

Appendix 6

Emissions-Based Charging Consultation

Executive Summary

To gauge the support for the proposed EBC proposal, an informal consultation was carried out between 5 March and 30 March, 2025.

A press release was issued on 5th March to signal the start of the consultation.
<https://media.reading.gov.uk/news/views-invited-on-introduction-of-emission-based-parking-charges>

It was promoted through a range of communication channels, outlined below.

Press Coverage

BBC TV South (6 Mar)

Reading Chronicle (6 Mar):

<https://www.readingchronicle.co.uk/news/24984484.parking-reading-will-getting-expensive/>

Reading Today (7 Mar): Consultation opens on emissions-based parking charges in Reading – Reading Today Online

BBC South Online (7 Mar): Emission-based parking charges plans opens for public views - BBC News

In print media

Reading Today print (13 Mar)

Reading Chronicle print (13 Mar)

Posts on RBC Facebook & Twitter/X

7 Mar: Item in Residents' email

24 Mar: Posts on RBC Facebook & Twitter/X with reminder of deadline approaching

The survey comprised of 18 multiple choice questions.

A total of 275 people responded to the survey.

Additionally, there were 28 emails sent directly to the Parking Managers email address. These are shown in Appendix 7.

- 64% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were concerned about the effects of air quality on their health.
- 34% strongly disagreed or disagreed that they were concerned about the effects of air quality on their health.

- A ratio of almost 2:1 expressing concerns about the impact of air quality on not only their health but also in the health of their family.

There was strong opposition from respondents to linking emissions-based charging to permits, with 70% disagreeing with question 7 which asked if permit parking charges should be linked to the CO2 and NOx emission levels of the vehicle.

When asked if the proposal would change their behaviour, 73% said it was unlikely to but 20% said that it was likely to.

A drop of 20% in Internal Combustion Engines on the roads in the borough would have a significant positive impact on air quality. It is unlikely the change would happen immediately. Potentially, it represents a significant shift in modal choice in line with the objectives of our Transport Strategy 2040.

Survey Questions

Q1 I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my children and family

Q2 I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my health

Q3 The Council has a key role to play in tackling the challenges of poor air quality and climate change

Q4 The Council should encourage motorists towards more sustainable and active modes of transport such as walking, cycling, and public transport, which positively contribute towards improved air quality and public health

Q5 All vehicles, including electric vehicles, should pay to park

Q6 Reading Borough Council should prioritise lower polluting vehicles by offering a lower parking charge than for higher polluting vehicles

Q7 Permit parking charges should be linked to the CO2 and NOx emission levels of the vehicle

Q8 How likely is it that the proposed scheme would change your behaviour?

Q9 I consider cost when choosing how to travel, even if a cheaper journey takes longer

Q10 I value convenience over cost and am prepared to pay for that convenience

Q11 What is your preferred mode of transport?

Q12 If you own a vehicle, what type do you own?

Q13 How often do you use your vehicle?

Q14 What is the primary purpose of your vehicle?

Q15 When parking at home, where do you park your vehicle?

Q16 If you use your vehicle to commute to and from your place of work, where do you park?

Q17 When parking for retail or leisure purposes, where do you park?

Q18 When visiting or caring for friends and family, where do you park?

Overview

Many respondents linked the cost of parking, both pay and display and permits to the cost of public transport. Concerns were raised about the potential for those earning least being penalised because of the environment in which they lived, i.e. terraced houses or flats.

Some respondents made the point that although they broadly supported the proposal, the impracticality and cost of public transport did not make it feasible to not use a private car.

Many respondents expressed strong opposition to the proposed emissions-based parking charges, viewing them as a financial burden on lower-income residents who cannot afford newer, less polluting vehicles. They argue that this policy disproportionately affects those without off-street parking, as they are more likely to own older, higher-emission cars.

Many see the proposal as a revenue-generating scheme rather than a genuine effort to improve air quality.

There is a call for improved public transport as a more effective solution to reduce car usage, with suggestions for lower bus fares and increased service frequency.

Some respondents also highlighted the need for better traffic management and infrastructure improvements, such as additional bridges and road maintenance, to alleviate congestion and pollution.

A few respondents suggested that vehicle size and weight should be considered in the charging scheme, as larger vehicles contribute more to road wear and pollution.

Others proposed exemptions or reduced charges for residents and those with specific needs, such as Blue Badge holders.

Overall, there is a significant concern that the proposed changes would exacerbate social inequality and financial strain on already struggling households, without effectively addressing the root causes of pollution and traffic issues in Reading. This was mentioned by 220 of 275 respondents.

Respondents frequently emphasised the need for affordable, reliable, and efficient public transport as a key measure to encourage sustainable travel choices. Many suggested that public transport should be cheaper than driving with some advocating for free or subsidised bus travel. Improved bus services, including more frequent and punctual buses, were also commonly mentioned.

There was significant concern about the affordability of electric vehicles, with calls for making them more accessible to the average person. Some respondents suggested infrastructure improvements for electric vehicles, such as more charging stations. Many respondents highlighted the importance of better cycling and walking infrastructure, including safe and well-maintained cycle lanes and pedestrian paths.

There were also calls for prioritising pedestrians and cyclists at junctions. Some respondents expressed opposition to measures perceived as punitive, such as

increased parking charges or restrictions on vehicle use, arguing that these disproportionately affect those who cannot afford newer or electric vehicles.

Others suggested that traffic management should focus on reducing congestion and pollution caused by through traffic rather than penalising local residents. A few respondents mentioned the need for broader government involvement and coordination in implementing sustainable travel measures, rather than relying solely on local councils. This was mentioned by 187 of 275 respondents.

Responses and Commentary

Question		Response
Q1	I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my children and family.	The response to Question 1 , was 64% strongly agreed or agreed and 34% strongly disagreed or disagreed. The response shows there is a concern among respondents about how air quality and the potential impact on health.
Q2	I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my health.	A similar level of concern was reflected in the responses to Question 2 .
Q3	The Council has a key role to play in tackling the challenges of poor air quality and climate change.	53% of respondents to Question 3 agreed that the council did have role to play. Respondents did agree (48%) that the council has a role to play in encouraging motorists to consider alternatives to the ICE or private car. 64% agreed that all vehicles should pay to park regardless of their means of propulsion. 68% did not agree that vehicles with lower emissions should be charged less. When asked if permits should be linked to emissions, 70% disagreed, many citing that they viewed this another tax to park outside their own home. A common view was that this would disproportionately affect those on lower incomes with older vehicles as they were viewed as being more likely to be impacted by the change.
Q4	The Council should encourage motorists towards more sustainable and active modes of transport such as walking, cycling, and public transport, which	

	positively contribute towards improved air quality and public health.	
Q5	All vehicles, including electric vehicles, should pay to park.	
Q6	Reading Borough Council should prioritise lower polluting vehicles by offering a lower parking charge than for higher polluting vehicles	
Q7	Permit parking charges should be linked to the CO2 and NOx emission levels of the vehicle.	
Q8	How likely is it that the proposed scheme would change your behaviour?	<p>Question 8 asked if the proposed scheme likely to change their behaviour. 74% said it was unlikely, but 20% said it would.</p> <p>49% of respondents said that they considered price when making a journey, 34% did not. Conversely, 51% of respondents valued convenience over cost, with 35% putting cost over convenience.</p>
Q9	I consider cost when choosing how to travel, even if a cheaper journey takes longer.	
Q10	I value convenience over cost and am prepared to pay for that convenience.	
Q11	What is your preferred mode of transport?	When asked what their preferred mode of transport was, only 48% stated the car. The remainder opting for more sustainable modes of transport.
Q12	If you own a vehicle, what type do you own?	Question 12 asked about the type of vehicle owned. 49% owned a petrol vehicle, 27% diesel, electric, 8% and hybrid 7%. The balance will undoubtedly shift over the coming years as EV become cheaper and the

		infrastructure improves, combined with the phasing out of ICE.
Q13	How often do you use your vehicle?	Questions 13 and 14 asked how often they used their vehicle and for what purpose. 47% said they used their vehicle daily and 31% weekly. The main use was for social and leisure, with 23% using their vehicle for commuting.
Q14	What is the primary purpose of your vehicle?	When parking at home 47% parked on private land, such as their drive. 29% parked in permit bays. When asked where they parked when they commuted to work, 49% said they parked in a private facility. 10% used a public car park.
Q15	When parking at home, where do you park your vehicle?	
Q16	If you use your vehicle to commute to and from your place of work, where do you park?	
Q17	When parking for retail or leisure purposes, where do you park?	Question 17 asked where they parked when using leisure facilities. 44% said a public car park, 23% said a private car park and only 4% on street bays. It is possible that some respondents may consider The Oracle or Riverside as being public car parks.
Q18	When visiting or caring for friends and family, where do you park?	Question 18 asked where respondents parked when they were visiting friends and family. The largest proportion (33%) said other, followed by 25% in an on-street bay.

The response to **Question 1**, (I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my children and family) was 64% strongly agreed or agreed and 34% strongly disagreed or disagreed. The response shows there is a concern among respondents about how air quality and the potential impact on health. A similar level of concern was reflected in the responses to question 2 (I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my health).

53% of respondents to **Question 3** (The Council has a key role to play in tackling the challenges of poor air quality and climate change) agreed that the council did have role to play.

Respondents did agree (48%) that the council has a role to play in encouraging motorists to consider alternatives to the ICE or private car. 64% agreed that all vehicles should pay to park regardless of their means of propulsion.

68% did not agree that vehicles with lower emissions should be charged less. When asked if permits should be linked to emissions, 70% disagreed, many citing that they viewed this another tax to park outside their own home. A common view was that this would disproportionately affect those on lower incomes with older vehicles as they were viewed as being more likely to be impacted by the change.

Question 8 asked if the proposed scheme likely to change their behaviour. 74% said it was unlikely, but 20% said it would.

49% of respondents said that they considered price when making a journey, 34% did not. Conversely, 51% of respondents valued convenience over cost, with 35% putting cost over convenience.

When asked (**Question 11**) what their preferred mode of transport was, only 48% stated the car. The remainder opting for more sustainable modes of transport.

Question 12 asked about the type of vehicle owned. 49% owned a petrol vehicle, 27% diesel, electric, 8% and hybrid 7%. The balance will undoubtedly shift over the coming years as EV become cheaper and the infrastructure improves, combined with the phasing out of ICE.

Questions 13 and 14 asked how often they used their vehicle and for what purpose. 47% said they used their vehicle daily and 31% weekly. The main use was for social and leisure, with 23% using their vehicle for commuting.

When parking at home 47% parked on private land, such as their drive. 29% parked in permit bays.

When asked where they parked when they commuted to work, 49% said they parked in a private facility. 10% used a public car park.

Question 17 asked where they parked when using leisure facilities. 44% said a public car park, 23% said a private car park and only 4% on street bays. It is possible that some respondents may consider The Oracle or Riverside as being public car parks.

Question 18 asked where respondents parked when they were visiting friends and family. The largest proportion (33%) said other, followed by 25% in an on-street bay.

Conclusion

As this was an informal consultation, there is no obligation on the council to accept the views expressed. However, the consultation does show that there is a certain level of cynicism connected to the reasons for introducing the scheme. To better show the intent behind the proposal, some positive communications should be put out informing the public of what the authority will do with any additional income, such as improved bus services.

In the event that we have a similar level of responses to the formal consultation, this will delay the implementation of the scheme. Each objection must be responded to.

By outlining the council's intention to make improvements to public transport services and/or subsidise bus fares or other schemes, objections are likely to be reduced as there will be greater acceptance of the proposal.

20% of respondents have said that the implementation of the scheme is likely to change their habits. This is a significant and a reduction of 20% ICE vehicles on the roads in the borough will have a significant impact on the current levels of pollution.

