

## LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYDON

To: all Members of the Council (via e-mail)  
Access Croydon, Town Hall Reception

### **PUBLIC NOTICE OF KEY DECISIONS MADE BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PLACE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & REGENERATION (JOB SHARE) ON 30 JULY 2019**

In accordance with the Scrutiny and Overview Procedure Rules, the following decisions may be implemented from **1300 hours on 7 August 2019** unless referred to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee:

The following apply to each decision listed below

**Reasons for these decisions:** are contained in the Part A report attached

**Other options considered and rejected:** are contained in the Part A report attached

**Details of conflicts of Interest declared by the Cabinet Member:** none

The Leader of the Council has delegated to the Cabinet Member the power to make the decisions set out below:

**KEY EXECUTIVE DECISION REFERENCE NO.:** 0419PL

**Decision Title:** Parking Policy 2019 – 2022

Having carefully read and considered the Part A report, and the requirements of the Council's public sector equality duty in relation to the issues detailed in the body of the reports, the Executive Director Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (Job Share)

**RESOLVED:** To

1. Note the outcome of the engagement on the draft Parking Policy 2019 – 2022; and
2. Finalise, agree to implement and publish the final Parking Policy 2019 – 2022 and the current associated Action Plan respectively attached at Appendix 1 and 2 of the report.

## Scrutiny Referral/Call-in Procedure

1. The decisions may be implemented **1300 hours on 9 August 2019** (5 working days after the decisions were made) unless referred to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.
2. The Council Solicitor shall refer the matter to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee if so requested by:-
  - i) the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee and 4 members of that Committee; or
  - ii) 20% of Council Members (14)
3. The referral shall be made on the approved pro-forma (*attached*) which should be submitted electronically or on paper to Victoria Lower by the deadline stated in this notice. Verification of signatures may be by individual e-mail, fax or by post. A decision may only be subject to the referral process once.
4. The Call-In referral shall be completed giving:
  - i) The grounds for the referral
  - ii) The outcome desired
  - iii) Information required to assist the Scrutiny and Overview Committee to consider the referral
  - iv) The date and the signatures of the Councillors requesting the Call-In
5. The decision taker and the relevant Chief Officer(s) shall be notified of the referral who shall suspend implementation of the decision.
6. The referral shall be considered at the next scheduled meeting of the Scrutiny & Overview Committee unless, in view of the Council Solicitor, this would cause undue delay. In such cases the Council Solicitor will consult with the decision taker and the Chair of Scrutiny and Overview to agree a date for an additional meeting. The Scrutiny & Overview Committee may only decide to consider a maximum of 3 referrals at any one meeting.
7. At the Scrutiny & Overview Committee meeting the referral will be considered by the Committee which shall determine how much time the Committee will give to the call in and how the item will be dealt with including whether or not it wishes to review the decision. If having considered the decision there are still concerns about the decision then the Committee may refer it back to the decision taker for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of the concerns.
8. The Scrutiny and Overview Committee may refer the decision to Full Council if it considers that the decision is outside of the budget and policy framework of the Council.
9. If the Scrutiny and Overview Committee decides that no further action is necessary then the decision may be implemented.

10. The Full Council may decide to take no further action in which case the decision may be implemented.
11. If the Council objects to the decision it can nullify the decision if it is outside of the policy framework and/or inconsistent with the budget.
12. If the decision is within the policy framework and consistent with the budget, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects together with its views on the decision. The decision taker shall choose whether to either amend / withdraw or implement the original decision within 10 working days or at the next meeting of the Cabinet of the referral from the Council.
13. The response shall be notified to all Members of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee
14. If either the Council or the Scrutiny and Overview Committee fails to meet in accordance with the Council calendar or in accordance with paragraph 6 above, then the decision may be implemented on the next working day after the meeting was scheduled or arranged to take place.
15. **URGENCY:** The referral procedure shall not apply in respect of urgent decisions. A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the referral process would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests. The record of the decision and the notice by which it is made public shall state if the decision is urgent and therefore not subject to the referral process.

Signed: Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer

**Date: 31 July 2019**

Contact Officers: [victoria.lower@croydon.gov.uk](mailto:victoria.lower@croydon.gov.uk) and [Cliona.may@croydon.gov.uk](mailto:Cliona.may@croydon.gov.uk)

## PROFORMA

### REFERRAL OF A KEY DECISION TO THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

For the attention of: Victoria Lower and Cliona May, Democratic Services & Scrutiny  
e-mail to

[Victoria.lower@croydon.gov.uk](mailto:Victoria.lower@croydon.gov.uk) and [Cliona.may@croydon.gov.uk](mailto:Cliona.may@croydon.gov.uk)

Meeting:

Meeting Date:

Agenda Item No:

#### Reasons for referral:

- i) The decision is outside of the Policy Framework
- ii) The decision is inconsistent with the budget
- iii) The decision is inconsistent with another Council Policy
- iv) Other: Please specify:

---

---

---

#### The outcome desired:

#### Information required to assist the Scrutiny and Overview Committee to consider the referral:

Signed:

Date:

Member of \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>Executive Director PLACE for key decision Not before 19 July 2019</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>PARKING POLICY 2019-2022</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa, Executive Director, Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Stuart King, Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport &amp; Regeneration (Job Share)</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>All</b>

**CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT/AMBITIOUS FOR CROYDON:**

The Parking Policy (the “policy”) is intended to effectively manage parking provision across the borough in line with the borough’s growth objectives, and to contribute towards achieving the clean and sustainable objectives set out in Our Corporate Plan for Croydon 2018-2022.

The policy sets out our aims and objectives and a supporting action plan sets out how these will be achieved.

The policy also contributes towards the following aims of the Corporate Plan:

- An excellent transport network that is safe, reliable and accessible to all.
- A cleaner and more sustainable environment.
- Happy, healthy and independent lives.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

All but 2 of the projects (see note below), listed in the Parking Policy Actions Plan are in the discussion or early planning phases, so are at a stage where the detailed financial impacts have not yet been determined. The evolving discussions and planning can be met within the established operations budget. There are no immediate capital costs associated with this report’s recommendation to agree the final Parking Policy.

Note, that the following specific projects forming part of the Parking Policy Actions Plan, and which will have financial implications within the current financial year, are presented in separate reports:

- a) School Streets - with recommendation to refer it to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee for members’ consideration and onward recommendation to Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share), and
- b) Emission-based parking charges – with recommendations for the Traffic Management Advisory Committee to consider the responses received to the formal consultation and make comments to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) as they consider necessary; and for the Executive Director Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) to consider the outcome of the consultation regarding Emission-Based Parking Charges; and subject to there being no significant changes which would necessitate further consultation, finalise, agree and implement the Emission-Based Parking Charges proposals.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Pursuant to the delegation from Cabinet to the Executive Director, Place on 25 March 2019 in consultation with the Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (Job Share) to :

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 Note the outcome of the engagement on the draft Parking Policy 2019-2022.</li><li>1.2 Finalise, agree to implement and publish the final Parking Policy 2019-2022 and the current associated Action Plan (which is an evolving document), as set out in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively.</li></ol> |
|--|

## **2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The policy sets out the aims and objectives over the period 2019 to 2022 for managing on- and off-street parking infrastructure, parking demand management, traffic and parking compliance, school streets safety and related customer services.
- 2.2 The policy is a key background document to the separate reports on School Streets and Emission-based parking charges.

## **3 DETAILS**

### **3.1 PARKING POLICY BACKGROUND**

- 3.1.1 Parking affects almost everyone that lives, works or visits Croydon to some extent. Whilst our road networks have grown, so too have the competing demands for this space for use by pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles, parking and public realm. With the pace of growth in homes and developments that Croydon is set to undergo, this Parking Policy, and its action plan, aim to respond to the challenges posed and deliver effective and safe parking infrastructure and management in the borough.
- 3.1.2 Public Health and Emissions

Air pollution is an important and increasingly more high profile public health issue, contributing to illness and shortened life expectancy. It disproportionately impacts on the most vulnerable in the population, in particular the sick, young and elderly. Those at higher risk include those with existing respiratory problems and chronic illnesses such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

- In Croydon, 19,226 residents registered with a Croydon GP suffer from asthma (2016/17). This is 4.73% of the GP register. Croydon has the 12th highest rate in London. Croydon has high rates of asthma among children and in 2016/17 there were 342 hospital admissions (under 19) per 100,000, which represented the highest rate in London.
- The indicator for estimated deaths attributable to particulate air pollution shows Croydon is in the worst 25% of local authorities nationally, although performance is better than the London average with the highest levels of air pollution in central London boroughs.
- A quarter of the total health costs of outdoor air pollution is estimated to be a result of emissions from cars and vans, corresponding to more than 10,000 premature deaths in the UK each year<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Health costs of air pollution from cars and vans, Brand & Hunt (2018)

### 3.1.3 National Drivers for the policy:

There are many strategies that have been introduced to improve air pollution and reduce emissions over recent years and months:

- The Industrial Strategy is based around Five Foundations of Productivity and Four Grand Challenges that invite innovation. One of the foundations is a major upgrade to the UK's infrastructure including a supporting support for electric vehicles through investment in the charging infrastructure. And amongst the Grand Challenges are: the Future of Mobility - in the way people, goods and services move, including innovation in electric and autonomous vehicles which could dramatically reduce carbon emissions and congestion through their use; and Clean Growth – maximising growth by development & use of low carbon technologies, by which reductions in emissions will be achieved.
- The national Road to Zero Strategy aims for 50-70% new car sales to be Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (ULEVs) by 2030 and to enable the rollout of supporting Electric Vehicle (EV) infrastructure & reduce emissions already on the roads.
- The Clean Air Strategy 2019, which aims to clean up the UK's air and reduce the damaging impact air pollution has on public health, including the harmful emissions from vehicles amongst other sources.

### 3.1.4 Regional Drivers:

As one of 33 London boroughs, Croydon has an obligation to align & work with a number of regional London strategies, policies and plans, such as:

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018, which applies a Healthy Streets Approach to transport that prioritises public health and amongst many objectives aims to reduce car dependency.
- The Mayor's new London Plan (draft), which is the statutory Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London. This includes policies to improve air quality within Sustainable Infrastructure & help ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place to meet needs such as increasing electric vehicles.

### 3.1.5 Local Drivers:

3.1.5.1 Our Corporate Plan for Croydon 2018-2022 sets out a number of priorities that are aimed at improving the environment we live in, and aim to make it more sustainable, to encourage and support health live. The key priorities linked to this Parking Policy include:

- An excellent transport network that is safe, reliable and accessible to all – by recognising the important link between transport and a sustainable environment and working collaboratively and undertaking informed decisions that are innovative based on the needs of a neighbourhood, for example, to encourage fewer short car journeys and reduce traffic congestion.
- A cleaner and more sustainable environment – by addressing air quality with the work we do, such as introducing pedestrian zones around schools to help improve air quality and reduce congestion.
- Happy, healthy and independent lives – by preventing issues from becoming a problem and having an environment that encourages and supports healthy living.

3.1.5.2 There are many facets to improving the environment and it is recognised that genuine collaborative working across all our service areas will be necessary to

secure positive outcomes. A variety of local policies, plans and pilots are already underway from different Council services perspectives that also work towards these and other outcomes such as:

Air Quality Action Plan 2017-2022 – which is a five year plan to improve air quality within Croydon. Its key priorities are:

- Controlling pollution from new developments,
- Tackling emissions from servicing and freight vehicles – which also includes tackling our own fleet by working towards having 75% of the council fleet/hired fleet to be ultra low emission capable vehicles by 2025, and
- Reducing exposure to air pollution & raising awareness for those you live and work in Croydon.

The Third Local Implementation Plan (LIP3) – which is under development and consultation to deliver outcomes against the three themes of the Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018, which are: Healthy streets and healthy people; A good public transport experience; New homes and jobs.

Amongst the proposed objectives some will indirectly support the lowering of emissions such as:

- By reducing traffic volumes,
- Supporting the shift to zero emission vehicles,
- Introducing new green infrastructure, specifically the Electric Mobility project will support the Council's ambition to install 400 electric vehicle charging points by 2022 and enable a shift to zero tailpipe emission vehicles, and
- Supporting the expansion of Car Clubs in the borough including electric vehicle charging provision and the introduction of flexible Car Clubs in the north of the borough.

#### 3.1.5.3 Sustainable Croydon:

A sustainable place is a key priority for Croydon. We are supporting significant growth in coming years which must provide benefit to our residents and existing businesses. Enabling this growth in a sustainable, healthy way will be crucial.

A Sustainable Croydon Summit was held in June 2019, bringing together schools, businesses, residents and stakeholders to discuss the opportunities for Croydon to become more sustainable.

#### 3.1.5.4 The Role a Parking Policy can play in tackling Air Quality in Croydon:

In the context of the above, it is clear that the introduction of a Parking Policy for Croydon can play an important role in helping to achieve Croydon's corporate outcomes by enabling a collaborative approach to managing parking provision across Croydon. As the borough grows in population and density the policy aims to improve the environment by delivering actions that will encourage and enable a lesser reliance on cars, a change to lower emitting vehicles and better management of the demand on the kerbside and that will secure a healthy and safe environment near to schools.

Parking management is a significant lever in influencing car ownership and use. It therefore has a role to play in addressing the borough's air quality and public health challenges. Many elements of car ownership and use costs are already being used to



influence behaviours, including road tax, diesel fuel duty and differential congestion charges, but these are national or regional schemes.

There are currently insufficient borough level measures and tools in place to address specific areas of localised matters in air quality, to support active travel, to reduce external traffic and to accommodate planned and future Growth Zone and suburban intensification.

## **3.2 ENGAGEMENT**

- 3.2.1 The draft version of the policy, as noted by Cabinet on 25 March 2019, was published on the Council's 'Have your say' web page. The associated survey asked 2 open ended questions for each the 6 policy areas (12 questions in total):

After reading our aim and objectives for [policy section title]:

- a) Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts on you?
- b) Do you expect any positive or negative impacts on your local/wider community?

The survey also asked respondents to optionally complete classification and equalities questions.

The survey period was for 4 weeks from 8 April to 5 May 2019.

- 3.2.2 A communication plan was developed to encourage responses to the draft policy survey. The engagement survey was communicated as follows:

- 108 direct emails to interest groups.
- 11 tweets.
- Facebook post.
- Your Croydon weekly e-newsletter article.
- Web-banner.
- Our Croydon (staff) weekly e-newsletter article

- 3.2.3 A total of 183 responses were received over the 4-week survey period.

- 3.2.4 Analysis of the total responses:

Responses were objectively categorised into the following 3 categories:

- a) Expressly opposes or states concerns about one or more elements of the policy.
- b) Expressly supports or states support for one or more elements of the policy.
- c) Neither supports nor opposes the particular policy section. These are termed 'other' and include 3 sub-types of responses:
  - i. Responses stating "no impact" or the section left blank, inferring neither clear opposition nor clear support.
  - ii. Comments referring to matters that the policy already covers within its provision and there is no contradiction. For example:
    - "Sounds ok but is lacking in the details".
    - "Electric vehicle infrastructure must be increased".

- “Review in 5 years, once the ULEZ has borne fruit”.
- iii. Comments referring to matters that are outside the defined parking policy scope. The council acknowledges such comments are valid in their own or wider contexts, but they do not contribute to the validation of the parking policy. For example:
- “Improve public transport”.
  - “Private and hospital car parking is a problem”.
  - “Wheelie bins on footpaths is a problem”.

Table 1 – Summary of consultation responses of all 183 respondents.

Policy section	Concern	Supports	Other
1 – Topics for collaborative working	44%	7%	49%
2 – Parking management	42%	7%	51%
3 – CPZs	28%	4%	68%
4 – School Street	9%	30%	61%
5 – Parking charges (emissions)	25%	16%	60%
6 – Innovation and technology	19%	14%	67%

### 3.2.5 Key statements of concern and responses

The background document ‘Parking policy engagement analysis’, lists the total concerns raised for each of the 6 sections of the draft Parking Policy. Table 2 below highlights the top 8 concerns. Note that multiple respondents have expressed multiple concerns, hence the percentages of respondents that have raised different concerns will not add up to a total of 100%.

Table 2 – Key concerns and responses.

Concerns and responses
<p><b>27 respondents (15%) commented:</b></p> <p><b><i>The policy on introducing new technology and phasing out P&amp;D machines might not consider people without access to mobile technology. The vast majority refers to the elderly as an example.</i></b></p> <p><u>Response:</u>            We will incorporate considerations to the stated concern within the planned work under Section 6 of the policy, where the objective is to gradually substitute Pay &amp; Display machines for more user-convenient technology such as mobile apps or other systems.</p> <p>There are practical reasons for the proposal to phase out P&amp;D machines. They are expensive to maintain and are also subject to deliberate damage and vandalism with machine replacement costs running into several thousand pounds per unit. It is not considered viable in the long term to maintain such expenditure when the council is facing ongoing reductions in funding.</p> <p>The benefits of alternative cashless parking payments include eliminating the need to find the right change for a pay and display machine, so you can simply use your mobile phone to pay. Depending on the technology used, drivers could telephone or text the location number of the chosen parking space.</p>

We realise that some users may not have access to a smart phone or may simply prefer to use cash and we will investigate different solutions to offer a cash payment option.

**20 respondents (11%) commented:**

***The policy is overly restrictive and anti-motorist, impacting too much on personal freedom and private finances.***

Response:

Car ownership in Croydon has grown from 132,572 to 148,256 vehicles over the last 10 years, with consequent congestion, access and public health costs. As described in the introductory section to the policy, the Council must seek to re-balance all access needs, against the increasing priorities for addressing the wider public health and air quality concerns. There are simply too many cars on the road. Not managing congestion and parking access is anti-motoring as well. As below, 9% of respondents feel they are currently hindered by illegal and inconsiderate parking and they request increased enforcement measures.

**20 respondents (11%) commented:**

***The policy on emission-based charges impacts disproportionately on low income residents, who cannot afford to replace the car.***

Response:

In Croydon an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been declared for the whole of the borough, for failing to meet the EU annual average limit for air pollutants. The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 and the London Mayor's Strategy require actions to reduce NOx and particulate matter emissions mainly at a local level. If parking charges were to be maintained at a lower level, then it is considered unlikely to influence a sufficient number of owners in their next car choices or indeed choices to have two or more vehicles and this in turn would impact negatively on the overarching objectives, as set out in paragraph 3.1. Residents and local businesses for whom parking and road congestion have adverse economic and quality of life implications include people who cannot immediately afford to replace their older cars. We must also consider fairness to residents who are vulnerable to air pollution, which disproportionately are the young, the elderly and those who live in some of the poorest areas of the borough. They represent groups that tend to have lower car ownership.

Active encouragement of lower emission vehicles and the underlying reduction in car use, benefits all individuals, families and neighbourhoods. Air pollution is an important and increasingly more high profile public health issue, contributing to illness and shortened life expectancy. It disproportionately impacts on the most vulnerable in the population, in particular the sick, young and elderly. Those at higher risk include those with existing respiratory problems and chronic illnesses such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. People who live or work near busy roads are at particularly high risk of exposure to the health harms of air pollution.

Any change to fee structures will have an impact on all local residents and it is important to note that the forecast model based on assumptions of changing car ownership, shows a net increase of 13.5% remains less than the 15% ONS Retail Price Index, since the permit charges were last reviewed in 2013.

The initial phase will only affect permit holders. In context of the 148,256 (in 2016) vehicles registered in Croydon, the higher £300 band on resident permits accounts for 371 vehicles in the highest emission group and 413 that predate Mar 2001. This equates to 8.7% of all active resident parking permits (9,048) as at the end of 2018, which are issued to residents across the whole income spectrum. Proportionally, the higher charge will apply to a very small number of residents on low income. The proposed charges can therefore not be generalised as having a disproportionate effect on residents with low income.

A later phase, yet to be fully developed and consulted on will apply emissions based charges to on street parking, where it is forecast that 12% of vehicles will be affected by increased charges with the remainder paying either the same as current charges or a reduced charge. The proposed charges can therefore not be generalised as having a disproportionate effect on residents with low income.

**16 respondents (9%) commented:**

***The policy is inadequate in addressing the amount of illegal and inconsiderate parking that is currently taking place. Respondents generally state that parking enforcement is currently insufficient or too lenient. By comparison, 1% of respondents stated that enforcement is too strict.***

Response:

Enforcement has to be balanced with equal concerns about personal freedom. The current regime has settled over a long period of time, to reach what can be considered a 'natural balance'. The policy does recognise that parking pressure has increased. Section 3 of the policy has an objective for reviewing the CPZ assessment guide. Section 6 of the policy has an objective to make the reporting of issues easier and improve the enforcement response to specific individual problems, such as obstructed driveways.

**16 respondents (9%) commented:**

***The policy does not include parking charges reduction measures. Respondents generally state that CPZ parking and permit charges are too high at present, mainly for residents. This respondent group includes a minority that demands unrestricted free parking everywhere.***

Response:

The new emissions-based charging structure presents an opportunity for drivers who switch to low emission cars, to significantly reduce their parking charges – e.g. by up to 90% for residents and in-town parking.

Universal parking charges reduction would contradict the legitimate aim of parking controls to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. In addition, it would not address and improve air quality impacts and consequent public health concerns across the borough. There is also, given the number of cars on Croydon's roads, an inherent contradiction in the demand for parking spaces being free of charge with unlimited length of stay and the same spaces being always readily available for residents to park near their homes and/or work.

**15 respondents (8%) commented:**

***The policy does not effectively address developments with insufficient parking provision.***

Response:

Section 1 of the Parking Policy, aims to address this concern by working collaboratively to assure a cohesive approach across planning, development and operational management of traffic and parking. This approach will incorporate considerations to the stated concern.

**12 respondents (7%) commented:**

***The policy does not address motorcycles, scooter and bicycle parking provision.***

Response:

The objectives of Section 1 of the Parking Policy, on collaborative working, do address this concern for powered 2-wheeled vehicles. The planned work will incorporate considerations to the stated concern.

**11 respondents (6%) commented:**

***The policy does not address that public transport and cycling/ walking infrastructure are not ready to be a viable alternative to the car.***

Response:

The objectives of Section 1 of the Parking Policy, on collaborative working, intend to address this concern such as by ensuring that planning and parking policy continually meet evolving needs. The planned work will incorporate considerations to the stated concern.

### 3.2.6 Key statements of support

The background document 'Parking policy engagement analysis', lists the top 5 supporting statements for each the 6 policy sections. Table 3 below summarises the 5 most common reasons for supporting the policy.

Table 3 – Key statements in support

Supporting statements
<b>51 respondents (28%) commented:</b> <b><i>The policy on School Streets will have a positive impact. It will be good for parents, children and residents to reduce cars near the school entrance. It will improve safety and child health.</i></b>
<b>20 respondents (11%) commented:</b> <b><i>The policy on parking and emissions charges will have a positive impact and the principle of polluter pay is generally fair.</i></b>
<b>16 respondents (9%) commented:</b>

***The policy on innovation and technology will have a positive impact. (2% specifically commenting that mobile cashless parking is more convenient.)***

**8 respondents (4%) commented:**

***Cars and parking in Croydon is a problem. The policy rightly addresses cars reduction and parking charges.***

**7 respondents (4%) commented:**

***The policy on collaborative working will have a positive impact.***

### 3.3 Equalities Analysis of the responses:

An equality analysis (EA) was conducted to review the potential for impact of the proposed Parking Policy and the associated Action Plan, based on those respondents that completed one or more of the equalities questions. This showed that of the total 183 respondents:

- 147 respondents some only answered a few of the classification and equalities questions
- 142 completed one or more of the equalities questions,
- 135 responded to age questions,
- 136 to disability,
- 134 to gender and
- 130 to ethnicity.

For consistency the percentages calculated below are based on the total number of responses for that specific question. The detailed breakdown of concerns, support and other comments by each respondent group is provided in the background document (see end of report).

#### 3.3.1 Noticeable observations:

- Of 136 respondents who answered the disability question, 17% declared a mild and 7% declared a more severe disability. 12% of respondents “prefer not to say” for this question.
- Of 130 respondents who answered the ethnicity question, 8% are of BAME origin, which is a relatively low proportion. 20% “prefer not to say”.
- Of 135 respondents who declared their age, 18% are under 40 years of age, which is a low proportion. 37% of respondents are 61 years or over. 10% “prefer not to say”.

#### 3.3.2 Analysis of responses from protected groups to each of the 6 sections of the policy showed:

- Section 1, Collaborative Working - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.

- Section 2, Parking Management - Responses to this section of the policy reflected some elevated level of concern from the protected groups of Disability and Age. These relate to respondents saying there are not enough disabled bays; not enough is being done to curb illegal parking; and a concern that Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) may infringe on pavement space. All of these concerns are recognised and will be addressed in the policy (see section 5 below).
- Section 3, Controlled Parking Zones - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.
- Section 4, School Streets - Responses to this section of the policy reflect some elevated level of support from some protected groups. The greatest number in support of school streets was from the over 61 age group who were more likely to say it would be good for children and make parking easier for residents.
- Section 5, Parking Charges – Of the respondents to this section, the disabled group showed some elevated level of concern for parking charges.
- Section 6, Innovation and Technology - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.

3.3.3 Regarding disability concerns the policy will adopt either the Disabled Parking Accreditation or London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for the provision of disabled parking bays various locations and also, the disabled Blue Badges and disabled companion badges are both exempt from these charges. In Croydon there are 11,459 individual and 71 organisational blue badges.

For detailed information see the supporting document, Parking policy engagement analysis.

Table 5 – Highlighted comments that are relevant to the protected groups.

Highlighted comments that are relevant to the protected groups
<p><b>6 respondents (3%) commented:</b></p> <p><b><i>Enforcement regime is too soft and ineffective.</i></b></p> <p><u>Response:</u>            Enforcement has to be balanced with equal concerns about personal freedom. The current regime has settled over a long period of time, to reach what can be considered a 'natural balance'. The policy does recognise that parking pressure has increased, including in disabled bays. Under Section 2 of the policy Parking Services are currently targeting Blue Badge fraud. Section 3 of the policy has an objective for reviewing the CPZ assessment guide. Section 6 of the policy has an objective to ease the reporting and improve the enforcement response to specific individual problems, such as obstructed driveways.</p>
<p><b>4 respondents (2%) commented:</b></p> <p><b><i>Ensure sufficient blue badge parking at key facilities.</i></b></p>

Response:

One of the objectives in Section 2 of the policy is to fairly balance parking capacity to diverse needs, and there is an action to achieve this in the associated Action Plan (see Appendix 2), which is to adopt the Disabled Parking Accreditation (in association with Disabled Motoring UK) or the London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for individual parking places. An initiative is ongoing for clamping down on Blue Badge fraud, which otherwise impacts on disabled bays.

**3 respondents (2%) commented:**

***Keep in mind equalities when removing or controlling parking.***

Response:

The policy has undergone an equalities assessment (EA). See section 7 in this report. The EA will be reviewed on a regular basis to consider impacts from any future actions.

**2 respondents (1%) commented:**

***Disability groups and blind, elderly should be recognised as unable to use new technology.***

Response:

Blue badge holders are exempt from parking charges and would not be affected by the introduction of mobile cashless parking payments.

The technology will be selected for its ability to use mobile phone accessibility features. The new technology is intended for use by people who already have capacity to drive a car. It is therefore unlikely to be used by the blind.

It is envisaged to initially trial new technology e.g. cashless payments, in a pilot area, to ensure the scheme does not discriminate against any user group.

**2 respondents (1%) commented:**

***Misuse of EVCP's is high in this borough [stated specifically by respondents who declared a disability].***

Response:

The EVCP delivery plan includes the development of a system for defining and enforcing compliance. The EVCPs are an evolving service and will become subject to periodic reviews, to ensure their ongoing most effective use in context of wider road user needs.

### 3.4 CONCLUSION

- 3.4.1 Whilst it is not considered that the engagement has identified areas of the draft Parking Policy which would require significant changes, it has identified areas for



minor revision to the policy text for clarification purposes and an additional objective for one section (see 3.6.2 below). In addition, comments from the engagement will help to inform discussions and development of projects set out in the action plan as they are scoped and specifications are designed, to progress the policy action plan over the 2019-2022 period.

#### 3.4.2 Proposed changes to the policy following the engagement

- a) Minor revisions have been made to better describe the aim at Section 1 – Collaborative Working.
- b) The following additional objective has been included at Section 4 – School Streets, (see Appendix 1, Section 4):
  - o To ensure School Streets eligibility criteria will:
    - afford carers and relatives to drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable, when implementing School Streets restrictions, and
    - afford schools the authority to issue eligibility to drive during the restricted hours when needed during pregnancy.

3.4.3 There are no proposed changes to the associated Action Plan (at Appendix 2) which is an evolving document.

## 4 **FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

The following specific projects forming part of the Parking Policy Actions Plan, and which will have financial implications within the current financial year, are detailed in separate reports, which are recommended for referral to:

- a) School Streets – Traffic Management Advisory Committee for members' consideration and onward recommendation to Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (job share), and
- b) Emission-based parking charges - with recommendations for the Traffic Management Advisory Committee to consider the responses received to the formal consultation and make comments to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) as they consider necessary; and for the Executive Director Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share) to consider the outcome of the consultation regarding Emission-Based Parking Charges; and subject to there being no significant changes which would necessitate further consultation, finalise, agree and implement the Emission-Based Parking Charges proposals.

The remaining projects listed in the Parking Policy Actions Plan are in the discussion or early planning phases, at a stage where the detailed financial impacts have not yet been determined. The evolving discussions and planning can be met within the established operations budget. There are no immediate capital costs associated with this report's recommendation to note the final Parking Policy.

### **1. Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations**

The financial implications of this project are currently not fully developed and are pending the outcome of the discussions, planning and development of detailed

projects specifications, which are programmed over the 2019-2022 policy period. A detailed financial model will be developed and reported as and when individual projects specifications are recommended for commencement.

## **2. The effect of the decision**

It is likely that there will be a need to undertake additional investment and additional income will incur. The implications will depend on the final projects definitions, to be developed over the 2019-2022 policy period. Parking schemes are generally expected to be self-financing and it is largely anticipated the projects outcomes will be developed on this basis.

