

Appendix 3 - Responses from the EBC permit charges consultation

		Comments and objections to proposed resident's permit	
Count	Theme	Comment/Objection	Response
1	Affordability	Against. The parking are already expensive, potholes everywhere, vans parks everywhere without respect or obey the law and Reading Council does nothing	<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>Highways carry out regular inspections, repairs and remedial works on an on-going basis throughout the borough. Parking Services carry out regular enforcement patrols throughout the borough and issue Penalty Charge Notices where appropriate.</p>
2	Affordability	Charging higher/excessive parking charges for higher emission vehicles is discriminatory. It effects the poorest in society who cannot afford a newer electric or hybrid vehicle.	<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> <p>No individual with protected characteristics will be discriminated against should the proposed scheme be introduced.</p>
3	Affordability Questions the motive behind the scheme.	Having reviewed the proposal based on my individual circumstances I will pay (currently) no more than I paid when I renewed in August 25. This is assuming you do not hike the price up for me next year (I fall in the 0-150 band). Whilst you say that this proposal is part of the scheme to reduce reliance on private cars and use/encourage more sustainable modes of transport, and improve air quality, this may not be the best option for all people, as their car may be the only way they can get to work quickly, juggling dropping kids to school,	

	Traffic flow.	<p>getting around to provide care for their elderly relatives etc. Buses , trains taxis may not be the best most efficient way for achieving what needs to be done in a busy working day, when most people are time poor with public transport not being the most cost efficient way to get around. Perhaps it may in the longer term, influence the choices they make on their next car purchase but people are holding onto the cars they have for longer as it is a question of affordability during a time when the cost of living is forever going up. To me it seems it is a way of getting more money for RBC from those in society that are least able to afford to change their cars out for a while. In terms of improving air quality, putting in bus lanes in some places in Reading I would say is having the opposite effect, as the flow of traffic at certain times of the day is at a standstill with fuel being burnt inefficiently (Cemetery junction, Oxford Road etc). No one seems to like the motorist these days. I cannot speak for anyone else but I generally don't use my car unless I have to - as in my road if you move your car trying to find a parking space when you get back after 17:00pm is very difficult and I end up parking in adjacent streets that my permit covers.</p>	
4?		<p>I do not agree with different rates for parking permits. The majority of people currently will not be able to afford an electric or hybrid vehicle and should not be penalised. Absolutely NO.</p>	<p>The level at which emissions based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicle swill not pay an increased tariff.</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</p>

			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.
5		I have a car with a 59 plate so I assume my car will be affected. I already pay expensive road tax because of the age of my car, I won't be able to pay to park soon around the Reading area. This means I won't be able to visit the town and spend money in the shops. I don't want to do my shopping online, this is impacting the high street shops already. I feel these powers will affect a lot of people who can't afford to buy new cars or upgrade theirs and this isn't fair to us. Especially as road tax is already expensive and so is buying a permit just so we can park outside our own houses.	<p>The level at which emissions-based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicles will not pay an increased tariff.</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>
6	Financial bias.	I objects to this pointless, money grab	<p>The objective of this proposal is to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, such as park and ride, walking or cycling for short journeys. It is not designed to generate excessive revenue.</p> <p>As with all services, the introduction of the proposed scheme will have a set up cost and an on-going cost.</p> <p>The level at which emissions-based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicles will not pay an increased tariff.</p>
7	Little to do with reducing pollution.	I do not agree with this proposal. Are you suggesting it is acceptable to continue with a vehicle classed as polluting by yourselves, as	The objective of this proposal is to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, such as park and

	<p>Reading buses.</p> <p>Air quality.</p> <p>Affordability.</p>	<p>long as you can afford to pay the higher charges? This proposal seems to having little to do with reducing pollution and more to do with yet another revenue raising exercise against Reading motorists. In your proposal you mention that 50% of cars would fall into the lower emission category. How do arrive at this figure - what is your evidence? What are you doing about the high polluting buses and taxis that continue to pollute the Reading air, especially outside schools and hospitals - a few buses running on gas or electricity will not suffice. Anticipating to add more of these vehicles is a long way off. What initiatives on air quality will be made by neighbouring councils - how can you limit their polluted air from mixing with Reading's at the boundary lines? How will you know when you've reached this arbitrary reduction in pollution levels - what (scientific) comparisons will be made and against what/who? This proposal will be and added burden on lower income families. Have you considered the impact to those that rely upon their cars for work and are unable to use public transport. What about disabled drivers? Burdening car drivers from one area could simply shift traffic congestion and pollution to the surrounding regions, creating new problems.</p>	<p>ride, walking or cycling for short journeys. It is not designed to generate excessive revenue.</p> <p>The structure of the proposed scheme is based upon the DVLA data used for charging for Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) (more commonly referred to as road tax)</p> <p>As with all services, the introduction of the proposed scheme will have a set up cost and an on-going cost. The level at which emissions-based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicles will not pay an increased tariff.</p> <p>The figure of 50% is arrived through the data we already hold.</p> <p>Reading buses are investing heavily in cleaner modes of transport and have a fleet of 20 electric buses due to come into service in the next few months. Pollution levels are monitored regularly by the Air Quality team.</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> <p>There will be no impact on those who hold blue badges.</p>
8	Cost of transport.	I do not agree. We already paid A LOT of money to use our cars. The parking has gone	The objective of this proposal is to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, such as park and