Appendix 1

Survey Results

Q1 I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my children and family

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	25.5	70
Agree	38.5	106
Disagree	21.5	59
Strongly Disagree	12.4	34
Don't Know	2.2	6

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Agree 38.5% (106 choices)
2. Strongly agree 25.5% (70 choices)
3. Disagree 21.5% (59 choices)
4. Strongly disagree 2.4% (34 choices)
5. Don't know 2.2% (6 choices)

Q2 I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my health

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	21.8	60
Agree	40	110
Disagree	23.3	64
Strongly Disagree	13.8	38
Don't Know	1.1	3

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Agree 40% (110 choices)
2. Disagree 23.3% (64 choices)
3. Strongly agree 21.8% (60 choices)
4. Strongly disagree 13.8% (38 choices)
5. Don't know 1.1% (3 choices)

Q3 The Council has a key role to play in tackling the challenges of poor air quality and climate change

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	21.5	59
Agree	31.6	87
Disagree	12	33
Strongly Disagree	15.6	43
Don't Know	1.1	3

225/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. Agree	31.6% (87 choices)
2. Strongly agree	21.5% (59 choices)
3. No answer	18.2% (50 choices)
4. Strongly disagree	15.6% (43 choices)
5. Disagree	12% (33 choices)
6. Don't know	1.1% (3 choices)

Q4 The Council should encourage motorists towards more sustainable and active modes of transport such as walking, cycling, and public transport, which positively contribute towards improved air quality and public health

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	23.6	65
Agree	25.5	70
Disagree	15.3	42
Strongly Disagree	18.9	52
Don't Know	1.5	4

233/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. Agree	25.5% (70 choices)
2. Strongly agree	23.6% (65 choices)
3. Strongly disagree	18.9% (52 choices)
4. Disagree	15.3% (42 choices)
5. No answer	15.3% (42 choices)
6. Don't know	1.5% (4 choices)

Q5 All vehicles, including electric vehicles, should pay to park

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	33.1	91
Agree	30.9	85
Disagree	12.7	35
Strongly Disagree	21.8	60
Don't Know	1.5	4

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Strongly agree	33.1% (91 choices)
2. Agree	30.9% (85 choices)
3. Strongly disagree	21.8% (60 choices)
4. Disagree	12.7% (35 choices)
5. Don't know	1.5% (4 choices)

Q6 Reading Borough Council should prioritise lower polluting vehicles by offering a lower parking charge than for higher polluting vehicles

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	16.7	46

Agree	15.6	43
Disagree	12.4	34
Strongly Disagree	55.3	152
Don't Know	0	0

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Strongly disagree	55.3% (152 choices)
2. Strongly agree	16.7% (46 choices)
3. Agree	15.6% (43 choices)
4. Disagree	12.4% (34 choices)
5. Don't know	0% (0 choices)

Q7 Permit parking charges should be linked to the CO2 and NOx emission levels of the vehicle

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	16.7	46
Agree	12.4	34
Disagree	12.4	34
Strongly Disagree	57.5	158
Don't Know	1.1	3

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Strongly disagree	57.5% (158 choices)
2. Strongly agree	16.7% (46 choices)
3. Agree	12.4% (34 choices)
4. Disagree	12.4% (34 choices)
5. Don't know	1.1% (3 choices)

Q8 How likely is it that the proposed scheme would change your behaviour?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Very Likely	9.1	25
Likely	10.2	28
Unlikely	20.4	56
Very Unlikely	53.5	147
Don't Know	6.9	19

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Very unlikely	53.5% (147 choices)
2. Unlikely	20.4% (56 choices)
3. Likely	10.2% (28 choices)
4. Very likely	9.1% (25 choices)
5. Don't know	6.9% (19 choices)

Q9 I consider cost when choosing how to travel, even if a cheaper journey takes longer

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	8.7	24
Agree	42.9	118
Disagree	25.8	71
Strongly Disagree	8.7	24
Don't Know	2.5	7

271/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. Agree	42.9% (118 choices)
2. Disagree	25.8% (71 choices)
3. Strongly disagree	18.5% (51 choices)
4. Strongly agree	8.7% (24 choices)
5. Don't know	2.5% (7 choices)
6. No answer	1.5% (4 choices)

Q10 I value convenience over cost and am prepared to pay for that convenience

	%	No. respondents from 275
Strongly Agree	13.8	38
Agree	37.5	103
Disagree	23.3	64
Strongly Disagree	7.3	38
Don't Know	3.6	10
No Answer	14.5	40

235/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. Agree	37.5% (103 choices)
2. Disagree	23.3% (64 choices)
3. No answer	14.5% (40 choices)
4. Strongly agree	13.8% (38 choices)
5. Strongly disagree	7.3% (20 choices)
6. Don't know	3.6% (10 choices)

Q11 What is your preferred mode of transport?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Car	48.7	134
Walk	22.5	62
Cycle	10.2	28
Train	7.6	21
Bus	5.5	15
Other	5.5	15

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Car	48.7% (134 choices)
--------	---------------------

2. Walk	22.5% (62 choices)
3. Cycle	10.2% (28 choices)
4. Train	7.6% (21 choices)
5. Bus	5.5% (15 choices)
6. Other	5.5% (15 choices)

Q12 If you own a vehicle, what type do you own?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Petrol	49.1	135
Diesel	27.6	76
Fully Electric	8	22
Don't own a vehicle	8	322
Hybrid	7.3	20
Don't Know	0	0

275/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Petrol	49.1% (135 choices)
2. Diesel	27.6% (76 choices)
3. Fully electric	8% (22 choices)
4. I don't own a vehicle	8% (22 choices)
5. Hybrid	7.3% (20 choices)
6. Don't know	0% (0 choices)

Q13 How often do you use your vehicle?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Most Days	46.9	129
Weekly	31.3	86
No Answer	9.5	26
Occasionally	9.1	25
Rarely	3.3	9
Never	0	0

249/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. Most days	46.9% (129 choices)
2. Weekly	31.3% (86 choices)
3. No answer	9.5% (26 choices)
4. Occasionally	9.1% (25 choices)
5. Rarely	3.3% (9 choices)
6. Never	0% (0 choices)

Q14 What is the primary purpose of your vehicle?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Social or Leisure Activities	35.6	98
Commuting to Work	23.3	64
Shopping	12	33
Business or Work	9.5	26
No Answer	8	22
Dropping/collecting Children from school	2.9	8
Other	8.7	24

253/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Social or leisure activities 35.6% (98 choices)
2. Commuting to work 23.3% (64 choices)
3. Shopping 12% (33 choices)
4. In the course of work or business 9.5% (26 choices)
5. No answer 8% (22 choices)
6. Dropping off or collecting children from school 2.9% (8 choices)
7. Other 8.7% (24 choices)

Q15 When parking at home, where do you park your vehicle?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Privately-Owned Off-Street Parking	47.60	131
On Street Bay in Resident's Parking Zone	29.8	82
No Answer	13.1	36
On Street – No parking restrictions	8	22
In a public car park	0	0
Other	1.5	4

239/275 - Multiple choice - choose one – optional

1. Privately owned off-street parking 47.6% (131 choices)
2. In an on-street bay in a residents' parking zone 29.8% (82 choices)
3. No answer 13.1% (36 choices)
4. On street (no parking restrictions) 8% (22 choices)
5. In a public car park 0% (0 choices)
6. Other 1.5% (4 choices)

Q16 If you use your vehicle to commute to and from your place of work, where do you park?

	%	No. respondents from 275
Private Facility	44.9	123
Public Facility	10.5	29
No answer	8	22

Other	36.7	101
-------	------	-----

253/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - required

1. Private facility	44.7% (123 choices)
2. Public facility	10.5% (29 choices)
3. No answer	8% (22 choices)
4. Other	36.7% (101 choices)

Q17 When parking for retail or leisure purposes, where do you park?

	%	No. respondents from 275
In a public car park	44.4	122
In a privately owned car park	23.3	64
No answer	16	44
On Street	4	11
Marked street bay	3.6	10
Other	8.7	24

231/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. In a public car park	44.4% (122 choices)
2. In a privately owned car park	23.3% (64 choices)
3. No answer	16% (44 choices)
4. On street (no parking restrictions)	4% (11 choices)
5. In a marked street bay	3.6% (10 choices)
6. Other	8.7% (24 choices)

Q18 When visiting or caring for friends and family, where do you park?

	%	No. respondents from 275
In a marked street bay	25.1	69
No answer	25.1	69
In privately owned car park	12	33
In a public car park	4.7	13
Other	33.1	91

206/275 - Multiple choice - choose one - optional

1. In a marked street bay	25.1% (69 choices)
2. No answer	25.1% (69 choices)
3. In a privately owned car park	12% (33 choices)
4. In a public car park	4.7% (13 choices)
5. Other	33.1% (91 choices)

Additional comments from respondents.

If you want to become like London then improve absolutely every single aspect of the town, starting for healthy streets, and cleaning the whole Borough, catching on overgrown vegetation. Basically, lets focus on better reading and then you could think of something else. Thank you

Parking fees should be based on the bus day ticket price as a minimum for any vehicle, and then more for the most polluting and space consuming vehicles.

I seldom use council car parks, when I attempted to park on street one time the Ring Go app didn't work, and if I need to pay for parking I would typically use The Oracle Riverside. Broad Street Mall could be a viable and cheaper alternative in the future. I'm agnostic on ULEZ as I now have a euro 6 car, previously would have had to pay on a daily basis, I imagine many others would have to do the same.

Another tax on the poor working class without off street parking at their homes.

Reading council cannot be trusted with allocating permits. They see this not as an opportunity to address climate issues but to ascertain money. Permits are already expensive just to park, we have no driveway and it costs me £140 to park my car. There is no incentive to get a hybrid or electric vehicle really because there is no incentive from the council, maybe a free permit or easy routes to get a charging point if we live on a street with no parking. I would encourage John Ennis or anyone involved in travel within the council to actually try and get from A - B.

From the Tesla garage to Caversham and see how many temporary traffic lights they come across, do it in a car or a bus, but see how many times you get stuck and ask yourself how much extra pollution that causes. Tackle the problems from within the council first before looking to penalise workers. What about workers with van's? Already stretched and you want to charge them more whilst hiking up council tax?

Fix the roads, calm the temporary traffic lights down, get some traffic wardens to manage all the cars parked in cycle lanes. Make some more cycle lanes that are safe. Stop looking to residents to pay to fix the problems largely caused by the council and their lack of management. I've worked in change and transformation for 10 years and honestly this part of Reading's management needs a massive overhaul and reset.

Stop driving customers away from shops you will kill the town.

I love the proposal, but one way to make it much better: charge also based on the size of the car. Cars are getting bigger and this brings with it numerous problems for

our compact Town. Congestion is a huge issue. Bigger cars also pollute more in the way of microplastics from the wearing down of tires, and they use more energy to power which does not yet all come from clean sources. They are also more dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists due to their larger weight and reduced visibility. Please charge based on both size and tailpipe pollution.

A better solution would be to improve the flow of all traffic in Reading and not just busses and cyclists, everyone suffers because of poor traffic management by the council.

This is a tax on the poor who are unable to afford modern cars. It is better for the environment to use an existing car and than to ship a new car from overseas.

This will impact many people who work in trade jobs or commute. Reading is a commuter hub location. To get people out of using their cars, public transport needs to be cheaper and available 24-7. Not just within Reading but to near by villages and towns. When it's £60 for a peak return to Paddington, you can understand why people would drive to London.

I drive regularly to Finchampstead, I am unable to use public transport after 8pm in the evening and during the day the journal time would be over an hour vs a 25 minute drive.

Car cause traffic, all cars cause that equally. By all means increase parking costs for everyone, but make it everyone to reduce traffic.

I struggle to understand why lower income houses near Kensington Road are charged extortionate rates to park in resident parking schemes. We can't afford to move to the suburbs with a driveway so have no option.

I think the proposal to charge residents based on the vehicle emissions is outrageous. I used to live in West Reading, arguably one of the more deprived areas of Reading. Do you really think it is fair to charge residents that cannot afford a low emission vehicle a premium to park their car? Many people are only just surviving day to day and you think it's a good idea to charge someone that cannot afford a £50k+ car more to park. Anyone that can afford such a car is likely not to care about a few extra pounds on a permit and will enjoy cheaper parking. In reality you will deprive families and children and you will hit the most sensitive families the most. People cannot afford to upgrade their vehicles and so would have no choice but to pay the increased charges.

I have no idea what Labour stand for anymore. Kick those who have no choice but to endure the kicking and make the best of a bad situation.

Many people who have an old polluting car is because they cannot afford a newer one. You already pay more tax if you have a polluting car. The set up of old streets with Victorian terraced houses with no private dedicated parking does not allow to have electric cars even if you wanted to and could afford one. There are not many

hybrid vehicles available, and electric / hybrid technology is not so well developed yet. Improve traffic in town, stop closing down roads for weeks, make contractors complete their work faster to avoid sitting in traffic, and build the 3rd bridge over The Thames if you want to reduce pollution in the town.

The proposed charges are another tax on the poorer residents of Reading who. The parking permits are a rip off, I would be interested to know what Reading council have done with all the money generated since they have been issued certainty not sent in the roads in my area.

This is clearly just another tax on poor people that you're sneaking in. Just like your criminally priced parking permits which stops people parking near their house, unless they don't mind paying that poor person tax which you've already introduced without asking anyone.

I think age of the car should be considered (i.e. classic cars) - maybe those should be given exemptions or a special tariff.

I do not have access to on-street parking on the same side of the road that my house is located on. I am also frequently unable to park within 100 metres of my property. This means that I am unable to install an electric charger at my property. There are no public facilities provided (e.g. lamppost chargers etc.) for me to charge an electric vehicle on my road. This means that electric car ownership is not currently viable at my residential address.

The average value of a property without off street parking is likely to be lower in Reading than properties with off street parking and the opportunity to provide electric car charging. This means that occupiers and owners of properties without off street parking are disadvantaged when it comes to electric car ownership.