## **3. Risks**

- Legally challenged on the proposed charges and levels of income not being commensurate with traffic management objectives.
- Legally challenged on insufficiency in measures resulting in air pollution (public health) and traffic management duties not being met.
- Car ownership and car use behaviour changes having an excessively adverse economic impact on residents, enterprises and businesses.
- Car ownership and car use behaviour changes beyond the model assumptions, resulting in income projections and the duty to self-finance parking schemes not being met.
- Concerns that the proposed charges will disadvantage those who rely on the motor vehicle.
- Penalising residents in areas where CPZs are more extensive.
- There are technical challenges in systems software and devices for implementing Emission-Based Parking Charges, virtual loading bay and open data systems. Such challenges have been resolved in other towns, but at cost implications that cannot yet be fully ascertained until consultation has confirmed the preferred methods and levels.

## **4. Financial options**

There are no immediate capital costs associated with this report's recommendation to agree the final Parking Policy.

## **5. Future savings/efficiencies**

The main aim of the policy is to improve parking and it's environmental impacts within the borough. These will be linked to Corporate Priorities e.g. Low Emissions, AQ & PH etc.

If the implementation of any proposed policy will result in a reduced income for the Council this will need to be carefully considered as this will impact the Council's budget.

## **6. Approval**

*Approved by: Kate Bingham, Head of Finance.*

## **5 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 5.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance that there are a variety of statutory functions engaged by the proposed parking policy and action plan. These include the following:
- 5.2 Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) which provides the Council with the power to implement the changes proposed in this report. This legislation gives a local authority the power to make Traffic Management Orders (TMO) to control parking by designating on-street parking places, charging for their use and imposing waiting and loading restrictions on vehicles of all or certain classes at all times or otherwise.
- 5.3 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the procedures set out at Schedule 9, Part III of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and detailed in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.
- 5.4 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, the Council must exercise its powers under that Act so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:-
- the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
  - the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve
  - amenity.
  - the national air quality strategy.
  - the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles.
  - any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.
- 5.5 The High Court has confirmed that the Council must have proper regard to the matters set out at s 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.
- 5.6 Finally it should be noted that the Courts have been clear that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is not a fiscal measure and does not authorise a local authority to use its powers to charge local residents for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes.
- 5.7 When designating and charging for parking places the authority should be governed solely by the section 122 purpose. There is in section 45 no statutory purpose specifically identified for charging. Charging may be justified provided it is aimed at the fulfilment of the statutory purposes which are identified in section 122 (broadly

referred to as “traffic management purposes”). Such purposes may include but are not limited to, the cost of provision of on-street and off-street parking, the cost of enforcement, the need to “restrain” competition for on-street parking, encouraging vehicles off-street, securing an appropriate balance between different classes of vehicles and users, and selecting charges which reflect periods of high demand. What the authority may not do is introduce charging and charging levels for the purpose, primary or secondary, of raising section 55(4) revenue.

- 5.8 In relation to implementation of the individual elements of the action plan and policy, there will be further legal implications, including in relation to potential equalities implications, data protection and compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation 2018 which will need to be addressed separately when these matters are brought forward for decision.

*Approved by, Sandra Herbert, Head of Litigation and Corporate Law on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance & Deputy Monitoring Officer*

## **6 HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 6.1 There are no immediate HR issues and if any arise these will be managed under the Council’s policies and procedures.

*Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of HR for and behalf of Sue Moorman, HR Director*

## **7 EQUALITIES IMPACT**

- 7.1 An Equality Analysis (EA) has been undertaken and was reviewed in response to the consultation. Of the respondents to the engagement, the main comments were related to the Parking Management & School Streets sections of the policy.
- 7.2 The findings of the analysis have concluded that the following mitigating actions will be taken:
- 7.2.1 Adoption of either the Disabled Parking Accreditation or London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for the provision of disabled parking bays various locations,
  - 7.2.2 Affording eligibility of carers and relatives to drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable, when implementing School Streets restrictions,
  - 7.2.3 Affording schools the authority to issue eligibility to drive during the restricted hours when needed during pregnancy.
- 7.3 The EA will be reviewed on a regular basis as various projects are brought forward and that any impacts will be assessed accordingly.

*Approved by: Yvonne Okiyo, Equalities Officer*

## **8 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

8.1 The Parking Policy is designed to help improve air quality in the borough.

## **9 CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT**

9.1 Elements of the Parking Policy, such as Schools Streets and residential CPZs, contributes to resolving hostile behaviours are presently daily occurrences experienced by residents, school staff, driving parents, children and other road users.

## **10 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED DECISION**

10.1 The Council has reviewed the over-arching requirements and ascertained the necessity for the Parking Policy.

## **11 OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

11.1 Without this policy, the Council would fail to meet its obligations under nationally and regionally devolved responsibilities to improve the borough's air quality and public health objectives. Nor would we be able to achieve the Council's obligations under the Mayor's Transport Strategy to reduce car dependency and other objectives such as reduced traffic. Furthermore, the Council would be making decisions about parking arrangements in the absence of any cohesive framework which is aligned to our corporate priorities. The making of any changes to parking arrangements in the absence of such a framework would be exposed to the risk of challenges.

Also, the policy is designed to address and support the priorities within the Corporate Plan.

An option could be to wait and see what new technologies and technical solutions emerges as de facto standard from the marketplace or from work delivered in other boroughs, before committing to setting the policy objectives. However, this would introduce a lag in addressing the national, regional and local drivers that include improving air quality, reducing emissions, public health priorities, reducing car dependency and reducing traffic and parking congestion.

---

### **CONTACT OFFICER:**

- Steve Iles, Director of Public Realm
- Anupa Patel, Head of Strategic Projects (Public Realm)
- Sarah Randall, Head of Parking Services

### **APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT**

- Appendix 1 - Proposed Parking Policy 2019-22
- Appendix 2 - Parking Policy Action Plan 2019-2022

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

- Cabinet report on draft parking Policy, 25 March 2019.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

- Parking policy engagement analysis.

## APPENDIX 1

### Draft Policy

<b>Policy Name</b>	<b>Parking Policy 2019-22</b>				
<b>Effective Date</b>	2019 TBC	<b>Date of last Revision</b>	N/A	<b>Date of next Revision</b>	Annual
<b>Applies to:</b>					
ALL WARDS					

<b>Version</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Revision Date</b>
1.0 (draft)	Steve Iles	20-02-2019
2.0 (draft)	Steve Iles	18-07-2019

#### **Scope:**

##### In-scope:

- All operational and customer services aspects of parking management, including their collaborative interfaces with other council functions.

##### Out of scope (although out of scope there will be interactions across all the following):

- Planning policies.
- Air quality Action Plan 2017-2022, including the implementation electric vehicle charging points.
- Strategic Transport plans, including Local Implementation Plan (LIP3) (draft).

#### **Policy Statement:**

Parking affects almost everyone that lives in, works in or visits Croydon to some extent. Whilst our road networks have grown, so too have the competing demands for this space for use by pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and parking. With the pace of growth in homes and developments that Croydon is set to undergo, this Parking Policy, and its emerging action plan, respond to the challenges posed and will deliver effective and safe parking infrastructure and management in the borough. It also complements and supports other local strategies and policies including our Corporate Plan 2018-2022 the Air Quality Action Plan, the Local Plan, the Third Local Implementation Plan and further, it supports the London Mayor's Transport Strategy.

The urban traffic infrastructure in Croydon was largely laid out in times when current levels of car use were not anticipated and the harmful effects of air pollution were not recognised. Car use has increased 10-fold over the past 50 years. Road traffic is projected to grow faster than car ownership, by 25% over the next 20 years<sup>1</sup>. The UK has 30.6 million cars and 4.4 million light vans, transporting some 670 billion passenger kilometres (2017 data<sup>2</sup>), in some 47 billion journeys per annum. A parking space is required at the beginning and the end of each car journey. Parking management is thereby a key factor in managing congestion, sustainability, liveability and economy.

Parking management is a significant lever in influencing car ownership and use. It therefore has a role to play in addressing the borough's air quality and public health challenges. Many elements of car ownership and use costs are already being used to influence behaviours, including road tax, diesel fuel duty and differential congestion charges. These are national or regional schemes, which tend to be moderated for the general denominator. The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 devolves responsibility for further reducing emissions mainly

to a local level. The national targets, such as the aim of 50-70% of new car sales being ULEV by 2030, require local authorities to develop the enabling support infrastructure. The London Mayor's regional proposal to extend the ULEZ emission requirements from central London the North and South Circulars by 2021 will also demand local considerations. There are currently insufficient borough level measures and tools in place to address specific areas of localised matters in air quality, to support active travel, to reduce external traffic and to accommodate planned and future Growth Zone and suburban intensification.

Air pollution is directly associated with car and vehicle traffic, with pollutant levels being generally higher inside cars than on the pavement. It is a serious public health issue, which impacts most on our vulnerable young and elders. Croydon currently has the unenviable record for the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 year) asthma and the third highest number of asthma deaths in London. 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution<sup>3</sup>. In the AQAP online public engagement survey 76% of 356 respondents rated their views on air pollution as 'very important' and a further 14% rated their views as 'important'. 88% agreed that the AQAP healthy streets initiatives are important. 84% agreed it is important to improve air quality awareness at schools. The school run presents a particularly harmful combination of air pollution and inactivity for our children and parents. The traffic chaos that often occurs outside schools at the beginning and end of the day is an unsafe environment for young children.

Each London Local Authority is required to produce a plan (a 'Local Implementation Plan') to implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy (MTS) within its area. The MTS aims for 'Good Growth' and sets outcomes including:

- 'Healthy Streets',
- Londoners to do at least 20 minutes of active travel each day to stay healthy (currently 26% of Croydon residents achieve this)
- 80% of journeys to be made by sustainable modes, namely walking, cycling, public transport (currently Croydon is at 49%)
- Reduce car ownership in London (the required Croydon reduction is 10,500 less cars owned by 2041)
- Reduce the volume of traffic in London (the required Croydon reduction is 5% by 2021 and 10% by 2041)

These are translated into the emerging third Croydon LIP (LIP3) with associated targets. The MTS also states that Traffic Reduction Strategies should be developed at a borough level as part of LIPs, with the aim of reducing car and freight traffic levels across London. Management of the supply of parking is a key means of restraining car use and ensuring space for the alternatives.

In the LIP3 online public engagement survey with just over 1000 responses in September 2018<sup>4</sup>, 86% agreed that traffic levels are too high in Croydon and 72% agreed traffic levels should be lowered. 74% agreed they are concerned about air quality. 62% agreed to use the car less if the alternatives were better. 70% agreed that public transport is convenient (11% are unsure and 19% disagree). By comparison, a lesser 58% agreed that travel by car is convenient. 57% agreed they would walk more if conditions were right. 77% disagreed that the present Croydon street environment encourages them to cycle, although a lesser, but still significant, 39% agreed they would cycle more if conditions were right. Many Croydon streets are perceived as hostile to cyclists and pedestrians, largely as result of congestion and air pollution. Legacy unresolved footway parking exemptions cause localised difficulties for the partially sighted, wheel- and push-chair users.

The level of Croydon residents who regularly travel by active methods (walking and cycling) is lower than in each of our neighbouring 6 boroughs. Only 26% of Croydon residents undertake the minimum 20 minutes of active travel each day needed to stay healthy<sup>3</sup>. One in three of our children are now overweight and two in three adults are overweight<sup>5</sup>. Just 0.7% of easy to cycle journeys are made by bike, which is currently the lowest cycling mode share of all London boroughs<sup>6</sup>. Fortunately, the analysis undertaken by Transport for London in 2016 reveals the areas of Croydon that have the greatest potential for active travel in London.

Croydon's Growth Zone programme and wider developments throughout the borough are forecast to add 23,500 jobs and 30,000 new homes in the next decade<sup>7</sup>, adding to the existing challenges. In areas of higher population density, there tends to be a shorter travel distance between home, work, shopping and leisure. At least a third of new homes planned for the borough will be in the Croydon Growth Zone, situated a walking distance to the



major public transport links that a majority of the residents will use to commute to work. This reduces the average reliance on the car and parking. However, currently 45% of people working in Croydon live outside the borough, and 50% of them commute by car<sup>8</sup>. The new jobs have the potential therefore to generate an increase in peak hour congestion and air pollution.

The average car is parked at home for about 80% of the time, parked elsewhere for about 16.5% of the time, and is actually only used for the remaining 3.5%<sup>9</sup>. Parking management measures typically operate by designating or moderating the provided space and through the parking time and charges structure. Motorists can respond to the measures by:

- Parking in a place that best suits personal needs,
- Parking in a different location with more space or lower charges, maybe further to walk,
- Parking for a different length of time,
- Making use of parking discounts, such as off-peak or emission-based pricing,
- Changing the mode of travel,
- Changing the destination, or
- Abandoning the journey.

Currently, 81% of all parking fee payments to the Croydon Council are made through the pay and display concept. The remainder 19% are parking permits and season tickets. The pay and display concept involves paying directly to a machine (29% cash, 20% card) or through a mobile phone app that mimics a machine (32%). The concept is based on drivers paying up-front for a pre-defined time. Such technology can raise driver anxiety. For example, it is difficult to fully enjoy dining or shopping in town while continually clock-watching the parking time. There is a perceived degree of unfairness in the Council retaining the income from unintended over-payments and from penalty-payments resulting from unintended overstays. The pre-payment concept is in fact not ensuring higher incomes. Emerging new technology is providing drivers with more convenient and efficient ways of paying for parking.

Although parking management is an important lever, its limitations must be recognised:

- The local authority can only influence policies in publicly controlled parking spaces,
- Parking cannot take into account the origin of the journey and therefore distance travelled,
- Parking fees are dependent upon the length of the parking period, which can be inversely proportional to the total amount of parking related travel, and
- Studies indicate that the readiness to pay parking charges is greater than the readiness to pay road toll – i.e. parking charges are under certain conditions the weaker influencer.

Parking controls will contribute to the control of congestion and emissions. The reciprocal – that emission-controls contribute to parking controls – does not automatically hold true. While transport policy in general is concerned with unreliability of journey times caused by unanticipated congestion, journey times can also become uncertain because of the failure to find vacant destination parking, with further consequences to local congestion arising from the searching and idling for parking spaces. All cars in fact take up parking space, cause congestion and show hostility towards cyclists and pedestrians, regardless of emission levels and fuel type. Emission-based parking charges are not the full solution to reducing congestion and making road space more attractive to cycling. General parking times and charges structure are more effective in achieving this.

'Home parking' and 'destination parking' should be considered separately. Resident permits are generally associated with home parking. Business and season ticket permits are generally associated with destination parking. Destination parking conditions are a significant influencer on travel mode decisions. Destination parking therefore influences most on congestion, air pollution, public realm, health and safety.

References:

1. DfT Road Traffic Forecasts, <http://maps.dft.gov.uk/rtf18-vis/#/>
2. DfT, Transport Statistics Great Britain 2018
3. <https://www.croydon.gov.uk/democracy/dande/policies/health/annual-public-health-report>
4. Draft LIP3 online engagement survey of 1,000 people in September 2018

5. <https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/Healthy%20Weight%20Action%20Plan%202017-2020.pdf>
6. <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/analysis-of-cycling-potential-2016.pdf>
7. <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/download-draft-london-plan-0>
8. TfL LIP3 Borough Indicators & DVLA ownership by local authority
9. RAC Foundation, Spaced Out: Perspectives on parking policy, July 2012

### Key terms & definitions:

- ANPR, Automatic Number Plate Recognition.
- AQAP, Air Quality Action Plan.
- CPZ, Controlled Parking Zone.
- DfT, Department for Transport.
- EVCP, Electric Vehicle Charging Point.
- LIP3, Local Implementation Plan (third revision 2019-2021).
- MTS, London Mayor's Transport Strategy.
- P&D, Pay and Display.
- School Street, in present context, is a street with a school entrance, which during the start and end of the school day is restricted to all vehicles with the exemption of the following: pedestrians, cyclists, residents of an address within the zone, emergency vehicles, care services, people with special access needs, registered disabled persons with grounds for accessing amenities within the zone, school vehicles, public transport, business employees and school staff with allocated parking on their workplace premises within the zone..
- SEN, Special Educational Needs.
- TfL, Transport for London.
- ULEV, Ultra Low Emission Vehicle.
- ULEZ, Ultra Low Emission Zone.

## Policy Sections

### Section 1: Collaborative Working

#### Aim:

Parking management is to be a collaborative process distributed across planning, strategic transport, engineering and operational functions with a cohesive approach that aligns and coordinates the resources and future plans to the over-reaching common purpose.

#### Objectives:

- To work collaboratively, to assure the coherent planning, development and operational management of traffic and parking, including to:
  - Engage with corporate strategic and other local authority functions.
  - Establish and maintain a catalogue of policy objectives, which can be shared and applied by all for common purpose functions.
  - Establish and maintain a catalogue of planning decisions, which can be consulted on and applied by the engineering and operational functions. The catalogue will include a feedback feature to which monitoring and impact information is attached.
  - Ensure that planning and parking policy continually meets evolving needs, including with regards to the delivery of cycle parking, cycle lanes, Car Club, EVCPs, highway safety, business deliveries and managing parking stress (e.g. car free or permit free developments). Where there is a cumulative effect from multiple smaller developments in proximity to one another in a CPZ

and where good public transport alternatives exist then we will seek to restrict occupiers from eligibility for on-street residential permits.

- Coordinate resources to enable the effects of cumulative pressures and displacement from new developments in areas of growth to be identified, monitored and managed so that impacts on current residents can be reduced.
- Coordinate the introduction of Traffic Management Orders in public parking places within parks and on housing estates.
- Continue to respond to operational service action requests for road safety or highway management reasons.
- Refer non-operational matters to town planners or traffic engineers as appropriate for review, to help address the impacts of schemes & /or developments that will attract & generate more parking demand by proactively considering the introduction of new restrictions or new permitted controlled parking.
- Liaise and consult with emergency services to ensure that new and existing parking arrangements continually facilitate their duties.
- Review the future parking management of powered 2-wheel, small freight/delivery and passenger transport vehicles (incl: black cabs and minicabs), which have a growing and evolving function in substituting for private car ownership and use.
- Temporarily suspend parking on request of utility companies, residents and developers, to facilitate access for works in accordance with statutory processes and associated licensing/permission regime.

## Section 2: Parking Management

### Aim:

To provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, without detracting from the quality of public realm, and to contribute to securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic. This includes contributing to the over-reaching policy aim of reducing car use and increasing walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

### Objectives:

- To fairly balance parking capacity, parking times and bay types (residential, P&D, business and shared use) and to optimise these to meet the diverse needs of all road users, while affording a degree of priority as follows :
  - On main roads: efficient, congestion-free and safe flow of people and goods (including public transport, cycles and pedestrians).
  - In residential streets: needs of local residents for parking near to home as permitted by planning policy and planning law.
  - In streets near to commercial, retail, healthcare and leisure locations: all motorists, public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians, as necessary to optimise opportunity and equality for access to and the vitality of a locality.
  - Near schools: children and parents that walk and cycle to school.
  - In all places, overriding all of the above: Priority to emergency services, vulnerable road users, disabled people, people with special access needs and sufficiency for Car Clubs and EVCP users.
- To install and operate the on- and off-street infrastructure necessary to enable the effective and efficient use of the parking provision. This includes to:
  - Operate a reactive and preventative maintenance regime for ensuring infrastructure, including signs and lines, continually conforms to requirements and is visually presentable.
  - Maintain around 1,500 parking spaces in 17 off-street car parks in a clean, safe and orderly state.

- New, amended or revoked on-street parking places are implemented by Traffic Management Orders, which are subject to advanced formal consultation through a Public Notice and approval by the relevant decision maker.
- To maintain and deploy sufficient and competent resources and devices to operate a civil enforcement system in compliance with the legislative framework and approved code of practice. This includes to:
  - Ensure a satisfactory level of compliance with the traffic and parking conditions established by road traffic laws (Highway Code) and/or by local Traffic Management Orders.
  - Maximise compliance with regulations in places used by vulnerable road users, such as cyclists, school children and disabled people.
  - Ensure enforcement on places where non-compliant parking would result in congestion, impact on highway safety and potentially result in delays to emergency service vehicles and public transport.
  - Implement and manage the compliance with conditions of use for parking spaces provided with Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP).
  - Receive and expeditiously process representation against any enforcement action in accordance with the approved code of practice.
  - Operate a continual improvement quality management approach to the Council's compliance enforcement system, to minimise the number of penalty charge appeals and service specific complaints.

### Section 3: Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)

Aim:

To manage parking where demand exceeds supply and/or unsafe conditions exist, through the design of permitted and restricted kerb space that fairly balances parking capacity, parking times and bay types (residential, P&D, business and shared use) in accordance with the locations and appropriate to the local communities and businesses.

Objectives:

- To develop a methodology for the definition of an impact area to be proactively considered for a CPZ.
- To pre-emptively develop, implement and operate future CPZs in accordance with the above proposed methodology. CPZs are implemented by new or amended Traffic Management Orders, which are subject to advanced formal consultation through a Public Notice and approval by the relevant decision maker.
- To regularly review the parking landscape having regard to the known developments, plans for growth and assumptions about levels of anticipated developments and the consequential parking impacts. This will include parking displacement impact in the wider vicinity of sites for all larger developments and other locations where parking issues are identified.
- To reactively receive, record and monitor requests and petitions from individuals, councillors and specific interest groups for CPZs, disabled bays and other parking arrangements. CPZs in residential streets with parking stress will give priority to the needs of local residents for parking near to home as permitted by planning policy and planning law, as well as to the emergency services, vulnerable road users, disabled people and sufficiency in Car Club (shared) and EVCP users.

### Section 4: School Streets

Aim:

To contribute to securing a healthy and safe environment near to schools, and to help children and parents use cars less and to walk, cycle and use public transport more.

#### Objectives:

- To implement and operate school streets, using ANPR technology, in all places where in agreement with the school, local residents and other public service authorities it will benefit children's health and safety, whilst being appropriate for local traffic conditions. New, amended or revoked school streets are implemented by Traffic Management Orders, which are subject to advanced formal consultation through a Public Notice and approval by the relevant decision maker.
- To operate an elevated peak-time compliance enforcement presence and/or school crossing patrols in locations where traffic conditions are assessed to adversely impact on safety and general order near schools, but where the implementation of a school street is assessed to be inappropriate.
- To ensure School Streets eligibility criteria will:
  - afford carers and relatives to drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable, when implementing School Streets restrictions, and
  - afford schools the authority to issue eligibility to drive during the restricted hours when needed during pregnancy.

## Section 5: Parking charges

#### Aim:

To operate the charges defined in local Traffic Management Orders for on- and off-street parking places. In accordance with the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, the level of charges will have regard to securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic (including pedestrians) having regard to the amenity, the national air quality strategy and any other relevant traffic management matters, and the requirement to self-finance the operational costs of providing and managing parking facilities. Any fees set are required to be reasonable and proportionate. Statutory guidance confirms that raising revenue should not be an objective of civil parking enforcement, nor should authorities set targets for revenue or the number of penalty charge notices (PCNs) they issue.

#### Objectives:

- To develop, implement and operate a differential parking and permit administration charges mechanism that will encourage the ownership, take-up and use of zero and low emission vehicles, while discouraging the ownership and use of noxious and high emission vehicles. The emission-based charging is proposed to be consulted on in accordance with the emergence of the enabling technologies to assess its applicability and impact on residents and road users within the borough with a view to promoting the use of low or zero emission vehicles.
- New and amended parking charges are implemented by new or amended Traffic Management Orders, which are subject to advanced formal consultation through a Public Notice and approval by the relevant decision maker.

## Section 6: Innovation and technology

#### Aims:

Parking services will, at a rate which the natural replacement cycle or reasonable investment costs permit, and subject to compliance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), end the use of closed data systems and instead promote the use of open data platforms and devices, to facilitate a digital Smart City transformation in the way people travel and to support innovation in transport information systems. The council's developing Digital Strategy will support the delivery of innovative systems to transform our platforms and devices.

#### Objectives:

- To embrace technology which helps customers to better access services and aids the efficiency of parking operations. This includes the expansion of cashless and mobile payment apps, with a resulting reduction in cash payments at machines. To gradually substitute Pay & Display machines for more user-convenient mobile apps and/or equivalent digital systems, which further enables the introduction of emission-based destination parking and unlocks valuable data in support of Smart City transportation objectives.
- To review and consider the introduction of virtual loading bays – i.e. using technology to enable a loading bay in any suitable place, for the time required.
- To open up existing parking places geographical information, on- and off-street parking definitions, restricted/unrestricted, the type of vehicle or permit accepted, yellow line restriction, parking spaces in a place and occupancy, times of operation, CPZs, duration (length of stay), tariff, payment methods and real-time space availability.

## Related laws or legislation

- Traffic Management Act 2004.
- London Local Authorities Act and Transport for London Act 2003, as amended by The Deregulation Act 2015.
- Greater London Authority Act 1999.
- Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997.
- Road Traffic Act 1991.
- Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, impacted by Environment Act 1995.
- The Blue Badge (Disabled Persons Parking) Scheme, as amended, introduced 1971 under Section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970.
- Equality Act 2010.
- Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 on footway and verge parking ban.
- Parking (Code of Practice) Bill 2017-19 (completing its second reading in Jan 2019).
- Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

### National strategy and policy:

- Road to zero strategy.
- Industrial strategy.
- National Clean Air Strategy 2019 (launched 14<sup>th</sup> Jan 2019).
- The Secretary of State's Statutory Guidance to Local Authorities on the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions.

### Regional strategy and policy:

- London Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018.
- London Mayor's new London Plan (draft).
- DfT Operational Guidance to Local Authorities: Parking Policy and Enforcement TMA 2004.

### Adopted independent best practice standards:

- Disabled Motoring UK: Disabled Parking Accreditation, an industry standard for demonstrating conformity to the Equality Act 2010.
- British Parking Association (BPA): Park Mark, an industry standard for demonstrating conformity to recognised requirements for managing safety and security in a parking place.

## Related LB Croydon Strategies and Policies

- Our Corporate Plan for Croydon 2018 – 2022
- Air Quality Action Plan 2017-2022
- Croydon Local Plan
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Local Implementation Plan (LIP3) (draft)
- Croydon Cycling Strategy 2018-23

The following strategies are also under development and will take the principles of this Parking Policy into consideration:

- Digital Strategy
- Community Strategy
- Sustainable City Strategy

## **Date of Next Review**

- April 2020
- This policy will be reviewed annually, to ensure that its principles and actions comply with any changes to legislation and reflect the changing needs of our communities.

**Parking Policy Action Plan 2019-2022**

<b>Core Principles</b>		
<u>Section 1: Collaborative working</u>		
<p>The aim is for Parking management to be a collaborative process distributed across planning, strategic transport, engineering and operational functions, and to embed a coherent approach that aligns and coordinates the individual sub-unit goals to the over-reaching common purpose. This will assure the coherent planning, development and operational management of traffic and parking.</p>		
<b>Our objective</b>	<b>Our action</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
To work collaboratively	Joined up discussion and consensus definitions for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of developments and public transport provisions upon parking.</li> <li>• the conditions of use and compliance for:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ loading and unloading,</li> <li>○ EVCP infrastructure,</li> <li>○ Car Clubs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2019 - 2022
	Catalogue development sites with permit restrictions and land owner agreements.	2019 - 2022
	Digitise TMO information to be shareable for public domain.	2019 - 2022

Section 2: Parking management

The aim is to provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, without detracting from the quality of public realm, and to contribute to securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic. This includes contributing to the over-reaching policy aim of reducing car use and increasing walking, cycling and the use of public transport. This will ensure: that



parking capacity & provision are balanced & optimized to meet the diverse needs of all road users; that on- and off-street infrastructure enables effective and efficient use of parking provision; a civil enforcement system in compliance with legislative framework and approved code of practice.		
Our objective	Our action	Implementation
To fairly balance parking capacity to diverse needs	Review and resolve legacy temporary exemptions for footway and verge parking.	2019 - 2020
	Ensure sufficient disabled parking provision as per the Disabled Parking Accreditation (DPA) or London Plan, whichever is of the higher standard.	2020 - 2021
To install and operate on- and off-street parking infrastructure	To maintain parking infrastructure, including signs and lines, across the borough to maintain satisfactory compliance.	2019 - 2022
To assure compliance with Traffic Management Orders	Implement and operate the compliance criteria of the future EVCP infrastructure.	2019 - 2022

<b><u>Section 3: Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)</u></b>		
The aim is to manage parking where demand exceeds supply and/or unsafe conditions exist, through the design of permitted and restricted kerb space that fairly balances parking capacity, parking times and bay types (residential, P&D, business and shared use) in accordance with the locations and appropriate to the local communities and businesses.		
Our objective	Our action	Implementation
Establish a consistent methodology for the assessment &/or development of CPZs.	Define methodology for new & existing CPZs to also include considerations for intensification areas, Car Clubs, EVPC infrastructure and shared bays.	2019 – 2020, Central Croydon.
		2020 -2021, rest of borough.

#### Section 4: School Streets

The aim is to contribute to securing a healthy and safe environment near to schools, and to help children and parents use cars less and to walk, cycle and use public transport more.

Our objective	Our action	Implementation
Implement and operate School Streets	Extend School Streets on an annual basis subject to it being appropriate for the area in question. At least 3 School Streets in Sep 2019 and 10 (indicative) Schools Streets in Sep 2020.	2019 - 2021

#### Section 5: Parking charges

The aim is to operate the charges defined in local Traffic Management Orders for on- and off-street parking places. In accordance to the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, the level of charges will have regard to securing the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicles and other traffic (including pedestrians) having regard to the amenity, the national air quality strategy and any other relevant traffic management matters, and the requirement to self-finance the operational costs of providing and managing parking facilities.

