns face similar challenges, especially in the wake of Covid and the rise in on-line shopping.</p> <p>Bus lanes are introduced to assist public service vehicles to maintain their timetables</p>
----	--	---	---

		<p>Price: From £14,995 Range: Up to 140 miles, not a particularly good write up on this car, so would not do any long journeys in it. However this may still not be affordable for many families who are trying to make ends meet. Value depreciation can be higher "steep First-Year Drop – Some models lose up to 50% of their value in the first year" source https://electricvehicletalks.com/understanding-ev-depreciation/. They are also heavier so wear and tear of road surfaces greater. For some having an electric vehicle is not a choice as infrastructure is lacking and if you live in terraced property where do you put a charge point and then trailing across pavements. Just feels to me that just don't want people to visit the town centre any more or come into Reading from towns around it everything is stacked against car owners.</p>	<p>and encourage reliability for the travelling public.</p> <p>Government have introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to encourage motorists to take up electric vehicles.</p>
41	Affordability Availability of EV charge points.	<p>I'm writing this as a resident in Reading who is fortunate enough to have a drive and an electric car. This is yet another tax on the less fortunate by charging people who may be unable to afford the cost of an electric, and if they were, would struggle to be able to charge the vehicle at home unless they have a drive.</p> <p>Hence, areas such as Newtown/Oxford Road/Katesgrove Areas, generally terraced housing, would be severely impacted by this decision. Are you proposing to offer reasonable cash incentives or assistance to assist people with charging their cars, or simply charging them more? I have less of an issue with on street parking bays, however as it does not include car parks, it seems pointless as you could just park in a car park does not pay the surcharge. Has any modelling been carried out to calculate the savings in emissions? Or has the modelling only looked at the increased revenue stream</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>The management of resources is of a concern to all, however it is beyond the scope of this consultation to address such issues.</p> <p>The council monitor the air quality throughout the borough. Air quality readings at the commencement date will be used as a level to measure future levels of air quality. This will</p>

			<p>give an indication as to the impact the scheme has had.</p> <p>On-street pay and display bays are generally used for short stops and are located at more convenient areas of the town.</p> <p>Car parks have been deliberately excluded from this proposal to provide a cost effective alternative to on-street pay and display bays.</p>
42	Affordability .	<p>Penalising the poor who can't afford a new car. Not everyone can afford a car and the infrastructure is currently not available to support this, so it is a money making scheme. It is a short term policy as in 20 years there will be next to no revenue from it</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Car parks have been deliberately excluded from this proposal to provide a cost effective alternative to on-street pay and display bays</p>
43	Affordability . Improve walking and cycling routes	<p>Please, please don't do this! You say this policy is not expected to change people's choices overnight, but it will impact their finances overnight, and it will severely impact those who can afford it the least. The reality is that living in Reading means you are likely to need a car to go to the shop, the recycling centre, doctor or vet appointments and other activities. Public transport is great but it can't cover all aspects of it, especially for people with mobility issues. Even if you are able to, cycling or sometimes just walking is not easy with the horrible traffic system that is the IDR.</p> <p>So why punish people for simply owning a car when you could incentivise people to use their cars less? Make better use of park and ride services, improve cycle and walking routes, add more</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>

		<p>buses, charge more for city centre car parks if you must, but leave residents parking alone.</p> <p>Also, why are you specifically targeting residents dependent on on street parking, who are likely to be poorer than those living in houses with dedicated parking spaces? It really is just a cruel policy aimed at pricing local residents out of Reading. It's already hard enough with housing costs near the train station and the general cost of living crisis. Is the council just hoping to get all the locals out of the town centre for more flats built for commuters who spend all day in London and don't engage with the town centre or any other local services?</p>	<p>The proposal for emissions-based charging, if accepted will be applied to on street pay and display bays too. Car parks are not being included in this proposal to provide a cost effective alternative to on street parking.</p>
44	Affordability	<p>Policy will penalise poorer people who cannot afford newer less polluting vehicles</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The starting level of the charges has been set at the higher level of the DVLA emissions structure to target vehicles that have higher levels of emissions. Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>Car parks have been deliberately excluded from this proposal to provide a cost effective alternative to on-street pay and display bays</p>
45	Affordability Investigate alternative methods of reducing pollution.	<p>This is a terrible idea. It unfairly charges and targets the poorest in society who are least able to make changes to their vehicles to comply. It is particularly unfair in relation to residents parking permits. Residence have no choice but to pay for a residence parking permit to park in their street since the council has introduced these measures. Increasing the charges for these permits workplace additional burdens on people who do not have the</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In</p>