	<p>Impact on families Affordability</p>	<p>significantly up in the last year so we can't take the car into town for shopping anymore. Meanwhile, the prices for buses have gone up so you are not even encouraging people to use to buses. Now you are suggesting that the permit prices should go up. What about people who have families and have larger cars that produce more emissions? What about people with older cars and cannot afford a new one that produce more emissions? Another money-grabbing proposal with ZERO impact for the residents. Is this your only option to help air quality then? How is it charging more helping air quality? People that need cars will continue to have cars and are forced to pay the ridiculous charges but it seems it is all in your benefit</p>	<p>ride, walking or cycling for short journeys. It is not designed to generate excessive revenue.</p> <p>The structure of the proposed scheme is based upon the DVLA data used for charging for Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) (more commonly referred to as road tax)</p> <p>As with all services, the introduction of the proposed scheme will have a set up cost and an on-going cost.</p> <p>The level at which emissions-based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicles will not pay an increased tariff.</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> <p>Reading buses are investing heavily in cleaner modes of transport and have a fleet of 20 electric buses due to come into service in the next few months. Pollution levels are monitored regularly by the Air Quality team.</p>
9	Affordability	<p>I think this disadvantages people who have less expensive cars and possibly less money. Newer cars often have lower emissions but not everyone can afford a newer car. Both cars cost the same to park, Some new cars are much bigger taking up a lot more space. I don't agree with this proposal.</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>

10	<p>Affordability</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure for EV</p>	<p>I think this is a bad idea. I have two points for objection and one suggestion. And one question 1. This scheme only targets those of us who cannot afford to buy large house with a drive. And let's be honest, it's these larger houses that will be multiple huge car families 2. The point of this scheme is presumably to put pressure on us to get lower emissions cars. Ideally electric cars. But there is no infrastructure to allow charging on on-street parking. We currently have two electric cars that park on our street and it's a nightmare as they have to try and get a parking space in front of their house (difficult) and then they have to run cables across and down the path (dangerous). Before forcing people into having to upgrade their cars I think you should ensure there is a proper plan to allow for electric charging on these road side parking streets. Suggestion: can you look to charge vehicles coming into reading? Either driving in via a low emission zone or by parking by charging them to park at different rates depending on their car emissions. These are also the people effecting emissions in the town centre. As we live close to the town centre we don't drive in we would walk or cycle. So we are not even effecting the town centre emissions like people who live further out and drive in. Question - what will you spend this money on that you raise? If you do it I think there should be a clear plan of what it is spent on to benefit the people you have decided to penalise</p>	<p>The objective of this proposal is to encourage motorists to consider alternative modes of transport, such as park and ride, walking or cycling for short journeys. The level at which emissions-based charging starts has been set deliberately at the higher end of the DVLA scale, meaning that a large proportion of vehicles will not pay an increased tariff.</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> <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 properties that do not have off street parking. 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>
----	---	---	---