Our objective	Our action	Implementation
Introduce emission-based parking charges	Introduce emission-based charging for residents parking permits, on a permit renewal basis.	2019
	Introduce emission-based charging for business permits.	2020
	Introduce emission-based charging for visitor permits.	2020

	Introduce diesel surcharge, initially for permits.	2020
	Introduce emission-based and diesel surcharging for on- and off-street parking places, including per event and season ticket charges.	2021

### Section 6: Innovation and technology

The aim is to end the use of closed data systems and instead promote the use of open data platforms and devices, to facilitate a digital Smart City transformation in the way people travel and to support innovation in transport information systems, at a rate dictated by the natural replacement cycle or reasonable investment costs permit.

Our objective	Our action	Implementation
Embrace new technology	Creating an online reporting portal for customers to report & receive feedback on parking issues.	2019 - 2022
	Expand alternative payment technologies for parking charges whilst reducing P&D machine numbers by 80%.	2019 - 2022
	Investigate new technologies and open data sources to provide guidance to drivers through apps or devices for nearest available parking spaces.	2019 - 2022
Consider introduction virtual loading bays	Review and evaluate technology options for virtual loading bays.	2019 - 2021
Open up parking data	Adopt emerging open data standards and collaborate with app developers and share data, within parameters of GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 requirements.	2019 - 2022
	Ensure future procurement enable open data platform access in accordance with GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 requirements.	2019 - 2022



# Result of Parking Policy engagement April to May 2019

Counts of respondents and groups expressing concern, support or 'other' under each the 6 parking policy areas

		(183)	About you (144 completed this question)											Age (135 completed this question)							Disabled (136)				Nature of disability (32 completed)							Gender (134)			Ethnicity (130)				
		All respondents	I work in Croydon	I live in Croydon	I represent a business in Croydon	I visit family and friends in Croydon	I visit Croydon for shopping and leisure	I study in Croydon	I have a child under 11 years in Croydon	I own a car	I live within a CPZ	I have off-street parking at home	Prefer not to say	Did not answer this question	>18	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+	Prefer not to say	No	Little	Lot	Prefer not to say	Visual	Hearing	Mobility	Learning	Communicating	Mental	Other	Female	Male	Prefer not to say	White	BAME	Prefer not to say	
Section 1	Concern	81	21	60	10	33	43	4	6	52	9	32	1	16	0	1	7	11	16	25	3	0	43	10	3	6	0	2	7	1	1	1	3	10	4	7	41	6	13
	Support	13	2	7	0	2	5	0	1	4	1	3	0	6	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	20	25	1	6	1	0
	Other	89	25	68	4	22	35	1	5	54	16	30	1	17	1	5	8	7	15	19	10	40	11	6	10	1	1	14	0	0	3	0	36	20	11	46	4	13	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	
Section 2	Concern	76	21	63	7	27	44	2	4	55	11	30	2	9	1	3	6	8	14	26	7	37	13	8	8	1	1	14	1	1	3	2	29	23	12	44	5	14	
	Support	13	5	12	0	4	8	0	2	9	1	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	5	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	1	9	0	2		
	Other	94	22	60	7	26	31	3	6	46	14	25	0	29	0	5	7	11	14	15	6	40	9	1	8	0	2	8	0	0	1	0	32	20	6	40	6	10	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	
Section 3	Concern	51	17	47	3	21	30	4	2	37	11	21	0	3	0	3	5	8	11	15	4	31	8	3	5	0	1	6	1	1	1	1	21	17	6	27	3	14	
	Support	8	1	6	0	2	6	0	1	6	1	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	7	0	0	
	Other	124	30	82	11	34	47	1	9	67	14	39	2	35	1	5	9	10	20	28	9	53	12	6	11	1	1	15	0	0	3	2	41	30	13	59	8	12	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	
Section 4	Concern	17	6	14	4	6	10	0	0	14	2	7	0	1	0	1	1	4	4	4	2	9	3	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	9	4	2	11	1	3	
	Support	55	17	49	7	24	36	1	4	41	9	27	0	4	0	2	5	4	10	27	3	36	10	1	4	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	20	25	3	36	4	8	
	Other	111	25	72	3	27	37	4	8	55	15	31	2	34	1	5	9	12	18	15	8	43	10	7	9	1	1	11	1	1	3	2	37	20	14	46	6	15	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	
Section 5	Concern	45	12	42	4	22	10	1	1	42	10	22	0	2	1	2	1	8	13	12	4	25	8	4	5	0	2	9	1	1	3	1	18	15	7	28	1	11	
	Support	29	10	26	4	13	36	0	4	22	5	17	0	2	0	0	6	3	6	11	1	20	6	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	10	15	1	23	2	2	
	Other	109	26	67	6	22	37	4	7	46	11	26	2	35	0	6	8	9	13	23	8	43	9	4	11	1	1	8	0	0	1	1	38	19	11	42	8	13	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	
Section 6	Concern	35	11	31	2	17	24	3	1	29	7	17	1	1	0	2	1	5	13	10	2	20	6	5	1	1	0	9	0	0	1	1	19	11	1	25	1	7	
	Support	25	8	24	9	12	20	0	3	22	4	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	6	6	2	18	5	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	15	2	19	2	2	
	Other	123	29	80	3	28	39	2	8	59	15	34	1	38	0	6	11	11	13	16	9	50	12	4	13	0	3	10	1	1	3	2	41	23	16	49	8	17	
	Total	183	48	135	14	57	83	5	12	110	26	65	2	39	1	8	15	20	32	46	13	88	23	9	16	1	3	22	1	1	4	3	66	49	19	93	11	26	

## Section 1 - Collaborative working

Aim: Joint working across council departments to embed a clear approach that aligns and coordinates parking in Croydon to meet national, regional and local guidance.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	81	44%	13	41%	6	55%	25	54%
Support	13	7%	2	6%	1	9%	2	4%
Other	89	49%	17	53%	4	36%	19	41%

### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 11% Policy is too restrictive and anti-motorist, impacting on personal freedom and finances.
- 8% Does not address developments with insufficient parking provision.
- 7% Does not extend to motorcycles, scooter and bicycle parking provision.
- 6% Public transport and active modes infrastructure is not ready as a viable alternative.
- 4% Must secure ability to park near shops, including for the disabled and elderly.

### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 4% Cars and parking in Croydon are problems. Must be address by car reduction and charges.
- 4% I agree. The policy on collaborative working will have positive impacts.
- 3% Policy on more alternatives to the car is good, such as EVCP, car club and cycling infrastructure.
- 1% Positive impacts from healthier lifestyles and improving air quality.
- 1% I welcome collaborative approaches.

### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 12% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- 11% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 4% Sounds ok but is lacking in the details. Don't forget to collaborate with all stakeholders.
- 4% Electric vehicle infrastructure must increase and vehicle prices decrease.
- 3% We are too many people, for the amount of road space.

### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- <1% I expect it to be harder to park anywhere with my blue badge.
- <1% Why is there nothing about the provision of strategically placed parking spaces for disabled drivers?
- <1% Enable disabled to easily access shopping without having to walk/be pushed in wheelchair to transport links.
- <1% Being on a low wage and a carer, money is very limited. This will make it harder for me to help my parents and elderly ne
- <1% You give no consideration to folk with restricted mobility issues that are not deemed bad enough by current legislation t

## Section 2 - Parking management

Aim: Provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, without impacting the quality of the streets and to ensure a swift, convenient and safe flow of vehicles and other traffic. This includes contributing to the over-reaching policy aim of reducing car use and increasing walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	76	42%	21	66%	5	45%	26	57%
Support	13	7%	1	3%	0	0%	5	11%
Other	94	51%	10	31%	6	55%	15	33%

### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 9% Enforcement regime is too soft and ineffective.
- 7% Too restrictive and anti-motorist, impacting on personal freedom and finances.
- 5% Need increased parking provision near shops and railway stations.
- 4% Does not address developments with insufficient parking provision.
- 3% Lacks commitment to protect disabled and elder parking.

### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 3% I agree. The policy on parking management will have positive impacts.
- 3% Enforcement is good, but some places need more.
- 2% Good to see a parking policy with consideration to EVCP, cycling and walking.
- 2% Removing cars from Centres and CPZs should be priority. Make space for cycling lanes.
- 1% The objectives are difficult to fault. Hope you are able to deliver.

### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 26% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 4% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- 2% Sounds worthy, but please "fairly balance" all users, consult and don't be too draconian.
- 2% Are 1,500 spaces in 17 car parks adequate for future needs? We need more parking.
- 1% Free flow of traffic is important, but so is inexpensive parking charges.

### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- 3% Enforcement regime is too soft and ineffective.
- 2% Ensure sufficient blue badge parking at key facilities.
- 1% Misuse of EVCP's is high in this borough.
- <1% Cheaper parking is needed.
- <1% Parking wardens need to be more understanding about the lack of parking bays.

### Section 3 - Controlled Parking Zones

Aim: Manage parking where demand exceeds supply or unsafe conditions exist, through the design of permitted and restricted kerb space that fairly balances parking capacity, parking times and bay types (residential, P&D, business and shared use) in accordance with the locations and as appropriate to the needs of local communities and businesses.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	51	28%	11	34%	3	27%	15	33%
Support	8	4%	3	9%	0	0%	3	7%
Other	124	68%	18	56%	8	73%	28	61%

#### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 9% CPZ parking/permit charges are too high.
- 5% Does not address developments with insufficient parking provision.
- 4% Expand CPZs throughout the borough.
- 3% CPZ enforcement regime is insufficient or too lenient.
- 3% Need to increase parking provision within CPZs.

#### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 3% I agree. The policy on CPZs will have positive impacts.
- 1% Good that housing developments are not allowed permits, except disabled parking.
- 1% Please give us a CPZ in my road. We are happy to pay.
- 1% I cannot wait for this to take place.
- <1% It is great if you are addressing parking in residential areas that have stations and schools.

#### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 33% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 7% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- 2% 1hr free parking is great, we urge its continuation.
- 2% Too many households have multiple cars.
- <1% Croydon should take advantage of Mayor's plans to reduce Inner London bus mileage and move it to the Outer London ar

#### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- 2% Keep in mind equalities when removing or controlling parking.
- <1% CPZ confusing. I have often been fined because I did not see or understand the signage.
- <1% Mild disabled drivers use reserved bay outside home of of severely disabled person.
- <1% Being on a low salary already and being a carer, I would not be able to afford to pay to park outside my house.
- <1% Allow more than three hours for disabled drivers not in disabled bays.



#### Section 4 - School Streets

Aim: Contribute to securing a healthy and safe environment near to schools, and to help children and parents use cars less and to walk, cycle and use public transport more.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	17	9%	4	13%	1	9%	4	9%
Support	55	30%	11	34%	4	36%	27	59%
Other	111	61%	17	53%	6	55%	15	33%

##### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 5% concern about the displacement into neighbouring roads.
- 3% concern about parents who need to drive, due to large catchment areas.
- 1% concern about increasing congestion, pollution and noise on main roads.
- 1% concern about unsafe walking; children are safer in cars.
- 1% reduced access for residents in School Street.

##### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 17% I agree. The policy on school streets will have positive impacts.
- 8% Positive for parents and children to get out of the car.
- 3% Good for safety and child health.
- 1% It is Council's duty not to back down of this plan, even if objections are certain.
- 1% I cannot wait for this to take place.

##### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 36% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 18% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- 3% Offer more bus services as well.
- 2% We need a school street in my area.
- 1% Ok, as long as the school streets are really necessary and does not affect main roads.

##### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- <1% If you are disabled and need to be at work then you need to drive and be able to park close.
- <1% Schools should have provision for off road parking for those dropping off or collection the children.
- [no further relevant comments received]

## Section 5 - Parking charges

Aim: Operate the charges defined in local Traffic Management Orders for on- and off-street parking places. Specific objective for introducing emission-based parking charges, to encourage a shift to zero and low emission vehicles.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	45	25%	12	38%	1	9%	12	26%
Support	29	16%	7	22%	2	18%	11	24%
Other	109	60%	13	41%	8	73%	23	50%

### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 11% Impacts disproportionately on low income residents, who cannot afford new car.
- 3% concern about unfairness impact on diesel owners.
- 3% concern about impact on Croydon and High Street economy.
- 2% concern that producing low emission cars causes more pollution.
- 2% concern emission charging is just a way of making money.

### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 9% I agree. The policy on parking charges will have positive impacts.
- 2% I agree. Polluter pay is fair, although drivers must be given time to make changes.
- 2% I cannot wait for this to take place. Get on with it.
- 1% I agree, although it will have a negative impact on my family's disposable income.
- <1% Yes, increase the charges. Croydon has excellent public transports.

### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 32% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 5% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- <1% I agree in part, but it does not the 50% of vehicles commuting into Croydon.
- <1% Positive, but at risk of being hit by multiple levers, such as ULEZ.
- <1% I don't think Croydon can afford to enforce it properly and drivers will just ignore it the same as they do the yellow lines.

### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- <1% Just way too over complicated.
- <1% Unfair to some people who can't afford efficient cars and also road tax.
- [no further relevant comments received]

## Section 6 - Innovation and technology

Aim: Create an open data platform where we can publish, share and use data to enable innovation in transport related information systems. Specific objective for more mobile cashless payment apps and digital systems, to gradually substitute pay and display machines.

	All respondents		Disabled		BAME		Aged 61+	
Concerns	35	19%	13	28%	1	9%	10	31%
Support	25	14%	10	22%	2	18%	6	19%
Other	123	67%	23	50%	8	73%	16	50%

### Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

- 15% Must consider those without access to mobile technology, including the elderly.
- 3% Cash payment option should remain an option.
- 3% What is a virtual loading bay?
- 2% Technology must be user-friendly
- 1% Technology must not add costs.

### Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

- 9% I agree. The policy on parking innovation and technology will have positive impacts.
- 2% I agree. Cashless parking is more convenient. Make it all electronic.
- 2% Great stuff. Bring it on. I cannot wait.
- 1% Make it easier to find parking spaces.
- 1% Find the parking meters unsightly and look forward to clear pavements.

### Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

- 42% Left the question about impact blank (unanswered).
- 5% Expressly stated "No impact" foreseen for the respondent self or the community.
- 2% Unsure about the relevance of this and what it will add.
- 1% There is not enough information to comment, please consider the non-tech savvy.
- <1% Making it easy to pay for parking does not drive the right marginal behaviour.

### Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

- 1% Disability groups and blind, elderly should be recognised as unable to use technology.
  - <1% Good idea but mitigations must be considered for older or technically disadvantaged individuals.
  - <1% I refuse to carry my phone all of the time. I am retired and do not want to be on call 24/7.
- [no further relevant comments received]

## Total comments received from 183 respondents

(note, the respondents' personal characteristics are not provided for privacy protection reasons)

ID	Response to Section 1: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts	Response to Section 2: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts	Response to Section 3: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts	Response to Section 4: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts	Response to Section 5: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts	Response to Section 6: Do you have any comments, including any positive or negative impacts
1	What are the changing demands on the roads? Surely this is wider roads with more lanes to safely accommodate bikes and cars? The statements are vague and unqualified.				Concrete buildings give off more co2 than cars. What about buses and lorries that drive through and are left running which cause more pollution than those cars parked that are not emitting?	Why have the need for payments at all? Just make bays available for parking but for no more than 2 hours.
2	There are businesses on the main road (yellow line restrictions) that park all their vehicles on nearby residential streets, making it increasingly difficult for residents to park near their own homes. These include fast food delivery cars and transit vans. These vehicles are sometimes left in place in from hours to days at a time. Restrictions on the length of time commercial type vehicles can remain parked up like this should be a welcome consideration.	Vehicles belonging to properties on the main road which has yellow line restrictions being parked up for days creating a nightmare for residents to park near their own homes.	something to stop selfish parking by people in a limited space road, taking up multiple spaces	It's not just parents that block the streets and park inconsiderately. Staff from the nearby school regularly park on residential streets all day, preventing residents from parking close to their homes.	Why not charge people for using their polluting vehicles instead of proposing to charge people for parking outside their homes (therefore not using and creating pollution). Proposal seems unfair as those who are more likely to be able to afford the newer non-polluting cars are likely to be the same that have the luxury of off-street parking. Anyone who falls into the ban of higher parking charges in their street will more than likely park in residential streets without restrictions. Those residents inevitably having more of a struggle to park near their own homes. It's just moving the problem from one place to another.	
3	Car club is a good idea but living in an area where I very rarely am able to park anywhere near my house the siting of car club cars will need engagement with local residents.	I can't park outside my house because of cars being dumped and local residents operating as car dealers without a licence. I would like more permitting so this can be enforced in Tennison Road SE25. More permits can only be a good thing.	See comments earlier. We badly need permits in Tennison Road. Cars regularly being dumped. Better enforcement	Really good idea. Parents need to get out of their cars and kids need to walk to school. Heavers Farm is a good example for this	Seems fine but it is likely that poorer people will have more polluting cars so this is likely to be regressive taxation	Good idea. People need to use their cars less and the 20 mph limit needs to be enforced
4	you should ensure planning permissions come with enough parking spaces, not the bare minimum required legally. It depends what you do but parking in Croydon is at peak saturation. Carparks are way too expensive.	There is no realistic recourse for inconsiderate/illegal parking. It is ignored and people get away with flouting the highway code on a regular basis. The negatives are already happening where I live, it is only going to get worse and worse and worse. Nothing happens to change or punish illegal parking	CPZ in South Croydon would be better than double yellow lines everywhere - which are ignored, like drop kerbs are.	You need to enforce double yellow lines properly outside and near to schools to stop unsafe, lazy illegal parking. If parents can't be bothered to walk a few feet more to park safely they aren't going to walk to school.	It isn't about polluters, it's about profit.	Great stuff. Bring it on!
5	My answer at Question 1 here also applies to question two. The constant ease with which planning applications for flats are given, particularly those which have little or no parking is having a negative impact on myself as a resident and on the local/wider community as it encourages people into the borough with cars when there are few places for them to park. Therefore the take up the spaces of other residents who have been here many years. I live in a road near a station and increasingly, we as residents are unable to park due to people parking outside our houses and travelling into London. Planning proposals like the 'syscraper' in Purley will cause all of the town to experience excessive parking by an influx of new residents.	The way to increase walking, cycling and the use of public transport is not to alter the parking provision, but to make the roads less busy, to have cycle lanes that do not peter out at the difficult bits of road to navigate ie junctions and to have public transport which is more frequent and more reliable. If you simply enforced the parking restrictions that presently are in place this would be a big help. I live in a residential road with yellow lines which are frequently parked upon blocking the road because there hasn't been enforcement in that road for at least 5 years now whereas there always used to be a patrol issuing tickets. This has an impact on me as a resident and on the wider community as blue light vehicles are hampered	Controlled parking zones are a disaster in Coulsdon and Purley where they have been expensive to install and have in no way improved the parking issues. This impacts me as a council tax paying resident who has had to pay for these changes. I have not seen any benefit.	20 mile an hour limits and parking restrictions are valid near schools during times when children are arriving and leaving ie first thing in the morning and late afternoon. They have a negative impact on me as a driver when the 20 mile per hour limit applies to many residential roads in places where there are not schools close by. The only thing that will make people use cars less and cycles and public transport more are if there are cycle lanes which do not peter out at difficult places eg junctions and if public transport is more readily available and is reliable.	Residents should always have a say in relation to parking charges.	This would not be of any use to me and I suspect to many in the community who do not live online eg older residents.
6	No	No	No	No impact	No	No
7	No		I live in CPZ North, it should be residents and visitors only on Sunday, either that or charge. Reducing parking in Central areas is not fair for residents who live in the centre of town, we still have a need for a car. More stress trying to find a parking space		Terrible idea, it will impact the poorer members of society who can't afford a new car	

8	As a motorcyclist, I believe you need to keep motorcycles exempt of any charges in future. I choose not to drive my car on the road unless I absolutely have to ie: family trips, etc. Motorcycles take up less space on the road and when parked. It's a better mode of transportation in good weather.					
9	It would be good to facilitate more cycle parking areas, there is a tendency to just leave them unattended, sometimes for long periods of time.		It would be useful to allow free parking up to a say an hour, especially in the town centre areas- croydon should do as much as possible to help the High Street sustainability. Hopefully more people would visit Croydon to shop.	School streets should be red lined AND patrolled at all schools. It would be much safer and help traffic flow.	I believe parking charges are too high in Croydon- I don't agree with emission based charging, as there may be a severe affordability issue here. With the low footfall of shoppers in Croydon, parking should be free until we have Westfield on board. If car park charges are increased on an emission based system, its likely even less people will visit shops in Croydon- which will be a major negative impact.	I am not sure this is really called for.
10	I work for CCHA, a housing association, one of the biggest in terms of stock in the borough. When you talk about housing estate car parks, I assume you mean those owned by the Council/part of your own housing stock? Not private car parks owned by housing associations - do you have the power to impose restrictions on private land we own? In order to work effectively within the borough CCHA need it's staff and contractors/partners to be able to move around and access our properties, it will be important to us that this continues. We have operated a pool car system to reduce the impact of cars in borough for some years now. As currently parking control within CCHA owned car parks is down to us, any control methods you bring into place within the areas we have properties, could impact on your residents and their own designated parking as the general public try to find other places to park. So it will be important that in the areas we operate we are fully consulted and if needed can help our residents understand the implications. Our residents are on low incomes and could be more disadvantaged than others by any new controls or fees, creating an unequal impact.	Really the same observations as Q1. Signage is really important, a period when new rules come into place and there is confusion needs more careful handling a good customer relations. Perhaps if a first error is made a fee can be waived, but not with successive errors in parking - to allow people to adjust to new controls. There are some parking areas CCHA manage for it's residents where even with external parking control we have struggled to stop the public and local businesses from impacting negatively on resident parking. The Council needs to be more actively involved in areas like this and partnership work as one land owner cannot control parking on its own, so I would welcome closer working on this. There is a need to talk to all those affected in an area about parking issues and for us not to try to work in isolation to find the best resolution to problems.	It will be important to work with land owners like CCHA in these areas for the same reasons as put in Q1 and Q3. There will be both negative and positive impacts I'm sure. If you are bringing in controls that limit or change what people have become accustomed too over a long period of time I feel there is bound to be even conflict and complaint. Parking issues for some can be very emotive and can have significant impacts on individuals and their lives. It will be important that equality impacts are considered. For others, long overdue parking control in their areas is needed. I would want you to ensure you communicate closely with us at CCHA so we can try to help our residents engage in any process where they will be forced to change parking habits.	We have sites near schools, if parking controls are brought in around these areas our own car parks for residents could have negative impacts with the public looking to park in these areas instead. This could also impact on our staff, contractors and partners who need to be able to visit our sites. We already have the odd site near a school where there are parking issues, it will be important that any parking changes are monitored and for the Council to be flexible in it's review of this and listen to the community and local landowners. So if a parking control scheme does not work that they look to change it and work in partnership with us.	Will these areas be more wider than they currently are, will they start to impact on resident parking and people needing to pay to park near their homes - so bringing in an extra unforeseen cost to where you live? Whilst I completely understand the pollution issues in towns and cities and need to address this, I am concerned that residents in social housing may be more disadvantaged than others in these scenarios. If a scheme is brought in, in say a year's time, there are a lot of people who cannot suddenly change their car to a more modern one with lower emissions. It could lead to social exclusion for some within the borough on lower incomes.	Any technology should also be used to communicate to road users and help people to understand new parking controls and not just be seen as revenue boost for the Council. Penalising people without good communication will just alienate them to what is actually intended - better use of the limited parking resources across the borough. Communication needs to be understandable to all and clear.
11	No					
12	Yes. the draft policy sets out to reduce car ownership and encouraging the use of public transport, walking or cycling. Many of us south of the borough have no choice but to drive into work. Public transport is expensive, slow, unreliable and dirty. Walking two hours into work - sweaty and tired is really not on. If the transport fares were cheaper and trains and buses reliable, we would have an option.	Free flow of traffic is important, but so is reasonable and inexpensive parking charges.	Yes. Understand the requirement for CPZ, but the cost is high.	No	Yes. Unless motorists are buying new cars, they should not be penalised.	No
13	None	Positive impact if it is implemented well. Excessive double yellow lines in residential areas has now made parking more difficult in my local area. Chase inconsiderate parking, rather than those who stay over a meter time for a few minutes, in particular inconsiderate parking by parents near schools, who "have to drop their children door to door.	Negatively impacts day to day life. Parking is already excessively expensive in Croydon, adding more expense will deter people from shopping into Croydon.	Enforce existing parking restrictions, educate parents that hazard lights do not excuse bad or entitled driving. School streets are a good idea IF they are in operation when schools are in operation, rather than 24/7	Majority of the pollution is made during the manufacture of the car, however this is missed. I drive an older car as it is cheaper to run, when the majority of cars are low emissions then this will be fair, until then another cash cow at the expense of the motorist.	
14	It will have a negative impact on me if parking provision is cut. Not EVERYBODY can or is able to cycle everywhere. It will have a negative impact on local businesses if people cannot park near the shops.		negative. parking fees are too expensive. paying in advance on a mobile phone is unfair when you do not know how long you want to park for. you end up over paying			

15	Only positive as parking is a nightmare	It's all fine and well but no one polices disabled spaces I can never get one able bodied people already have taken them				
16	Nothing obvious. Not where I live. Would hope that more is done to reduce parking near schools. Also more could be done about roads where parking is not suitable but where there is no management, e.g Coombe Lane, Oaks Road and other areas.	Final bullet point re resources - would like to see this in action as there is often poor/dangerous parking in places but as there is no parking management - yellow lines etc - then vehicles are able to park unsafely	Allowing parking in cycle lanes	Hopefully safer near schools and fewer vehicles	Better air quality would be a positive impact on the community.	Could inform decision about whether to use the car or take public transport
17	We need as many new cycle lanes as possible and these where possible should have a small raised divider which separates them from the road but which is still traversable to bikes and vehicles where necessary (e.g. moving out the way of emergency vehicles, turning right, re-joining cycle lanes). Positive impacts from encouraging healthier lifestyles, and improving air quality.	Continuing on a similar theme but looking at the borough more generally I think it is essential to increase the cost of street parking. Currently driving based emissions account for 25% of all pollution in the UK ( see Health Impacts of Cars in London â€œ Mayor of London Report) yet parking continues to be extremely cheap (see explainer video - <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2018/oct/30/why-we-should-be-paying-more-for-parking-video-explainer">https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2018/oct/30/why-we-should-be-paying-more-for-parking-video-explainer</a> ). When parking is cheap, more people buy cars, this results in higher car usage. More parking on streets and more car journeys reduces space for public transport and slows it down, in effect starting a vicious circle which further increase car journey times. In Croydon the cost of a first resident permit is Â£80 pounds almost a fraction of the cost of other London Boroughs such as Islington (Â£475), Enfield (Â£330), Lambeth (Â£306), Camden (Â£296). Even in neighbouring Wandsworth the cost of a first permit (Â£146-166) is more than the cost of a second car permit per property in Croydon Â£126. Having two cars is rarely a necessity and should not be charged so cheaply when each extra journey has a huge social cost. We should therefore be hugely increasing the cost of a second car permit.	We do not need more parking! Quite the opposite! Pavement space is needed to make pavements accessible environments that people want to use to encourage walking. This is unacceptable. People need space to walk and pollution is already breaking legal levels in many areas, more parking is not the answer.	This is a good idea.	Second car permits should be made much more expensive as mentioned in question 4	
18	Charging points are essential. Issues regarding restricting delivery vehicles to private and business addresses.	All streets should have some form of parking restriction. Only focusing CPZ in some areas impacts the surrounding non-CPZ streets and my ability to park. Times should be extended in CPZ up to midnight. The increase of EVCP will impact on normal bays as they will decrease.				
19		Ensure sufficient blue badge parking at key facilities	Parking officials should take a reasonable approach to potential parking offences. For example not giving tickets if a car overhangs a parking space when there are free spaces. The current attitude sometimes seems more based on revenue maximisation than common sense		Emissions based charges needs to take account of resident's ability to afford new cars. Many residents need cars but can't afford new low emission vehicles. It would be unreasonable to load residents who are least able to afford higher costs with such charges. It suggests political grandstanding.	
20	There are both positive impacts on me and all who drive or walk on the pavements. Too much emphasis is being placed on cyclists, and not much on vehicle owners. Too much rspace given to cyclists, who pay no taxes, and vehicle owners who pay taxes to keep vehicles on the road is being punished. Many small companies will go out of busines and closed putting many out of work because of the aggressive stance on motorists. They have to rely on their vehicles to transport goods, or drive to make deliveries but more and more road spaces are being given to cyclists. We put too much traffic lights in cities so vehicles has to stop constantly causing polutions. Pedestrians should be put under roars or overhead causing vehicles to run smoothly. Definitely will on both local and the wider community. As though we all want clean air, and understands the drive for cleaner vehicles on the road, too many people in government local and national hate vehicles. The positive impact is clean air and better traffic management yes, but who will pay? The local trader will always have to foot the bill! Motorists pay taxes, cyclists dont.. The negative is that too many small traders are being forced out of business as electric vehicles are far too expensive for some. So many have to rely on the old vehicles to keep business afloat.	Not positive, only negative, the poor will pay for your mismanagement. Too much pressure on the motorists, people are being charged in hospitals to be sick.	Control parking zones are a joke, we only punish the poor. Hospitals should be a free parking zone. People are being charged to be ill! This country is a joke!	People have to drop off their children on way to work. They must be allowed to drive and park in those areas. It is a joke we are cutting traffic when people need to drive to get to the train or bus after dropping off children. We are destroying communities with these restricts that are penal.	I give up, this is too long, I dont have time for this.	I give up, this is too long, I dont have time for this.