		resource is to change their vehicles. It seems unfair to place additional charges in situations where residents have no option but to purchase a residence permit which for the second vehicle is already very expensive. Last the council should be applauded for efforts to reduce pollution they should investigate alternative methods to do this that are less punitive to reading residents who the council should be protecting.	<p>relation to the permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>A number of options have been considered in previous years and discounted for various reasons. A clean air zone was previously considered and dismissed as not being cost effective solution.</p>
46	Money grab.	This is another "money grab" from a greedy council.	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>The use of revenue generated by parking is laid down in the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act. Surplus revenue must be ring fenced into transport related projects.</p>
47	Lack of EV charging facilities. Affordability Charge moving vehicles. Charge heavier vehicles. 3 rd bridge	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposal to make residents who have vehicles deemed more polluting pay more for on street parking. There is no on street charging provision (apart from 1 street) for people to charge electric cars therefore how are residents who have to park on the street expected to charge a green car - dangle a cable from an upstairs window if they can park near their house/flat and possibly injure a pedestrian? As it is people who cannot afford a house with a front drive will still have to pay a higher rate to charge than those who can charge at home. If you put more charging points in then people are more likely to change.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>1 The council is in the process of appointing a contractor to install approximately 1500 Electric Charging points on-street throughout the borough. Work is scheduled to commence in April 2026. Highways are also considering</p>

		<p>Residents who live in the smaller houses which mean they need to park on the street are more likely to find it harder to afford a new car so why are you penalising them? Why not charge the lorries and cars who travel through Reading and have been shown to produce most of the pollution? You could also target larger heavier cars (Chelsea tractors) such as in Europe.</p> <p>I developed asthma last year and am sure the pollution in Reading has contributed to this. I appreciate Oxfordshire have been difficult about the 3rd bridge over the Thames but this is now critical to protecting resident's health. You should be prioritising this rather than penalising residents to make yourselves feel better about doing nothing about the pollution in the town. Your own studies have shown this to be mainly from through lorries.</p> <p>I appreciate the Council are wanting to do something about the pollution in the town but the proposals appear to be aimed at easy targets who aren't actually the main polluters and are the least able to object or be able to afford to change vehicles. I therefore think the proposals should be changed.</p>	<p>other options to allow residents to charge their vehicle from their own electricity supply through the installation of ducting under the pavements.</p> <p>2 The level at which charges emission-based charging has been deliberately set at a higher level to avoid many of the older vehicle being charged the higher rates.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>The technology is not presently available to levy charges based on a vehicles size and weight. However, we are aware of work going on to develop such systems.</p> <p>3 Colleagues in Transport continue to hold discussions with our neighbours regarding an additional bridge, however, there has not been any significant progress in the development of this project at the time of writing.</p> <p>The council has a duty to improve air quality for residents. While there other options, the timescale and cost of implementation are prohibitive in the current economic climate.</p>
48	Affordability	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam</p> <p>As you know hybrid and electric cars are much more expensive</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air</p>