The enforcement of increased charges based on vehicle emissions would therefore have a disproportionate financial effect on residents from a poorer background. Meanwhile residents who have higher incomes, occupying higher value properties, would continue to be able to drive polluting vehicles with no financial penalty imposed.

Afraid to say that this comes across as yet another scheme to extract money from those who own a car.

Another tax on the poorer residents who don't have the means to buy a house with a drive way! OR an electric car!!! (and I work FULL TIME and on what I thought was a good salary, but i struggle to pay for day to day living. Savings dwindled to nothing because of rising hidden costs on EVERYTHING!

I think you need to address the coordination of badly timed and badly judged roadworks by the council before you start picking on individual motorists. For example for the last two weeks, roadworks close to both bridges across to Caversham, near Carters, and roadworks on the A4 near Prospect Park have caused massive tailbacks throughout Reading. That combined with an increase in stationary traffic on the London Road into Reading, the neverending road works on the A33 from Rose Kiln Lane etc etc are far more likely to have an impact on air pollution than any changes to residents or other parking restrictions.

When you introduce increased parking charges or permit zones, does anybody ever think further ahead than that? It seems to be a short term fix for the council - nobody ever wonders why there are so many people asking for drop kerbs so they can pave over their garden so they get free parking (perhaps that would explain why the air pollution increases and we get flooding etc etc)? Or make a bit of extra money by paving over their garden and renting the parking space out on JustPark?

Lastly, while I appreciate that electric cars may be seen as less polluting - where is the proof for this over their whole lifetime? How sustainable are electric cars - presumably the lithium grows on trees and the batteries can be replaced easily and the batteries recycled and used or disposed of safely. No I thought not. Plus has anybody actually spent any time looking into the infrastructure required for the charging of electric cars? Im not sure it is possible on terraced properties or blocks of flats so it would be particularly unfair to charge people in these areas more.

Car weight and hence wear on road should be a factor - like and electric 4x4 is still a massive car and an obstacle to cycling.

Parking fees are a blunt instrument. Significant traffic is from outside of Reading and simply transits through the town from South Oxon to M4 - they don't stop or park so there's only one way to get them and that is a toll on the bridge.

Lower emission vehicle like electric vehicle are still expensive and outside the reach of most people. This scheme will penalise people on lower income and older vehicles.

I think you are mixing air quality with green house gases. I agree that we need to reduce carbon so low carbon emissions are good. BUT the biggest impact on air quality for health are NOx and particulates (mainly from tyres and brakes). This there is a conflict between low carbon (Evs) and the need to reduce particulates as they are heavier producing more particulates from their tyres and brakes (and also more damage to local roads). Thus you need to consider how to reduce those particulates (not sure how you do that if you don't reduce cars (miles driven) on the road. I particularly like Reading Buses use of compressed BioMethane.

This is a punishment for those that cannot afford new or newer vehicles. Carbon neutral by 2030 is impossible to achieve and there are bigger issues in the town to deal with. All you're doing is raising money for more vanity projects stop taxing the poor.

1. Stupid to charge "non-polluting" less - it should be done on weight and size, electric SUVs will do as much damage to the roads if not more, and pollution (heavy = more disc brake dust). You would also have to update the parking scheme in another 5 years as people switch and revenue falls.
2. Its always tinkering - why cant you just take the Dutch rule book and apply it. Pedestrian = king on roundabouts the path is raised to it acts like a speed bump. car has to slow down.
3. Every time I walk into town i get pushed into the road by house bins. Take 2 car parking spaces per road and convert them into large Bin storage.
4. a painted line on the road is not a cycle lane. Please take a walk down the Thames path from Reading to TVP. It used to be a lovely way to get to work - now its filthily, and with all the burnt out boats and litter it feels dangerous.

These proposals will disproportionately affect low income residents.

The only way Reading will ever be pollution free is by building the third bridge to take through traffic away from the town centre IDR. Once it is built then the IDR can become a single carriageway with a beautiful green space circling part of the town. It feels like another cash grab by punishing those who cannot afford a lower emission vehicle.

Traffic that has no need to be in Reading needs a viable alternative route, and another Thames Bridge.

I think it's absolutely disgusting to charge drivers yet again more money for parking!! Forcing people to pay for the only car they can afford. Maybe if the parking officers started patrolling areas of permit only and gave the appropriate tickets to illegally parked vehicles which by the way at my zone O7R there are many just maybe the money generated will pay for pollution control in this god awful town or stop digging the roads at every turn for months at a time and the council will save money!! Leave the drivers alone we pay enough!!!

I would be concerned about charging for on street resident parking bays as this would be likely to disproportionately impact lower income households. Charging should focus on destination parking including town centre car parks - possibly workplace parking as well. Reducing congestion and encouraging a shift towards public transport and walking/cycling and away from private vehicles should be the priority focus, rather than emissions. If private vehicles (albeit 'clean' ones) remain in large numbers in the town centre then these create congestion, slow down buses and remain a hazard for vulnerable road users, in addition to concerns over social inequality.

I don't believe parking charges should be increased for terraced housing where residents have no choice about where to park.

I think any increased charges should target high value and high polluting SUVs rather than lower value vehicles that pollute more due to being older as it should not disproportionately affect lower income people and should not encourage people to buy a new car when they wouldn't have done otherwise as that is also not very sustainable. SUVs take up more space on the roads, are more polluting and take up more parking space so more should be done to discourage their use.

Permit parking should be emissions based. PAYG parking SHOULD NOT. It would make parking costs impossible to know in advance and difficult to enforce correctly.

A combination of educating, incentivising and implementing policies would help.

Please get back in your box and stop trying to make peoples' lives a misery. Thanks

Have other measures such as the size of the vehicle been considered?

On street residential parkers can not own an electric vehicle (30% of all home owners nationally). We live here as we cannot afford a bigger house with a drive. We also don't own less polluting cars newer cars because we cannot afford them. But we still need a car to visit / care for family who are not local, go shopping to a town with shops, take part in our leisure activities. We pay higher (from) April VED, we pay ULED etc. we cannot keep on paying for your mistakes. How much has the pollution increased since you brought in the new bus lanes? Tell us the truth.

When cars are parked they are not producing emissions, so it is irrelevant whether a parked vehicle is electric, petrol or diesel. Vehicles only produce emissions when driving. The majority of modern cars have low emissions.

RBC have no right to personal details stored by the DVLA unless a penalty notice has to be issued. It is an invasion of privacy. People have a right to go about their business without interference.

Every time you parked on the street which could be several times a day, each meter would have to ask permission. There would be a delay for the information to be confirmed. Parking would be a longer process. It is an invasion of privacy.

RBC could apply this to residents parking permits because the permit is linking the vehicle to a specific address of an RBC resident whose personal details you already have for council tax etc. Visitor permits would be exempt because RBC have no right to know who visits a private address.

What are the most polluting vehicles - lorries. However, they only park on street temporarily for deliveries. The biggest polluters are lorries using Reading as a cut through to Basingstoke (A33), Oxford (A4074), Panbourne and Didcot (A329),

Henley (A4155), Maidenhead (A4) and via A4 to the M40 at High Wycombe.

Electric vehicles should pay a higher Road tax at because they are heavier and do more damage to the roads.

1. You are penalising people who don't have driveways. How do you expect people to be able to charge an electric vehicle when they don't have access to a charging point?
2. People who live in streets with resident parking are in cheaper houses, and much less likely to be able to afford to change cars than those with driveways and access to parking points
3. Surely it is worse for the environment for me to buy a new car than to keep the low emission one that I have?
4. People who live in streets with resident parking are in cheaper houses, and much less likely to be able to afford to change cars than those with driveways and access to parking points.
5. I have no choice but to drive to work, it is 12 miles away and not accessible by public transport.
6. The only really viable way to reduce traffic in Reading is to build the third Thames crossing to prevent traffic from having to drive through the town

This is the biggest load of virtue signalling, money grabbing ***** I have ever seen or read. Your job is to provide what people want - not try to extract more money from them based on a lot of "green crap"! This serves no purpose whatsoever. Furthermore we already pay a bloody fortune to be on the road, the county don't even make them carworthy any more - and we should be able to park on them without parting with yet more money which we've paid multiple times over just to be there!

I strongly agree with penalising higher emissions however this is too complicated. We already have car tax so why not use that to charge extra and get the government to divvy out the extra cash to councils. Or push up council tax and parking generally and make public transport brilliant.

The vast majority of polluting vehicles are older vehicles, often as it is the only type of vehicle certain demographics can afford. This is essentially another tax on people. Electric cars are only suitable as company cars due to their extreme costs and are out of the reach of most people. Trying to get people to use park and ride has failed, look at the two empty facilities at Winnersh and TVP. Decongest the roads and keep traffic moving will reduce air pollution far quicker than taxing people who can't afford it.

Emissions-based charging is a brilliant scheme, and can be seen to work (particularly in collaboration with a Clean Air Zone) e.g.: Bath & Bristol councils

Further investment needs to be made to improve public transport connections within and around Reading, both in new routes and improving the service reliability of the

existing ones. Buses in particular struggle on sections of the road network where there is simply too much traffic. The Oxford Road in particular has been awful since roadworks near Reading West station have commenced.

I honestly think that consideration needs to be given to a modern tram network to supplement the Reading Buses network; these can offer the increased capacity and reliability of service to encourage more people to shift from using cars, especially if the route design avoids using existing roads (or where it has to share road space, it avoids the currently overload arteries).

Penalising residents by tying permits to car emissions feels the wrong way. Focus should be on removing the number of non resident cars (using Reading as a cut through). You will more likely drive residents away rather than have them change their vehicles.

Disappointed that there isn't a proposal for a ULEZ zone to encourage the worst polluters to change their vehicles. After some cars and vans pass or when they're parked for the school run I can struggle to breathe for a while due to the pollution and I don't suffer from asthma. I worry for the town's children.

The air pollution in Caversham is alarming on some days. Please could this be monitored locally? The local monitoring station is at Cemetery junction.

Electric cars are currently a luxury purchase, far more expensive than petrol or diesel vehicles. Until this cost difference is addressed, the policy of encouraging electric vehicles unfairly targets those who simply cannot afford to make the switch, myself included. It's unrealistic to expect everyone to be able to buy an electric car.

Additionally, as I rely on street parking and don't have a dedicated charging space, I would be forced to use commercial charging bays, which come with higher fees. I've previously asked the council about the possibility of creating dedicated charging bays outside people's homes, but my concerns were ignored.

I don't believe this policy will have a significant environmental impact. Reading is already a major thoroughfare, and the areas being targeted seem to unfairly penalise residents like me who rely on cars. Furthermore, with a new runway approved at Heathrow, more planes will be flying over the town, negating any environmental benefits achieved by penalising petrol and diesel vehicles in Reading.

I understand that the council may proceed with this scheme regardless of public feedback, which raises questions about the purpose of conducting a survey. I've seen similar projects, like the bike lane on Sidmouth Street that seems underused, and the bus lanes at Cemetery Junction, which appear to have increased traffic and pollution. Having lived here all my life, I've observed that some of these changes have worsened traffic leading to more emissions and causing vehicles to be stuck in traffic rather than moving efficiently through the town.

I support the proposal that all vehicles should pay more to park when coming into Reading based on their emissions. The proposal that residents should pay more for their permit should apply only to the most polluting vehicles.

The parking charges near Town centre are becoming prohibitive already. Serious risk to businesses in the area as we now have started avoiding going to town due to the extra £5 to £10 parking fee and 'homelessness' on display.

Please see comments further back, do something about traffic coming in from other counties before forcing another tax on locals.

I personally have a fully electric car (a MG5) and have to use public chargers. I live in a terraced house, so no possibility of charging at home. In Reading there are very almost no chargers which are not also in car parks where you have to pay to park there or you are limited to short amounts of time, so can't get a full charge! It makes it very difficult. I think councils are here to serve the public. Electric cars are still very expensive and not frankly in reach of people the majority of people who live around here. If you want to help - make buses cheaper, don't tax people more, which is what seems to be proposed here. Also ban diesel buses - force them to be electric - there is no reason not to do so, if you are serious. Lead by example, not with a stick,

This is yet another money grab from RBC and a war on the motorist. Yes, we should do something about through traffic but residents of Reading need cars. Permits are already extortionate for on street spaces where people actually live and this is making it worse. In addition to the traffic inducing bus lanes - which will worsen air quality

RBC should strongly consider not charging residents permits, they should be looking at large truck, and cars using Reading as cut through, e.g. the Oxford Rd. We pay enough to park in our road, which is not regulated well by the wardens already, as recently we have had large van and busses park while living in an airb and B, no tickets issued! they were taking up 2 car places. If you are going to charge us more, it's just unfair.