	What will the revenue be spent on?		
11	Electric buses	I think this proposal needs delaying until after the busses are all electric, similarly to Oxford. You must Lead by example. Make busses fully electric before punishing people for using something that they might not be able to afford to replace. I have an electric car, which obviously is (hilariously) better for the environment than the buses that you're trying to push people to use, all in the same of air quality. I have an air quality sensor that doesn't peak when cars pass by, but when the busses pass. Lead. By. Example.	Reading buses are investing heavily in cleaner modes of transport and have a fleet of 20 electric buses due to come into service in the next few months. Pollution levels are monitored regularly by the Air Quality team.
12	Commercial Impact	I'm baffled at what RBC are doing. They sold the BSM car park allowing Oracle to have an effective monopoly. Parking charges are disgraceful. Public transport from villages do not allow options other than driving and now you want to further erode people's ability to use the town centre. The town is full of empty shops and RBC seem determined to increase the loss of business. What happened to regeneration and business growth?? That said, RBC has ignored every consultation feedback on every topic so not sure this will be different	BSM was held on a long lease. The landlord of the site expressed an interest in redeveloping part of the site for housing. The car park was not being used to capacity meaning that other facilities within the town centre could accommodate the loss of spaces. Parking charges are set at a level that reflects the council's wider policies of reducing reliance on the private car and moving towards the council's stated aim of net zero by 2030.

13	Affordability	This is an awful idea that will punish the poor and those that can't afford a brand new car, or those that don't have a driveway and access to charge electric cars. Terrible idea that must not proceed.	<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> <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 properties that do not have off street parking.</p>
14	<p>Comparison between older and newer vehicles.</p> <p>Affordability</p>	You can have a person with a car that omits less emissions but driving into town 5 working days a week and then have someone that drives in periodically because of how far they live from town, limited public transport or have mobility issues or because of an appointment or how much shopping they are coming in for and they shall be penalised. The person driving in 5 days a week may end up producing more emissions but they wont be charged the same. To scrap a perfectly good car is not always a viable option or climate friendly and then throw in that it may not get used often, so it may actually be more climate friendly than the car with less emissions that is used more frequently. This feels like it is one of those consultations that the climate spin doctor has got his hands on and the logic is very questionable.	<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> <p>Insofar as we are able, we have sought to avoid a one size fits all approach because we recognise that there are individual differences. However, there is a limit as to the lengths we are able to go to accommodate those differences. By increasing parking charges, we aim to encourage drivers to consider alternative modes of transport, especially for short journeys.</p>
15	Affordability.	I'm really concerned that this is going to penalise people who are already struggling to make ends meet. Permits are already a lot of	The Council has sought to balance public concerns with its statutory responsibilities to improve air quality and meet

		<p>money, and this is going to be another bill increase which will stop them ever being able to afford to upgrade a vehicle. The increases per emissions band are far too high. I am also more in favour of a general small increase for everyone, with a significant discount then offered for people with lower emission vehicles. People cannot move house to get away from this issue. People cannot just change their car immediately if they can't afford the permit. Other incentives need to be discussed instead I believe.</p>	<p>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 where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
16	Affordability	<p>Not needed already paying too much council tax</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 linked to council tax. Revenue generated from parking is held in a separate account and can only be used for transport related projects.</p>
17	Affordability	<p>The proposal is ridiculous and yet another scandalous hit on working tax paying people. We already pay council tax, road tax, fuel duties etc. this is all another money making exercise for you to get more money when you need to look more into how you are spending and wasting it.</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 where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>

18	Affordability	This is a horrible idea, it's unfairly targeting those who can't afford newer cars. The council should focus on policies that encourage people to use public transport in a positive way such as improving roads or state of the buses etc.	<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 where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
19	Affordability	This is an awful idea that will punish the poor and those that can't afford a brand new car, or those that don't have a driveway and access to charge electric cars. Terrible idea that must not proceed.	<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 where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>
20	Affordability Alternative suggestion	This method of reducing emissions is flawed, as those of whom that own a vehicle that produces more emissions, tend to be from a lower socioeconomic background. Meaning those who have less income, less disposable income, will be disproportionately, affected by this. A better solution is to categorise parking spaces, have more allocated spaces for low emission vehicles, but have fewer spaces available for higher emitting cars. Meaning more people will likely take the bus to their	<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 where the proposed increase will cost as little as an additional 18p per week.</p>