		<p>compared to petrol or diesel driven cars. Hence they are owned by higher income people. Charging the people with lower income who can not afford buying these expensive vehicles is adding more burden on them. I believe this is clear discrimination against poorer and possibly older people who would rather have old petrol driven cars.</p> <p>Additionally tax on petrol cars are more expensive than electric cars, hence the people who own them have already paid extra to the tax man. Adding extra charges for parking is paying twice for same reason.</p> <p>Thank you for revisiting your decision</p>	<p>quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges.</p> <p>In an attempt to address the expense of EV, Government has introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to assist people with the transition for petrol/diesel vehicles to EV.</p>
49	<p>Broadly in support</p> <p>Price of public transport</p> <p>PM2 particulates.</p> <p>Against EBC on permits.</p> <p>Affordability</p> <p>Lack of EV charge points.</p>	<p>I broadly support the proposed policy to introduce emission-based parking charges in Reading. Targeting roads in and around the town centre- particularly those identified as air pollution hotspots- should be a priority.</p> <p>Increasing charges for on-street parking in these areas, especially near sensitive locations such as the Royal Berkshire Hospital, could help encourage modal shift away from private car use and towards more sustainable transport options.</p> <p>However, for this policy to be effective, it must be accompanied by a robust and attractive public transport offer. I welcome the council's initiative to offer £1.50 bus fares from central Caversham, which is a positive step. Nevertheless, many people who drive into Reading for leisure purposes are families, for whom public transport is often less convenient and more expensive than parking.</p> <p>To address this, I urge the council to consider introducing affordable 'family tickets' for bus travel - e.g. £5.50 for two adults and two children- on selected routes as part of a 12-month trial. This would make public transport a more viable and appealing alternative to driving, especially when compared to the cost of parking in town-</p>	<p>It is noted that although the comments are broadly in support of the proposal, there are several areas in the response where an objection is registered.</p> <p>We are aware that of other particulate pollutants that fall beyond the scope of this proposal. Presently the technology is not in place to address those issues, however we are aware of development work being carried out in this area.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. With regard to the permit scheme, we anticipate 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>In an attempt to address the expense of EV, Government has introduced a number of</p>

		<p>centre locations such as the Oracle, which currently charges around £6 for 2–3 hours.</p> <p>The council should also recognise that while zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) significantly reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx/NO₂) emissions, they do not eliminate all forms of air pollution. Fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), which poses a greater risk to human health, will continue to be emitted - particularly from tyre and brake wear, as well as road surface abrasion. This underscores the importance of investing in and promoting a stronger public transport offer, as reducing overall vehicle use remains essential for improving air quality and protecting public health.</p> <p>I do not support the introduction of emission-based charges for residential parking permits. The aim of this policy should be to reduce unnecessary car travel into the town centre, not to penalise residents who have no alternative but to park on the street near their homes. ZEVs still significantly more expensive than internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles, many residents cannot afford to switch at this time.</p> <p>Furthermore, a large proportion of homes with on-street parking lack access to private EV chargepoints, making the transition even more difficult. I recommend that the council reconsider this aspect of the policy and instead review it closer to 2035, when all new cars and vans are expected to be zero-emission at the tailpipe. This would allow more time for the market to mature and for residents to make the transition more equitably. As an interim measure, the council could consider applying emission-based residential permit charges only to streets identified as air pollution hotspots, rather than implementing a blanket approach across all residential areas.</p>	<p>schemes with financial incentives to assist people with the transition for petrol/diesel vehicles to EV.</p> <p>The council is in the process of appointing a contractor to install approximately 1500 Electric Charging points on-street throughout the borough. Work is scheduled to commence in April 2026. Highways are also considering other options to allow residents to charge their vehicle from their own electricity supply through the installation of ducting under the pavements.</p>
--	--	--	---

Note- those comments highlighted in yellow are in reference to the EBC proposals for permit schemes

Other responses not attributed to Pay and Display

	Theme	Comment	
1	Size of vehicle. Pavement parking.	As a pedestrian I would far prefer the scheme to be based on the width of the car rather than emissions mainly to try and reduce the number of cars parking partially on pavements due to width of road limitations. This is a far bigger problem for elderly and/or disabled pedestrians than very limited poor emissions. It is also a problem which is likely to increase as the number of electric powered vehicles increases whereas emissions from older vehicles will decrease naturally over the next few years anyway. Please follow the Highway Code etc and prioritise the real needs of pedestrians instead of just following the latest trend. Thank you.	We do not have the technology in place to be able to base charges on the size and weight of a vehicle. We are aware of development work being conducted into the feasibility of this system but at the time of writing the technology is not available.
2	Idling vehicles. Anomalies with specific vehicles.	I have not read the documents, I've only read your overview. I want to give the perspective of a resident living on top of street parking currently free for two hours and requiring permits beyond that. I wonder if your policies will also capture the people who spend their lunchbreaks idling their engines. Isn't good for the environment but I wonder if that would be caught by your policies. Also - the same two cars seem to be getting traffic fines several times a week each week. I wonder if the traffic wardens spot "weird" things like that and pass this information on. It makes me wonder if people in the neighbourhood do not understand the restrictions and whether they actually ever pay the fines, those particular individuals must be facing fines in the thousands so something doesn't seem quite right there.	On occasions when a Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) has concerns or observes any "weird" or suspicious activity, they are encouraged to report it through established channels.
3	Blue Badge holders.	Hi there, I just got this email and read the link information included. I'm worried that Blue Badge holders like myself aren't mentioned in the email or the link.	As a Blue Badge holder you will see no change. Providing the Blue Badge and time clock are clearly displayed in the vehicle, you will benefit from the parking concessions in place at the location. As you