21	Collaboration should be beneficial	Work in community with parking permit visiting 5 people each day. North borough is well connected but need car for South for business. South borough often neglected.	Cpz confusing. I have often been fined because I did not see or understand the signage. People will be frustrated at more enforcement without better signage.	Live near school and dangerous pulling out as cars park everywhere causing chaos. School walking buses should help	Confusing for people. Machines are complicated enough for parking.	Don't understand virtual loading bay. Like idea of traffic real time. Digital only parking bad for older generation.
22	with the ULEZ in place extended to larger areas of London and Kingston having a similar charge, this is forcing people who have no means to purchase a new car into more debt. This should be reviewed in 5 years when the ULEZ and its extension has borne some fruit. I do not believe charging for higher emissions if fair on the less affluent of residents.	no	there are roads where more spaces can be created, like mine Bisenden Rd	none	with the ULEZ in place extended to larger areas of London and Kingston having a similar charge, this is forcing people who have no means to purchase a new car into more debt. This should be reviewed in 5 years when the ULEZ and its extension has borne some fruit. I do not believe charging for higher emissions if fair on the less affluent of residents. Negative impact on community.	there is not enough information here to comment, please consider those who do not have access to or are not tech savvy
23	No	Can you address the process/support for drop kerb installation - if more people are able to install/access their own front gardens this will remove pressure for on street parking. Can you be clearer about how parking changes can be requested - for example where a development such as a new supermarket is being introduced. At the moment it's not clear how you can request a parking review and who is responsible for responding.	No	No	How will you define the thresholds for emission based charging - the DVLA do not hold accurate information on whether a vehicle has been retrofitted, etc.	No
24						
25	I work at Croydon hospital, they have sold car park at same time council must of known for planning permission, now pay and display everywhere. Makes parking very difficult especially as very unsafe area and working unsociable hrs. Poor transport options unless you want to pay for 2 buses. Local economy will suffer if no suitable parking. Already difficult to get staff now we will suffer further. Negative. People will find it harder and more expensive to work due to local transport. May as well work in London where u get better London weighting. Croydon already a dead town with disaster shopping centre.	Parking in local shopping areas already ruining areas. I will travel with car to Bromley West Wickham where cheaper and easier to park. Croydon will suffer. Croydon is already suffering. Flats everywhere no family housing. Parking will be another nail in its coffin. Do you want to make Croydon a no go area where gangs rule streets.	Negative if parking becomes expensive or harder people will drive their car to other areas where easier to park. West Wickham. Beckenham. Purley way. Croydon local areas will die	School crossing control is needed. The lack of these does not help. If their was safety for kids parents would be happier for them to walk. Plus need improve safety on streets parents will not change. If stabbing / gangs not challenged I will still drive. Doesn't matter what you do. It will impact negatively on the community.		Don't forget the older people. Not everyone is digitally gifted. Technology is not everything
26	none so far	I would like to see zero parking during term time near schools. This includes dropping children off	no	yes make parking near schools during term time an offense including dropping off. Will not impact on community.	yes who is going to pay for new cars? People cannot always afford to upgrade to the latest car.	Yes make it easy to find and to contact someone if you have a query.
27	The intensified use of land by the building of flats in the Borough is being advanced in the face of limited road space. The need for cars is not going away so we should be looking at more car pools, underground car parks in the centre but reasonably priced if shoppers are not to be deterred from visiting central Croydon. Bigger subsidies for small electric cars needed to reduce pollution in the often traffic choked roads. The competition for road space is going to mean conflict between drivers unless new developments are moderated and have sufficient on site parking. Maybe parking space should be prioritised for electric cars. Visiting/ delivery traffic needs parking space. Lack of parking for delivery vehicles and tradesmen makes their job difficult and stressful.	These are laudable aims but don't forget underground parking as an option. Paris has many such car parks along with other European cities., some quite small like Bruges. Obviously more walking benefits health and reduces demand on NHS.	Certainly needed but the roads have to be wide enough to do this. The planners are approving flats fronting footpaths making all these laudable intentions a nonsense. There must be joined up planning between transport and hi house building. No impact on community as long as the roads are wide enough for parked cars in the first place.	A laudable aim but hard to implement. Kids are not made to look after themselves earlier enough and a bit getting enough exercise. Driving near schools is going to be slow going at peak times.	To get people to try electric cars they need to be cheaper to buy and range anxiety addressed. I am not in favour of yet more punishment of motorists. They are being milked mercilessly by Govt as it is with all sorts of negative consequences for the high street and the economy. UK needs to be market leader in electric car manufacturing. Hostility towards Government from the high charges. Incentivise people not punish them if you want lasting change	I don't know what half this stuff means. Clarify for lay folk.
28	Linking fees to emissions is fair and sensible. Retaining resident spaces near to my house is essential, any reduction would be vigorously opposed. On road curb-side charging points for electric vehicles will be needed if we are to be encouraged to go electric. The policy of allowing the development of large blocks of flats for private sale with no allocation of residents parking is naïve and unworkable. Get real please! I trust the council to make good decisions. The move away from private to public transport is timely but can only be successful if the public improves faster than the private is discouraged.	Your policy stated above: - "needs of local residents for parking near to home." is laudable but there is little evidence of its sincerity in light of planning permissions for large density private flats with no parking entitlement. The notion that the resultant number of cars belonging to local residents can be accommodated is as foolish as the notion that each home can manage 3 wheelie bins without clogging up the public realm to an unacceptable degree. Again greater thought and more realistic planning is necessary. I hope for good sense to prevail and I am optimistic by nature. In reality I actually expect negative impacts because the problem is bigger than the current proposed solutions.	I hope for good sense to prevail and I am optimistic by nature. In reality I actually expect negative impacts because the problem is bigger than the current proposed solutions.	School streets are essential to protect young childrens' developing lungs. Any inconvenience to motorists is irrelevant and their rights do not match the prospective harm that can ensue. Do not back down on this plan. Objections are a certainty but good sense must prevail. Pollution is a killer, Councillors have a duty to be both courteous and candid in confirming that the school streets are not optional but compulsory.	As previously stated, I agree to the fairness of this policy provided that the provision of spaces remains at or above the current level. The price rises will be opposed as are any price rises in any circumstances. Good communications programmes can mitigate this provided that the provision as per section 9 is not simultaneously reduced.	New technology should help although pricing and capacity will be the factors on which your proposals and results will be measured. No reason to anticipate negativity as 99% drivers have smart phones. Capacity and pricing are bigger issues.

29	You should keep to the promises you made to the residents in the Beulah Grove area. By making it cheaper for family to park in the bays when visiting not the misled 50pence reduction. Also deal with abandoned cars quicker than a months notice you loose revenue so does the government. No impact on community what so ever	Again making promises that you cannot keep to the state of the roads and marking are discussing around the whole of the Croydon area.	Yes as answered in section 1. You should keep to the promises you made to the residents in the Beulah Grove area. By making it cheaper for family to park in the bays when visiting not the misled 50pence reduction. Also deal with abandoned cars quicker than a months notice you loose revenue so does the government	More pressure should be put on parents who just ignore the request not to park near schools more parking bays should be put around the area to stop this	They should be lowered as not everyone can afford the prices.	None
30	positive	Positive impact.	The Council should consider borough-wide CPZ as was done in Wandsworth. It prevents displacements. It also brings revenue and creates jobs. Positive if implemented borough-wide.	Positive to close streets near schools and encourage parents and children to walk more. Positive to enforce closure of streets near schools twice a day.	Positive impact to make polluter pays. Positive impact if implemented borough-wide.	Positive impact
31	I hate Croydon parking policy at weekends which is killing the town centre I used to shop in Croydon every weekend, now everything is online because of parking charges. Please innovate and designate Sundays as free on street parking day. Parking charges will cause the death of Croydon central retail	Fine if free on Sundays. Continued weekend charging will kill Croydon	none on me, but impact on retail	Good idea if can separate residents from school runners. More children walking to school is good. Penalising residents is bad	Make on street parking free every Sunday	none
32	Yes, what is missing from this is consideration of residents only parking around busy stations and schools. We are plagued by people parking over our driveway because of this. You also don't seem to be addressing the issue of lack of parking for new developments, which is becoming a problem also. It will probably make parking worse in residential areas generally.	Regardless of your aim to reduce car use, this cannot happen without improving public transport in tandem with this. And currently it is cheaper to drive into Croydon and park than it is for me to take my family on the train. I believe your plans are well intentioned, but unrealistic	This is great if you are addressing parking in residential areas that have stations and schools. We constantly have people parking half over our drive, which makes it dangerous to get the car in and out. Positive if it is actually enforced. Currently it's often impossible to get through to your parking enforcement people and the phone just rings out. If you are going to implement these rules, you need to staff the department properly.	If this can be done effectively it would be great. The pedestrian crossings near to our school are dangerous. People often drive right through and this happens daily. Who is going to enforce this? We have a big problem with people sitting outside the school with their engines running, which crates visible pollution.	Seems fair so long as you have some allowance for business vehicles until they can be upgraded to meet the requirements. Very positive. There are some horrendously polluting vehicles here. Who is going to police or enforce this though? Are you employing more staff?	Nine of this matters if you aren't going to enforce things. Apps and virtual loading etc. Are pointless I'd no one is monitoring it. Positive if you enforce it properly.
33	I think that motorbike, scooter and bicycle use need to be encouraged. I suspect that there will be a negative effect.	I don't know. I have concerns about the number of overweight lorries that are parked on the streets and nothing is done about them and that companies are using the streets to park their vehicles on	Controlled parking is a nightmare, it impacts on being able to use local shops as you have to park so far away and are unable to carry goods, I hate that front gardens are being lost to park cars on. Maybe there should be a cop on the number of cars per household, some households now have 4 or 5 cars. It always affects the elderly and disabled and poorer people.	Good luck with that one! Road rage will just happen further away! Anyone who is unfortunate enough to live near a school will be in a living hell, I envisage them all parking on my road if you introduce school streets	No No No, that is not fair, it is always the poor that suffer, I can't afford to get a new car	I don't really understand the plan. I always find technology to be a pain. I no longer use the self check out in supermarkets because it always fails. I also object to big brother knowing where I am. I don't think there will be many benefits unless you offer a dual o[tion of cash and tech.
34	Need more details. To soon to comment.	No	No	Negative	Unfair on diesel owner	
35	No commercial vehicles should be allowed to park in residential streets					
36				As a resident on a street near Woodcote schools my family and other residents have been negatively impacted. We are regularly blocked on/off our drives by inconsiderate school parents. We also suffer regular rudeness from said parents. The problem is not resolved, simply moved. Parents do not want to walk and will always cause obstruction by parking in the area closest to schools. Taxing sugar is not the solution to obesity, getting parents to walk their children to school is.	Another money making scheme. The 20 mph zones are causing considerably more pollution, removing these would reduce pollution without the need for her another form of tax	
37	Being forced to pay for inconvenience and something I don't want. Worsening traffic. More financial punishment for drivers and being forced to pay for things which inconvenience drivers.	Deal with those that park selfishly. I expect more parking spaces to disappear that are already at a premium.	Manage increased demand for parking by making less spaces available??	Have a consultation on those who carry out the school run to see where it is necessary.	How much pollution will be caused by the increased demand for electricity? Also what about the harmful by-products of electric vehicle components. Will those that intend to use the infrastructure eg cycle lanes, charging points be expected to pay for it or all of us be saddled with the cost, whether we want it or not? Use of the road causes wear and tear - there should be no exemptions/road users that pay nothing. Another stealth tax on motorists. Once we have been sold the green dream, it will be taxed the hell out of. Will all be made to drive the same soulless, monitorable, ugly boxes soon.	What about those unable to use technology? Expect the technology to be used to think of creative taxation



38	My road is depressingly clogged up with parked cars (including my own). It appears a nationwide problem, which requires a nationwide solution. I doubt the council can resolve the root problem, which is that car ownership is simply too high in densely populated towns. For me personally, the policy does not go far enough in supporting the development of the alternative to the car, such as better public transport and active travel facilities. If the over-reaching aim was truly ambitious about getting people out of polluting cars then the policy should give more priority to creating space for cycling and walking, at the expense of the priority on providing parking bays. Electric and shared cars are equally problematic to cycling and walking, in terms of space and road safety. A change in average fuel type will help pollution, but it will not in itself encourage active travel.	Good to see the policy want parking management to help giving priority to cycling and walking. I try to walk, but find the aggressive traffic, noise and pollution too much. I try the bus, but find it irregular and at times packed with people right in your face (coughing and spluttering at this time of year). In fear of ending up in an ambulance or worse, I wouldn't try to cycle in Croydon. The car is slow and bad, but it offers me at a comfortable ride. Why does the policy not aim to maximise enforcement on main roads, where it is much needed? Too many drivers pull up at shops and cash points, causing obstruction to other traffic and busses. It is a big put off to cyclists. The drivers may only stop for 5 minutes, but the constancy of the many drivers stopping can make it a practically permanent unmanaged obstruction in some places. It needs an anti-social campaign. The policy generally lacks campaigning and education objectives.	I want overall less cars parking in my road. Cars are intrusive and unsightly. Give me back the space and freedom that I had as a kid. It never hurt me cycling and walking as a kid, when there was much fewer cars about. Maybe my car-free childhood world was less productive and economically unviable today. I don't know. CPZs should offer less bays that there is car ownership in a road. Introduce long stretches of clear space, where no-one can park. In particular on bends and near junctions. Without national disincentives, it is the only way the local council can help reduce car dependency and improve the local environment.	No opinion	No opinion on personal impact. Emissions charging can help pollution, but its main direct effect is to switch people to lesser polluting cars. It is anti-social that we don't care for the harm we are causing to the vulnerable. It will not in itself encourage a switch to active travel. The only way to reduce car dependency in problem areas is to price out most parking, including for residents, and reduce the number of available parking bays. People who cannot cope without a car can then make an economic decision to move to a lesser densely populated area, selling their home to someone who is willing to cope without a car. Those who absolutely want to own a car they should live further out of town. This would eventually resolve the parking problems in residential roads.	I personally find the parking meters unsightly and look forward to seeing them gone. I like an open clean pavement. Maybe also give more consideration to the siting of signs and lamp posts as well. They are obstructive to pedestrians in places. The policy aims seem very sensible. Technology can help making a difference. Informing the drivers would make them choose the best time to drive and make them choose not to drive at times when parking conditions are already impossible.
39			The number of housing plots, which previously only had one dwelling, being developed into blocks of flats (all approved by Croydon Council despite protests by local residents) is likely to produce more CPZ's in the south of the borough.			
40	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user	Cyclists should be insured and taxed and pay for parking like any other road user
41	Less car use will reduce pollution. However, public transport need to improve with more reliable, frequent, affordable transport. Local small business may suffer. Elderly, disabled people and people with heavy shopping (a bag of potatoes) will find travelling with public transport very challenging.					
42	No	My partner has a blue badge and we have a disabled bay outside our house. He is very disabled and completely reliant on access to this parking space which allows him to remain independent. However, when he is out, I frequently see other blue badge holders park in the space and then walk perfectly ably to their home or place of work. We feel there should be a 2 tier system for those who are absolutely reliant on disabled spaces outside their home or elsewhere, and those for whom it is a convenience, but not a necessity. Too many blue badges appear to be issued to those with little or no mobility issues which causes huge problems for those genuinely in need.	Please refer to my previous comments regarding disabled bays. = My partner has a blue badge and we have a disabled bay outside our house. He is very disabled and completely reliant on access to this parking space which allows him to remain independent. However, when he is out, I frequently see other blue badge holders park in the space and then walk perfectly ably to their home or place of work. We feel there should be a 2 tier system for those who are absolutely reliant on disabled spaces outside their home or elsewhere, and those for whom it is a convenience, but not a necessity. Too many blue badges appear to be issued to those with little or no mobility issues which causes huge problems for those genuinely in need.	None	None	No
43	no impact on me. Negative for community, the amount of new housing in the town centre is increasing but car parking isn't					
44	It omits lack of parking caused by housing developments on current parking sites reducing the amount of parking available on high streets. Further exacerbated by not enough parking available for houses being built anyway. This is having significant impact on our high street (Coulsdon). If there is no parking for people to use around the high street then people don't visit the high street, resulting in multiple shops closing as we are already seeing. Independent shops especially are massive contributors to our community which is also deteriorating. Parking will provide - more business investment, better community and happier locals!	Again the number of parking spaces available is the primary concern that needs to be addressed. Particularly near high street and train stations. Currently I don't use council or business services on the high street as I often can't find a parking space and can only stay for 1hr Max when I do get one anyway. It is a stupid assumption that building lots of new houses with less spaces will not make the problem even worse! We can't use the high street because we can't get near it by car. I have two kids and going shopping locally by bus is more difficult than driving to a big supermarket. Coulsdon has spectacular independent shops and council services (such as library activities for kids) which I would love to support if only I could get there and park.	Primary issue is that there is simply not enough high street parking available. Exacerbated by increased social housing with not enough additional parking provided Secondary issue is that only having an hour max stay is not enough to use services (ie if I want to attend an hours kids class at library). Don't mind paying extra for longer but useless if can't stay longer at all. Impact on businesses as people aren't using high street in local towns	None	Good principle. Don't mind paying a limited amount as long as can park for long enough	Cashless payment would be really helpful. Wouldn't want all investment in technology though to detriment of basic requirements like more parking bays in local towns (Coulsdon, purley etc). In Coulsdon all parking bays are always full as there are so few of them. Cashless payment would be more convenient for sure but would probably not impact high street business.

45	Croydon is the only borough where use of cars has increased in the past 20 years while cycling has decreased. We need more and better cycling infrastructures. The ones I used to commute from Foresdale to my son's school and then to central Croydon (over 4 miles) are poor. We also need better tram timing and extensions so people can rely on trams to go to more places. Tram is faster than cars. We also need to be able to take bikes on trams, this will help people to cycle more if they know they can move their bikes more easily and will stop them taking cars. Cycle infrastructure should be separated from roads and take road space rather than green space to encourage people to cycle more which would mean less parking space needed. We don't need more parking, we need better bus/tram service, better cycling infrastructure and to think about removing car from the road. Car share is also a very good project as people don't always use car everyday. We would get rid of our car if there was something easy to use close to ours.	introduce parking more on the outskirts of towns so town centres are for pedestrians and provide better cycling/bus/tram infrastructure. Removing cars should be the priority rather than safeguarding parking space for them.	remove the need for cars so there will be less pressure to have parking spaces. Those kind of zones don't work that well unless you make parking unaffordable like northern countries are starting to do.	offer other alternatives such as provide more school bus services so parents won't feel they need to take their kids to school by car. Less traffic by schools would be nice. At the moment, I don't feel safe taking my son to his nursery based on the traffic amount and when he is bigger, I am not sure I will want him to cycle there on a separate bike so I would welcome less cars and better infrastructure	we should shift to no vehicles and have only emergency services exception. Black cabs should not be excluded and delivery vans only during out of rush hours time to reduce pollution impacts. Less pollution will be good as people with asthma would be able to exercise more outside	not sure what this will add
46	The constant new builds and enlargement of schools etc of course impacts on street parking. It is you that gives the planning permission so that's where the problem lies. Pointing out parking problems with new builds rarely if ever halts the build. Negative impact of course. Parking on the public highway is not a right but having it made more difficult by ill thought out plans is a problem.					
47	There are too many apartments etc being built especially in central Croydon. The additional residents will impact on congestion on public transport as well as schools, NHS facilities etc					
48	Yes the continuing building of flats in spaces where homes were, and squeezing in more back garden development just displaces cars into the surrounding areas. Again public transport provision in this area is woefully inadequate very expensive. The notion that because a development is close to a station and therefore very little need to provide parking is at odds with the realities of living here, not everyone has a 9-5 London job. Many work shifts and go outside the borough to areas poorly serviced by public transport. Local schools oversubscribed as well as GPs a car is essential.				The proposed differential permit charges for vehicles which are diesel and older, dramatically impacts on the budgets of lower earning residents who depend on the car for jobs as they are likely to work shifts and find public transport unavailable at the times they need to get to work. We were encouraged to buy diesel and now are stuck with vehicles that we can't replace.	
49	I am concerned that you are considering people having to purchase parking permits to park in their own streets (place of residence). This has happened in other boroughs under all sorts of guises and is fundamentally unfair and solely money making. Financial burdens put on those who can least afford it to maintain a standard of living.	All sounds good as long as residents are NOT going to have to pay to park near their place of residence. Have seen awful systems in place in other local authorities where parking permit systems have financially crippled local residents.	Areas already exist in Croydon where recent parking restrictions have made it very difficult to continue to support small businesses that I have been supporting for years. Croydon has become so run down impacted by expensive parking and parking restrictions meaning people go elsewhere to shop etc. So many retail units have shut down, there are empty units everywhere and those struggling because of recent parking restrictions/ charges.. Personally I have had to spend a lot longer driving around to find parking that didn't incur charges etc hence less environmentally friendly. Picking children/ people up can involve just keep driving around instead of parking up and waiting for them etc.	OK as long as they are really necessary and not just ticking boxes re adhering to a policy.	This really targets those who can least afford it, those who cannot afford to replace their vehicles, however much they would like to drive a low/no emission car. Very unfair, socially divisive policy. As above- socially divisive- favours those who can afford to regularly replace their vehicles.	Need to consider those who do not have access to parking apps etc

50	If you are going to encourage people to walk, perhaps you should do something about all the vehicles parked on and blocking the pavements, so that people can walk without so much risk of being hit by a vehicle, either when we're on the pavement or because we have to walk in the road. It would also help if the parking rules, level of traffic and other services were co-ordinated a little better. I expect you to do whatever you've already decided to do, as you've drafted the policy before asking for opinions from residents.	You are asking the questions in the wrong order. How are you deciding the needs?	No	Perhaps you could mark the cycle paths more clearly. I understood that it was illegal to cycle on the pavement, yet many people do so, and not just small children.	And what about the effect on houses of large lorries with their engines running whilst they unload? this is not just pollution, it's also potentially damaging the building - we can feel the vibrations, and the stat of the kerbs and pavements are laughable!	I think you should allow cashless payments which do not require apps or signing in. Shops do not usually require membership - I can buy something in a shop simply by paying with a card - why does buying a ticket for parking have to be more complicated? And what is a virtual loading bay? You are talking about real, physical goods being delivered either to someone's home or to a shop where people walk in and pick real physical things off a shelf - like food? I don't see how there can be any "virtual" about this. If it's software which is downloaded, there is neither vehicle nor parking involved.
51	We need more and better sign posted parking for motorcycles and bicycles. For example, the pedestrian ramp access to the central library often has bicycles chained to the hand rails which can make it impossible to use it. If you get round the corner of the ramp and are then unable to let go of the rail to turn round then you have to wait for someone to help you. A large sign indicating where the bicycle parking is located would be useful.	I can't remember the last time there was an empty disabled parking space in Fell Road. Or anywhere on-street in central Croydon.			How on earth are you going to do that?!!!!	
52	There is not enough consideration about parking spaces taken by council. The council give planning permission to all kind of new buildings including high rise residential buildings but NOT ENOUGH thought has been given to parking spaces. There are not enough parking spaces available to all residents. There should be compulsory requirement to build underground car parking spaces for all new buildings especially multi-storey/ high rise buildings. Somehow council doesn't see this as the problem but really should look 15-20 years in the future and how the current decision will impact the local residents. The objectives set by the council are seem to be valid i.e. deliveries to businesses and residents, cycle lanes, etc. however it is quite tight already in terms of space therefore it would be very hard task as in no doubt there will be negative impact by taking the space away from cars and given to cycling lanes, cycle parking, etc.	The positive impact yes once has been thoroughly studied and thought through. The consultations with local residents and businesses may be helpful. Needs of local residents for parking near to home. So far council did not show enough clear and deep thought of managing of CPZ zones in Croydon area creating domino's effect by creating zones in one area but not thoroughly studying and thinking about the impact on the surrounding areas. That had a massive impact on the residents which are struggling to get on with their normal lives, i.e. not be able to park the cars near on the roads due to other residents trying to dodge the fare on their CPZ road and get free parking on surrounding roads where the parking is still free.	Again, with regards to objective the council should think about any new planning permission given to potential developers. The creation of parking facilities MUST BE compulsory element/part of planning permission. The developers should be responsible by designing and creating enough parking spaces for new residents and its guests, deliveries, etc. At the moment it seems council looks on one side being having extra residents and revenue coming in in the form of council tax but there are other important areas to consider such as: waste collection, recycling, deliveries and of course parking. It is imperative to think about the future of the Croydon and its residents as we all want to live and do business with the pleasure in mind not nightmare. The CPZ zones are must have in the current situation. There are many cars on the roads and not enough space. If Croydon wants to introduce cycling lanes and cycling parking and get people out of their cars and on bikes, the people local residents want be sure that if they cycle to station or shop they can leave their bike safely in there, so when they return the bike is still there in one piece. Once that is created the people will see this as a better option than cars.	That is definitely good idea. Creating no cars pick up and drop off school should be priority. If more of us - parents start using the public transport and walk to school rather than cars the school area will be much safer with cleaner air.	Whilst this will of course have a negative impact on me, my family and our disposable income I do agree with this and the charges should be based on vehicle emissions. The lower emission there lower charge should be. Positive impact on community would be that people will finally get rid off old cars and before they purchase the new car they will think twice and benchmark cars based on their emission to environment, so cleaner air for us all.	Agreed, Thumbs up!
53	Positive impact. I cannot wait for it to take place. The increase in "Residents parking Permits" is well overdue. This is the outcomes from house conversions into flats. And where each flat sometimes owns two cars. Also most house previously with one car now own two or more cars. I am a supporter and encourage the council to proceed with this change as soon as possible. This will hopefully lead to a change in behaviours and less conflict between neighbours.	No negative impacts. All objectives are positive. I cannot wait for it to take place.	No negative impacts. All are positive. Positive impact. I cannot wait for it to take place.	Parking within 100metres of schools must be banned at all times. As schools are often used for other events "out of times". Positive impact. I cannot wait for it to take place.	Yes up the charges. Croydon has excellent public transport system. Positive impact on community. I cannot wait for it to take place.	Good idea. Positive impact. I cannot wait for it to take place.
54	My husband is a disabled cab driver. I am concerned that these plans - whatever they are; there are no details whatsoever so its hard to answer these questions - will have a negative impact on him by increasing parking costs and limiting cab points. Please remember that disabled people are cab drivers too, not just unemployed (although he will soon be unemployed if the costs of being a cab driver continue to massively increase). Like many others I need my car to get about. I live in Sanderstead and to e.g. get to Purley, the buses take absolutely ages and require 2 buses. Once on the bus, there's no space for bags so it's not a viable option when shopping. The trains in the area are horrendous, parking at stations is very expensive and the trains run every 15 or 30 minutes depending on the time day. If the parking in local areas is going to be decimated please do not just expect people to use public transport without increasing the provision. Please also remember that some people cannot cycle.		What are your actual plans? Why are you consulting on an aim to 'Understand x, y, z'. What happens once you understand? If the aim 'Understand x, y, z' actually means that parking will be even more restricted in the area then it already is, then cheaper daily deals need to be provided near stations and in central Croydon.	Please do not assume that people could easily walk to school but just don't bother. The only way to 'help people walk' is to enable them to drop the kids off at 7am so they have time to walk home again before the commute, or to walk to the nearest station etc to get to work. Or, ensure each child attends school within half a mile of their home. Also, remember that disabled people will probably need to drive to school to drop their kids off. My husband had to do this and the school staff can make it very difficult by not opening gates for ages/making him ask for entry every single day and also by parking in the disabled bay themselves (when not disabled).	If I could afford to buy a new low emission car then I would. Punishing me for being poor by charging me a higher parking rate for having an older car seems very unfair and will mean I have less money to save for a new low emission car. My car is not a high polluter and its not diesel, but its not a new hybrid car either.	

55	I would like Residents Associations to be included in the collaboration process. Not able to judge.	The objective should not be to maximise paid parking arrangements to maximise revenue.	Should not be introduced to maximise revenue and should not allow long stay parking near to train or other transport stations.	Agree. Positive	Car park charges should not deter shoppers from using town centre car parks. Probably negative impact on community.	
56	I think this is a vital pillar of the policy - without an underpinning impetus to work collaboratively, certain groups will proceed combatively. Groups will moan, and the press will report it, but the aim of the policy is a more noble one, so ignore them.	I am a non-car-owning cyclist. I applaud all this. Policing must be draconian or it won't work (look at the number of drivers who ignore the 20mph speed limits because they think no one is watching them). People will always bend, if not break, the rules from selfishness. I expect outsiders' cars to be parked outside of houses; bus-stops to be taken up with parked cars; pavements blocked by parked private vehicles.	The lengths to which car-owners will go in order to find an overnight parking spot seems to know no bounds: getting home early, and taking up two cars' spaces with one vehicle, so another member of the household can arrive later and park; filling the nearest street with no controls so that residents suddenly have nowhere to park; building new houses with limited parking (good) but not preventing those who live there from owning multiple vehicles. Negative - my road will become flooded with vehicles from further afield. Grass verges will be chewed up. Buses won't be able to move. Unless EVERYWHERE is a CPZ.	The nearest 'car-friendly' street to each school street will become a nightmare, won't it, as drivers finish their journeys there instead of outside the school. Anyone who lives near a school (though not the same street as the school) can expect to have a lot more traffic, I'd have thought.		Although I am not a car-owner nor a car-driver, I do not own a mobile telephone and am concerned at the growing reliance on this technology. A cashless society may reduce the amount of begging on the streets, no?
57	It's too vague to know if there are any positive or negative impacts.	Money should be spent on EVCP's if the Borough reaches a certain number of the vehicles that have this requirement and not before. I do not think that punishing people for owning a non environment car is better than incentivising people. Its better to make an change such as the entire Royal Mail fleet in the Borough of Croydon is now going electric and have both an incentive and cost beneficial reason to put the EVCP in. lead by example. Like they do in the Netherlands or Norway or China where a city has an entire cab fleet of electric cars.	Too vague to answer.	Yes. Positive for the kids, negative for the streets in the proximity of the school during drop off times.	Too vague. I gather ths survey which excludes any real research methodologies was designed by a visiting high school grade 10 work experience kid. The questions are subjective and not objective. Seriously.	
58	There is no mention throughout any of the documents of cycling Quietways development, and in particular about how this may fit with a parking strategy.	Would have preferred inclusion of how parking strategy fits with Secure Parking for cyclists, as outlined in the Croydon 2018-2023 cycling plan.		Croydon is extremely poor at enforcing parking/driving rules it creates. There is routine flouting of no parking rules at my nearest school, with an average of 3 cars dropping off children in the prohibited area each day in the period 0845 - 0900. It would be far preferable for the road to simply be closed if there is not going to be any enforcement of parking rules. Some selfish drivers clearly have no intention of obeying rules put in place for the protection of their own children, justifying further measures to be put in place. I expect significantly positive impacts to arise from School Streets and encourage the fastest and widest implementation possible.	Positive for community, although there is a danger of having multiple levers to achieve the same outcome, given the existing policy levels of Vehicle Emissions Duty and ULEZ. Nonetheless, it is does not seem an unreasonable policy although one which should probably be limited to urban areas.	A comprehensive map of cycling parking would be very welcome, although this needs to be wider than just Croydon. It is difficult to envisage what a virtual loading bay would bay would be, how it would be of benefit and how it would operate - there is insufficient information in the documents. There is a concern that if payment is too seamless then it removes incentives. For example, annual passes are convenient and easy but do not then drive marginal behaviour. There has to be a balance to ensure that payment structures and systems always incentivise the right marginal behaviours. It is difficult to see these proposals having much impact, either positive or negative.
59	At one point in your document you state : "Where there is a cumulative effect from multiple smaller developments in proximity to one another in a CPZ and where good public transport alternatives exist then we will seek to restrict occupiers from eligibility for on-street residential permits." I think it is absolutely wrong to restrict residents from parking near their homes. The Council is seeking to "intensify" the suburbs, including encouraging developers to build small blocks of flats where there once was just one house. Existing residents in these streets then have a more crowded environment. To then prevent them from being able to park near their homes is wrong. All new developments should have adequate parking provided as part of the design.	Existing exemptions for footway / verge parking (which I assume means the current arrangement whereby a car is allowed to park part on the footway to keep the roadway clear) should be maintained, not removed. If cars are prevented from parking part on the footway, it will result in narrow roads becoming even more impassable to traffic.	Controlled Parking Zones should only be introduced if agreed by a majority of local residents in that area. I think it would have a negative effect for the people that live in an area if the introduction of more controlled parking zones meant that residents could no longer park near their homes.		This penalises those on lower incomes. Often, the only car people on lower incomes can afford is an older one which is likely to be one with higher emissions. While I understand the aims behind this policy, I think it is ill-thought through.	
60	Croydon is always busy with cars! Hard to find parking and parking in the town centre too expensive.					