Reading council has a duty of care to all its residents and visitors. Using this scheme as a cover for simply raising additional revenue, whilst knowingly penalising those less well off, is despicable. Why not charge on the weight of a vehicle so reducing the number of large SUVs damaging the roads, avoiding penalising less well people who have to drive older vehicles and would reduce the damage to our roads, which the council would save money in doing.

The proposed changes victimise poorer families and those on low incomes.

I am supportive so long as pedestrians are prioritised more.

Implementing these changes is another way to tax those that cannot afford the newer vehicles. I think it is discriminatory to those without access to electric/hybrid cars.

STOP penalizing citizens with charges, we are in a cost of living crisis where everything is increasing in price with the exception of salaries. Keep raising costs and adding additional costs, people wont be able to afford to work and will convert to living off benefits.

If Reading Borough Council genuinely care about the environment, work with the manufacturers and dealerships to lower the cost of sustainable vehicles (public transport is not an option for a lot of individuals).

Charging for parking... where is this money going? who benefits from the £££ which the council will charge? Cars will remain and Reading Borough Councils pockets will get bigger under to proviso costs are to encourage sustainable travel.

Reading Borough Council sold the majority of land across Reading to housing developers, this in turn created more vehicles into the town as no provisions in place.

Reading Borough Council made ££ out of selling it's land (and continues to do so), YOU bought the vehicles into the Town, RBC to pay NOT the residents. Pretty sure the next thing RBC will look at charging its residents will be for the air we breath.

If I need to pop to town (1 hour), then it is cheaper for me to drive - this needs to be addressed if you want people to use the bus more often.

If you're going to introduce bus lanes then ensure that they actually make bus journeys quicker rather than buses getting held up in the queues caused by the bus lanes.

By putting an extra charge on higher emission cars then you are effectively costing the poorer people in society more money. Not everyone can afford to upgrade to a new low emission car.

Not everyone can have an electric car especially if they live on a Victorian street with nowhere to install a charger - we shouldn't be penalised for this.

You already charge a high price for permit parking which goes up every year. To now be adding extra cost for emissions is ridiculous. Most people are already stretched financially and if they can't afford a new car then they are going to be penalised for this by having to pay extra for emissions when they don't have a choice like people with more money. Also this is not fair to people who are paying for permits to park in their street when they unfortunately don't have a driveway and people who have a driveway or can afford low emissions cars or electric will not be penalised. No matter how much people would like to be more sustainable, the cost of buying a new car does not make it possible when finances are already stretched and now you are further adding to their financial stress by increasing permits which we have no choice but have to have to live in an area where they are needed.

Consider pricing by vehicle weight. Cars, even electric ones, are getting too big.

The idea of varying parking charges / travel costs based on emissions is farcical given that the punctuality of the buses is horrific and the routes are not comprehensive enough (e.g. no direct bus service between Tilehurst and Whitley) so for a lot of people there is no real viable alternative than to drive.

Additionally, the council should put more focus on recouping more money from non-residents of Reading (seeing as they are the demographic that use services provided by Reading without actually contributing to fund them) or even national companies who have a presence in Reading (e.g. Tesco, Morrisons, B&Q, Selco etc) rather than continuously penalising residents of Reading.

Although I agree with the general idea that higher polluting vehicles should be subject to higher charges, and am pleased the council are considering ways to encourage residents to choose more sustainable transport options, I do not believe the 'pay to park' plan will encourage owners of such vehicles to switch to cleaner ones. An extra few pounds to park will be less expensive than paying for a new car.

The council should instead focus their efforts on encouraging residents to consider more sustainable options for shorter journeys (e.g. driving from Caversham/Tilehurst into town). Frequent buses would be the most popular. The council used to offer '£1 to town', could this be reintroduced on weekends, starting with a six month trial? Or 'family tickets' (x2 adults x2 children) with a £5 return fare (cheaper than 3 hours in The Oracle), again trialling at weekends for six months. Reading Buses already offer similar group tickets (x4 adults for £5.50).

However, if the council decided to go ahead with their 'pay to park plan' it should only be introduced for certain roads that frequently see high visitor numbers (e.g. roads near the Royal Berkshire Hospital) or public car parks (e.g. Kings Meadow). It is unfair on residents who own higher polluting vehicles living in houses with no off-street parking to pay for the privilege of parking outside their own home.

Additionally, the council should make a public commitment that money raised from the scheme will be spent on improving sustainable transport options (e.g. additional buses or switching to more electric buses). This would give residents more confidence in the council at a time when there is wide spread disillusion in politics.

Not everyone can just go out and buy a new car. Do not punish those that have to make do with the vehicle they have.

My impression on filling in the above questionnaire is that the questions are worded in a biased way and will illicit the answers the council wants rather than to find out peoples true wishes. For example, by asking questions such as "I worry about the impact of poor air quality on my children and family" at the start of the questionnaire biases the responses to all following questions. If instead the first questions were, for example, along the lines of "Do you think that those who cannot afford to buy a

more modern car should be penalised by making them pay more for parking" I suggest that the responses to the following questions you asked would be different. In other words, your survey is designed to give the answer you want rather necessarily what the residents might want. Is your case for the proposed changes to parking charges etc so weak that you have to send out such a biased survey?

This is genuinely disgraceful and deeply regressive. People don't typically drive older more polluting cars for fun. They drive them because they can't afford newer cars. The idea of charging poorer people more to park, so that some richer people and politicians can feel like they made a difference is truly shameful.

I totally oppose the introduction of these emission charges for residents parking bays. Many of the people who street park are on lower incomes. They can't afford the latest low emission vehicles but need a car to get to work. This policy seems designed to panelise those on lower incomes while the wealthy pay less while they park their new cars on their drives or in their garages.

Increasing the cost for older cars only punishes the poorest. They generally end up with the older more polluting cars that are discarded by the better off when silly, ill thought schemes like this are dreamed up.

I am concerned that I cannot afford to buy an electric vehicle and I don't feel I should be penalised for this by having to pay higher parking charges than those lucky and wealthy enough to buy an electric vehicle. Furthermore in roads like mine, with only on-street permit parking, people with electric cars already stretch leads to charge their cars across the pavements, causing a trip hazard. Offering cheaper parking permits for electric vehicles will encourage this selfish behaviour. It also exacerbates the competition for parking space as e-vehicle owners want to be able to park outside their house at all times.

"Sustainable" travel is unsustainable. If you require people to pay extra for parking if they don't have the cars you deem sustainable, how is charging them more going to give them more money to afford the vehicles you have arbitrarily decided are sustainable? There are so many differing opinions on electric cars and the long term costs and environmental impact. Trying to control citizens is wrong. Especially when based on ambiguous and heavily biased opinions.

Do NOT make a blanket tax on what is deemed high-polluting or non-electric. Our diesel car is old, but passes its yearly MOTs and is in better shape than many other newer cars out there. In addition, the environmental cost of replacing a perfectly useable and clean vehicle is bonkers and totally wrong.

I must use the car for certain trips (commuting to the train station in Twyford; going to tennis / football lessons for the children; going grocery shopping). It is extremely unfair to tax mine higher than a newer one, when the cost to replace it just does not make economic sense for us, nor environmental sense.

I don't really see the point in this survey as Councillor Ennis stated on national TV that residents can have their say but the Council will introduce the policy anyway!

Disabled so need my car public transport impossible

Stop this nonsense

I use my car very rarely, but an emission based charge would impact me unfairly due to the rare use. Less than 500 miles in the last year.

Bring it on and quickly! Doing so will not only tackle air pollution and congestion, it will also improve the condition of roads but importantly will improve mental and physical health, tackle the obesity issue that is destroying our NHS and just make people generally nicer to one another. People in cars are largely just horrible to one another and to other road users. I often get victimised for no other reason than daring to ride a bicycle on the mean streets of Reading!

I think this proposed project is an excessive and unnecessary waste of resource - let national tax policy in relation to motoring costs look after the incentivization towards net zero. It's over-interference and with no realistic prospect of making a difference and ROI is questionable. There are too many rules, regulations, which require far too many people to operate and enforce them. Stick to the core council work and stop further, over-complicating, the already complicated. You have more than enough to do already without inventing more tenuous and dubious reasons to squander our desperately hard-earned income when it's already more than in hand.

CO2 and NOx emissions are a long way from the solution. Electric vehicles are extremely heavy compared to petrol and diesel, and damage roads more. They also wear tyres significantly because of their weight, and pollution from particles is significantly greater from tyres than exhaust emissions. So please do not treat electric vehicles as perfect. You must also remember that electric vehicles are expensive to buy, or are a tax efficient option for those on company car schemes. These are people of above average income, so charging them is a very regressive approach. If you really want to make a difference, a drastic approach like raising parking charges for all and making Reading Buses free might work better.

I do not agree with the proposal to charge more for residents parking for higher emission vehicles. This is discriminatory to those who cannot afford to replace their vehicle with a newer model and is not considering the overall environmental impact of scrapping perfectly working older vehicles for newer ones even if everyone could afford to do so.

There is virtually zero infrastructure for hybrid/electric vehicles in most of the borough particularly for on street parking so that is not a viable option for many areas currently. Council would need to have that in place before penalising motorists. In my area we had a CPR zone imposed against much opposition on the flimsy reason of parking from commuters using the rail station which was never really an issue and even less so since 2020.

So basically it's solely income generation for the Council - the prospect of paying even more to do so is not supporting residents already facing Council Tax increase and other additional costs. It's unfair on those who do not have driveways, disproportionately impacting those most likely with lower incomes/smaller properties.

Causing residents of Reading to pay additionally to park their vehicles because they have higher emissions will penalise those who do not have off street parking. This seems ridiculous to push costs on those who tend to be poorer who don't have gravel drive ways to park their cars or who are benefiting the local environment by their gardens rather than turning them into carparks. It seems obvious that the charges should be placed on those who drive into or through Reading in high emission vehicles. People who live in Reading should at least initially be exempt to minimise opposition from voters in Reading. The resulting decrease in traffic will free road space for public transport and make the road less intimidating for cyclists as well as improving air quality. The existing proposal seems particularly ineffective as it excludes car parks.

I am not sure this proposal goes far enough I feel road use charging and parking charges should both be brought in to drive modal shift.

I am strongly against higher parking charges for cars that use either petrol or Diesel. In my situation, I don't have a garage or a parking in front of my house. There's a big green area in front of my house and me and my neighbours are not supposed to park on the green for protecting nature.

As a result, I had to buy a petrol car. Even if I want to and believe in environmental conservation, I can't buy an electric car as I can't put an electric charging point on the road. So, either council should allow me to park my car on the green and then I can charge my electric car OR scrap this idea of higher parking charges completely.

In summary, please don't tell me the problem; give me a solution to the problem. So, for me, either let me park closer to my house and charge my car or let me live peacefully. I am already paying enough in taxes!!

Charging more for parking based on emissions is stupid. A parked car has no emissions. I say again a parked car has no emissions. So other than introducing a one off additional fee each time you park, there can be no logic whatsoever in charging a higher rate for each hour of parking. This refers to the council controlled parking on road and public car parks. Permit parking I object to in principle but doesn't have this same fatal flaw. I can assure you such fees are a deterrent to coming into Reading and that is detrimental to Reading's economy as I will simply spend my money elsewhere. There are so many alternatives this is simply bad for Reading.

The answer is to reduce bus fares and make public transport cheap. Very cheap and frequent. Then more people will use it as using a car becomes more expensive.

This utopia however doesn't work in the suburbs and a car is needed as public transport isn't a realistic option unless you want to go where the bus goes at the time the bus goes. What actually happens is bus fares go up.

The train is outside your control but the same logic applies. Should be very cheap. I use the trains but never the bus.

This is a proposal which is no more than a money grab from Reading residents and which will not go away even if everybody drove electric cars as the council will get used to the revenue stream.

I think if you live in Reading you should get a free parking permit, if on a permit street, second car chargeable. Parking in Reading is ridiculously expensive compared to places like Henley. I know you are resurfacing roads, but ours was done completely unnecessarily and yet on the Reading Road near Donkin Hill the holes are dreadful. Lots of money is wasted and yet we are paying more and more.

Poor people can't change the car as often as they would like. Charging by emissions is just another tax for poor people, penalising them for driving an old car. With the cost of living crisis this will affect a lot of citizens, low income citizens will be forced to use public transport while higher incomes won't be affected as normally they would have a nice driveway or garage. Please dont tax us more.

Reading buses seem like a good service - but they all seem to terminate in town, so to travel across town it's always required to swap buses which is time consuming and expensive and is the main reason I don't use buses. I'd like to see some circular routes around the outskirts of town.

People are struggling to pay bills, they can not afford a green car, so you are simply taxing and penalising those who can not make a change. Some areas are unable to have green vehicles due to the infrastructure ie terrace roads, again you are being unrealistic and penalising those who are in this situation.