		<p>desired destination if there's no space available. any infringements I.e. a high emitting vehicle in a low emitting space, subject to a premium charge on the parking, but not a high priced fine. All of the spaces are the same price for the same period of stay. Schemes to help those that would like to purchase a low emissions vehicle but are not financially able could be offered a buyback scheme, where the council can take second hand trade-ins on existing high emitting cars, and in-turn, credit buyers to purchase a second hand electric car (that is up to standard).</p>	<p>Moving forward, the council will install EV only bays on street. These bays will only be able to be used by EV, thereby limiting the available space for higher polluting vehicles.</p> <p>The council does not have the resources or knowledge to operate a vehicle trade-in scheme. Government has launched a number of schemes with motor manufacturers to incentivise the take up of new EV.</p>
21	Not balanced.	<p>You can have a person with a car that omits less emissions but driving into town 5 working days a week and then have someone that drives in periodically because of how far they live from town, limited public transport or have mobility issues or because of an appointment or how much shopping they are coming in for and they shall be penalised. The person driving in 5 days a week may end up producing more emissions but they wont be charged the same. To scrap a perfectly good car is not always a viable option or climate friendly and then throw in that it may not get used often, so it may actually be more climate friendly than the car with less emissions that is used more frequently. This feels like it is one of those consultations that the climate spin doctor has got his hands on and the logic is very questionable.</p>	<p>The council is looking at increased charges based on Emissions for both Pay ad Display and permits, so anticipates it will impact regular visitors with high emission vehicles in a similar way.</p> <p>The wider suggestions inferred, such as congestion charging, are noted but are not under consideration at this time. These suggestions will be presented to councillors for consideration before a final decision is made.</p>

Count	Theme	Comment in support	
1	Supportive	I think it's a good idea to charge higher fuel consuming vehicles more to park	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.
2	Supportive	I very much agree with the proposal for those polluting more to pay more. Why should people who choose a more environmentally friendly option pay the same as the vehicles which take up more space on the streets and fill the air with pollution. And what about those residents who choose to not own a car (me included)? Is there a way these people can be rewarded?	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.
3	Supportive Concerns: Affordability Retain current level of charges until vehicle is changed.	While I support the general principle of discouraging the use of larger and more polluting cars in Reading, we should remember that most of the owners of the worst cars have private driveways so will not be affected by this change. To prevent this change being perceived as a tax on those who live in lower income neighbourhoods, I think that residents should be allowed to renew their permits on existing vehicles at the current rate indefinitely. The new higher rates should only apply to cars that residents buy new or second hand after the introduction of this policy, as this would serve the objective of encouraging residents to choose less polluting cars when they can do so, without punishing those on lower incomes who cannot afford to replace a working vehicle.	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.
4	Supportive	Looks to be a fair and reasonable proposal.	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.

5	<p>Supportive</p> <p>Reward for not contributing to pollution.</p>	<p>I very much agree with the proposal for those polluting more to pay more. Why should people who choose a more environmentally friendly option pay the same as the vehicles which take up more space on the streets and fill the air with pollution. And what about those residents who choose to not own a car (me included)? Is there a way these people can be rewarded?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.</p>
6	<p>Supportive.</p> <p>Concerns: Pavement parking. Large vehicles. Idling vehicles</p>	<p>It's long overdue and I would also like to see more expensive permits for larger cars as they take up more space and do more damage. Also, on roads like mine, we've had rubbish collections missed because the cars are too large and take up too much space in the road. There is also an issue with pavement parking, and cars being too large in driveways so they stick out and lessen pavement space, making it harder to get around and unsafer. In my road there is also a problem with people sitting around in cars leaving the engine running, or playing music very loudly, which is noisy and pollutes the air needlessly.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.</p>
7	<p>Supportive.</p> <p>Concerns: Affordability Discounted charges for lower emissions vehicles.</p>	<p>While I welcome a move to reduce pollution I think this could end up negatively impacting lower income families. To aide in avoiding this I believe it should only be applied to vehicles first registered after 2020. If introduced I want to see not only higher charges for high polluting vehicles but discounted charges for low emission vehicles. The charges should be on a sliding scale from "no pollution" to the worst polluters. This would help to further incentivise people to purchase lower polluting vehicles.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.</p>

8	Supportive	I think it's a good idea to charge higher fuel consuming vehicles more to park.	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.
9	Supportive	I think this is an excellent idea and I would encourage the Council to go further and introduce a low emission zone. My daughter and I regularly cycle to Madjeski Stadium on weekdays and breathing the pollution from Diesel cars is awful. This puts other people off cycling too. The government does not seem to be tackling the issue so I am happy for Reading Council to introduce this scheme. Drivers with the most polluting cars should be taxed higher to encourage them to consider the environmental impact of their actions.	Thank you for your comments and suggestions, they will be shared with Councillors for consideration before a decision is made.

Footnote – There are a small number of objections that relate to permits only received from the Pay and Display EBC consultation. These are set out separately within Appendix 1 of the report. A small number of objections to permits were also set out in supporting or objecting responses to the Pay and Display consultation, these remain in the main “Support” or “Objections” tables but are highlighted.

			<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 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> <p>Revenue generation</p> <p>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>
--	--	--	---