61	<p>Parking for cars is far too restrictive and far too expensive across the borough. While it's understandable in Croydon town centre or near to train stations, there is no need for such a heavy-handed approach across the borough. Even in quiet suburban locations in the borough, car parking is often expensive, with large numbers of parking enforcement officers employed to hand out large punitive fines for minor infractions. In many European towns and cities, city centre parking is free and plentiful. Why? To attract more visitors, of course. I would like to see this approach in Croydon: removal of parking restrictions wherever possible, to attract more visitors to the borough. This will help to increase opportunities and income in Croydon. That depends on what's envisaged. If it's to make car parking more difficult and more expensive, the impact on the borough will be negative. If it's to make car parking easier, cheaper and perhaps free, the impact on the local economy will be very positive. They do this in many European towns and cities and it works very well for them to have free or very cheap (and plentiful) parking in city centres. Croydon retailers and businesses need a boost as the borough is clearly struggling economically at the moment. Please don't base your plans on air pollution. Petrol cars will be finished within about a</p>	<p>Please provide more cycle lanes and bicycle parking please. Since Croydon is twinned with the beautiful Dutch city of Arnhem, I would strongly advise you to go and spend some time in Arnhem to see how they manage traffic, particularly bicycles and cars. We can learn a lot from our European twins, friends and partners; say no to isolationism. It depends on what's envisaged. As you may have gathered, I'm advocating strong and decisive action to bring more visitors into the borough, based on cheaper and better car parking. I'm also advocating strong and decisive action to improve cycling in the borough, particularly more cycle lanes. These two actions are sometimes perceived to be mutually exclusive, but that isn't the case at all. You can promote car use and bicycle use at the same time, you don't have to prioritise one over the other. Just ask the Dutch, they know how to manage these things.</p>	<p>Reduce the number, size and scope of Controlled Parking Zones. Take more decisive action to encourage more visitors coming by car into Croydon retail centres by making parking cheaper and easier. Retailers are really struggling at the moment and need a significant boost. Reduce the number of enforcement officers, and ask them to be more lenient and more polite and considerate. If someone comes to Croydon and gets a £150 parking ticket because they overstayed a meter by one minute, how likely is it that they'll return to the borough? If CPZs are expanded, there will be a negative impact on just about everyone: residents, businesses, retailers, visitors, shoppers and many others. Croydon should be looking to reduce or eliminate some of its CPZs in order to encourage more visitors into the borough and give the local economy a significant boost.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the best way to improve traffic management in school streets is outside your control: staggered starting times. Only schools, and/or the DFES, can introduce staggered starting (and finishing) times for pupils. I would suggest that you campaign to get schools to consider doing this. It won't be easy as many parents and teachers will complain. Otherwise, aim to enhance traffic restrictions (eg speed bumps) in school roads, widen pavements where possible, introduce more bike lanes. Most pupils don't really need to be brought to school by car but a lot of parents worry a lot about what could happen to their children on the way to school or back, such as getting run over. More traffic-calming measures and other measures to help improve the situation of cyclists and pedestrians in school streets would go a long way.</p>	<p>The 'polluter' isn't the driver or the car owner. It's the car manufacturer. Therefore it's irresponsible to increase taxes (i.e. fines) on car owners or drivers. It also hits the poor far harder than it hits the rich (who can afford brand new low-emissions cars) If you don't like air pollution, buy new electric cars for all the people who you think are 'polluters'. Please take some ownership of the problems and stop discriminating against the least well-off in our society. Traffic and parking issues are about the economy as well as the environment. Please don't ignore this fact. Clearly if you're going to start handing out heavy fines to people whose cars are more than 13 years old, then you're going to increase poverty among the poor. Either because they'll have to pay these fines or because they'll have to buy a new car. And they won't even be able to sell the old one, which will become worthless. I don't really understand the British obsession with fines. In other European countries, if you overstay a meter by ten minutes, you'll get a fine of about seven euros. That's perfectly appropriate given the 'offence' which has been committed. In the UK, if you overstay a meter by ten minutes and get caught, you can expect to pay a minimum of £60 (approx 70 euros) and often much more. It's utterly disproportionate.</p>	<p>Replacing pay-and-display parking meters with cashless ones is cruel and barbaric. Many people don't have smartphones. But worst of all, spending 10-15 minutes trying to call some automated service and enter your registration details and bank card number to a computer is a nightmare. It's made me late for numerous appointments. Cash is quick and easy. There are far, far better solutions which you should consider. In France, for example, they have digital parking meters - you enter your registration and it's sent to their computer - but you can pay by cash or card. No need to display a ticket, as the enforcement officers have the info. No need walk back to the car to put the ticket in - just great. Croydon could learn a lot from the French. Digital parking meters which only accept payments by phone should be abolished and outlawed as they have an extremely negative impact on many car drivers, particularly the poor and elderly. They must accept payments by cash and card (at the machine, not by phone) in order to reduce this negative impact.</p>
62	<p>Negative. There is already a fight against car drivers by Croydon Council vis a vis reduced parking spaces, reduced speed limits, narrower roads etc.</p>					
63	<p>I welcome any collaborative approaches to facilitating safer cycling within the borough</p>					
64	<p>Ensure that treatment across the Borough is the same from North to South as at present it is not and different criteria exist - people in the north are deprived of parking spaces because the council considers that public transport is adequate which means people having a car do not have a space to park in the north. I expect this council to consider enlarging the parking zones so that they can make more money out of it - as that seems to be their only objective with parking. Consideration of double yellow lines at junctions where cars are parks illegally has been turned down to the adverse effect on safety for both drivers and pedestrians.</p>	<p>You already fail to ensure you have the resources to enforce your 20 mph zones. I have been overtaken on the wrong side of islands, sworn at, had fists shaken at me for driving at 20 mph. You admit you haven't the resources to deal with this so why make some roads (and in particular Norbury Crescent/Melfort Road) a 20 mph zone. It doesn't make it any safer as the majority of drivers go at 35+ down the road. I can only hope but don't hold my breath. Double yellow lines are needed at all the junctions to prevent people parking right up to the corners thus preventing drivers seeing anything that is coming and endangering pedestrians.</p>	<p>As I have said before the North needs a level playing field with the South. We already suffer greater density per area and greater parking restrictions or lack of parking spaces for new build. It would be good if parking could be sorted. A lot of people in my road have two, three or four cars for one household. It would not seem unreasonable for them to be granted one parking space per house (if they have no run in or garage) - this could be a positive to the area - what you do about the excess cars I am not sure but presumably payment of some description to park more than one car might be a possibility.</p>	<p>If something happened to alleviate this situation it would definitely be a positive for the whole community. Having two schools opposite one another in Kensington Avenue causes absolute mayhem between 3.00 and 4.00 pm each day. Unfortunately Kensington Avenue is used by many people as a 'cut through' to and from the Green Lane area so I assume it would not be possible to make it a school street. However, if you don't want to get into an argument, wait 10 minutes or risk damaging your car you do not drive that way between 3 and 4 pm. As the school leaving time for the secondary school appears to be any time during that hour it makes it more difficult to resolve. Unless school parking restrictions can be made on both sides of Kensington Avenue and for greater lengths I do not see how you are ever going to solve this problem.</p>	<p>Do you have the resources to manage this? How will you check out cars parked in metered bays? Could be chaos with no-one knowing how much to pay for their parking.</p>	<p>I hate having to ring to pay for my parking. What happens to the person who doesn't have a mobile phone? This is discrimination and not a level playing field. The couple of times I have tried to do this, I have wasted at least 10 minutes endeavouring to sort out the instructions. I shall just not come into Croydon any more than I absolutely have to if this is what you are going to do. I feel sorry for the older members of the community who may have to use their cars due to mobility problems and may not have a mobile phone having to cope with this situation. You will be discriminating against them.</p>
65	<p>This is too vague to comment on. Without detail it's impossible to know.</p>	<p>As a set of objectives it's difficult to fault - the key is what you do to deliver it. Impossible to say.</p>			<p>I would assume that emission based charging is another blunt stick to lever money out of what is not a very affluent community. As the mayor is finding, those who have fewer resources have more polluting cars - those with more resources will trade up and avoid EMC.</p>	<p>No detail. The IT needs to be robust or the exercise is pointless.</p>
66	<p>No objections but we must consider solving the problem of rat runs around Croydon. I live in Pawsons Road, and over the last 3 years it has become worse to the point there is constant traffic all day and worse in the mornings and evenings. Also the pay and display needs to be extended across Croydon/Thornton Heath now, as the roads that have not been converted are now a nightmare with little or no passing spaces in what are narrow roads.</p>		<p>Croydon/Thornton Heath needs CPZ across the whole area, otherwise the roads without CPZ will suffer speed restrictions i.e. 20mph need to be enforced better as very little traffic is taking notice of the speed signs</p>	<p>Completely agree, we need to reduce the number of school drop offs and collections. Parts of Thornton Heath become completely congested with parents dropping off and waiting to collect</p>		

67	Basically I know it's very difficult, but parking in parks to my mind is not a good idea, with the pollution & safety aspect, also in my opinion Croydon is overcrowded, hence too many people & too many cars. I know this is not a very sensible statement in connection with the parking dilemma, but I believe all of our cities, the large ones anyways are getting jammed up with too much demand on every service you could name, including of course parking!! If parking was allowed in parks it would take away any peace & quiet that is so difficult to find these days, in connection with box above, too many people with too many cars, something should be done to limit somehow the congestion caused by the overuse of the motor car. Take the school run for example, this is a nightmare that causes no end of problems, with congestion & more pollution with engines running etc, more use of school buses would help?! In general unless something is done to limit the overcrowding of our cities, then the car problem including parking will in my mind only get worse!					
68		People bringing work vans home, parking them in a residential street and they also have 2 cars				
69	Why is there nothing about the provision of strategically placed parking spaces for disabled drivers?	No mention again of the needs of disabled drivers. Negative outcome for disabled drivers.	Again it is as if disabled motorists do not exist. Restricted access for disabled drivers.			
70		When granting planning permission for new developments, ensure that enough parking is included on site to avoid so much road parking				
71	Bike parking will result in bike thefts if security is not given priority. Vandalised bikes left for months before removed are an eye sore and an advert for other thieves.	Sometimes I can not park in my street let alone outside my hour. Why on earth are we building all these high rise flats without adequate parking arrangements. People will always need cars.	People in our road voted against CPZ because they have off street parking. I do not have off street parking. It was the cost of the permits that put them off. Permits should be dirt cheap or better so free then you will get more votes for CPZ	I don't live near a school. I feel for parents dropping their children off for school and then having to go to work. Why should they pay a childminder to take their children to school so they have time to catch a bus or train that frequently lets them down	Not affected personally. All congestion and low emission charges should be low. People's livelihoods are at stake here. I feel for people who bought diesel cars at the government's suggestion.	Not everyone is on the internet Not everyone pays on their phone
72	I am 73 and I have lived in Central Croydon all my life. I use a bike or walk to get around generally but I have a car for visiting friends and family who live further away. I also use the car for when I get my heavy food shopping. I do not like the idea of paying £300 for a parking permit because I live in Croydon. Put the charge on people driving into Croydon (especially the Council workers who are given free passes to park in Central Croydon) they should be paying to come into work as everyone else has to. Croydon's best assets are the planting of the roundabouts. Over the last 10 years of trying to be a green council they have managed to put in ridiculously short cycle lanes. Then narrow the roads, widen the pavements and remove cycle lanes. Now you are suggesting putting back cycle lanes! Car parking has ridiculously long hours on metered areas and car parks are too expensive for shoppers. I love Croydon but the running of some council departments has no consideration for people who actually live here.	That sounds really good. It's going to be a hard task for all residents to have accessible parking near where they live with the 1,000's of homes being built. More overcrowding as with the doctors, hospitals, schools, in the area. All trying to get into the same spaces.	Sounds good on paper. I don't think that the council understands that the expansion of central Croydon has happened too quickly. So a lot needs to be done to catch up with the growth. More overcrowding, less common ground.	I think that it's important for children to be able to walk safely to school, but many can't get into a place near home so a car might be essential for some parents. Also people having to deliver to separate schools or drive on to get to work. So difficult to achieve one outcome.	I feel that you need to hit people coming into the area not be heavy on people who live here. Good to encourage cleaner cars but not everyone can afford to buy electric or hybrid cars.	I think this might need to be introduced gradually. I know of people who don't have computers or phones with technical usage. Mixed views.
73	Positive					
74	Yes You are ruining local parades You are incompetent as a council and are using social cleansing and your left wing policies to feather your own nests. You lot Councillors are bereft of common decency and do not know the meaning of democracy You are out to bleed this once great borough dry You are probably in breach of local communities act And there are grave concerns of reports in the public domain of your complicity and ignorance.	A rip of council to pay its chosen staff and councillors money At the expense of hard working deprived council tax payers. You lot are so incompetent. Will ruin this once great borough.	Incompetence galores with your ill bred ideas akin to communism. Totally negative.	You have no clues Look at mayhem at coombe School in Purley way What did you do send what brains you and useless incompetent staff and labour councillors For a holiday funded by council tax payers? Great destruction of this Borough.	Idiots. Ruined already.	What with your practices not divulging interests in contracts given to related parties you expect us to believe what you proclaim? Typical labour hypocrisy

75	Find it very hard to park where I live as it is . People park all day , get bus or train . Workers from Bus garage - at least 5 cars park every day .					
76	Cycle lanes separate to motor vehicles would be great. Don't charge for parking at outdoor spaces - people go there to exercise, so counterproductive.	Please don't start charging for permits across the borough for parking at home (like Sutton are proposing). Parked cars don't cause pollution- moving ones do!	Refer to previous answer - don't charge residents to park where they live. It unfairly penalises poorer residents. Whilst it remains legal to own a car, it is unfair to penalise those residents without off-street parking facilities. By all means encourage car shares etc, but those vehicles still have to be parked somewhere.	Reduce speed limits outside all schools. Provide drop-off zones in safe places. With so many working parents it is not possible for all children to walk to school. Incentivise walking in some way, even on wet days when traffic is worse.	Marvellous! Another policy to penalise the poor. Electric vehicles are really expensive- until the prices drop in the future, people won't be able to change cars. They will just take their business elsewhere- ie go to Bluewater to shop instead of Croydon.	Technology has its place but remember those who find a cashless society difficult. Maybe have a Smart Croydon card - pre-loadable like Oyster for people without access to mobiles for payment.
77	Agree	No impact on me, but impacts on community.	No - yes	Much needed. Too many unsafe drop offs near schools. Awful inconsiderate parking. Engines idling omitting pollution.	Unsure about this. Fines for fooling engines though.	No
78	There are opportunities to improve parking and increase safety by use of more local 'one-way' systems. An example would be Birdhurst Road/ Birdhurst Rise in South Croydon. At present cars mainly use Birdhurst Road, this is awkward as parking bays alternate from one side of the road to the other. Making Birdhurst Road Northbound and Birdhurst Rise southbound would enable parking on both sides of both roads. The policy would provide more parking and improve the traffic flow			A good idea, but may have problems on well used roads	Good idea, but not sure how this could be implemented, especially for occasional visitors to the area.	This could discriminate against many older motorists who do not have access to the necessary technology and would tend to drive them out of Croydon for shopping and leisure to the detriment of businesses. Perhaps an 'Oyster' type card could be introduced for those without mobile phones or contactless cards.
79	Increased cycle lanes and road surface (less potholes) should be a priority. Yes continued reduction in parking spaces and increase in cost.	Is there to be less parking spaces in Coulsdon. Lack of parking strangles shops. Difficulty in town centre parking and thereby less use of local shops.				
80	The provision for parking in the borough is being slowly eroded as the council allows existing car parks to be used for building and other uses. The council have made the parking conditions far worse in places like the restaurant area in Croydon by introducing weird shaped parking bays, also in Coulsdon, Why. The council do little to help businesses that rely on the ability for people to park easily and without high cost. The council is not motorist friendly, yet has consistently encourages more people and cars into the borough by building more dwellings, lack of joined up thinking. The draft plan suggests people switch vehicles, easier said than done, in tough economic times, especially for older people, where does the money come from?	it is rubbish	Rubbish	ill conceived. passes the problem onto surrounding areas	You are wrongly assuming people driving older vehicles, have the ability to go out and purchase new vehicles, how do you police such a scheme. The council wasted millions on introducing 20mph zones throughout the borough, very few motorists take any notice of it and no one polices the new speed limits. Total waste of out money	Utter crap. You assume everybody uses new technology, they do not. Smart City? You cannot run a dumb city, how do you propose to make Croydon a smart city without wasting more millions I cannot wait to get away from Croydon it is a horrible place, to be avoided
81	n/a					
82						
83	I suspect that this is just a way of extending parking restrictions in order to raise revenue from permits and parking charges, unless the proposed areas of restriction are detailed this cannot be determined. I have no way of knowing from this report if my local area is affected. However we do already suffer from potentially dangerous parking on the highway and the restriction of buses and traffic flow due to parked this new policy will make it worse if it drives new housing cars onto the already parked streets.	Negative - as this will result in more cars parked on the streets - there needs to be more off street car parks with convenient locations to transport i.e. East and West Croydon and cheap prices so that all can avail themselves of them, this will prevent the need for commuters to park in areas outside the centre as happens now - we have people drive up from Kent or Sussex and leave their cars all day in our street just outside of the restriction. My street which is major road and bus route is already impacted by commuters parking cars and restricting the flow of traffic, further pushing cars onto the street by building flats with insufficient parking will make this worse.	Need to know where these are proposed - generally I think on street bay parking is unsafe for those manoeuvring onto and off private drives and is just a way of generating revenue. Most residents can not afford permit or parking fees. Affordability - the majority of borough residents can not afford the parking charges or permits and like me cannot use public transport for many of their journey. I cannot for instance use public transport for shopping - I cannot lift bags on and off buses - it's a supermarket trolley to boot to home, or we don't eat. When visiting elderly relatives they are not near transport so again it's a car journey to theirs to take them to the doctors or shopping.	No impact on me personally. Again if parking is restricted near schools it will push the cars onto other residential streets which are already under pressure. If I have to downsize so lose my driveway I will become housebound as I cannot be too far from my car and have to use my car for visiting, shopping etc.	It's going to cost me Which for me is negative, we have a large car (7 seater) as my husband uses the vehicle for his business, transporting ladders and equipment and rubbish. I use the vehicle for shopping and transporting elderly relatives we already pay a premium for fuel and road tax further premiums for parking is punitive. Will there be a grant to assist the community in transferring to less punitively charged vehicles?	It's already been proven that we elderly do not operate cashless services well. I do not use apps and struggle to operate a mobile. Local Authority insistence on this to be able to park is discriminatory and ageist. Most of the older members of the community and those who cannot afford smart phones will be deprived of facilities - it is already very difficult to conduct business with the LA with so much of it online.
84	This is another attempt at hitting the already ripped off motorists and another way of getting more money. Negative as people will be pushed to use outside the boroughs shopping centres.	Yes none of these statements are aimed at improving the high streets shopping and stopping people driving out to other boroughs and spending their monies. Business will close as parking currently in Croydon is so expensive.	As before you should stop preventing people driving into the two centre and encourage park and ride locations. Pushing cars and people elsewhere will have a negative effect on shops and growth for Croydon	All children should walk to school where possible as we did growing up ! None of this free travel that allows gangs to collaborate together at short notices	Has London polluters pay system work ? NO It's just another way of making money. People will go to large shopping centres with free parking and the high st will die	This is a good idea. Positive as long as it works

85	No. It might make it more difficult for those using street parking to leave their cars and then go to a railway station to use the train for work. And this might be an improvement for those living in those streets.	The cost of parking will be an important issue	Parking cost is still the issue	I support this regardless of the potential inconvenience to individual drivers.	As I live near bus and train routes I won't be affected to any degree. The council must beware of making Croydon less attractive to road users, which could impact the local economy.	This will make paying easier. Positive.
86	Collaborative working should be the norm across Council departments. If they don't, the Chief Executive should be changed as she'd be clearly failing her responsibilities.	The increasing provision of EVCPs should be met by a reduction in parking space to avoid impacting pavement space. The tendency to install EVCPs on the pavement should be reconsidered as they can and do interfere with the free-flow of pedestrians. You will not encourage greater walking if obstacles to walking on the pavement are increased. Where EVCPs are provided in car parks, there needs to be provision so that a proportion of them are available for use at any time. Reducing the number of parking spaces, eg by the introduction of EVCP infrastructure between parking spaces, rather than on the pavement, should not be matched by an increase in controlled parking elsewhere. Let there be more competition for parking spaces. I used to drive to where I could park for free, then get the bus the last few stops to the town centre. Because buses are frequent and good quality, I now take the bus all the way. I would expect an increase in parking charges and greater competition for parking spaces to lead to similar behaviour across the general population.	New housing developments should not allow for parking provision except for disabled parking. The use of disabled parking permits have to be policed vigorously to minimise fraud. Consultation should take place with London Buses to ensure that large housing developments are suitably supported by improved public transport facilities, eg revised routing, additional bus routes. With the Mayor's plans to reduce Inner London bus mileage and move it to the Outer London areas, advantage should be taken to encourage increased frequencies and new in-fill bus routes where provision is poorer. I don't understand the expectation of increased demand for parking. What's the basis for this? Surely, we should be taking steps, such as differential parking charges for more polluting vehicles, discouraging the school run by banning vehicles from streets with schools (except for disability access), to reduce the number of vehicles in Croydon. The era of private personal motoring is coming to an end and the strategies being put in place need to recognise this and bring it in faster. Is there a plan in place to revisit these policies when Uber is banned from operating in London (if that ever actually happens)?	Surely, the aim should be to remove private vehicles and taxis from streets with schools on them? Prohibiting access during the hours around when school starts and ends will help a lot. You've had three streets where this has been trialled. I've seen no results from those trials in South Norwood and Coulsdon/Woodcote. Have they been successful in reducing overall traffic levels in the surrounding streets, or just moved the problem further away? Where it's not possible to ban traffic from a street near a school, speed limits should be reduced and strictly enforced with cameras. Bad parking should be quickly penalised. Reducing traffic in the vicinity of schools will make the school environment much better. Perhaps introduce local clean air zones such as in Shoreditch where only zero-emission vehicles are permitted during the day? Anything that reduces emissions in the vicinity of a school is to be encouraged.	Get on with it! Encouraging the move to low or zero emission vehicles will always have a positive impact on the community.	Get on with it! There has to be an acceptance that a proportion of people do not have smart phones and are therefore unable to use an app. No barriers should be introduced to those who are technologically impaired.
87	Parking on one side only on narrow roads. No parking in cycle lanes Where there are grass verges, have parking bays. Permits for work people where there is restricted parking. Better flow of traffic.	Free car parks in residential areas for each area. Freer roads.	Allow more than three hours for disabled drivers not in disabled bays	No stopping or parking for 200 yards outside schools, except for resident of that street, from eight til nine thirty AM and two forty five til four PM. The streets would not be blocked at these times and maybe children would encouraged to walk to school	Charging is not the answer, it impacts on poorer people	This sounds like a good idea but not everyone has a smart phone
88	Two wheeled motor vehicles should maintain free parking & increase their availability. Yes..the increasing housing developments in South Norwood receiving planning consent without off street parking is causing unprecedented overloading of on street parking availability for existing & long term Residents/Home Owners.					
89	None yet. Difficult to tell without more information.	No looks straight forward. Again short on specific details so commenting is not easy. I am sure there will be both [positive and negative impact on community] but until the details are published it is impossible to judge	Not until I know whether I will be subject to a cpz. Probably.	I'm sure that it will impact negatively on the streets near a school street by moving the parents there. The impact will be positive for those living nearer to a school. The battle to park near a school street will impact negatively on those living near one.	This will negatively impact those who can't afford to upgrade their vehicles. Air quality may improve in the immediate surroundings but the polluting cars will find alternatives.	What is a virtual
90	We have enough cycle lanes. It is the motorist that pays for them, as they pay no road tax. Any accidents caused by cyclists are also paid by the motorist as they have no insurance, Off street parking should be of no concern to anyone but the property owner. We have a diesel vehicle because we have a large caravan. If you look at the larger picture we pollute less, because we do not 'fly' on out holiday. We should not be penalised at home. We already pay more in road tax as it is. There is no justification for being penalised again for a lower emission zone. Encourage the parents that drive their children to school to make them walk, just like I had to.	Sadly the expense of off street parking is detrimental to the retailers. That is why large shopping centre like Blue Water and Thurrock do so well because they cater to the car driver. Sometimes shopping is too bulky or heavy to go by public transport. Stop treating the motorist as the enemy and embrace the convenience which can increase spending in the falling high street.	Restrict parking to 2 cars per household.		I do not agree with emission based parking charges or areas. Diesel cars pay more already in road tax with no justification for overall 'pollution footprint'. Either reduce the road tax and introduce charges for areas - not both. Idling engines due to traffic congestion causes much more problems.	I personally have no problem with technology and mobile payments, but please always consider an alternative for those who can't.
91	Negative	Parking is already a problem, expensive, and limited. The dense population of Croydon is the issue	Negative. Again it is the density of population that is the problem	Negative.	Negative. I avoid travelling to Croydon because of the cost and crowds. This doesn't help, just reinforce my position. It is the density of population that is the problem	Irrelevant to the wider issue



92	sounds ok but says little means nothing. negative I'm sure it will mean parking cost increases . more parking zones negative	negative more silly short cycle lanes to make it look like a lot but meaningless. SHOULD STOP DROP PAVEMENTS . 2 CAR FAMILIES DONT STILL TAKE UP 2 CAR SPACES ON INFRONT OF THEIR HOUSE AND ONE INFRONT OF OTHERS. MORE PAID PARKING WOULD HIT THE LOCAL SHOPS	THESE are just money making systems . when canvas residents they are ignored. MORE needs to be done around schools strict controls 8-9.30 and 2.30-4pm for all drivers including parents. Only to making money for the council getting more streets zoned.	stop all parking near around schools during 8.00 to 9.30 and 2.30 till 4. time zoned or yellow lines . more lollipop persons. strict enforcement of parking regulations to include no parent parking within an area around school gates		
93	EVCP provision is terrible & should be increased. Idling vehicles are not targeted as much as they should be, increase wardens. Parking permits should be increased across the borough, especially for roads around tram stops. Improved environmental outcomes could easily be achieved if the correct things are targeted.	Misuse of EVCP's is high on this borough. Individuals should be able to take a picture of a non compliant car reg & send to the council to issue a fine. Enforcement for all traffic related compliance requires more resources.	Currently CPZ do not extend far enough around tram stops. Resident bays are required further out. A pledge to ensure permits are not used as cash cows by the council might encourage more local support.	Introduce exclusion zones around schools at drop off and pick up time. Make parking expensive for non residents at these times & increase monitoring of idling cars.	Would positively impact the environment & should be introduced quickly	Good idea but mitigations must be considered for older or technically disadvantaged individuals
94	No	It doesn't explicitly state an objective of providing much needed additional parking				
95	The proposals will have a negative impact on my use of my car for social domestic and work purposes. There will be a negative impact on the local and wider community.	The streets in Croydon are not safe to walk in due to the increase in knife crime. Painting white lines on roads does not constitute safe cycle lanes and public transport is unreliable. The 'aim' therefore of reducing car use will have a negative impact on me.	TOTAL NEGATIVE IMPACT ON ME	The streets are unsafe to walk in so using a car is the only safe way to transport children to school.	The public was encouraged by a former Labour Chancellor to invest in diesel cars. It is disgraceful that the public is now threatened with parking charges for carrying out that recommendation. TOTAL NEGATIVE IMPACT ON ME	Unless the use of data is 100% secure, this potentially will have a negative impact on me
96	I believe that there should be free parking outside independent retailers to help boost business. The current parking in Croydon seems adequate enough though the parking signs are not at all clear and in plain English - can I park there in a loading bay for 20 minutes or is that just for deliveries big red parking bays and smaller bays - can you park there. Clear signs would be welcome. I dont expect this will be a good change, Some schools are on major roads, Trinity, Coloma are two examples where there is much traffic outside the school so I cannot see how there will be a positive impact if the roads are 'controlled'.	Coloma and Trinity have a large catchment area most students cannot walk to school so either get a lift or public transport if this is restricted this will have a negative impact for the school community with unnecessary travel time.		Coloma and Trinity have a large catchment area most students cannot walk to school so either get a lift or public transport if this is restricted this will have a negative impact for the school community with unnecessary travel time.		
97	Residential road should have double yellow lines on all corners and bends to stop edge to edge parking which makes turning in and out of roads virtually impossible and often dangerous. Side road which are heavily parked should have zones at balanced points in the road where no one can park to allow passing areas for through traffic. Speed bumps on the majority of roads should be removed, now we have the 20mph zone, this will improve the road surfaces and reduce damage to cars and their suspension. As a disabled driver, there are insufficient parking zones for disabled drivers and I think the Borough could afford to allow the same regime as Lambeth for drivers to park in permit zones if available. Unless the change is radical and fair, then there will be a negative impact on the whole community. Shopping areas with no easy parking access are dying and I for one will never go into Central Croydon shopping, its much too difficult and somewhat harrowing with all the various traffic systems in place.	There are clearly insufficient parking wardens outside of Central Croydon to maintain uncluttered roads. i.e., South Norwood High Street, which is a basket case. The roads in the north of the Borough are mostly unfit for purpose and should be resurfaced before any further surface activity takes place., parking cameras similar to those working in West Wickham would be appropriate.	Will these zones prevent industrial users to carry on parking willy nilly, i.e., car and van hire companies who farm their cars out to surrounding roads when they are not on hire.	Put camera parking zones in place around schools, so if you park during the times children are entering or leaving school, there is an automatic fine with no reduction for early payment and if a persistent offender then legal proceedings for points on licence and an eventual bank. Should tackle the 4x4 brigade.	Unless the Borough is in the position to buy off older cars so the owner can replace them, then they are putting themselves in the position of excluding a large number of possible customers for their shops. Furthermore unless they can guarantee that their buses and council vehicles in the Borough are electric and not polluting, it is a cynical method of raising a "tax" with no improvement to health in the area. Only more cost at which point those with money will move out of the Borough.	You have neither the expertise nor the will to do it properly and these systems are very easily hacked, so will you be responsible for the losses to people whose card has been hacked via your card systems.
98	No	There should be a greater emphasis on Parking enforcement. Selsdon high street in particular frequently sees cars parked on the white road markings leading to the controlled crossing. Cars regularly double park beside the occupied parking bays. Cars regularly Park on the pavement. These actions are hazardous to other road users, and pedestrians.	Parking zones around schools will improve safety when I take my grandchildren to school. Local residents may be inconvenienced.	Will improve safety around schools and encourage healthy walking to school	No	I do not like paying for parking by using an app. Too many mistakes are made, parking fines issued in error, leaving the motorist to appeal. Some people prefer to use cash or card.