Travelling into reading is only to use the regions hospital. These proposals will discriminate against those with older vehicles - perhaps enforced on them by ill health. Who wishes to stand around in the cold and catch several buses or the park and ride facility after chemotherapy or other unpleasant treatments.

I think it higher parking fees for high polluting vehicles is fine, but should only ramp up for really high polluting as it seems to me 50%+ of the pollution is done by 5% of the vehicles. Also, keeping high-polluting older delivery vans and lorries out of town centre would make a big difference.

Reading parking costs are already extortionate and by increasing them further will lead to less people coming to Reading to shop and making the town even more run down.

I think that charging more for higher emission vehicles would have the effect of adversely impacting underserved and disadvantaged communities disproportionately. Those who drive more polluting vehicles will generally be those who cannot afford the latest more expensive vehicles but rely on older cheaper models. You should do an impact assessment on what effect this policy would have and how it would comply with the Equalities Act 2010 regarding indirect discrimination. Thanks.

100% against emissions charging as it is discriminatory on lower income earners who it hits the most.

Electric cars, despite what the Government pushes out, are not more eco friendly when the entire production process from mining of raw materials through to end-of-life disposal is taken into account, And if we add in the capital cost of new electric charge point infrastructure the cost/benefit ratio is even worse.

The proposed changes will have a significant and unequal impact on individuals with lower incomes, as they may not have the financial means to purchase a new electric or hybrid vehicle. This creates an economic disparity, where those who can afford these vehicles benefit, while those who cannot are left facing additional burdens.

Additionally, electric and hybrid vehicles tend to be heavier than traditional gas-powered cars due to their large battery packs. This increased weight contributes to faster wear and tear on road surfaces, potentially leading to higher maintenance costs for infrastructure in the long run.

Higher polluting vehicles already pay extra road tax, that should be enough to "punish" people rather than adding extras everywhere. Electric vehicles pay minimal road tax, it was nothing, despite being twice as heavy as a "normal" car and hence damaging roads more so they should actually pay more!!

So you want to make even more difficult for those who have a moral objection to electric cars that use materials drawn from the earth by exploited children or who cannot afford such horrendous items?

Get out of people's lives and stop trying to control what they do, especially when it is clear the scheme is a cynical excuse to get more money out of people who cannot afford a newer or electric car - it is very hard to believe that you have residents' best interests at heart.

As the proposed changes are not clearly laid out (I did not see them before I was taken to this survey) it is difficult to comment on them. You say, in the survey that you would offer lower charges for 'sustainable' vehicles based on CO2 or NOx ratings, but I fear that you will simply RAISE the charges for older vehicles.

Another scheme to bolster the council funds at the expense of working people who cannot afford a newer/less emitting vehicle

I agree with the need for joined up transport strategy and sustainable travel. I feel that Blue Badger holders should be exempt from parking charges - often there is no alternative to using the car and parking close to the visited location.

Our bus service (Nos 17 and 4,4a) is very good and I frequently use the bus to go into Reading town centre. Where it is feasible I use the train to places outside Reading but not for more complex journeys without direct links with Reading. Has the Council considered a Park and Ride in the Shepherds Hill / Sutton Seeds roundabout area to reduce traffic coming in on the A4 (East)??

1. The policy is regressive and penalises those least able to afford the increased charges
2. The policy ignores the problems of excessive weight and particulate releases of electric vehicles which result in more harm at local level than petrol and diesel cars
3. The policy unfairly penalises diesel vehicles which have lower CO2 emissions than equivalent petrol vehicles
4. To meet its stated aims, the policy should reward the cleanest cars with a discount while penalising the most polluting cars, resulting in no overall increase in charges, so it seems unacceptably opportunist of the council to use this as a way of increasing (substantially) income from on street parking.

I feel this scheme punishes those unable to change their vehicles. Cars are important for many people, and for many essential. To charge people more at a time where there are record numbers at foodbanks, ever increasing tax's, and the cost of living has never been harder is immoral. It's not just the people who can claim benefits that are struggling and it's another attempt at charging regular people more who don't receive anything back from the Government. We should be trying to keep money in people's pockets and so they can spend on the local economy or afford the essentials that have become too expensive.

should not be increasing costs for drivers, all vehicles should be taxed the same, this would reduce costs for the majority of drivers at a time when the cost of living is at an all-time high.

I'm very concerned about the level of pollution from road traffic in Reading and hope that this and more can be done to alleviate the problem. I note the recently reported success of the ULEZs in London and hope that similar measures are adopted in Reading.

Stop putting cycle lanes in (that nobody uses) and bus lanes and the traffic will flow better thus avoiding any pollution. Allow Uber to operate in Reading to stop the black cabs ripping off people, cheaper taxis might encourage people to leave their cars at home for a day in Reading. Or let Reading turn into a Ghost Town!

There is no man-made climate change. EVs are a fire hazard and a crime against humanity.

This is the most ridiculous policy I have ever seen proposed by Reading council. It won't make any difference to emissions. Just another deceitful scheme to extract more money out of long-suffering residents. Net zero is the biggest scam ever imposed on the UK. If the government continues with this policy it will ruin the economy and make us into a third-world country.

I have two cars. I cannot switch to electric as I cannot park outside my house. And even if I could, I can't run a cable over the public footpath. These should be considered first.

Your proposal will unfairly penalise the less wealthy in society who cannot afford a newer car, it will only benefit the wealthy, and it will not make any difference to air quality. You also need to demonstrate that any changes you make to charging do not increase the overall revenue generated for the council, otherwise this is just another money spinner at the expense of motorists.

I feel that this will be extra money for people to pay out. Everyone knows how tight money is for families and this is typically the group of people that will have extra expense. I also feel that this just another way for the council to get more money from the people of Reading. The road tax is going up very soon, surely this is enough without adding more.

Restricting choices will not help. It has been shown that electric vehicles are worse for the environment. Maybe not building on the few green spaces and protecting nature areas and wildlife would do far more to help.

Life is difficult enough without slapping extra charges on parking for what could be essential services. Jumping on the band wagon of using charge increases on cars is penalising those who have diesel vehicles - which can't be changed quickly or even ever at all. Consider the cost of changing a vehicle to a newer car to pensioners on limited budgets. Families could also be similarly unable to simply change a car quickly - household budgets are stretched to capacity with all the other charges you levy as well.

Penalising people that cannot afford to purchase a lower emission car is fundamentally wrong. There is no charging infrastructure to allow me to charge a vehicle at home and the cost to use public charging stations is much higher.

non electric vehicles already pay more tax - road tax; you can't keep penalising non electric cars – without offering a scrappage scheme and significantly improving the charging infrastructure within Reading.

This proposal serves to discriminate against those of us who are unable to afford newer vehicles and are not able to charge an ev due to there being no infrastructure in place for roadside charging. This is 100% a cash grabbing greenwashing proposal from a car hating labour council.

I know you are planning a clean air zone - I read the very lengthy report when it came out. Reading town centre is already dying a death with empty shops and low footfall, mainly thanks to ridiculously high rents but not helped by asinine bus lane projects. People prefer to go shopping in Bracknell. By increasing parking charges and penalising non-electric cars you are making matters worse. Everyone has seen ULEZ in London, especially the nonsensical expansion, and knows it is more about raising money than clean air. If you keep going down this route, Reading will just be a large collection of flats, Turkish barber shops and fast food takeaways. Oh, and I presume they are using environmentally-friendly concrete to build all these new flats?

Much more needs to be done to encourage full electric vehicle use. With the advent of the unfathomable road taxing of fully electric cars to the same rate as the polluting ones anything actioned locally to reward the expense of going electric, free parking, electric only bays, more charging points etc. should be actioned.

I no longer shop in central Reading, I shop Caversham, Vastern Rd, Woodley and Online. Grandchildren minding is Woodley. Reading traffic policies have forced me out of Reading shops.

As an officer of environmental sustainability in a council I understand the need to reduce emissions however, any policy that charges those without EV/hybrids more than those with is short sighted. We own one car and drive only when it is necessary however with a toddler and an infant a car is still definitely necessary. We cycle and get the train to work. We walk into town. We walk to nursery. However, we can not afford nursery 5 days a week so we need a car to drive our child to grandparents a few days a week. There is no alternative to get her there. We are not alone in this.

I work in EV infrastructure so I am pro EV however my family, along with many others, simply can not afford an EV yet. Instead we take other approaches to reduce our emissions and impact (without the threat of additional charges!). Charging those who can't afford EV/hybrids more simply puts us further away from affording an EV/hybrid.

I can understand the logic in charging visitors to Reading who chose to drive into the town. However, surely the money that is intended to implement the new parking system would be better spent in improving and implementing methods encouraging visitors to use other transport methods. For example park and ride. This is an equitable solution that doesn't punish the lower classes. Adding EV charging points at the park and rides would also encourage those with low polluting vehicles to utilise the park and rides reducing traffic even further-which is surely the actual goal? To reduce traffic not just fill the town with larger EVs with higher tyre pollution.

Charging residents differing amounts based on the vehicle they are able to afford to park outside their own homes without any accountability on the council to provide on street charging provisions is despicable. Residents purchasing parking permits

do so because they do not have access to a drive or off street parking. This makes EVs and plug-in options even less affordable. We can not afford an EV but if we could, we would have to factor in where we could park (most likely at cost) to charge our EV at staggering costs compared to those able to charge at home.

Before the council can even contemplate introducing additional charges for residents without EVs the council needs to ensure there is adequate, equitable and reliable provision of EV Charging infrastructure in its residential areas with high proportions of on street parking properties. Within a 15 minute walk radius of my house (with over 80% on street residences) there are 2 on street slow charge points. How is this supposed to serve the community to transition to EVs? Use the money to implement EV infrastructure and sustainable transport measures. This will positively encourage more people to transition. Punishing those for not being able to afford EVs will just push the transition back further.

The proposed plan yet again hits the poorest people in the community, it is poorest who will have the highest polluting vehicles and have the lowest ability to change the vehicles for a lower polluting vehicle. The wealthiest won't be effected as they will already have a car that less polluting and they won't care how much it costs to park.

Unfortunately Reading council's plans hit the wrong people. It's like running an EV, if you live in a house with a drive then being able to charge using cheap electricity (around 6 to 10p per kWh) at home is an option. If you live in flats or don't have a drive charging ends up being in public chargers that are around 40p to 90p per kWh dependant on how long you want to wait for your car to charge.

To make these changes the council first need to look at the concerns causing a high pollution in the town such as unused cycle lanes/paths e.g. Sidmouth Street also bus lanes that have made getting into the town a longer journey causing more traffic and pollution e.g. London road by Palmer Park if these issues were actually thought of before the council decided they were placed in measure then maybe residents would understand changes however, trying to push people towards the likes of electric vehicles when they are just as damaging in production of electric vehicles the mining for lithium for the so-called batteries is killing the planet making people pay more for petrol and diesel vehicles is ridiculous. SORT THE ISSUES FIRST!!!!!!

The proposal is stick method not a carrot. The town center is in bad shape and the proposals will prevent visitors. Street bays cause traffic congestion, a root cause of pollution. This proposal is another cash cow for the council.

Why allow residents parking on a RED ROUTE? The purpose of a red route is to prevent congestion so why allow any parking?

I do not disagree with the principle of differential charging based on vehicle emissions, but such charging should not disadvantage those least able to afford it - typically older cars are more polluting, but less expensive to purchase, and consequently favoured by lower income households. Furthermore, a vehicle's

emissions depend to some degree on the maintenance of the engine. A poorly or infrequently serviced engine is likely to emit a higher level of emissions than the official data indicates.

How reliably can the DVLA data be accessed? If parking machines experience difficult retrieving the data, or fail to retrieve the correct data, public confidence in the system will diminish very quickly.

no

As a Blue Badge holder I can park for free in the Pay & Display bays in Reading. However this is using my carers' cars, so it could one day be a normal petrol car and on another day be a large diesel. I have no say over what kind of car my carers use, but as they are on low pay, I've never yet seen a carer use a hybrid or electric car, it's always older cars. So if I have to pay, I'll be paying different amounts based on what carer is driving me on that day, which is really unfair. Please keep free Pay & Display parking for Blue Badge holders. Because of my wheelchair and disability, we can't get on a bus (or walk or cycle), so we have to use the car. I know other people get a choice but I don't.

Any proposed changes should be supported by objective data to show that there are health issues. Even then I would want to see objective data for different parts of the town as I know suburbs will be lower than say specific hot spots in the town centre. Where is the data?

Charge more for 2nd resident permit. Shortage of spaces by us. Ensure enforcement of parking restrictions with more frequent checks at the weekend and early evening (6-7pm).

Setting higher parking charges on higher emissions vehicles has two target groups - those who drive large, inefficient, modern cars where it is appropriate to penalise the decision not to choose a more efficient, less polluting car and those who drive older cars where it is not appropriate to penalise as no decision was made to be less efficient.