		<p>Are we going to be exempt from these charges? I genuinely can't use a bus to get into Reading. I have carers who will drive me in when eg I need to go to my dentist and opticians, both who are in the town centre.</p> <p>At the moment my Blue Badge just goes in any car because it's connected to me, not a particular car. How will it work with my carers' cars? It can be a different car bringing me in, depending on which shift they're working.</p> <p>ALSO, if one of them is ill at the last minute, it can change very quickly who is bringing me in.</p> <p>Please can you assure me that this has been considered, so I won't be in a worse financial position because of my disability? I don't have the luxury of being able to walk in to Reading, or get a bus unfortunately.</p> <p>Thanks very much,</p>	<p>rightly say, the badge is associated to you and not a specific vehicle.</p>
4	<p>Car parks.</p> <p>Resident permits.</p>	<p>The consultation says "The proposal is for on street pay and display parking bays and permits, including residents permits but does not include car parks."</p> <p>Could you please clarify how this proposal will impact resident permits please?</p>	<p>This consultation referred specifically to pay and display parking. A separate consultation on resident permits will be carried out.</p>
5	<p>Resident permits.</p>	<p>The published proposals appear to refer to Pay & Display charges only.</p> <p>Are there proposals to change pricing for resident permits (permanent) for their own vehicles parked on-street?</p>	<p>The consultation was for pay and display, which was a statutory consultation.</p> <p>A separate consultation for resident's permits will be carried out.</p>
6	<p>EBC is a blunt instrument.</p> <p>Use of resources in building</p>	<p>Dear all,</p> <p>The new emissions charging proposal is a blunt instrument.</p> <p>1. The true impact of emissions on the environment is a combination of the efficiency of the vehicle x the mileage driven per year. Simply assuming that because a vehicle has poor emissions relative to another does not tell the whole story. A relatively inefficient vehicle driven infrequently could well have a lesser impact than a newer one driven more regularly.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Using charges to manage parking is, is widely used throughout the country and beyond as a tool for managing kerbside space.</p>

	<p>a new car.</p> <p>Additional complication.</p>	<p>2. A major source of emissions is the creation of a new vehicle from scratch. An older second hand vehicle which may have higher emissions on paper may actually be overall kinder to the environment.</p> <p>3. Parking is already complicated by the various parking apps available that have to be negotiated. Having to key in your registration every time adds another layer of complexity, not least for less able people . What do you hope to achieve with this really? Will people change their cars on the basis of this? I don't think so. If you need to raise more money for the council simply increase the parking charges for everyone and avoid further complexity.</p>	<p>There are many nuanced situations, many unique to an individual, unfortunately we are not technologically able to accommodate these unique variations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
7	<p>Affordability</p>	<p>I am emailing as I feel very strongly against being charged more for parking outside my own home.</p> <p>For the past 5 years, my husband works from home and I work I Reading, I would never consider driving to work due to climate change. I cycle and if I do not cycle I get the bus.</p> <p>If we go to town with our children, we get the bus.</p> <p>I do agree to pay a slightly higher charge for pay and display should I or anyone else want to take their car into town bot NOT for residential parking permits.</p> <p>It it fundamentally wrong for someone doing what they can for climate change, who cannot afford a new car because they are still trying to pay their mortgage off at nearly 60!, to be charged more for their car sitting outside their home.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>