99	<p>1. Cycle lanes should be decreased not increased. All they currently do is narrow the roads for motorised vehicles (cars, buses, etc), thereby actually increasing pollution due to the stop-start progress of vehicles. 2. There is no need for EVCPs in the immediate future. The two EVCP bays in the Sanderstead Road council car park are always empty. In the past few months I have been unable to park on a number of occasions due to the car park being full, although this might be due to non-Croydon residents using the council car park rather than the station car park for rush-hour commuting to and from London. Mainly negative impacts for both my local and wider communities.</p>	<p>My wife and I are both too old to increase our walking and we cannot cycle.</p>	<p>The CPZs are currently reasonable with regards to the effective times of 9am to 5pm on Mondays to Saturdays and free on Sundays. There would be a negative impact if the current time slots, as stated above, were to be altered.</p>	<p>Seems reasonable.</p>	<p>Has any consideration been given to elderly residents who might have old cars. Probably negative impact on the community. Many people cannot afford to buy new or fairly new cars.</p>	<p>Once again, no consideration for elderly residents who do not use mobile apps.</p>
100	<p>In the Whole of the Borough, Public should be allowed to Park FREE for First 30 minutes on ALL the meters followed by paying times. More Meters should be installed to facilitate this. This will help shopping public and the shop keepers. More shops will benefit trade, hence less closures and of course, more business rates for the Council. Everyone benefits. I am quite sure EVERYONE will benefit.</p>	<p>See section 1. Also, Residents should have FREE parking similar to Harringey Borough.</p>				
101	<p>Negative will be if you do this in one street it could impact on the surrounding streets. Analysis and careful consideration needs to be given to any change to do.</p>	<p>In residential streets you need to make sure that you increase the parking times so that residents can park before the CPZ ends. More cameras to catch those not obeying the road laws/rules. Including those driving the wrong way down a one way road and those parking illegally. Tougher penalties should be adopted.</p>	<p>Consideration was not given on my road where almost all the houses opposite have had a dropped kerb meaning the only spaces for the rest of the road have been reduced greatly. This has put a significant strain on the residents who don't have a drive. This could impact negatively if proper evidence is not gathered on how the rest of the road operates with less spaces.</p>	<p>This is needed to stop parents parking illegally across peoples drives when dropping their children off. Again more cameras and tougher penalties are needed.</p>	<p>This is needed. It will affect low income families but for the overall environmental impact it's needed.</p>	<p>Nothing to add</p>
102	<p>May I suggest an idea that is used in the USA for parking (most is free) but where you spend X amount of money they will cover your parking costs. This is to encourage car drivers to shop personally rather than go online.</p>	<p>is it viable to have a FREE parking time from 10am to 4pm for shoppers on Saturdays in small shopping areas and such as Croydon shopping centre Saturday and Sunday. Trying to get more AEs across the counters and improving the shopping experience. Plus able to pay the council tax etc to keep shops open!!</p>	<p>Negative, I have received parking tickets even though I have a Permit to park in my Street</p>	<p>I would suggest making school streets One Way. I am sure there will be parking tends to bring out the worse in some drivers.</p>	<p>The government designated diesel vehicles were the ideal for cars and vans many years ago therefore manufacturers made them, (as usual they lied or were economical with the truth) I think it would be very unfair to punish those with diesel vehicles unless there is a worthwhile trade in program.</p>	<p>Totally agree!</p>
103	<p>Planning policy inconsistent. Population increase, new homes are being approved with little or no parking. Needs impact of on street parking around site of the planning application, increase public transport to cope with more car-less people. No mention of use of cars by council employees. 1) Having car parks for council employees in the town centre seems at odds with the policy of seeking to reduce pollution. 2) the use of chauffeur cars by senior council employees and cabinet members seems unnecessary or at the very least should move to small less polluting vehicles 3) school staff parking both on site and on street. Negative as main drivers to car ownership are not being addressed. Public transport is primarily to and from London i.e lack of a suitable public transport across Sutton and Bromley.</p>	<p>The control of most of the parking will be under Westfield/ Hammerson control and so the small number of council controlled parking has little impact in central Croydon. Failure to get stores like Aldi to provide sufficient spaces exacerbates problems. I expect things will get worse. The number of cars in our area continues to rise. The hunger of the council for money will encourage them to increase parking for residents in local streets.</p>	<p>The Aim &amp; Objectives don't actually say anything. It is so vague as to let the council do anything. Assume this will be a cash cow for the council citing spurious "supply &amp; demand".</p>		<p>The council don't control most of the parking. Does the technology exist to do this in a cost effective manner? Considering Croydon as a shopping destination, their charges are already substantially above Sutton &amp; Bromley. This policy could potentially make it much worse. More affluent people with bigger cars (ie the sort of people Westfield wants) would be discouraged from visiting Croydon unless it was a common policy across the adjoining boroughs it could backfire. Potentially disastrous for Croydon retail businesses.</p>	
104	<p>Being a carer I have great difficulty in parking in the street where he lives, he has a blue badge and a disabled bay outside his address (which we had to apply to the Council for) but anyone else with a blue badge is also able to park here, he attends dialysis three times a week and various other hospital appointments, his space is not guaranteed for him and his front garden is not big enough for parking on. If I take him in my car I cannot use his blue badge as I would have to move his vehicle out of the space, and there is nowhere in the street to park. He uses a four wheeled rollator to steady him when he walks and gets out of breath easily. More people are being brought into the area by building of flats but not enough provisions have been made for parking, every household has at least one vehicle and controlled parking in certain areas just pushes it out to other areas.</p>	<p>I have only seen one cycle lane on the Brighton Road in Croydon, the roads are too busy for cycles and we do not have the capacity for separate cycle lanes like in Holland. All the large supermarkets are out of Town so householders have cars to get to them, you can't bring home your shopping on a cycle. More people in the community means more vehicles, the new school in Haling Road, South Croydon causes great disruption to the area the Council have had to have a traffic warden in attendance due to parents causing obstructions on residents and other road users, this school was meant to be for local children who would walk to school but this doesn't seem to be the case.</p>	<p>How will this be policed? On a regular basis someone always parks causing an obstruction over a disabled bay or they park without a displaying a blue badge, in certain roads it needs to be resident only parking and for the disabled bays to be for the designated car that had it installed as if a visitor uses it the person who had it installed will have nowhere to park. It will push the problem to another area and cause congestion somewhere else.</p>	<p>It is very dangerous in Haling Road South Croydon as parents park wherever they like, there is also a [...] garage who's cars are also parked along the same road and this two way street become one way due to the number of parked cars.</p>	<p>This will make a Croydon like London, there will be no reason for people to come into town if they are being charged to drive in the town as it has nothing to offer in its current state we have no decent shopping centre any more and parking charges are also very high.</p>	<p>Elderly and disabled people will struggle with new technology.</p>

105	Some of the language used is jargon which means what is being suggested is really unclear. I don't see why there would be need to use a legal order to prevent or regulate off street parking. I live in a simple residential road and I brought my property because it has off street parking. Until last August I had carers visiting my home for times a week to care for my mother. What happens to people in these circumstances? If these schemes are not considered carefully it will add additional stress to household budgets. We already have a very high council tax. Parking restrictions could limit support from family and friends for those who don't reach the threshold for formal services as well as limiting the freedom of visiting friends or family. People have to work very hard to pay essential bills and I am concerned that as a local resident I will have to foot the bill for something that will keep increasing over time. This is an additional stress around my home environment. Whilst parking can be an issue at points - it is occasional not a regular occurrence.	No impact. This should be about improving things for people so we can go about our business in and around the borough with the risk of incurring fines and penalties.	No	This needs to be fair and proportionate. There is a need to weigh up people's needs to get their children to school and park nearby. I work and have to drive as the journey would be twice as long due to location and bus routes. I don't expect to park outside the school but need to be within reasonable distance to walk the children in and return to my vehicle. There are many parents in a similar position. Please focus and prioritize the worst affected locations .	Potential of reducing visitors to Croydon especially when the new shopping complex is complex. Affect on businesses through effect of costly or reduced parking facilities.	Ni
106	Agree in principle to the aims. The Cane Hill estate in Coulsdon has increased car volumes significantly and will continue to grow as the development completes.	All parking in the borough should be based on a permit, issued against a social security number, address and proof of the ability to off-street park or have sufficient allocated parking spaces available in line with all applicants as provided by the council. The road traffic act is not well understood and Nuisance parking is more of an issue in the Coulsdon community.	Agree if successfully implemented. Positive response if it cuts down on Nuisance parking and non-resident commercial vehicles occupying local zoned spaces.	Healthy and safe is difficult where major road junctions have to be crossed or hilly roads are walked by minors. Footpaths already provide separate movement, but bicycle lanes can be more dangerous due to narrowing of road width. Timed exclusion similar to around Woodcote School might help. Shifting parking might simply move the problem somewhere else, and the impact of traffic flow and a pedestrian route needs to be considered.	This should follow government guidelines, but will this encourage more license plate cloning, insurance evasion and how do you enforce on the spot where polluters? Positive for community if managed well, monitored and enforced. Where is your compound for any breaches of rules? You sold them all off.	Positive if combined with an intelligent app which provides data on available parking spaces at destination parking. If the app works well.
107		Living on a main road I believe that there should also be consideration for the fact that Whitehorse Lane is a residential road and that to protect the housing and living conditions of the residents the speed limit of the road should be limited to 20 mph as in other South London boroughs. I also believe the Council should enforce the no parking regulations on Crystal Palace match days as residents move their cars from outside their houses on the main road only for outsiders to park in the spaces. If there is a parking ban on match days to allow for efficient movement of traffic and access for emergency services then it should be implemented.	We have been given permission to park with wheels on the pavement at the top of Whitehorse Lane and the pavement used to be marked to indicate this but over recent years this marking has not been made. It would be good to have it redrawn.	I think it is essential to have parking denied outside schools at dropping off and collecting times. I would particularly request it outside Oasis Shirley Park site in Longhurst Road where children are in danger daily especially from vehicles which pay no respect to laws on parking on corners. Stroud Green Way is similarly congested and cars have great difficulty both parking and moving away with traffic moving in both directions and being unable to pass each other. needs Both these roads need to be to be school streets urgently. The Ice cream van parked in Stroud Green Way at the end of school similarly needs to be banned at this time as it escalates the danger, with its engine running and its high sides hampering visibility when crossing. I hope the children and all pedestrians will be safer arriving at and leaving school.		
108	No. The statements are too vague to know.	No impact on me. I find it hard to believe the maintenance costs of the off street parking is an issue in comparison with the income from the car parks. If it us then the contractd need to be reviewed	No	Other councils who have applied these rules have signed then poorly making it hard to understand restrictions especially if they are not full time. Surely the aim of this is to provide a positive impact on the health of the community	I feel these initiatives should be driven by central government when a car is purchased by tax / grants rather than on parking in the local area. This could unfairly punish people who have owned their cars since before the rules came in. Overall buying even an electric new car is worse for the planet than maintaining an old one due to the impact of production	Thus should be positive
109	I do not have a vehicle or any parking-issues, myself. It seems to me that Croydon Council has embraced development with no more than pious hopes (or the embrace of restrictive measures) to mitigate/deal with the effects. If people cannot park, they will not come to live in Croydon or stop off to use local shops.	Enforcement alone will achieve nothing. All of this is predicated on the (over-optimistic) premise that every car-journey can simply be replaced by a cycle-journey.	Simply stopping people parking will not, in and of itself, stop them using their cars. If people cannot easily park, they will not choose to reside here or to visit for business or shopping.	Nothing affects me, personally. If you stop people parking near schools, that will NOT stop them using cars. They will use local streets near enough for the purpose, increasing noise, pollution and potential hazards.	Nothing affects me, personally. Even if you penalise the car-user as a polluter, that (alone) will NOT stop/reduce car-use.	None impact. If people cannot park, they will either not visit at all or drive/park in even more deleterious ways.
110	No	No	No	No	Yes if can't afford new vehicle	No

111	Motorists must not be financially penalised under the guise of perceived "environmental benefits" for the sake of finding more revenue in the face of central government cuts. A balance must be found that is fair to all road users. The idea of collaboration is positive but car driving residents must be heard too. Charging for car parking in parks is a negative, denying some people the opportunity to use recreational public green spaces for free.	All sound worthy aims but must not be at the expense of drivers. Public transport is excellent but some people (my partner included) are shift workers and rely on car use. Please "fairly balance" all users and do not go to the often-default position of charging motorists more.	Negative - proposed charging for parking in green public spaces/parks. Must still be fair to motorists and not a pretext to charge parking fees and restrict spaces, just to recoup falling revenues from central government. Shift workers doing unsociable hours rely on cars and often cannot afford newer cars that are seen as more environmentally friendly. Parking must not be restricted to the extent that it creates barriers to supporting local shops in Crystal Palace etc. Parking charges must not unfairly mean some locals can no longer enjoy green, public spaces.	I live a few roads away from a school. Please do not enforce changes on only the school street, without thinking of how this will simply push traffic onto streets in the surrounding area ie it will potentially create less parking spaces, in fewer streets in the vicinity, creating more congestion in the area near the school. Potentially more traffic on my road and surrounding streets if the street the school is on has restrictions. I am obviously not against making streets safer and cleaner for children but planners must consider nearby residents having to suffer knock on effects of any restrictions they wish to impose.	Emission based charging is a worthy ideal but in practice penalises people who rely on a car (shift workers for eg) but who cannot afford newer cars. Negative affects: more congestion on roads outside any restricted areas. Barriers to some people using and supporting local shops of parking is restricted/charged. I want to see thriving local retail for the good of the community. Negative impact in charging for parking in parks and green spaces - access for all, not barriers. Please do think about planning knock on effects of any restrictive bays to surrounding roads and please do not simply default to charging as far and wide as you think you can push through, as a means of meeting central govt funding gaps. I am a car owner but I also actively use public transport whenever I can. I dont want to be penalised financially on those occasions when I have to use my car.	Fine in principle, but consider the older generation who might not want to be forced to use technology in this way. Choice and balance is essential.
112		One hour free parking in Selsdon and Coulsdon works well so extend it to Sanderstead shops area , hamsey green and warlinham (if Surrey CC permit)	One hour free parking in Selsdon and Coulsdon works well so extend it to Sanderstead shops area , hamsey green and warlinham (if Surrey CC permit)	Extend tp Sandertad , Limpfeld Road and nearby streets	Good	NO this is not good for everyone, PLEASE NO more mobile cashless payment apps and digital systems
113	Yes, any review is all about ensuring more revenue income, with less going to the community, eg buses.	Yes, base additional charges not on tax band, but length of vehicles. EG have smaller bays for smaller cars and smaller tariffs.	I think the current system of first block of PAD minutes is excellent and I would urge continuation.	Years ago at Selsdon Library car park (pre [...]), it showed an excellent example of parents being picking up their children. The car park was heaving for 10 minutes twice a day. Then Croydon did the current deal with [...] and put a stop to common sense in the name of money. And now blame parents. Install smart (camera like railway stations) parking around schools operational only during the arrival and departing school times, within a area to encourage parking further away.	Yes, it's absolute rubbish. How can I be a more polluter in an older car doing 2,000 miles a year then a great big 4x4 doing 50,000 miles a year, yet because on paper the latter is less polluting per foot.	So this statement clearly states to get rid of PAD machines thus removing the first Bloch of free parking minutes. Local parking and central parking have all contributed to the demise of the "high street. Why would anyone want to pay say a fiver to park in a town centre, or park free at an out of town retail centre. It's not about the amount, it's physiological resentment.
114	We need more initiatives to encourage use of electric vehicles and more space on roads for cycle lanes. It's not very clear what your objectives are from the above so it's very difficult to know how it will impact the community	On Holmesdale Road, SE25, the parking restrictions should be adjusted so that on match days it is resident parking ONLY. It is ridiculous that on so many days a year, residents do not have priority over visitors. This would encourage more fans to use public transport instead of drive as well. It's also important to install more cycle parking bays on the streets and electrical charging stations.				
115	Yep, if any of your previous hair brain schemes are to go by , they'll be heaps of disruption , roads made smaller, as if they could get any smaller. Pot Holes still wont be attended to. It'll come to the national debt, you'll outsource it to a foreign contractor & we the people who live in here will be worse off all round. As long as it doesn't cost us the homeowner anymore money. Its not the job of the council to fleece everyone. Vehicle owners pay enough firstly for their Cars ( subsequent Labour government encouraged car owners to buy Diesel fuel cars ) now you decide you don't like them.	On the topic of Lines & signs , you haven't maintained the road traffic lines anywhere as far as I can see. As a council when you consulted with us years ago about new Street Lighting ( which we didn't need ) No one in the department had the foresight to put EVCP's into the new lampposts !	The council hasn't got the parking right for the business's there's No Free time at all to pop into our High Street .	Everyone should attend their local school. Same goes for the teachers & support staff that work there.	I bought a new Car so I already feel I've made a serious contribution to the economy .	, I don't feel that any thought was given to putting a system in place whilst the extensive upheaval happened with the Street Lighting. More expense. More upheaval.
116	Enable disabled to easily access shopping without having to walk/be pushed in wheelchair to transport links. I expect better public transport links to dissuade people from using cars.	I expect resident parking to be enforced.			How do small businesses find money for new vehicles?	Not everyone is able to use computers, mobile phones, apps etc. Disability groups and blind, elderly should be recognised.
117	EVCP would have to be secure for me to be able to use. I live in a small terrace so I realise there is no space close by to park an electric car overnight. Essential car user as my elderly Mother in Purley may need urgent attention. People who have cars in the town centre have a reason, they may have children at school some distance away, then need to get to work themselves. Or they may have elderly parents to car for like me. It is unfair to penalise these people by further increasing parking charges for residents permits. It is already expensive to have a visitor in the daytime who needs to park!					



118	<p>Parking restrictions really impacts on both my disabled parents; and elderly neighbors who are unable to walk much, carry bags etc. When I help them using my car, I have had numerous fines for stopping to either drop them or pick them up near shops, bus stops, city centre. This needs to be looked into. Yes, will have to pay more for parking. Being on a low wage and a carer, money is very limited. This will make it harder for me to help my parents and elderly neighbours with their shopping.</p>		<p>Being on a low salary already and being a carer, I would not be able to afford to pay to park outside my house. This is more money I cannot afford! Restrict houses on how many cars they have! I share one car with 3 adults. Other houses have 3 to 4 cars. One car per adult! Allow one free car parking per house and charge for extra cars.</p>	<p>Great! But improve transport system! Have more buses that not only go into Croydon but also connect other areas.</p>		<p>I dislike the use of mobile apps to pay for parking. It's hard for elderly to use and some of us do not have smart phones</p>
119						
120	<p>As a cyclist and a car owner, anything that makes the roads safer is good, also anything that takes the most polluting vehicles off the road is very good. Please, please make developers provide proper off road parking on new developments - most new developments in Shirley have negligible off road parking provision which just means more vehicles left on the road PLUS more vehicle crime (another unwelcome development). We live in The Rosery which is off Bywood Avenue, at the moment Bywood is used as a car park for Arena Tram halt so this whole area is a free for all as far as parking is concerned - we regularly have large lorries parked in Bywood which makes it quite dangerous road, as it is a main "rat run" between Long Lane and the Wickham Road. So if your policies removed these lorries that would help greatly. Overall though I don't expect anything to happen, people are to wedded to their cars!!!</p>	<p>I agree totally with your policies as far as I am concerned it wont affect me as I would NEVER take my car into Croydon and when not in use it is garaged. The car is only used for long journeys and the weekly shop - my car is immaculate but is 16 years old so could be affected by some of your policies, hence if we are forced to scrap a perfectly good car I feel some compensation should be offered. Hopefully the roads would be come less clogged with old wrecks BUT I really don't see anything happening in practice because nothing is ever enforced - I'm afraid the yellow lines seem to be totally ignored and the cycle lanes - WHAT A JOKE!!!</p>	<p>I wish you luck we are a crescent round the back of Bywood shops and what should be a quiet road is permanently used as a turning circle for people driving to/from the shops - no one seems to walk any more!</p>	<p>Again I wish you luck our next door neighbour is a teacher and the tales she tells of selfish parent parking.....</p>	<p>Very good idea, how you will enforce it without installing cameras I don't know! No impact because I don't think Croydon can afford to enforce it properly and drivers will just ignore it the same as they do the yellow lines.</p>	<p>How will this affect old farts like me who have an old mobile and REFUSE to carry it all the time - I'm not a Luddite but I refuse to be on call 24/7 I stooped that when I retired - sorry rant over!</p>
121	<p>Any changes to encourage greater use of public transport must take into account the availability of public transport in any particular area as not everyone can walk or cycle (older or disabled people, those with very small children), great distances. There are no laws governing the purchase of vehicles so residential parking should be used to try to discourage households having many vehicles. Sufficient off-street parking should be allowed for in any new developments (eg one vehicle per household), with on-street parking made more difficult to discourage overflow onto streets. There should be better parking facilities for two-wheeled vehicles and cycles, but they must be secure. That depends entirely on what policies are adopted and how they are policed. If handled correctly, encouraging the gradual reduction in car ownership for those who are able to walk/cycle or who have access to good public transport, the benefits to local and wider communities would be great. However, putting policies in place is one thing, having the available funds to police them is another - everywhere you go there are examples of people parking illegally and they do so because there is almost zero chance of being caught.</p>	<p>Positive impacts in terms of reduced pollution through smoother flow of traffic, and, hopefully, reduced number of vehicles. Any reduction of off-street parking will help the flow of traffic. At the moment there are many streets which are effectively one-way only, because of the width of the streets and the number of vehicles parked on them. The congestion makes it very difficult for buses, fire tenders, ambulances etc to get through easily.</p>	<p>As with all other aspects of these aims/objectives, if handled correctly, they would positively impact on both the local and wider community. A good idea to introduce time restrictions in areas where parking is a premium - including local shops. This would allow people to still shop locally, which is essential for the shops themselves to remain viable, but would stop people leaving their vehicles there for a long period of time, thereby preventing others from using the spaces. Again, though, how would it be policed?</p>	<p>Encouraging walking/cycling from a very early age means more chance that children will continue to walk/cycle as they grow up, but there would need to be safe cycle paths. There are too many instances of parents not wanting to walk any further than necessary, and of preferring not to have to stop the car and get out of it, so they will try to park right outside the school gates. There are also cases of parents coming to pick children up after school, parking close to the gates but leaving their engines running so they can listen to the radio, or continue to have the heating/air-conditioning on while they wait - thereby contributing to pollution.</p>	<p>A shift to zero/low emission vehicles is a good objective, however I believe some help should be given to encourage the phasing out of diesel and older vehicles, especially for small businesses. 'Polluter pays' is fair, to a point, but those lower income people who rely on a vehicle but can't afford a new one, may be adversely affected. Any reduction in pollution is positive for everyone.</p>	<p>Accessibility to 'real time' travel information and making it easy for people to find a pay for parking would be helpful, but you can't "innovate" so much that those who are not 'technology-inclined' find getting around very difficult.</p>
122	<p>Don't forget the ordinary driver who uses a car solo, because they need to start work early or finish late &amp; wants to stay safe getting to/from public transport, or has mobility issues not severe enough to be disabled, or aged relatives to visit, take to appointments, or heavy stuff to carry. If too much parking space is given to minority road users, the majority will be unable to access facilities.</p>	<p>Mostly negative as the ordinary user will have fewer spaces or more expensive parking charges. Central shopping centers are already losing out to internet, high parking charges will speed that decline. Need balance between the minority road users and those with special needs and the ordinary users. Low income workers may live a distance from public transport where housing is cheaper &amp; need cars to get to work or to transport hubs.</p>	<p>CPZ need to allow for local businesses to survive and for car users to access public transport</p>	<p>balance the needs of the school drop off period with the needs of local residents - encourage walking but don't make it harder for parents to drop children off - they may be going straight to work.</p>	<p>Charges are necessary to limit use but not so high as to prevent local businesses from thriving. Street full of local businesses who need customers - parking should encourage use of local.</p>	<p>Make it easier to find out where to park, charges, when it's free. My social life requires me to use my car to get to events &amp; back late at night (safety), I need to be able to park near my destinations and when I get back home.</p>
123	<p>Not sure how we can have comments until we know what the nature of the proposals are - you are simply saying you will have consultation with the goals above. All very laudable, but until we know who you are consulting with and what the impact of the proposals will be, it is impossible to comment.</p>	<p>Again all good. Need to reduce number of signs and road furniture, to make parking or traffic directives clear. Also parking tariffs need looking at - more expensive here in Croydon than other boroughs. 24/7 parking restrictions are unreasonable. Would include places of worship along with leisure/work locations.</p>	<p>Sounds reasonable - need to see substance of proposals. Until we see specific proposals we cannot judge the impact.</p>	<p>Encourage parents to walk their children to school</p>	<p>Yes.....what about huge outsized vehicles (SUVs) which take up much more space than regular cars? Until the actual proposals are outlined, impossible to comment.</p>	<p>Maybe explain this in plain English? Until concrete proposals are presented, it is impossible to comment.</p>