Those driving older cars did not have a choice for a more efficient hybrid or electric car and are most likely to be the strata of the population less able to afford a new, more efficient car, and higher parking fees.

Forcing people to purchase a new car is not a clearly and entirely positive thing for the environment as the manufacturing of a replacement car instead of using an existing car until the end of its service life is highly polluting.

We all know that emissions are an issue, however it's always the people who can never afford to purchase a better vehicle that are penalised, please think realistically.

There is an ongoing attempt by Reading council to drive vehicles off the road, there is an awful new bus lane at the top of London Road, which just causes large traffic

jams, while empty bus routes are not improving transport in Reading. Many people I speak to just see Reading Council as trying to ruin business in Reading centre - there is no effort to reduce antisocial behaviour in Reading centre, with cyclists and food delivery bikes speeding around the pedestrian areas, and these policies to demonise car users just means ever more delivery bikes and delivery drivers, while destroying retail business in Reading. From a regular visitor to Reading centre, I now rarely travel to Reading centre - the cost of parking, dreadful travel in with ever more empty bus routes and poor traffic planning (even just the traffic lights sequencing at the bottom of Silver Street (heading west the main lights change after the side lights rather than in the correct sequence). I believe the council should be encouraging trade and supporting business in Reading, not planning ever more punitive means to exclude people from access to the town centre.

VED is already very high, Car park permits also more than most boroughs along with devaluation of vehicles and property if brought in, my elderly drive a older car, pay over £400 a year for VED + council on road parking charges - They rarely do over 1000 miles per year?

Brilliant effort, please do more to protect our kids

To get more cyclists on the road, we need to address the perceived and real dangers of cycling amongst vehicles. A combination of both lower speed limits and segregated lanes are crucial to get people who wouldn't even think of cycling to get on a bike.

Be brave! Ensure this is one part of a suite of behaviour change interventions to make active travel more safe and attractive.

Could also consider the size. Too many huge cars these days.

I think it is really good, and the council should keep doing everything they can to reduce car use in reading and surrounding areas.

Agree with this and should be accompanied by awareness programme e.g. including engine idling, and availability of free cycle training for adults that Avanti Cycling provide.

I think this is one of the most heartless things RBC could do to the people of the town. I have made my feelings clear in the last long answer. I would LOVE to be able to replace my car with an electric car. I would love solar panels, I would love a heat pump. Not only because I know these things will save me money, but because I care for our environment. I don't have any of these things, not because I don't want them, but because I can't afford any of them. I see people in big houses with roofs full of solar panels and it's them who will be paying less on their bills than me. I see people driving around in new EVs (which are probably mostly company cars) and it's me still paying high diesel prices and now – having to pay MORE than the wealthy just to park. This is an outrageous way to treat the people living in this town and it is enough to make me want this labour council OUT. I was so happy with this labour

council, especially under Jason. I felt that he really listened to the people in the town and wanted the best for us, I felt like he cared about us and he was doing an amazing job at serving the people of this town. Now it just feels like this labour council has something to prove. Someone on the council wants to put their mark on something to say they've 'done something' or 'achieved something'. Since when was serving the people of the town not 'something' enough? This literally makes me feel more downtrodden than I did before. This is absolutely unacceptable and must not be allowed to pass as someone's vanity project. It is not what the town is calling out for. Give us more facilities for mental health, SEN school places, SOCIAL PLACES for teenagers (and don't fob me off that these higher charges will pay for it) – prioritise them in your own budget. I cannot express enough how disappointed I will be if this goes through and I will never vote a labour councillor again.

This is just another opportunity for the council to raise revenue. This has nothing to do with air quality and encouraging people to use public transport.

If the council was concerned with encouraging more people to use public transport in Reading, there would better orbital bus services in Reading, directly linking places such as Woodley and Earley to the retail parks on A33 (for example) rather than forcing everyone to head to the town centre and change there, better bus priority and frequencies on certain routes.

There would also be a concerted effort to get Government and Rail Operators to simplify and significantly lower rail fares. What GWR charges (especially during peak times) is a scandal. It is no wonder that people would rather drive than pay such rip-off fees. And I say this as someone who works in the UK rail industry!

Attempting to force people out of their vehicles by stealth and accumulative tax is wrong and immoral, is not the way to make this nation more green. If anything, all you are doing is piling on the financial stress to people and families who have already been hit in every direction in the recent financial climate. Energy bills, inflation, interest rates, and ever increasing council tax bills (for which we do not see any value for money for), this is just another opportunity to bleed the everyday working person dry. When will it stop. Understand... most people who park on the street, do so, because they do not have the luxury of being able to afford their own driveway.

Attempting to implement ULEZ charges within Reading is a very easy way to generate income for the council, however it is a lazy way to tackle emissions because it does not seek to think outside the box or ask itself why people are driving rather than using public transport, nor does it answer the question as to why there are more older "polluting" cars in use. Essentially by doing this you are more than likely attacking residents on low income who may need cars to get around for multiple nuanced reasons but cannot afford to own newer model/ electric/ hybrid cars.

It is also a short sighted policy as if all residents switched over to electric vehicles within the span of a year, how would the council then generate revenue if it was

charging vastly less/ not charging people with electric cars to park. drive their cars within certain areas?

Instead of trying to reduce emissions by looking at things like: making sure that road works are staggered so that multiple parts of Reading do not have roadworks going on at the same time, thus causing traffic and idle cars to release emissions, or making sure all bus routes have enough buses running on them to incentivize people to take them, you expect that people will just chose to use them, again not taking into account the nuance of why a person needs to use a car. Constantly promoting cycling or footpaths also only caters to able bodied residents and again bus fleet is not particularly equipped to deal with multiple people who may not be able bodied catching a bus.

Instead of turning every empty space into flats perhaps RBC should look at rewilding certain areas and promoting green spaces - the old civic offices building was temporarily turned into allotments, which would not only provide essential clean, green spaces but also provided wellbeing and community to surrounding residents but instead that was removed in favor of building housing that is marketed as "affordable" but is not affordable to the residents being priced out of their town.

The whole concept is flawed, as it will penalise the poorest people with the longest to travel to pay more. Until electric cars become more affordable for the majority i don't think the council should charge more for those who don't have ecars. There will be a natural progression towards ecars anyway, and until the UK's infrastructure improves it is pointless getting a fully electric car. I would opt for a hybrid for my next car as I don't trust fully electric cars. I will certainly not be buying a Teslar in a hurry.

Anything that discourages high pollution vehicles, ridiculous 4x4s picking up kids from school, promoting public transport and sustainable travel is welcome! Prioritising maintenance of pavements over roads would help too, many are hazardous for elderly or disabled people and discourage walking.

It would be useful to state what difference (or percentage difference) there would be in the parking charges. Some reassurance that it is not just a revenue raising scheme would be useful too.

Higher charges should apply to

- a. More polluting vehicles
- b. Larger vehicles
- c. Vehicles not in frequent use, e.g. motorhomes, storage vans, caravans, etc.

I have a strong opinion on this. First, ICE car owners are already taxed on emissions at the point of purchase, at insurance, at registration and with fuel duty. Most cities now charge to enter clean air zones, again based on emissions. But your bright idea is to charge an emissions tax for a car that's turned off and parked. And I bet this will not reduce the price for anyone, rather increase it for most. Who came up with

that? Create a clean air zone if you must, at least that makes sense. Or finally address the appalling bridge situation for getting from Reading to Caversham.

Not to mention the frankly embarrassing number of public chargers in reading. Or the fact that I'm not allowed to charge a car in front of my house because running a cable across the pavement is illegal. A big electric car weighing 3+ tonnes that's over the width of an already narrow on-street parking bay does more damage to the surface than my diesel car if they are both turned off. Take the car's weight into consideration instead.

You need to take a hard look at how you are spending an ever-increasing council tax rather than forcing

introducing another ridiculous arbitrary tax. Might as well start charging a tax for the falling rain.

I have JUST bought a fully electric car, knowing this change was looming, and wanting to get ahead of the curve. So it's already worked as an incentive to me.

Why don't you build some roads and bridges, and work on a cheaper public transport, instead of trying to rob the public with your new fees and taxes.

Those with vehicles with higher emissions may not be able afford to change / upgrade their vehicle.

All types of vehicles will still be driven on roads through the borough, it is just parking this will impact.

Sceptical about whether this will produce behaviour change. Think this is likely to be seen as an opportunity for cash strapped council to raise money. The council should be honest about this.

Will the monies be ring fenced for clean air projects and/or transport projects?

If you introduced charging to drive into Reading, or you pursue charging for parking based on emissions I will stop going to Reading, and will go to other town centres for shopping and leisure.

This proposal is penalising those least able to afford newer cleaner cars. People with resident parking permits don't have the option of charging electric or hybrid vehicles as there are no facilities to charge vehicles at home. The introduction of parking permits where I live has not made any difference to the number of cars parking on the streets and was just a money making exercise as I believe this is too.

The problem with the proposal is it is based on the emission data captured for vehicle tax purposes (primarily CO2 emissions), which are highly relevant for carbon emissions, but largely irrelevant from a public health (roadside pollution)

perspective.

Given that the median (and average) age of cars in the UK is around 9-10 years, it can be assumed that a very high proportion of the fleet is Euro 6. Euro 6 emissions of harmful components from a public health perspective are really low.

The proposed parking charge differential would greatly favour EV's which, although 0 in carbon emissions, have particulate matter (PM) emissions from tyres and brakes which are around 30% higher than comparable Petrol or Diesel vehicles. Reference example <https://www.emissionsanalytics.com/news/do-no-harm>.

The composition of EV tyres also makes these PM emissions particularly toxic. All up, EV emissions from a roadside health perspective are probably equivalent to around a Euro 5 diesel!

All vehicles produce emissions whether they are electric, petrol or diesel, just different compositions of emissions. What is evident, however, is the primary determinant of emissions is not fuel type, but vehicle weight. If a differential parking charge is to be applied, I would propose that it is based on exactly that.

I'm fully supportive of reducing emissions and moving to cleaner transport options.

In major cities which have things well sorted (eg Tokyo - which I know well), the use of private vehicles is comparatively low for the following reasons: Fantastic availability of public transport. Basically the max walk to public transport is around 1km. Essentially 0 on-road parking permitted. Public car parking time limits relatively low (a few hours only). Extensive use of bus lanes, utilising the road space where on-road parking might once have been allowed. Re-allocation of the total road space to create very wide footpaths which are shared by both pedestrians and cyclists. In summary, making alternative transport options more readily available, cheaper & safer than private vehicles will produce the best result. Just making parking more expensive won't change behaviours (in the absence of other options). Better to remove the parking entirely and use the space created for more sustainable options.

I disagree with the council's plans to effectively price car drivers off the road and the active travel projects in place so far just cause traffic congestion.

1. Shinfield Rd cycle lanes...very rarely used and cyclists often still use the road.
2. Sidmouth St...I have never seen this used by cyclists.
3. London Rd bus lane...an ill thought out scheme that causes much congestion including tailbacks up the slip road from the A3290.

Reading has a disjointed transposition plan - cycle lanes that don't join up (Sidmouth Street) ridiculously short bus lanes that just cause unnecessary congestion & more pollution- there needs to be a comprehensive review to offer sustainable transport solutions - develop park & ride - like Oxford - you just don't drive into Oxford because they have a system that works - Reading should but there's nothing to go into Reading for - just more & more flats, no shops - it will be a

ghost town if this carries on - no community just people renting & moving on - you are destroying the soul of Reading - where's future planning for generations ahead??

Vehicles are vehicles whether they be electric or otherwise and all should be treated equally. EVs are expensive and few people are able to afford them, not everyone changes their car regularly. Your proposals penalise those who can least afford an EV and support those who have the most disposable income.

Your proposals will discourage those from outside to come and shop in Reading. Our town centre is already in decline and has become a second rate shopping centre, mostly filled with unhealthy food outlets. How are your proposals going to incentivise people to come into Reading? This is a short sighted initiative that's jumping on the band wagon of being 'green'. Focus more on providing local services!

The additional cost being added to non-EV/Hybrid vehicles will get the council more money but it will be very unpopular because it is for PARKING. Parked cars don't have emissions so there is a disconnect between this charge and the impact to air quality that this change proposes to mitigate.

Instead, if there was an additional cost applied for DRIVING in and around central reading zones/ it could drastically cut traffic, have improve air quality, whilst being a consistent and improved revenue stream over your current parking proposal. This can be slowly phased in e.g. at peak times similar to congestion charge but also support LEZ priorities.

If being honest, we realise the council is doing this purely for generating an additional revenue stream and air quality improvement targets are a secondary benefit. However, everyone can benefit if you were to consider an alternative levy for driving where the people are, rather than parking (which is already a huge area of contention).