8	Affordability	<p>As a Reading resident who has to foot the bill for expensive on street parking (from which my car is constantly damaged!), I strongly oppose a price increase to resident permits based on emissions.</p> <p>I cannot afford a new car, and even though I don't use mine regularly and opt to walk or use the bus, I do still rely on it for other needs as we have young children therefore still need a permit. It is already a struggle for us to afford the other increases in cost of living, please reconsider increasing yet another thing for families who are financially struggling. This only impacts the people who don't have the privilege of a drive way, who live in cheaper smaller houses.</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
9	<p>EBC should not apply to permits.</p> <p>Charge moving vehicles not parked ones.</p> <p>Clean air zone.</p>	<p>This proposal should NOT apply to residents permits: these were intended to prevent commuters/shoppers from displacing residents. They should not be treated as a cash-cow by the council in this way:</p> <p>(1) they were originally free but now charged</p> <p>(2) why should I be penalised for leaving my (old, diesel) car outside my house (on a resident permit) and WALKING to the railway station? Applying this policy to charged on-street parking, but not to non-council car-parks is unfair and inconsistent.</p> <p>If you care about air quality and safety you should</p>	<p>The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The council has a duty to manage the highway network within its boundaries. Part of the management is to balance competing needs of the public at large. Charging for parking is a well-established means of control and widely used. There are costs with managing permit spaces to ensure use as designed and these costs are borne by the permit holders, which again is normal.</p>

		<p>(1) be imposing levies on car MOVEMENTS and not on PARKED vehicles: for example, clean air zones like in Bath and Bristol and</p> <p>(2) consider charges based on car weight to discourage SUVs (eg: see https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2025/aug/29/giant-cars-motoring-uk-public-safety-paris).</p>	<p>The council have no power to place a levy on private car parks.</p> <p>A clean air zone or congestion zone was investigated some time ago and was not considered viable at that time.</p> <p>We do not have the technological systems in place to be able to base charges on the size and weight of a vehicle. We are aware of development work being conducted into the feasibility of this system but at the time of writing the technology is not available.</p>
	Affordability	Strongly object to this. I already pay road tax based on emmissions to be able to park on the road, and high Council Tax. It's bad enough having to pay you to park outside my own house already, and a proposal to increase this for any reason is not appreciated.	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit schemes we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
10	Affordability.	I would love to buy a new car with lower emissions but I can't afford it. I would love to use public transport but I have to travel 19 miles to Slough and back 5 days a week with my autistic son, as there were no school places available in Reading. I can't afford my	The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality

		<p>parking to go up along with everything else. Making the chance of me buying a car with lower emissions become even further away!</p>	<p>and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The policy is not designed to specifically target older vehicles. The aim is to encourage those who have vehicles emitting high levels of pollutants at the tail pipe to consider other modes of transport.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p> <p>Government have introduced a number of schemes with financial incentives to encourage motorists to take up electric vehicles.</p>
11	<p>Affordability.</p> <p>London Road bus lane</p>	<p>I find it staggering that hard working residents who have no option but to park on street are at risk of yet further financial strain as a result of this consultation. You speak of emissions yet the new inbound bus lane on London Road - by a children's playground & park - causes tailbacks on regular occasions where before there were none at these times. The amount of idling cars & trucks will without a doubt be increasing the level of pollution that you state you wish to bring down. The increase in residents parking is becoming absurd & now, under the veil of climate policy you intend</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>Overall traffic management is a much wider topic than this consultation allows. Many of the points raised in</p>

		<p>to raise this even more, with the potential to put some self employed / low earners deeper into financial difficulty. Awful decision, RBC needs to do better to target the through traffic, push it onto the M4 for example</p>	<p>the response are beyond the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>The policy is not designed to specifically target older vehicles. The aim is to encourage those who have vehicles emitting high levels of pollutants, regardless of age, at the tail pipe to consider other modes of transport.</p> <p>The introduction of the bus lane on the London Road is designed to enable public transport to keep to timetables, thereby improving reliability and encouraging usage through improved reliability.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO2 at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit scheme we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
12	Affordability	<p>Strongly object to this. I already pay road tax based on emissions to be able to park on the road, and high Council Tax. It's bad enough having to pay you to park outside my own house already, and a proposal to increase this for any reason is not appreciated.</p>	<p>Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet climate objectives, alongside relevant legal and policy considerations.</p> <p>The Vehicle Excise Duty (VED or more commonly known as road tax) is levied by Government and not by</p>

			<p>the local authority. The purpose of this proposal is to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for short journeys.</p> <p>Any vehicle emitting less than 151g CO₂ at the tail pipe will see no increase in charges. In relation to the permit proposal we anticipate that 50% of residents will not be affected by the change and 25% will fall into the first band where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
--	--	--	--