124	I have an EV and would be keen to see more charging points across Croydon. If at car parks, it would be interesting to see whether charging spaces are for limited periods of time or vehicles can park for the whole day whilst charging. Perhaps increased costs / reduced availability for parking.					
125	If you need a car to commute to work as there is no public transport or the Journey takes 3 x longer then schemes that penalise car ownership have a detrimental effect especially if the jobs are low paid care work/agriculture ground maintenance etc. I see negative impacts of displaced cars from the street close by with a school. Parents are short of time although we would all love to walk our children to school its not feasible if you also need to get to work.	All I can see is more backgarden developemts conversion of a family home that may have had two cars to multiple flats and increased cars displaced onto surrounding roads as the developers can allocate 1 or two car parking places and bicycle storage when in reality 4-5 cars will be used. ver few people have the luxury of lots of time and one child to take to school via a bike. Less cars just means more supermarket/amazon delivery drivers clogging up the streets as family shoping on public transport is time consuming and exhausting. Just see more arguments and disputes over parking	it just displaces the cars onto adjoining streets	after being encouraged to buy a diesel then now find out they are infact worse with no spare income to upgrade the car your stuck. If you have a job that requires a large say delivery driver then again you are unfairly penalised. All these measures seem to hit the lower income families in the borough. I will be going into croydon as little as possible if these measures come in, Easier to go to other shoping and leisure facilities.	Improve transport links at the moment travelling through croydon takes at least 2 buses	
126	No idea, there are no details as to what you're actually planning to do. It's all hot air at the moment.	I'm assuming this is all a smokescreen so the council can raise revenue from traffic violations and parking fees		Looks like you want to penalise the 90 plus per cent of motorists in the borough who do not drive "low emission " vehicles, You should be aware that these poor sods are also electors who hopefully will vote you grasping avaricious bastards out of office.	There is no such thing as a "virtual loading bay" Stop being stupid.	
127	Negative impacts are going to be restrictive use to car users, higher cost for car users, and higher parking charges. Higher cost, prohibitive to park.	Increase traffic flow is a positive. Reduced parking is a negative. Could be prohibitive for vulnerable people, disabled and elderly to have a car.	Negative impact on people trying to drive and shop in Croydon, particularly smaller shops/ streets. Reducing parking and increasing cost of parking outside shops, especially for disabled and elderly.	Positive if it makes life safer Negative as it puts traffic flow and pressure on other streets. Of course people want to model walking to school and healthy living - BUT working parents have to get to work too!	Yes - as someone who is a victim of governments lying about Diesel vehicles I purchased one AGAINST MY INSTINCT and will now be punished for Government lies! Negatives yes - issues with deliveries in the area. Retail is already suffering enough. This is just a profiteering way for Councils to make money.	Positive if it enables people to have options. Negative when it fails. More people will likely be fined for technology fails. Higher cost to taxpayer to implement. Loss of jobs.
128	Recent [proposed] changes to buses in Croydon are antithetic to the proposed parking policy changes. Some proposed changes are reasonable, but need to be done carefully - the Borough [and visitors] will not suddenly change to electric vehicles; the change in proportion needs to be managed, if leading, to prevent driving business out-of-borough. If done sensitively, no. If the Council forces change, the effect will be detrimental. History, unhappily, suggests the latter.	Recent [proposed] changes to buses in Croydon are antithetic to the proposed parking policy changes. Some proposed changes are reasonable, but need to be done carefully - the Borough [and visitors] will not suddenly change to electric vehicles; the change in proportion needs to be managed, if leading, to prevent driving business out-of-borough. If done sensitively, no. If the Council forces change, the effect will be detrimental. History, unhappily, suggests the latter.	Recent [proposed] changes to buses in Croydon are antithetic to the proposed parking policy changes. Some proposed changes are reasonable, but need to be done carefully - the Borough [and visitors] will not suddenly change to electric vehicles; the change in proportion needs to be managed, if leading, to prevent driving business out-of-borough. If done sensitively, no. If the Council forces change, the effect will be detrimental. History, unhappily, suggests the latter.	Recent [proposed] changes to buses in Croydon are antithetic to the proposed parking policy changes. Some proposed changes are reasonable, but need to be done carefully - the Borough [and visitors] will not suddenly change to electric vehicles; the change in proportion needs to be managed, if leading, to prevent driving business out-of-borough..	Recent [proposed] changes to buses in Croydon are antithetic to the proposed parking policy changes. Some proposed changes are reasonable, but need to be done carefully - the Borough [and visitors] will not suddenly change to electric vehicles; the change in proportion needs to be managed, if leading, to prevent driving business out-of-borough. If done sensitively, no impact on community. If the Council forces change, the effect will be detrimental. History, unhappily, suggests the latter.	Welcome this.
129	Yes making life for people that have to use a car unbearable especially when public transport itâ€™s not been very reliable lately. I canâ€™t see how we can improve y adding more cycle lanes I was stuck in heavy traffic for approximately 30 minutes and I counted 4 bikes in half hour and around 300 cars burning fuel going no where	I agree totally agree regarding facilitating walking and cycling near schools but traffic itâ€™s no going to disappear over night and most of the changes proposed will only increase pollution in the short term. Mostly negative impact on community.	It would be a start if the planning department would insist on the right number of parking spaces on hi rise blocks and on conversions in to flats. Chaos.	I agree. Positive	I agree but needs to be done by giving enough time to the motorist to make the appropriate changes. Yes and no impact on community.	Yes I agree
130	Negative- shoppers won't come (tackle crime first) May push parking further out. 'Changing demands of Croydon roads' The statement above is about discouraging car users to alternative means of transport, whilst increasing the volume of housing without adequate parking facilities. Ensure adequate parking when approving housing would be 1st step.	Aims sounds correct. My challenge is how do we know 1500 parking spaces and 17 car parks is adequate for future needs? How many do we have now versus what number for next 5 years? What is the presumed population increase in the whole of Croydon borough to meet with this volume? Negative, not tackling increase in population alongside policy.	The statement is sound, but disconnected with section 2. I repeat, is 1700 parking spaces enough for growing needs. Frankly, I worked in Croydon for many years, I avoid Croydon shopping now so any negative impact on parking will drive (excuse pun) me elsewhere. Will push parking further out?	Completely agree, The need to drive to schools should be tackled and reduced. Increased population with schools not meeting needs results in further distances for school travel. Would school bus be an answer? Until schooling meets population growth with no alternative means of transport Negative With crime rates increasing, make Croydon safer to encourage walking	In theory, fantastic, but not everyone has the resources to change to low emission vehicles and therefore penalises low income families It's a money making scheme to finance all the proposed changes. Car companies are still manufacturing diesel and is not aligned in policy. Absolutely NEGATIVE!	
131	Very negative and discriminates against poorer residents. EVCP's are very useful although only wealthy residents will be able to avail themselves of this technology. Shared vehicles on a regular basis doesn't work for the long term and is pie in the sky if it's thought this could have a big impact on car use.	Vey negative. If one lives in central London or parts of north Croydon then may be this could help reduce car use but otherwise this is draconian and out of touch with the reality of most residents daily lives	CPZ's are a con on residents and a way of increasing council revenue. Very negative impact.	The council's process is not transparent as to whom makes the decision and this cannot be challenged in a public forum that allows issues to be raised and dealt with	Completely opposed. This will impact the poorer residents of the borough. Will raise revenue for the Council. Political spin nothing more! Very negative impact on community. It's pur politics and will be driven by the council even if no one wants it as was the 20 miles speed limits	Is negative to older residents and is about reducing council costs not about making life easier for residents
132	I seems there is a large focus on all other vehicle users beside the "normal" car user. If the above is true, then it will result in normal car users having less parking options than there already are.					

133	Parking is a v emotive subject. Residents want to be able to park near their homes for security of their vehicles and themselves. They need to be able to get to work so not dependent on the state and for their own well-being but most cannot afford to change vehicles very often. Cleaner vehicles should be led by the manufacturer. More enforcement of bad parking especially around schools and removal of untaxed/motâ€™d vehicles should be routine. Anger at those that abuse currently Believe the Council will not listen but will just impose regardless of feelings of residents rather than dieting out the problem as seen as a totally money making idea.	Residents want to work to get to their place of work easily. Re-provide proper reasonably priced commuter parking near to stations to enable people to get to work easily not everyone can cycle up very steep hills or wants to arrive at their destination smelling of sweat Everyone has busy lives stress affects their health and well-being Parking close to home is wanted for security Provide van parking away from residential areas as they block visibility	Hitting my limited pocket Enforcement of bad parking and removing untaxed unsafe vehicles should come first as the roads would be clearer. Only a small minority have unlimited funds Everyone want to feed their families and be warm and safe The poorest and most vulnerable will be hardest hit.	Mums and Dads want their child safely delivered to school Most do not live next to a school and need to get to work Most schools do not have capacity for parent parking but introducing safe drop off areas would help enormously. Negative comments yes as all about making money and upsetting daily lives	The poor and vulnerable cannot afford to change vehicles often It's the manufacturer who should be dealing with emissions not the Public Vans should be restricted from parking in residential streets as they block visibility and make it unsafe for children and elderly. Poorer parents Children less fed as less money More reliance then on the taxpayers as cannot get to work.	Prefer to pay cash for parking as machines are often hard to see display especially in the sun Telephone takes ages Sos do not always work and you have to have so many. Is cashless proven yet to be 100% safe? The elderly find technology most difficult to deal with and less likely to be able to cope- in 20 years time it will be different - but need vehicles to prevent social isolation.
134		There should be less parking near schools as this impacts on commuters and residents. People dropping off their children at school also cause congestion and inconsiderate parking.	As long as these plans do not impact on existing residents this is understandable.	I think this is definitely appropriate, particularly when schools are clustered close together. I think there need to be more restrictions on allowing parents to park so close to schools as this causes congestion and dangerous conditions for other road users, pedestrians and residents.	I agree with this and think more councils should follow this example.	Older people who do not use technology may be negatively impacted by this. Their needs also need to be considered.
135	High Rates High Rents Falling high street sales due to online store. Staff unable to park Poor public transport How do you encourage more people to use dying high street stores ? If you scare away the customers you will be left with Ghettos and dead local shops. Yes Negative the community will suffer as they need local services and retail outlets. (especially older and disabled customers). Unemployment will increase	Need more parking slots allocated for local use. Need traffic wardens to be more understanding before issuing tickets. Need to reduce parking fines. Negative as local access will diminish.	Give a grace period of 5 years to help remove diesel cars which were bought after encouragement by Labor policies which have now backfired and cost the general public millions. Some positivity to allow residents to park	positive	Good in the long run but will come at a cost. Allow 5 years grace to allow Diesel cars to be replaced with low emission cars.	positive
136	Ensure that cycle lanes do not interrupt the free flow of traffic in high density levels by adopting different times for their sole use. I feel that any reduction in parking spaces throughout the Borough should be carefully managed so as not to impact on local shops and community facilities.	1500 parking spaces throughout the borough seems like quite a significant reduction. Adequate parking spaces must be preserved to ensure we have sufficient for current car ownership and those that wish to visit the borough. A gradual increase in charges would be a better way to discourage car ownership. Yes, if you reduce the current car parking spaces.	You must take into consideration that the population is living longer - older people are unable to use cycles in the same way as the young. A reduction in parking spaces has a direct hit on the elderly. A better solution would be to consider dedicating parking spaces to those say over 70/75?	School streets are a good idea and should be encouraged as well as other measures to reduce the number of cars being used to transport children to school. Positive impact	Emission based parking is a good idea but there is a need to introduce it gradually so as not to unfairly disbenefit those that can't afford to change their car	All good ideas
137	There are a lot of flats going up without the same number of parking spaces as flats. I think this will mean more parking on the road. There is a block of 9 flats about to finish at the end of my road. Opening Coombe Wood school has increased road use and parking on my road next to the school. More flats will mean more cars on the road. I think this will negatively impact my and the wider community.	People are not going to stop using cars because you want them to.				
138	You are only interested in reducing motorists and penalising them. What about the cyclists and Motor cyclists. if westfields comes to croydon no one will use it because all the parking restrictions. you have both. Only negative impact. Transport infrastructure is not in place to support the community.	Cheaper parking	Residents pay enough already without increased parking charges		Too dear	
139	A the measuress this is to restrict car parking I do not agree with any of. People wont bother travelling into Croydon.	I don't agree with reduction of car travel but do in the management of parking. Yes if they can't park easily people wont come to Croydon.	CPZs only where indiscriminate parking causes safety issues orcauses traffic jams	Yes approve of restricting parking near schools	No agree with parking charges but do not agree with charging "polluters" more unless its a fair and is done on engine size and not the age of the vehicle.	No don't need any of it. You should still make payment available by cash. If people can't find somewhere to park easily and can pay by whatever method they prefer they wont bother coming to Croydon.
140	I expect it to be harder to park anywhere with my blue badge. There is no provision for making life easier for disabled people that cannot use bikes etc. Making it easier for those with a blue badge to park where they need to.	There are many places in Croydon where there are already yellow lines that are not enforced, how are you going to enforce even more restrictions. I expect more people to park illegally and get away with it.	Again this would need to be enforced	It would help if the council actually listened to residents during consultations	I have an old car because I cannot afford a newer one due to being on a low income, these parking charges would penalise those that cannot afford new cars.	This completely ignores the older generation who do not use or even own mobile devices and contactless cards etc.



141		<p>Given the recent implementation of a borough wide 20mph speed limit and the aims of the council to improve conditions generally, air quality would improve considerably, if speed bumps were removed throughout the borough. Studies show that the additional necessity for vehicles to accelerate after negotiating such obstacles (having slowed from a greater speed to a near standstill), contributes to higher levels of pollution across the board and therefore noticeably poorer air quality. Speed bump removal would also bring about more convenient and safer parking conditions within the borough as a whole, and would be in line with stated council policy, by improving traffic flow and facilitating better parking conditions for all road users.</p>	<p>Given the recent implementation of a borough wide 20mph speed limit and the aims of the council to improve conditions generally, air quality would improve considerably, if speed bumps were removed throughout the borough. Studies show that the additional necessity for vehicles to accelerate after negotiating such obstacles (having slowed from a greater speed to a near standstill), contributes to higher levels of pollution across the board and therefore noticeably poorer air quality. Speed bump removal would also bring about more convenient and safer parking conditions within the borough as a whole, and would be in line with stated council policy, by improving traffic flow and facilitating better parking conditions for all road users.</p>		<p>Given the existing road system, and the unlikelihood of most car owners to give up their vehicles, perhaps consideration could be given for the implementation of a local authority council tax 'break' to allow borough residents to purchase low emission vehicles more easily. This would have a positive impact for all borough residents, and could be modelled nationally and raise Croydon's profile.</p>	<p>Respectfully, following on from Q9s answer, in this ideal vision for Croydon, where all residents have easier access to low emission vehicles, perhaps a Croydon App could be included in the package(?). Again, all borough residents could potentially benefit.</p>
142	<p>I have no comments. The impacts depend on the solutions proposed. I can think of a number of solutions that would cause serious negative impact on my local community if they were progressed.</p>	<p>The impacts depend on the solutions proposed. - if controlled parking was introduced on my road then that would cause a serious negative impact on me, I would not be able to afford the parking permits required (even at resident rates) which means I would have to give up my vehicle and this would impact my wellbeing. I work full time and provide caring assistance to a disabled adult and an elderly parent, although I could utilise public transport or walking this is impractical. The impacts depend on the solutions proposed. You need a better way of reporting parking violations rather than online and the council need to do something immediately when they are reported rather than waiting 2+ hours to respond and the vehicle has moved on</p>	<p>As previous - The impacts depend on the solutions proposed. - if controlled parking was introduced on my road then that would cause a serious negative impact on me, I would not be able to afford the parking permits required (even at resident rates) which means I would have to give up my vehicle and this would impact my wellbeing. I work full time and provide caring assistance to a disabled adult and an elderly parent, although I could utilise public transport or walking this is impractical</p>	<p>There is a school at the end of my road - at drop off / pick up times it is impossible to drive / park on my road due to parents dropping off and collecting children. The local community is already negatively impacted by the local schools</p>	<p>No comment on impact on me personally. There will be a negative impact on poorer families who cannot afford to update their vehicles to a zero or low emission one.</p>	<p>You need to improve your traffic cameras. My vehicle was involved in an incident but when I requested and paid for the CCTV footage (to obtain the registration of the vehicle that hit me) the quality of the images were so poor that details were not visible. Technology needs to be fit for purpose. Making use of technology is a good thing but has a negative impact on older residents - as I know of a number that don't actually have internet access or a smart phone and would prefer to speak with a human being.</p>
143	<p>Positive. It's a great initiative to get a clear parking policy in place. Croydon is growing and with that growth there is ever increasing demand on our existing street scene. With increasing concerns around pollution we need to ensure Croydon is leading London on this by become London's first eco-borough. Promote more sustainable forms of transport by introducing car clubs. EV bays, rapid charge points, cycle parking including bikehangars. Remove parking in areas where its a barrier to sustainable transport such as on cycle or bus routes.</p>	<p>Remove parking to make way for cycle lanes and cycle parking.</p>	<p>Keep in mind equalities remove parking but ensure parking is available for disabled people.</p>	<p>Yes school streets are fantastic and we should have more.</p>		
144	<p>The number of charging points need to be increased in all areas of Croydon. It is a waste of money adding them in areas with houses, they need to be added in areas with flats where residents do not have their own dedicated parking. Car clubs for businesses should be encouraged, perhaps using business rates rebates?</p>	<p>Any withdrawal of parking spaces MUST go through a consultation process, particularly as there is a substantial number of new flats being built in Croydon. More people wanting fewer spaces is not going to work!</p>	<p>Proactively trying to find solutions to parking is a positive BUT there needs to be consultations with residents and businesses. Imposing CPZs might not always be the answer. Perhaps encouraging new housing developments to fund more spaces or fund additional charging points would help.</p>	<p>If carried out successfully, improving traffic around schools would be a positive, however I think it is difficult to do!</p>	<p>Emissions based parking is NOT The answer. This will impact me as an electric is not suitable for where I live (in a flat so no access to charging). New charges MUST go through consultation. The likelihood is that people with older cars have these vehicles because they cannot afford to change them. Providing more charging points will encourage people to buy electric cars without negativity impacting those that cannot afford them.</p>	<p>Better use of technology is a positive, but the option of cash payments should always be available.</p>
145	<p>Although I am all for making making environmental improvements for the sake of our planets future etc.. I and just about everyone I know who have no choice but to use a car for work are noticing that drivers have become the target for 'punishment'. the lowest paid people are continually kicked in teeth with increasing costs. Making more EVCPs will cost a lot, who benefits? only those elite few who can afford these ridiculously expensive electric or hybrid cars. Car clubs are not always viable, when you need to use your car at short notice to attend a urgent visit you now become an unreliable member of car club. Public transport far to unreliable when you have others relying on you! We need other solutions for the everyday person. Cycling is not an option for lots of people, if you have miles to travel each day and need to carry documents etc then cycling is not viable. Creating new cycle lanes would be beneficial to get them OFF the road in which tax payers are paying to use yet they are held up behind them trying to pass on narrow roads / lanes. I'd love to see a ban of cyclists using our actual roads, it's far too dangerous for both drivers and cyclists to be encouraging it until more work is done to separate them.</p>	<p>The maintenance of our roads needs to be looked at to ensure the efficient flow you are trying to achieve. Road works and utility works happen all too often, seemingly in the same spots with no future planning to maybe carry out work at the same time as others to try and shorten the time in which road users are affected. For example Coombe lane has had temp traffic lights up somewhere along the road constantly since christmas, this is bad planning and could have caused a lot less stress for a lot of people had it been managed adequately. Car parking is far too expensive. You want to increase usage of public transport by making everything more expensive to drive however some don't have a choice! Please stop punishing the driver all the way along the line, we are not all able to make other arrangements and persecuting the ones who PAY the road taxes etc is a joke. So far in this policy I have seen NO support for those who have no choice but to use a car. We are all important, not just the cyclists or those who can afford electric.</p>	<p>There are many areas / roads in the borough that require assistance in improving the residential parking. There have been arguments and estate battles due to parking, I see this in my working role as well as personal. I have had to send families to mediation due to arguments and fights breaking out over parking and I have begun to see this happening in the road in which I live where parking is becoming poorer and poorer. Fining people always seems to be the answer, however there are never solutions provided. We pay council tax and road tax etc but cannot get a parking spot anywhere near our houses because people are pushed away from other areas and trying to find parking elsewhere. The knock on effect is not thought through and not fair! Parking permits are expensive, car parks even more so. make these more reasonable, offer discounts to those who have no choice - trying to make money from this by issuing tickets and PCN's just makes residents more angry and more likely to upset others by trying avoid those PCN's! Telling drivers NO PARKING but offering no other solution? Yet again drivers punished. YES please do get bays on restricted kerb sides (keeping of the road) this is just wasted space essentially. We cannot currently park on kerbs or verges..why?? this would alleviate a lot of issues in a lot of roads!</p>	<p>Parents are having to travel further to school for various reasons, walking is not always an option however those who can I am sure do! No one wants to volunteer themselves into the carnage of school drop off parking if they don't have to? Surely? The traditional lolly pop man must be a hugely missed asset at a lot of schools. There are three schools in my immediate vicinity, I cannot get anywhere without passing at least one. The traffic caused is atrocious but the main problem are the selfish people who double park to save themselves a walk. The schools need to become more involved with ensuring parents understand the impact on others road users and residents. The lollypop man's presence stopped this behaviour, no there is no one to monitor or report back when it's occurring. quite a simple solution really!</p>	<p>Yet again the poorest must pay. How on earth is this a good solution?? make life even harder for those already struggling?? STOP punishing the drivers and find some way to assist them. Emission based charging is a horrendous idea. Why does everything need to be charged? It's already far too expensive, as previously said punishing those who have NO choice is disgusting yet that's the only ideas that ever come out. Stop the drivers, yet rubbish unreliable public transport that you may well get stabbed or robbed or attacked on, or cycle and risk getting your head stoved in when you fall off. Please come up with some decent ideas that actually help the people who pay for these things to be done! Needing a car for work purposes is not my choice yet I have to pay extortionate amounts of parking fees, tax and petrol to keep going. Now Croydon want to kick us further by charging for emissions. GO CROYDON :((((</p>	<p>Am all for using technology for improvements however only if they work properly and are user friendly - these things seem to be great in theory but in reality are a nightmare! Possibly impact - hard to predict this.</p>



146				It is ridiculous		
147	All the objectives will make a good impact. I find parking difficult in Croydon, though I can see how the objectives will help my issues. I'm not sure what a EVCP is.					
148	None because no one is shopping in Croydon the only people there are the poor and desolate. The cost of car parking in Croydon has been one of the main reasons for Croydon's town centre being degraded. The cost parking has had a major effect on the shops in Croydon and Employment as no-one wants to go to Croydon when Sutton and Bromley are so much more cheaper with bright, busy town centres. I would go as far as to say that car park charges had a detrimental effect on the whole of Croydon	What parking management it costs too much to park in Croydon. Nothing impacts just more poor people with no money drinking beer and begging in the town, who would want to park here in Croydon				
149					The documents I have seen do not explain how this will work. How will emissions be assessed. My car will not attract the ULEZ charge. Why should I pay more than the current £80 to park outside my own house? I have some mobility problems and my house is some distance from the station. I will be penalised financially for this disability. Security at night is an issue. The proposal penalises those who have older cars and cannot afford to replace them. Also owners of older cars tend to take better care of their vehicles because they will not be trading them in on a 2/3 year cycle.	
150		I am concerned of the impact on parking for residents of Dering Road. It would be beneficial if these changes include a later time frame for non-resident parking. At the current time fees end at 6pm and enforcement officers don't seem to check vehicles after 10am. Once 3pm arrives the road becomes hectic and after 7pm it can be impossible for residents to park due to people using free parking to access local restaurants		I am concerned about the impact of this if this would affect the street Dering place, where Howard Primary school is located as local residents rely on bays along this street to park. More bays could be safely fitted and improve parking for residents whilst not impacting school safety	This shift would be a negative impact on those who live in the Borough and need a car for work. Personally I can not afford to purchase a new car but I have to use one for work, and creating higher bills for those in a less privileged situation is unfair to the users who rely on the bays. I'm sure there are hundreds of others in the same situation. This would create a bigger financial deficit for those who can't afford to change their car and would only be positive to those already in a better financial situation. It would not change the traffic in the area or the use of cars as so many rely on them. Increasing bills will only lessen the ability for people to save towards a new car.	This could possibly have a negative impact on the older generation. I believe a shift is good and personally rarely use cash, however it would be beneficial to have some cash payments in place
151	You give no consideration to folk with restricted mobility issues that are not deemed bad enough by current legislation to warrant a disabled parking badge. Negative will be the only impact in the Croydon area. All you ever do is restrict or stop hard working people from enjoying the right to use a vehicle they have paid for, and have to continue to pay for, the right to use it on the roads in Croydon.	Reducing car usage is a matter for the individual. You have no right to inflict your stupid ideas on the rest of us. Negative impacts. One look at the recent changes to many streets in Croydon by making them "one way only" is prime example of getting it wrong.	If you insisted that all new buildings of all types provided suitable parking for its purpose the problem would reduce. Fiddling around with parking metres won't help. Once again your attempts to force people off the roads will come back to haunt you, as shops begin to fail and close. I am stunned by the stupidity of this council.	Stopping or slowing traffic near schools will achieve nothing because air moves. This policy is a joke. I should think many parents will complain about the foolishness of your plans but I suspect it will make no difference to your desire to impose your idiot ideas on them.	Polluter pays. This is nothing but a money-making idea taken from that idiot of a mayor of London. I expect the sheep will like it.	I like to use cash. Some older folk do not like or want to use "apps" and "cell phones". They just want to pay and park. Still they will be dead soon so we don't need to consider them now. I believe the impact will be negative. Stop interfering with the right to free movement by whatever means I choose.
152	none	2 wheel parking on pavements should be allowed for access to large & emergency vehicles		I think parents should be discouraged from parking within half a mile of the school. School buses should be provided and used. If electric school buses were used this would improve the air quality and help parking for everyone else	many will be adversely impacted by introducing a pollution tax - incentive schemes for new electric cars would help	make it all electronic
153	I am concerned about traffic management orders. I do not want more regulation as this imposes on freedom for people. We need to find ways of extending road system and making access to Croydon easier not harder if we want it to be economic hub. There needs to be more parking not less. Public transport needs vast improvements if you want to restrict use of car. Also do not restrict cabs and mini cabs given poor public transport. Boroughs such as Coulsdon have traffic problems from new housing without consideration of roads and transport and also have no easy public transport.	Just that need to improve parking not make it worse. Improve public transport substantially then think about reducing cars. If you are in Coulsdon you have no choice!!! No tube, tram and a few buses		Disagree entirely. Parents do not need more pressure when often needing to get to work etc. Just, more bureaucracy that we will be paying for and cause of congestion on other streets	No. Just way too over complicated. And unfair because some people can't afford efficient cars and also road tax takes this into account so you are double taxing	

154	Use of electric cars will only increase when the price lowers but where off street parking is not available there will need to be some scheme to ensure residents can park outside their property to charge the vehicle overnight.	Limit the parking of commercial vehicles in residential streets e.g numerous branded white vans, mini buses and passenger ambulances, most of which should be stored on companies own property not residential roads.	Extend PCZs as far as practicable in the most congested areas and limit each address to 2 parking permits even if the property has been converted into 2 or more flats or used as an HMO.	It will be good to encourage residents to walk to work or school where possible but the council will need to allocate school places near enough to enable this to happen, I know of some cases where it is a 40 minute walk to school so a car journey is required.		
155	It sounds like the proposed changes, will bring cleaner air to Croydon, but with the restrictions to be imposed, this is hardly surprising, since less people will come to Croydon to use it's facilities, such as shops and restaurants. One of the only positive things will be the ability to pay parking fees more easily, as mentioned, causing less anxiety. The parking fees in Croydon are already astronomically high and I can see that they will only increase with the cost of the new systems implemented. I make most of my visits to Croydon, that involve shopping, or visits to banks etc, by motorcycle, because at the moment making and access is so much easier than by car and parking is thankfully free and plentiful. There will be positives and negatives as I see it. The pressure on people who need to use their cars for coming to Croydon will increase, but the impact on the roads in terms of traffic may decrease. This may of course be cancelled out by the fact that the population is growing quickly and so there will be more road users. The idea of using bicycles or walking as a substitute for car use, is not like in places such as Holland, where the topography is flat, with no hills. The UK makes inadequate provision for cyclists or pedestrians, unlike many European countries, that have dedicated cycle lanes, which are separated from the roads. UK roads are just not built to take such	1500 parking spaces is woefully inadequate. 15000 would be more in keeping with the amount of people wanting to use Croydon. Of course there are private car parks, but the firms that run those put their prices up hugely, when they took them over from the Council some years ago. I guess it will increase traffic in other areas, if Croydon becomes less accessible, as people abandon the idea of using Croydon as a place to shop or visit. No doubt some businesses will consider re locating too, if their staff cannot come and park easily. Building more houses to accommodate more people, but then to restrict parking, will have an adverse affect on parking and people will be inconvenienced.	So, ou know there will be growth in the area and the policy is going to be to restrict parking even more...? Negative impacts, with more restrictions.	Again, the UK has pursued a policy of building schools with no off road parking for children to be dropped off and picked up, thus keeping the streets bulging with cars. All schools should be built or have made provision for off road parking for those dropping off or collection the children, as they do in other European countries and the USA. The introduction of patrols will improve the flow of general traffic, but probably make it more difficult for the parents of the children. Safer for the children, with the changes, but probably more frustrating and just as difficult for road users.	Yet more legislation, forced on the everyday driver, before the technology is available or affordable to most people. This is a policy that puts the cart before the horse as happens time and time again in the UK. Electric cars ( just about the only option so far) are very very expensive to buy and have such restrictive range. They then have to be left somewhere to be charged, before one can continue a journey. Dreadful technology, that is woefully inadequate for many people, plus the infrastructure is years from being ready to cope with millions of people switching from traditionally powered vehicles. The production and running of electric vehicles is not the "green" technology it is sold to us as, in all the propaganda. Yes, negative impact on community, where people are again forced to try and afford an electric car and dispose of a perfectly good car that they may own already. The vast amount of minerals needed to be mined to create an electric vehicle, is a detrimental impact on the environment, which we in the Western world seem to ignore. A case of out of sight, out of mind.	Cash payment should still remain an option. Yet another move to force people to use contactless payment, which many still don't trust or feel comfortable using. Fraud, since this method is increasing, has also multiplied, which again causes people anxiety. Most people will welcome the use of contactless payment, especially the younger generation.
156			The cost to residents is too high. There should be consideration given to residents not having to pay at all for the first permit - especially if the CPZ has been introduced in theory to stop non-residents parking. There should be no additional charges on top of the actual parking charge when buying a ticket via the app. There should be trade-person tickets (like blue badge maybe) that could give free parking for a period of time (but not enough for them to use them for parking all day).			Apps should be free to use and not require sign up, there should be no hidden costs or charges, Any charges (or as a minimum when additional charges should be applied) should be included on the street signs which display the pay and display costs. Not everyone can use a mobile phone so what provision do you make for these people?
157	Thankfully I very rarely go into Croydon, as it is an unsafe dirty dive of a town, so as long as parking does not change where I live I do not think I will be affected too much. The council seems intent on ruining the South of the borough with so many developments being given planning permission, and I smile when I see plans going through with bicycle sheds and only one parking space and no on road parking ..... that will not stop people having cars, every young person wants to drive as soon as they are old enough - it is part of becoming an adult and the first of hopefully many achievements in their lives, so the we end up with cars being parked on pavements etc. There are just too many people!					
158	Although not mentioned, I feel that by increasing the number of bus lanes, people's commutes will be much quicker by bus compared to travelling by car and therefore will encourage more people to take the bus.	Some developers tend to feel that if a new housing development is close to good transport links, absolute minimum parking/disabled bays only are required and therefore the lack of parking spaces is taken to the extreme e.g. the proposed Purley Skyscraper. In reality this is not the case and some people living within those developments will need a car and therefore a parking space.				I am confused as to why paying by the RingGo app is more expensive than placing money in the pay and display machine. Usually using the app is cheaper as it allows the Council to make savings as machines do not have to be maintained. Should Croydon stop using the pre-payment method on the app and switch to a method similar to the one used in Wandsworth, the price per half hour/hour should be clearly displayed before clicking 'start' otherwise people may not be aware of how much their parking could cost. Although more convenient for many, I appreciate that the elderly may not wish to pay for their parking via the RingGo app as it could appear complex.