As an EV owner, this proposal is not going to impact me, but it will reflect poorly on the council for parking regulations that are already very unpopular. Council/private car park offering discounted EV parking may be helpful, but ultimately, meeting a air quality goal does not start with Parking permit inflation.

This is another money-making scheme designed to unfairly punish people who are forced to pay for a parking permit to be able to park near their house. It is also highly questionable whether it is legal to further punish only the people who are forced to pay for parking permits when other council tax payers who drive more polluting cars but do not have to pay for parking are excluded from this money making scam. And what about those who drive into Reading for work, and park in car parks or on the street? Why are you only targetting one group? Immoral, unethical but not unsurprising from Reading Borough Council.

Implementation of the plan needs to be done carefully. I can already see issues when parking ticket machines insist your Nissan Prius is in fact a Range Rover Evoque and charges you wrong. Reading's implementation of Parking PCN's already lacks the human touch - I can easily foresee some unfortunate person in this position being unable to park in Reading for months while they try to sort it out.

Any changes you make are unlikely to alter my behaviour because I very rarely drive into Reading. I walk or catch the bus.

The questions are not well worded. For example, like most people, I consider cost when choosing a form of transport, but "even if a cheaper option takes longer" doesn't follow from merely considering cost. Many other things are part of that consideration. And most people use many forms of transport. A responsive council will ensure those options are available and efficiently managed. Please remember the job of a council is to provide the services that residents want and pay for through the council tax. It is not a mandate to dream up ideologically-driven social experimentation.

It is really unfair to charge residents that live in houses that have on street parking. These are the residents of Reading who are the lower salary owners and cannot afford to buy lower emissions cars. Additionally, and ironically, if you live in an on street parking permit area you aren't able to have electric plug in because the parking is on the street and not allocated. The only fair system would be to charge any Reading resident an emission based fee for their vehicle, not just the people that can't afford or are unable to buy a more economic vehicle.

World-class stupid survey. You should probably take some training in creating surveys. Or, just recruit clever people.

Its grossly unfair to penalise residents if they happen to have a car that has high emissions. People cannot afford to change their cars, they cant go electric as there is no where to charge vehicles. Most of the residents parking is in streets with Terrace housing. this is a ULEZ tax by stealth. People have to drive to the supermarket it is not feasible to do a weekly shop by bus! All the DIY shops are being moved further and further away as are things such as the Range, B & M Ikea its not feasible to travel by bus if you are buying large items. Encouraging people to travel into town by bus is one thing (I always use the bus for that journey) but people with no drives or free on street parking should be made to pay because of poor air quality it is totally outrageous. Why you think they should pay and not the people driving in to park in a council car park is beyond me. You need to deal with the large lorries driving through Reading and leaving their engines running.

Electric SUVs are still an issue! Even if they don't pollute the local air as much, they still require much more energy than is reasonable to carry just a few people (often just the one or two!). They take a lot of space, damage roads and are very unsafe for those around them. So please consider other metrics than emissions only.

Maybe engine size or car weight and pollution levels? Or the energy involved in building the car?

Strongly oppose. Already being charged to park outside my home. I have no alternative and am being penalised. Believe this is another money-making task.

Small cars should be given concessions rather than the large heavy Chelsea electric tractors that block our roads and cost so much in resources to produce. Cars are now about 0.5m wider than they were in the 1960s causing congestion when parked or moving.

I object to being charged to park outside my own house based on emissions. If you want to introduce a scheme to deter driving in town, introduce a ULEZ scheme. I use my car infrequently and should not be penalised for leaving it parked outside my own home. Charge more in car parks, not for residents. This proposal is unfair. I can't entirely dispense with my car as I need it to help my elderly parents. Why penalise me? Strongly disagree with this money-making scheme. Sort out better transport to reduce emissions.

I feel charging locals more based on emissions is unfair. The worse cars for emissions are all a lot of Readings residents can afford (especially if they live in an area with only on street parking) the far greater problem is all the vehicles just passing through the town so finding a way to decrease those emissions would be far more beneficial. I think you will have a lot of very annoyed residents if they are charged extra when they already have to pay to park outside their own houses.

I am glad that there that this initiative has come about and that it is being taken forward as one of a range of measures for making a positive impact on the environment and helping to live more sustainably.

The people most impacted by this will be poorer demographics who will be less able to afford a new, lower emission car. Everyone wants a new car, but many can't afford one. Many will need their car for low paid jobs with no access to free office parking and already have to spend the first hour or two of every day paying for parking. They might also be working unsociable shifts where there is little or no public transport.

This policy will discriminate against those people who can least afford it.

I know you are looking at cycling too - but putting cycle lanes in is pointless if people cannot trust the safety of their bike. I know so many people who have given up cycling because their bike keeps getting stolen.

Each parking space in town is a big sign saying "please drive here". Following the examples of Amsterdam and Paris, in future I would like the Council to consider reducing on-street parking spaces altogether, not just disincentivising their use by

polluting vehicles. There are many places in the borough where street space is wasted for the storage of cars when there are so many other better uses, be it bus lanes, cycle lanes, widened pavements, more green space, or café seating areas. Good examples include the Oxford Road bridge over the A329 and Castle Street outside the Magistrates Court. In both cases multistorey car parks are just a few minutes' walk away. Of course, disabled parking spaces should be retained or even increased.

For Public transport to work people do not need to know when the bus/train/tube is going to arrive the frequency of service has to be around 15 mins as a max. Then people will use the service, integration is key. The stick approach only works with a carrot, there is not carrot with your proposal. - I live in WBC work in RBC - Member of Green Liberal Democrats.

We own an old diesel car and have relatively low mileage. I strongly believe that the best thing environmentally is for us to keep using this car for as long as it is reliable rather than scrapping it. Furthermore we live in a terraced house and charging an electric car would be very difficult, so this penalises people who live in terraces or flats and those who can't afford to upgrade their car, even if they want to.

The emissions-based parking charges are a bad idea. If Reading is concerned about air quality, a ULEZ zone should be considered instead, especially for non-residents.

If the council is going to proceed, consideration needs to be made for vehicles that, for whatever reason lack emissions data from DVLA. There needs to be an alternative way for an appropriate category to be assigned to the vehicle in this case, not just the default highest rate.

The varied charges should not apply to parking permits, as these are the only way for many residents to get parking, so it is creating a hierarchy that punishes residents who don't have their own driveway (tending to be those in smaller terraced houses and lower-income areas, not those in larger suburban homes).

If the council is planning to apply it to parking permits, a scrappage / market-value sale scheme should be put in place to allow all residents affected by a higher rate to afford to buy a lower-emissions car on such a short notice.

Your survey is too narrow, as in you ask the question 'What is your preferred mode of transport?' I answered car, but that implies I just use a car, I don't, I use local buses and also regularly use the train to visit friends etc in Newbury, Wokingham & Aldershot. Also, your survey is suggesting that the lower the emissions on your car the less you may have to pay for parking permits etc, but as often is the case the people best able to afford these additional costs are the ones who already have or are able to afford an electric or hybrid vehicle. In other words the people with the cheaper vehicles (as that's all they can afford to buy) will get clobbered with the additional cost.

Use of all vehicles, including electric vehicles, should be discouraged through taxation. Generally it is the wealthy who own electric vehicles and they should pay their fair share of parking fees. We also need to double down on overconsumption; people should be living more simply. At the same time incentives should be given to help people switch from old polluting vehicles to second-hand and new electric vehicles.

Do not penalise the lower income by differential costs

Stop making things complicated for people. just focus on having good schools and keeping the streets save.

Several traffic schemes around reading cause extra congestion and queues, i am more worried about those causing emmissions than I am about parked cars. We are in a cost of living crisis, some people may not be able to replace their (high emission) cars which are needed, and who will be penalised as a result. What are you going to do to support them?

The idea of charging drivers who visit Reading with a higher polluting vehicle is a good one, but your proposal does not include car parks, which it should do.

Any vehicle driving into Reading is clearly adding to pollution.

The proposal to include Residents Parking Areas is unfair. Residents Parking areas mainly cover roads where there is no alternative but to park on the road, and these tend to be the terraced housing and less affluent areas of the town. Where the street has private drives and detached (more expensive) properties there is no need for a Residents Parking scheme.

If you live in a terraced property and have an older, more polluting vehicle, this is usually due to affordability rather then a life style choice.

Where is your evidence that vehicles from residents parking areas are adding to poor air quality?

A stationary vehicle in a Residents Parking area is not adding to poor air quality, whereas a visiting vehicle to Reading must be, however small.

Your inclusion of Resident Permit Parking Areas will punish poorer people of the town and should be dropped from this proposal.

More cycle/bus lanes please!

I think that any emissions-related increase in parking permit could unfairly penalise those with high emissions, low usage vehicles. I live centrally, in a permitted parking area, and have a diesel campervan that I use for weekends away only - within Reading, I travel by foot, bus or bike. If I do need to park anywhere else, my vehicle is too tall for car parks, so I need to park on the street. Similarly, I think that this will

unfairly penalise those with older vehicles - recommend focussing on positive measures, rather than punitive ones.

It is important to reduce air pollution and pollution-related variable charging makes sense.

The proposed charging of less well-off residents, who are the ones most likely to own older, more polluting cars, will just make people worse off and fuel a backlash against even effective, socially fair policies to combat pollution. The reason they drive these old cars is that they cannot afford to replace them. You are also charging cars which are parked, therefore those paying the most might as well drive their old banger around as much as possible, thus creating maximum pollution, to receive value for money. The council also makes a profit from selling residents' parking permits and risks creating the impression it is virtue signalling while really it is just punishing the poor.

1. I already pay a penalty for owning an older car through my annual road tax, which is considerably higher than for newer technology vehicles. This scheme proposes to tax me again for owning an older car. You cannot tax the same condition twice.
2. Any penalty for having an older car (petrol/diesel) should be based on USAGE as this is the activity which creates pollution, congestion etc. A static, parked car does not create pollution so taxing a parked car will not meet the intended objective of the scheme (pollution/congestion reduction).
3. If my neighbour has the same vehicle as me and both vehicles are the same age, but my neighbour has a driveway in which to park his whereas I have to park in the road, the proposed scheme unjustly penalises me because I do not have a driveway. That is wrong, unfair, and challengeable. Again, it would not change the road usage habits of either of us, so there is no reduction in no pollution/congestion.
4. I already pay the council to park my car in my street and surrounding streets, through the Residents' Parking Scheme. You can should not tax street parking twice.
5. More generally, Reading residents should not be penalised ahead of non-residents. For example, I live near a grammar school where very many pupils are non-Reading residents and are dropped off/collected by parents driving into the town/my neighbourhood causing significant traffic congestion and pollution. There are good local bus services available with connections to the rail station. The council should firstly look to alter the road usage behaviour of these non-residents who, additionally, do not contribute to Reading's road maintenance budget via council tax yet use the roads, create pollution etc. It also puts Reading residents as a very soft target.
6. I am very much in favour of reducing vehicular traffic, congestion and pollution but this should be done on a USAGE basis such as with the ULEZ system in London. So much traffic in and through Reading is non-residential traffic. This should be the primary target group.
7. The proposed scheme to penalise on a parking basis does not seem well thought out and its ability to meet its stated objectives is doubtful. It sounds more like a tax raising initiative and not a well-considered strategic initiative to improve the town.

8. Better enforcement of local speed restrictions (20mph zones) through technology would also reduce pollution, alter driving behaviours, and raise much needed revenue.

I feel the council is more of a money making scheme rather than actually caring about pollution. If you really want to help then we need affordable priced electric cars. I've spent sooo much just for an electric car which not everyone can afford. Hope you understand.

You haven't really explained the plan in any detail before asking questions about the plan. I'm not sure exactly what you're proposing. Is this about parking or also driving? Is it about parking at home or parking in paid bays?

RFL punishes hybrids for no obvious reason. Reading BC dwellers are already paying plenty for rubbish roads. Electricity has to be produced somewhere, so even all electric cars are just moving the problem.

Lower cost resident's parking will not make a big enough difference to influence the choice of car for most people. Changing cars is expensive, and most people are not in a position to do so unless there are other requirements, such as repairs or a bigger vehicle needed. This just feels like a way to make more money, trying to pitch it as an environmental measure. Making busses a more affordable and practical choice for journeys in and around Reading would be much more beneficial.

Whilst electric cars may not generate emissions themselves, there are different environmental implications to consider, such as the materials required for batteries, disposing of batteries and replacing tyres more often.

Better traffic management to reduce congestion would, I believe, have a greater impact on air quality. Most people would not be in a position to buy an electric car, and the infrastructure is not in place for charging, particularly for those who use on street parking at home.

Most of the congestion in the town is caused by the council's own traffic mismanagement.

No

It looks like a way to make money. I can't imagine the air quality will change much as the vehicles spend most of their time parked and emissions have improved massively over the years.

The proposed changes are designed to punish people for the right to use whichever vehicle they choose. It is discriminatory towards people who cannot afford more economical vehicles. Greater emissions are caused by the lack of flowing traffic around Reading with the constant cycle of roadworks, fibre works (essential) and Thames Water. Bus routes are also an issue as they don't logically flow with traffic and have to cut and stop traffic. Keep the traffic moving and emissions will drop.

I really do support cleaner air in Reading - the days I am able to walk to work, I often need to cover my nose and mouth with a scarf due to exhaust fumes at key junctions. However, I strongly feel charging more to park isn't going to address the problem. As a public sector employee who needs their car to carry out certain aspects of my job (somedays this involves motorway travel too, so riding a pedal bike is not an option), as well as my childcare pick ups on days I work further from home, it won't stop me driving and parking, therefore the increased charges will result in NO reduction in my carbon emissions. Unfortunately, I am not currently I'm in a position to be able to afford a car with lower emissions, as much as I would like one. I would instead like to see:

1. 'NO IDLING' signage/zones and education about turning off engines when stationary disseminated into workplaces, schools, via local media etc. This would be a huge help and likely quick win to improving air quality in Reading, and I suspect may have a better impact on air quality than the current proposals.
2. Better coordination of roadworks/phasing of key traffic signals so traffic is not held up in town.
3. More enforceable yellow box junctions which helps prevent traffic jams in the first place - junctions are not blocked so traffic can flow through better.
4. More school streets to protect the air quality around schools, and to force more parents to walk/cycle their children to school.
5. Greater pressure on local delivery companies to use electric vehicles - specifically Amazon, Evri.
6. More trees being planted to offset the inevitable carbon emissions.
7. Greater pressure on the schools in Redlands Ward and surrounds to provide and use school transport. The difference in traffic when Reading School, Kendrick, St Joseph's and The Abbey are closed early (before RBC schools shut for holidays) is staggering. These schools attract students from all over Berks and South Oxon, and whilst some do travel on coaches, many do not and are individually dropped off.

Reading has such a huge traffic problem, particularly getting to and from Caversham. You need to work out how to get people walking, on buses or on bikes. People don't cycle because it's felt dangerous because of too many cars. Cycle routes are often full of glass (ie next to bottle banks which is such a stupid idea), ok for a bit and then non-existent, or put you on really busy roads like under Vastern roundabout railway bridge. There are no safe routes through and across the town centre

Use carrot not stick approach. Remove failing A4 bus lane. Fill potholes. Maintain roads properly. Potholes endanger all road users. Invest in education and where necessary penalise all road users who ride or drive without respect for safety of other, particularly vulnerable, road users.

I think you should focus on the people doing short drives not punish those of us on permit streets. Part of the reason I picked to live where I live is so that I can walk to the shops and walk or cycle into the town centre. Those of us closer to town already

pay permits, and probably use our cars less as we are closer to things like the shops etc. I use my car once a week or so for journeys that would take 3x as long by public transport, or that I can not cycle or walk. The people causing air pollution are the ones driving their cars and in particular those doing short drives eg the school run, you need to find ways of discouraging that. Not fining us for having a car that may cause more emissions when driven, but is merely being parked on a resident road.

I am supportive of the idea of varied charges depending on the emissions of the vehicle, however there must be consideration that lower socio-economic households may be more likely to have lower emission vehicles. Not taking this into consideration will have a disproportionate impact on these households. The scheme either needs to take household income into consideration or provide additional support measures to mitigate this disproportionate impact. People may rely on a lower emission vehicle to work, taking such a simple approach without considering contextual factors could put increasing pressure against the backdrop of ever increasing cost of living.

The idea that a council that already heavily taxes residents with parking permits thinks it is OK to now dictate what car I buy is ridiculous.

The bus lane on London Road has made travel horrendous. It has done nothing to cut emissions only created traffic queues and late buses. People who use a motorway to visit a town are very unlikely to use a bus!

Your proposals are a tax on the poor, who generally don't have the choice to change their vehicle to one with lower emissions. If I have a 20 year old Fiesta that will cost me more to park than a new £100k hybrid Range Rover. Makes no sense at all and this proposal is not in the interest of citizens at all.

Also consider that a lower emissions vehicle doing a high mileage will emit more emissions overall than a higher emissions vehicle doing a low mileage. And parked cars emit no emissions! Your proposals are virtue signalling nonsense and just another money grab.

The general public are already struggling with the cost of living rises and living on the bread line if Reading Borough Council bring in these extra fees this could cause unnecessary extra stress and worry about how they will get to work, visit family members because they can financially not afford to pay these additional charges let alone potentially having to buy another car.

Maybe the council should think about the amount of flats within the town centre you are allowing to be built. Building more flats will increase the towns population along with more cars on the road causing our roads to become more congested then what they already are and more cars polluting the air.

Surely we should encourage the most polluting cars to be parked so they are not actually driving more?

Please don't destroy our local businesses with further parking charges. Run a fast, AFFORDABLE, reliable and safe bus service that people choose to use. It's usually cheaper for us to get a taxi than use the bus.

If you charge more for the most polluting vehicles, the people who can't afford to buy a new car will be the ones that suffer the most. I have to use my car to get to work, I have to use my car to pick up my children.

We'd all like to be more environmentally friendly, but neighbours are robbed at knife point in Caversham for their electric bikes, it's not always safe to walk home in the dark.

This appears to be another way to tax and financially penalise people in the name of sustainability. Most electric vehicles are cost prohibitive to the majority of families yet by increasing costs to park you are targeting people that most likely can not afford newer or electric vehicles.

Current national vehicle VED rates already take into account a vehicles emissions and therefore your proposal will effectively mean people pay twice to drive their car.

At a time where the cost of living still remains high, this is an absolute disgrace from a Labour led council.

As an example, thousands of pounds were spent on the cycle lane on the Shinfield Road past the University, which ironically is barely used. The recent bus lane from the A329M towards Cemetey junction has caused totally avoidable bottlenecks and excess traffic.

Serious questions should be asked at the top of Reading Borough Council to find out why such incompetent decisions are being made, rather than burying heads in sand and then doubling down with more ludicrous proposal that will adversely effect citizens of Reading.

Yet another tax on the less well off who can't afford new cars - especially electric ones.

The majority of people are not in a position to be able to afford to switch to an electric or lower emissions car, so this proposal punishes the less well off.

This is a terrible idea. You are overstepping the bounds of democracy. I do not support you penalising the public for making our own choices, and this is obviously your starting position before you impose charges on us just for driving around.

Businesses already struggle due to high parking charges, and this will just cause even fewer people to want to come into Reading so businesses will close.

I understand the parking charge proposal is motivated by necessary requirement to upgrade on-street parking meters, not primarily to address emissions and may be seen by some residents as an exploitative grab for cash. Perhaps RBC should signal intention but delay implementation of 'emissions-based charging' – at least to allow people time to change vehicles.

The proposal is a controversial policy suggestion and councillors and the public should be sceptical, especially as the result may lose support for positive emissions regulatory changes.

Emissions-based taxing on-street parking may serve as a tax on the poor and the council is first requested to consider the distribution of old/polluting car ownership amongst Reading's demographics to ensure the approach is indeed fair. Depending on assessment Reading may consider plans for London-style CAZ grants or other positive incentives to calibrate fairness for the charging approach. On-street parking charges neglect emissions from vehicles in car parks and more importantly those driving through Reading. The proposal neglects a main source of emissions that can be more easily addressed without political down-side and is long overdue from Independent Transport Commission recommendations over 10 years ago.

Emissions-based charging can easily use ANPR at Thames Bridges as a more preferred option. Time spent driving causes emissions, not time spent parked. A proposal and estimated calculations to implement ANPR at the two Thams Bridges has been highlighted by Reading Friends of the Earth (mainly authored by me) to Reading Borough Council over 5 years ago. I am happy to discuss this again.

Parking in Reading is already really expensive, so I don't think anything will be achieved by charging more for high polluting vehicles. Clearly people are willing to pay a lot to park. Electric vehicles are significantly more expensive than combustion engined vehicles, so I don't think your parking charges will change peoples thinking when it comes to buying their next car, especially as many in the Reading area don't earn enough to splash the cash on a new, incredibly expensive car. When the cost comparison is closer, this kind of proposal can be considered again. For most, a petrol car and higher parking charges will be a cheaper option than an electric car and low parking charges. If one is lucky enough to afford a high emission vehicle, then I would imagine you won't change their mind will higher parking charges.

There are very few charging points in Reading. Invest in making this much better, including residential areas with shared parking, like flats / apartments. If you live in a flat and you park 30 - 40 metres from your home and you are 3-4 floors up, you can't plug into your home. There are a lot of central Reading residents with this dilemma.

Invest in lower cost of bus and train travel (particularly buses).

Invest in park and ride. Visit other towns and cities where there is good park and ride facilities. You will see how bad Reading is. Make sure it is accessible from each main entry point to Reading. You have invested a lot in bus lane conversion and I rarely see them used by buses. By encouraging people to park out of town, you can

have cleaner air, make use of the bus lanes so they actually add value, reduce traffic, reduce the weight of in town parking and more travellers spreads the constant costs of running a bus service. I don't know how many people come into town to shop and want to have their car nearby so they can transport heavy items. Perhaps consider a drop off service taking peoples purchases to their park and ride for collection later? Perhaps add online purchase parcel pick up points too so there is more value to using the park and ride.

Reducing greenhouse gases comes in 2 parts. How much we emit, which is the focus of this questionnaire. There is also the plant life that removes greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. Maximise green spaces, plant more in the spaces you have, consider how to increase green spaces, do not approve plans to build on green spaces, and where there is no choice, ensure the effect of the green space is replaced locally.

Taxing people more does nothing to reduce pollution. Get a grip.

The principle is sound. But much of Reading's housing stock is terraced, and that will surely have a bigger influence on people's ability to swap to hybrid/electric cars. Without resolving the issue of how those living without driveways/private spaces can charge their electric cars, it seems unfairly punitive to charge petrol/diesel cars higher parking charges. I can't swap to an electric car without having to pay for charging at public charge points because of the parking situation at my home.

You are penalising people who don't have a driveway. We are already taxed enough by the government and you are raising cost for something we've already been taxed on. We have to drive for work there is no bus route.

Please stop using motorists as a cash cow. As a retired pensioner I rely on my vehicle for social and leisure activities; public transport does not, and cannot, meet my needs. I resent being charged ever more by the council for the use of my vehicle which is essential to my social life and leisure activities, and therefore my wellbeing.

Before the council imposes additional charges for residents permits, I would like to see them proactively provide charging facilities for those who cannot park outside their own properties. How can we move to EVs when we have no means to charge them? Not to mention the environmental impact of replacing a perfectly functioning petrol vehicle with an EV, that can't be charged outside my home. Why would I do that, it makes no practical sense whatsoever. The proposal has been ill thought through, and simply comes across as a money making exercise from a group of residents who have no way to object if it's put through. Are we simply cash cows? I fail to see how my car contributes more pollution to the town by being parked in a residents permit bay, than a lorry or a high emissions vehicle that is driven through the town or parked on a private drive in the borough. Why penalise those who are least able to change their behaviour. Madness.

I drive a 2020 car so I am not talking about myself so it is not a biased response but often those driving the worst polluting cars or older cars cannot afford to upgrade to

a car to something like an electric. So I think these kinds of initiatives often impact the least well off so I do not agree with them at all. It further impacts them more than others. I am happy to pay for parking like everyone else. And I often walk to town from my house or get the bus.

I understand that you are trying to prioritise people health (which is good) HOWEVER, a lot of people who perhaps have older and more polluting cars, have them because they CANNOT AFFORD TO BUY SOMETHING MORE MODERN AND SUSTAINABLE!!! By introducing this emissions based parking charges you are CONTINUING CAPITALISM AND PUNISHING THE WORKING CLASS FOR BEING UNABLE TO AFFORD MORE MODERN VEHICLES!!! Life is expensive and difficult enough as it is!

Perhaps you should consider improving the public transport around Reading instead! The buses are awful and never on time and need a huge re-vamping. I have not enjoyed being on a bus in Reading probably in well over 15years. The experience is always disgusting and very much puts me off using them unless it is my only option. The trains are okay however, they are STUPID expensive (which I know you don't have much say in). But regardless, if you want better air in and around Reading, improve our options of public transport.

Charging even more for parking is disgusting. You will be penalising people who can't afford electric cars, not to mention the provision of car charging in Reading is so poor. It costs so much just to park on my own street the idea of paying more is awful. I have no option but to use my car as the roads are unsafe to cycle on and public transport is terrible. Reading council why are you punishing your residents.

Yet again it will be less abled people, who need a vehicle to get about, and the less well off that are going to be penalised. They can't afford to go and buy a new car. If I didn't have a car then I wouldn't go out. The bus lane on London Road hasn't done anything to improve air quality.....and that was the intention, it's made car journeys longer and there's more standing traffic.