159	<p>Yes. The consultation makes no note of and has no control presently over NCP and other privately owned car parks in Croydon. To make a real difference including into the future with Westfield, you have to take back control of privately owned car parks and direct traffic there to. Without doing this you can have minimal effect on business and leisure visits to Croydon especially as Westfield intends to attract traffic from Surrey, Sussex and Kent from where in the latter case, there are no direct main train lines into Croydon. You are tinkering at the edges. If you want a vibrant town centre that attracts people other than just locals, then you have got to provide good facilities for out-of-town visitors. Note that so called "out-of-town" shopping centres such as Purley Way have "free" car parking for shoppers for at least for a few hours, and that is why people go there. You have got to manage traffic so that people can access the Town Centre for minimal cost and that means park and ride or walk from peripheral car parks (apart from disabled and emergency vehicle access). Many of these private car parks are only part full now and that is because the town centre is dead and their charges are high. This would be a good time to buy back or cpo those car parks and take back control.</p>	<p>Not personally. I'm fortunate in that my house was built in 1910 and has always had parking off-road. I feel bad for older residents of the borough who live in streets with no off-road parking, who are on pensions and who own older cars that they can't afford to renew but who use them very little. A car does not pollute if it is not used. It is daily commuters and car movements that cause the majority of the pollution not stationary vehicles. You are tinkering with the surface. 1500 spaces compared to maybe 5000 multi-storey spaces in private hands. Take back control if you want to make a real difference but don't kill off parking that is required by shoppers and by out-of-town visitors who spend money in our town and might bring it back to life.</p>	<p>No. But I've always thought it ridiculous that there are parking restrictions after 6pm until Midnight around the Fairfield Halls where parking for visitors (and showing them goodwill) is essential.</p>	<p>Excellent idea. Far too many parents run their children to school when they could walk or catch the bus. Will improve community.</p>	<p>An older resident with a car he hardly ever uses is not causing pollution whilst it's just sitting there. I note that you only expect the parking revenue to increase by £125k but the costs of implementing this is likely to be millions. Don't rush it. Introduce it gradually.</p>	<p>No, I can walk anywhere from where I live although the loss of direct buses to Mayday Hospital from the south is a negative. You've got to introduce intelligent "Parking Spaces Available" signs in conjunction with the private car park operators (or take back CP control). Then you could get visitor parking off the streets and reduce the need for traffic wardens policing unfortunate visitors.</p>
160	<p>THE POLICIES THTA YOU COME UP ARE BEYOND BELIEF.YOUR AIM IS TO OVERPAY THE UNDERWORKED , UNDERQUALIFIED STAFF THAT YOU HAVE EMPLOYED FROM MS NEGRENNI UPWARDS.YOU ARE RUINING LOCAL PARADES, SHOPPING CENTRE AND DO NOT REALISE HOW MUCH REVENUE YOU ARE LOSSING WHEN LOCAL SHOPS CLOSE DOWN IN COUNCIL RATES.THIS BOROUGH IS BEING RUN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE COUNCILLORS AND OVERPAID YES STAFF WHO ARE EMPLOYED BUT DO NOT DELIVER. YOU HAVE RUINED PARTS OF THIS BOROUGH AND CONTINUE TO DO SO.YOU HAVE SOLD LAND AT BELOW MARKET PRICES-WERE YOUR ACTIONS LEGAL?</p>					
161	<p>As a pensioner I would find it difficult to buy a new electric vehicle. I own a 2002 Fiesta and already pay higher road tax £200 due to it being considered higher emission. However I use the car once or twice a week. However the costs of car clubs even 2nd hand ones are very high. People we visit include areas not accessible by local transport. I hope that these extra charges will not be unfair. Remember for a new electric vehicle to be produced uses up and causes more emissions than savings on disposing of my Fiesta. We are purchasing a property in [...] road where there is no free parking from 8am to midnight. I feel that people who visit us from Orpington will be put off by not having a place to park.</p>	<p>Similar to my early answer. Of course it is good to provide local residence parking. I hope you won't be removing it or cause excessive increases. It is already very over priced in Central Croydon. It would be more reasonable to allow Ruskin road the same restrictions as West Croydon as it is near the station. Should offer Monday to Saturday no free parking between 9 and 6 as in West Croydon. This at least would allow me visitors who don't have access to the Tram or direct bus / train links.</p>	<p>Probably this I answered with the previous questions in Section 1 and 2. Obviously there should not be unsafe conditions existing. Prioritise local residents and their visitors for parking needs.</p>	<p>Sometimes on School markings a confusing message is sent. This is where a sign says no parking eg between 8.30 and 9.30 and 3pm and 4pm. Often these parking restrictions already seem to be there as there is a yellow line. So one can't park there throughout the day making the sign confusing.</p>	<p>This I feel is very unfair for elderly people who cannot afford a new car. You may confine people to their homes if ridiculous surcharges are introduced. I do hope as councillors you have not already decided to implement these things irrespective of what your local electorate have to say.</p>	<p>This could be helpful for younger and middle aged people but pensioners may find it frightening as to how to use. Not everyone is confident even if they do have a smart phone. you must allow the old fashioned way of paying with coins also.</p>
162	<p>I currently hold a parking permit in the north zone. I do voluntary work, am currently a chair of governors in a local primary school, have a school drop 3 miles from my home and have medical needs, I travel a lot but I use public transport everyday. Under the proposed scheme my car would be subject to a huge hike in my permit cost. If this change takes effect, you will force me to drive my car everyday thereby increasing the pollution I put into the air. Yes I do. Most of the areas that have residents permits are in disadvantaged areas. Yet again you are penalising the poor who won't be able to afford a new car that meets the emissions criteria.</p>					

163	We need a much greater emphasis on: electric vehicle charging, on streets and in car parks, provision of shared vehicles, pay per minute parking charges, up to a total time limit. Only positive, if we can commit to a more flexible and more environmental policy					
164	We agree that parking in Croydon is becoming a problem for us all and that we need to think of ways to deal with this . We have taken action by only having one low emission car and traveling by transport. However we still have the continued problem of parking our car in our road as it is use by all to park and use local station therefore the only day we are able to park is Sunday. Why can't we have resident parking so. Can enjoy my own car and transport service without stress . There is always going to be issues to start with but once the changes are made people will get use to it ,	Yes go for it allow us a parking bay by our home. Not from local community , but from others who park on our roads to travel into London	Yes please need it on our road , would be willing to pay as resident. No community impact, not local but others who park on our roads to use our station.	Yes, both	Yes	Yes both positives and negatives
165	It has to be realistic parking areas for the amount of cars which will need it. Problems parking will be the trouble.	Not enough parking at schools some parents need to drive because of disability or having to go straight to work		As before if u are disabled and need to be at work then you need to drive and be able to park close	It all sounds like it's just money making	Not everyone is able to use mobile app they need to be able to ya with cash
166	I expect it will all be negative for Joe Public		expect it will cost Joe Public an arm and a leg hope payments wont change from money to electronic transactions, not all especially the poorest and the struggling havew the luxury of pone banking on a smart phone		no amount of encouragement will magic new cars which meet the criteria for most of croydon residents. cant understand how £1.50 on an oyster card gets you all over the borough if you can manage the buses and trams but parking if you need to can make or break the days allotted money flow for a lot of people.	forgetting about real live people
167	No for me. Positive for community.					
168	Thanks donâ€™t believe there should be any restrictions on off street parking. If people have bought houses with driveways then there should be no restrictions on them using them. As a mother with a baby and 3 other young children I drive when I go out for 2 reason. 1 - I live at the bottom of a steep hill and one of my sons wouldnâ€™t be able to walk up it, 2 - I canâ€™t always get the buggy on the bus as other buggies are already on there and 3 - I often have a time limit due to school runs. I do use the bus where possible though. More PND where Mums canâ€™t access services due to not being able to drive or park near them with a new baby. People not being able to park where they were when they bought properties. Less people volunteer to take old people to the shops and therefore more isolation for the elderly Less family being able to visit from outside London.					
169				Feel all children should walk to school unless mitigating circumstances	Govt. has a lot to answer for re encouraging diesel vehicles. Consideration needs to be given to that sector if car owners	Consideration needs to be given to those who do not have / access to internet
170	I hope people in new build flats donâ€™t get parking permits in Croydon. The main concern is parking for flats.					
171	No	Off street parking for house owners to be limited to one car per house. People who own multiple cars should park on their driveway or be charged for parking on the road. Off street parking is becoming a problem in local suburban streets.	Trucks and larger vans should be banned from parking in residential streets from 5.00pm to 8.00am as business people park their vehicle in the street nearby at their leisure without any consideration to others. Council has been turning a blind eye even when home owners have raised these issues in the past.		Hybrid and electric vehicles should be exempt from charges and more charging points to be installed in strategic points to encourage people to buy electric cars. No community impact.	Positive

172	As a pedestrian ie someone who does not own a car most of these initiatives are for car drivers so where do pedestrians fit in? Off-street parking means parking on the pavement where I live which means I have less space to walk on the pavement - as well as having to circumnavigate the fly-tipping on the pavements. These objectives do not cater for pedestrians who are only allowed on pavements whereas the cars can go on the road and park on pavements. Thus these objectives will negatively impact on me and my family. All negative impacts as more cars will be in/parking in the area - more congestion, less space to walk for pedestrians and more pollution for kids, elderly and those with breathing problems.	sounds ok but in practice there will be more congestion and pollution	Again this is skewed to car drivers needs not pedestrians who rely on the roads to be clear for walking. Negative impacts - more congestion and pollution.	yes seems ok - but too many parents will still bring their cars irrespective of knowing there is no/limited parking available. Negative impacts - more congestion, pollution and cars are still a danger to children	you cannot pay to compensate for being a polluter - just reduce the number of cars - so reducing the pollution. There are too many cars in thornthorpe/heath/croydon. Will result in more congestion.	this sounds ok but it just is bringing in money for the council - this is not helping the environment. Negative impacts - more congestion and pollution
173		"Needs of local residents for parking near to home" this impacts me. I live near Norwood Junction rail station, Harris school/sixth form college and Selhurst Park football ground. We have no parking for restrictions allowing residents to park in my own area. "safe walking and cycling near schools." No one enforces the no parking on yellow lines around the school. Causing traffic chaos and dangerous road conditions.	Id like to see a permits only parking 1200 to 1400 in my road, Dison Road, SE25 [...]	See previous comments re yellow line parking issues around Selhurst Road/Clifton Road		
174					do not introduce emission based charging. This is outrageous, we already have it in London. You're making it harder for the poorer people in the borough and just aiming this towards the rich who can afford flashy new cars with low or no emissions. Not all of us are as well off as others and it's disgusting to think that you'd try to include this policy locally. You'll do what you want anyway so it feels pointless commenting on this but I hope that you listen and don't burden us with more charges that we can't pay for. We pay insurance and road tax, what more do you want from us?!	
175	The Crescent CR0 [...]. Although this seems to be a positive step whatever decision are finally agreed on have the decency to review any unforeseen impact affecting all stakeholders.	My experience of parking management is appalling. CPZ introduced at CR0 [...]. Parking spaces huge increase allowing the speed of traffic to increase to an alarming level. Two schools occupy this rd and pick up/ drop off is a nightmare. Parents don't pay to park, wardens stand and watch the chaos residents can't park.	CPZ as above but experience shows that on the crescent children's lives have now been put at greater risk with more parents using vehicles for school run, congestion reaching critical, drivers anger and incompetence increasing verbal and aggressive confrontations. Council informed and does nothing.	I understand that there are two school streets in my area. In my opinion they are deserving but if my other comments are taken into account ie school runs, congestion, aggressive behaviour, emissions, speeding and inconsiderate parents then The Crescent is a deserving case. The Crescent is a disaster waiting to happen. Zero enforcement, no crossing/ patrol and I have already proven to the council by submitting video evidence there is already a massive negative impact on safety and general order.	Make them pay.	
176	Lion Green Road Car Park must be kept open. Coulsdon shops need the support of local community Older people need somewhere to park in Coulsdon.	Elderly people cannot carry heavy shopping and need parking near shops. I don't know how this will impact.	No	Restrictions around schools good idea	Motoring expensive enough	Not everyone uses smart technology. Will impact older generation.



177	<p>New planning regulations to be introduced to mandate all new build developments to be provided with EVCPs by the developer. Each new family home (terrace, semi or detached properties) to have a minimum of 1 x EVCP and each new block of flats to have approx. 50% of EVCPs for the number of dwelling units with the block. In the case of family homes the new EVCPs should be provided either on the property. In the case of blocks of flats this should be provided on the land that the blocks of flats are on with the remaining balance provided on or adjacent to public land i.e. residential roads etc. The CIL payments should be increased and ring fenced to cater for this requirement. Although there are existing planning regulations to assess and determine parking and highways impact, the decisions taken by the planning department and its officers are inconsistent. It is clear that there is no common approach or joined up thinking when it comes to parking and highways impact. For example:- Within the Chatsworth Road Conservation Area 72% of the single family homes have been converted to flats of mainly 1 and 2 bedroom units. This has exacerbated the demand for both on street and off street parking. Despite the area having a PTAL rating of 6B, developers are still requesting permission to create off street parking in their planning</p>		<p>It is unfair to increase parking permit costs to residents in CPZs particularly if that vehicle is not often used. I regularly use my bicycle to commute but do not wish to give up my family car. This will only encourage more vehicles to be parked off-street.</p>		<p>Emissions based parking charges will NOT discourage the 50% of the vehicle commutes into Croydon. People may change their vehicles but the vehicle commutes will still continue. Overall parking charges and business parking permits need to be increased to discourage the vehicle commute in the first place. If cycle commutes are to be increased they need to feel and be safe. This does not just mean cycle lanes etc., but also when there is an incident involving a cyclist. Despite the vulnerabilities of cycling the law does not provide adequate protection for them. I have been knocked off my bike twice suffering injuries to myself and damage to my bike and yet the police do not take this seriously. Drivers are often aggressive and abusive to cyclists. Cycling commutes will not increase until cyclists feel safe and are indeed properly protected by the law and the police.</p>	
178	<p>We support a collaborative approach across all council departments, However, this should also include planning. We believe that the needs for the local economy must also be taken into consideration when deciding on parking policy along with the topography of the local area and provision of public transport. We think it is wrong that the council applies a lower standard off-street parking to social housing. Our experience is that people in social housing have the same requirements as those in private housing. People in social housing may not own as many vehicles, but they still tend to drive them and frequently drive company vehicles which they bring home. Not providing sufficient off-street parking for them leads to conflict and strife between neighbours and communities in local streets.. All car parks must have at least 2 electric vehicle changing points in the long-term section. Park and Ride with low parking charges should be considered at strategic locations around the borough in areas such as Coulsdon, Addington Village, Ashburton and Shirley enabling and encourage people to use public transport to reach central Croydon.</p>	<p>Parking in district centres needs to be adequate to allow them to remain attractive and viable. This should include at least one adequate town centre public car park with a mixture of short- and long-term parking. It should also provide adequate on street metered parking where the first hour is free and the second hour is paid for in periods 20 or 30 minutes. Enforcement : It is important that there is adequate enforcement of parking, However, enforcement not only needs to be fair but needs to be seen to be fair. Parking fines need to be issued for genuine disregard for the rules and not for minor infringements as a means of revenue raising. Information: There needs to adequate information which can be clear and simple to understand on the council's web site. Where people can enter their vehicle registration number and receive the information they need about parking charges across the borough. We understand the London Mayor's Healthy Streets policy of encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport policy and are generally supportive of this policy. However, we are off the view that this should be undertaken by encouragement not by force. We are concerned that Croydon is interpreting the London plan too rigidly and does not take into to consideration that areas like Coulsdon and Upper Norwood are on the edge of Croydon and London</p>	<p>We are supportive of Controlled Parking Zones especially where there is parking stress in residential areas around traffic objectives such as stations or work places on industrial estates or business parks. These CPZ must be fair to existing residents and on street parking charges should be set a fair level. Where businesses are in a CPZ they must also be allowed parking permits where a vehicle is essential to the viability of that business.</p>		<p>Emissions based parking punishes the poor, in particular those residents without their own drives, big houses and new cars. The policy seems more about looking to be doing something on pollution rather than a measured policy. A parked car doesn't generate any emissions. Additional cost may simply mean I park in a non CPZ out of hours and drive to work. Presently cycle!! Local businesses have been given short term free parking to encourage trade and use of car for short journeys. Joined up thinking. As a resident in a road next to a tram stop and local shops we actually requested a CPZ to allow us to park somewhere near our house. At the time we were assured cost of CPZ was purely to cover costs. This is already being stretched as with changes in infrastructure and no fixed meters to service should reduce cost.</p>	

179	<p>Croydon residents would welcome collaboration across all Council Departments to ensure all parts of the Borough are treated equitably. This must include the Planning Department whose interpretation of planning policies to enforce their draconian anti-car policies has led to much of the parking problems, particularly in outer wards such as Coulsdon.</p> <p>Accepting that more homes are needed, the planning department's approval for almost all developments, especially the 9 apartment blocks squeezed into what was once a family home sized plot has caused many difficulties. Planning officials erroneously believe that residents will not have cars if adequate parking spaces, even when space does allow, are not provided. Yes, they will...but will seek out side street parking on our already congested and dangerous narrow roads. This policy adds considerably to many of the problems, which one assumes you are trying to address.</p>	<p>The London Plan would seem to offer flexibility when considering areas sitting on the periphery of large centres such as Croydon to allow smaller district centres to survive. There appears to be little of this flexibility evident when considering the topography and demographics of Coulsdon. Many of our older properties are cottages offering no space to use for parking off-road meaning that even greater thought should be given when approving new residences.</p> <p>Businesses in smaller district centres and local parades are struggling to survive for well- publicised reasons and would benefit from better parking provision including car parks and a combination of short and longer term on-street parking. Coulsdon does benefit from a 1hr free provision, although spaces are severely limited. As not all own a smart- phone, parking metres really MUST retain a cash paying facility, particularly helpful for the more elderly.</p>	<p>These have a role when introduced around stations to prevent all-day commuter parking but not in roads where residents wish to leave their cars at home in order to use public transport. Stress occurs when such residents are unwell or on holiday so need to find somewhere else to park if 11-12pm restrictions apply.</p>	<p>We understand the need to encourage peoples and students to walk, cycle and use public transport to travel to and from school. However, there must be adequate public transport and parking restrictions should not be imposed in the way they were at Woodcote School Coulsdon which instead of reducing car use to school resulted in displacement to surrounding streets. There must also be adequate provision in these schemes to protect existing residents, casual visitors and trades people carrying out lawful business, carers and health worker along emergency services.</p>	<p>We understand the London Mayor's Healthy Streets policy of encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport policy and are generally supportive of this policy. Car Parks and on street metered parking : It is not clear how this can be applied and monitored based o emissions nor how the differing prices for parking could be displayed in advance that a driver entering a car park would be aware of the variable charges. Any change to emission-based charging in car parks must be both simple and seen to be fair. We do not believe the technology is available to administer this fairly and car parks and on street metered parking should continue to be based on the length of time parked regardless of the emission band of the vehicle. CPZ Residents Permits : This would be much simpler to administer an emission-based parking charge as the vehicle has to be registered and can be easily checked on line to establish the band. We would also caution against setting the parking charges too low for Band 1 vehicles as this could over time dramatically affect the council parking revenue requiring a jump in price at a later date to maintain sufficient revenue to implement and monitor parking with in the borough. Visitors Permits : Should remain as now based on a per vehicle and not be emission-based. Although they could be separated into categories such as</p>	
180	<p>As commutting cyclist, there is no infrastructure in Croydon, just try cycling across Croydon West to East. Were, as at East Croydon money has been spent it's completely wasted giving no benefit. Whilst the desire to have an electric car is very much present, the practicality of recharging it in a terraced residential street seems years off. The whole of Croydon has just had all street lamps replaced without charging infrastructure, planning seems a bit late.</p> <p>All policy seems all stick and no carrot.</p>					
181	<p>A more sensitive approach to parking provision when determining planning applications, as large house conversions, new developments with low level parking for residents, increases competition for parking on the residential streets. A more prohibitive approach to turning front gardens into parking places because this reduces parking spaces on the street, and can lead to conflict if a drive parks over someone's drive way; poor sight lines can also cause a danger of crashes as drivers reverse out. While the encouragement of a greater use of cycles and walking is to be welcomed, given Croydon's low base and the dangers to cyclists from vehicles, and the bad riding behaviour of many cyclists risking accidents with drivers and pedestrians, the growth is likely to be slow, without the creation of safe cycle routes through the back streets. Lesson need to be learnt about the fiasco of the cycle way in the Norbury Avenue/Kensington Ave area.</p> <p>There is a problem of cyclists riding along the pavements especially on both sides of London Rd, which is understandable as it is safer for them to do so, but they are a danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>The Council should consider lobbying the Government to bring in a cycle licence and</p>	<p>Parking restriction signs can be confusing, e.g. in Fairview Rd which leads to drivers misunderstanding and being issued fixed term penalties. Enforcement needs to be undertaken against parking on street corners especially those with yellow lines; and many of those lines need fresh painting to make them more obvious. Enforcement against car dealers along London Rd opposite Pollards Hill from parking vehicles in the street – which are difficult to identify because they do t have a for sale sign; one way is to regularly check car sales on the internet to identify those cars for sale which are parking in the streets. In order to help sustain the economic viability of the shops through Norbury District Centre extended parking times are needed along London Rd to enable potential shoppers to park.</p>	<p>Re-zoning of railway fares to extend Zone 3 to East and West Croydon to reduce the number of commuters who drive into Norbury and park in those streets that do not have controlled parking zone provision.</p> <p>Until [re-zoning] is implemented Controlled Parking Zones off London Rd in Norbury should be free to residents, which will make it easier to extend CPZs as there are residents who understandably resent having to pay to park; and consideration of restricted parking times to deter commuters while allowing residents free parking.</p>	<p>Motor traffic volumes around schools should be reduced through targeted interventions. Although timed road closures reduce congestion at peak times, they do not work at all school sites and also do not reduce the harmful emissions children are exposed to during the school day.</p> <p>We therefore call for this scheme to be extended and renamed as a safe routes to school programme, with low traffic neighborhoods and filtered permeability (alongside parking restrictions and enforcement) as a means of delivering the longer term behavior change needed to improve the health of our young people.</p>	<p>We support the proposed changes to parking charges but wish to highlight that cycle parking charges need to be considered alongside parking permits and charges as even the least polluting cars should be more expensive to park than a cycle. It should not be the case that residents need to pay for cycle parking but a car parked on the same street can be left for free.</p> <p>However, we again highlight that charge zones need to be extended and that charges need to be strongly enforced so that public realm improvements can be financed as part of the parking strategy for the borough. There should be clear communication to residents to inform how the parking surcharge is spent but that there should be consideration to targeting it to the healthy school streets programme in order to mitigate the greater risks poor air quality poses to children's health.</p>	

182	<p>This policy should also be viewed as a public health matter and there should be an explicit reference to working with the council's public health leads to deliver this policy successfully. Crucially, none of the objectives detail actions to be taken, rather the impression is given that its main purpose is to review the current situation. We would highlight the fact that currently 60% of Croydon's residents use active or sustainable transport to get to work each day, yet the majority of our kerbside space is allocated to motor vehicle storage, using what could be now be described as an outdated transport planning model. The kerbside space currently allocated for vehicle storage is public realm, owned by all residents. If this space is well-managed and inviting our streets become safer and more inviting for all. However, if motor vehicle storage continues to be prioritised in the way we currently see, we will continue to see grey, hostile, intimidating public realm in our civic spaces.</p> <p>Finally, given that the population of Croydon is expected to continue to grow, this policy should be setting an agenda to mitigate the future health impacts of an increase of car ownership and journeys taken within the borough.</p>	<p>Parking management should be used as tool to drive behaviour change towards sustainable and active travel and improve our public realm. Therefore, not only should it aim to reallocate space from motor vehicle storage to allow for these changes, but it should also include key aims around enforcement to ensure our pavements and streets are accessible to all, especially our most vulnerable residents. We would highlight the commendable aims suggested in Lambeth Council's 'Equality Streets': Parking in a Liveable Lambeth' should be adapted to form the basis of Croydon's aims for this policy. In particular, the fact that objective 1 is that: All public realm works should acknowledge the need for a balance between the priorities of different users. This should include those with children's buggies and a particular focus on vulnerable users and those that require assistance with their mobility, such as in the use of wheelchairs, scooters, walking frames or sticks, in accordance with Lambeth's policies on road user hierarchy and road danger reduction.</p> <p>Furthermore, as a member of the wider London Living Streets Group, we support their view that: In the rush to foster demand for electric vehicles (EV), London is letting bulky EV charging points (EVCPs) clutter its footways. These installations take</p>	<p>Though Croydon is an outer London borough, the north of the borough shares many of the characteristics of inner London boroughs such as Lambeth and Southwark. We therefore call for the policy to target an increase in CPZ coverage of the borough, in particular where car ownership levels are lower yet the health impact of motor traffic is significantly worse. We would highlight that only 19% of Croydon is currently covered by CPZ, a far lower percentage than other outer London boroughs, such as Waltham Forest (49%) or Brent (62%) and ask for this policy to put in place a year on year increase of CPZ coverage, working towards 50% within five years. Finally, in reference to the statement around businesses, we again quote Lambeth's 'Equality Streets' document in asking for: Existing evidence regarding the importance of the "pedestrian pound" should be collated and presented to Business Improvement District (BID) members for dissemination in order to counter the commonly held belief that customers who drive are more valuable to businesses than those who walk or cycle.</p>			<p>Drawing again from 'Liveable Lambeth', we highlight the following recommendations:</p> <p>7. Car club, cycle hangar and electric charging provision should be comprehensive, widespread (i.e. not just in affluent areas and including estates) and integrated into CPZ specification. Installation of cycle hangars should include consideration of non-standard sized cycles, such as cargo bikes, tricycles, Christiana bikes and tandems.</p> <p>17. Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) should be equipped with appropriate technology to enable easy capturing and publishing of offences, and air quality monitoring.</p> <p>19. In order to support behaviour change, an awareness/publicity campaign in relation to enforcement of minor offences should be carried out, while also highlighting high profile prosecutions. A log of minor offences committed should also be published regularly.</p> <p>21 Clear and comprehensive details of car and cycle parking across the borough should be made available online, based on a robust asset record database, as and when the information becomes available (the commission notes that the parking feasibility study</p>
183			<p>I live on .. Notson road in South Norwood and we have no issues with parking on and around the nearby streets. I would advise not placing permits around that location. It's a nightmare when you have guests and it's unnecessary for that area plus we leave our cars at home if travelling by train. The neighbours are extremely considerate when it comes to parking and we don't have any issues with people leaving their vehicles who don't live in the area.</p>	<p>The word "encouragement" is used in your document, which might signify persuasion, but enforcement seems to be your mode of choice. Fairly recently, restrictions were applied around Woodcote Schools without consultation with residents in nearby roads, mainly cul-de-sacs who continue to suffer great inconvenience at drop off and pick up times. No initial thought was given to deliveries, traders or care workers needing to access during the restricted times.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to all if our children could walk to school along safe, uncongested roads breathing unpolluted air, but we are far away from this being a reality. In the meantime, parents must do the best they can within the limits placed on their lives.</p>	<p>Parking charges must be fair and reasonable to encourage the vitality of district centres and together with enforcement must not be seen as just revenue raising for the Council.</p>	



# Equality Analysis Form

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of Equality Analysis

The council has an important role in creating a fair society through the services we provide, the people we employ and the money we spend. Equality is integral to everything the council does. We are committed to making Croydon a stronger, fairer borough where no community or individual is held back.

Undertaking an Equality Analysis helps to determine whether a proposed change will have a positive, negative, or no impact on groups that share a protected characteristic. Conclusions drawn from Equality Analyses helps us to better understand the needs of all our communities, enable us to target services and budgets more effectively and also helps us to comply with the Equality Act 2010.

An equality analysis must be completed as early as possible during the planning stages of any proposed change to ensure information gained from the process is incorporated in any decisions made.

In practice, the term '**proposed change**' broadly covers the following:-

- Policies, strategies and plans;
- Projects and programmes;
- Commissioning (including re-commissioning and de-commissioning);
- Service review;
- Budget allocation/analysis;
- Staff restructures (including outsourcing);
- Business transformation programmes;
- Organisational change programmes;
- Processes (for example thresholds, eligibility, entitlements, and access criteria).

## 2. Proposed change

Directorate	PLACE
Title of proposed change	Parking Policy
Name of Officer carrying out Equality Analysis	Anupa Patel

## 2.1 Purpose of proposed change (see 1.1 above for examples of proposed changes)

Briefly summarise the proposed change and why it is being considered. Please also state if it is an amendment to an existing arrangement or a new proposal.

**The proposal is to introduce a new Parking Policy that is intended to effectively manage parking provision across the borough in line with the Corporate Plan and the borough's growth objectives.**

**Our Corporate Plan for Croydon 2018-2022 sets out a number of priorities that are aimed at improving the environment we live in, and aim to make it more sustainable, to encourage and support health live. The key priorities linked to this Parking Policy include:**

- An excellent transport network that is safe, reliable and accessible to all – by recognising the important link between transport and a sustainable environment and working collaboratively and undertaking informed decisions that are innovative based on the needs of a neighbourhood, for example, to encourage fewer short car journeys and reduce traffic congestion.**
- A cleaner and more sustainable environment – by addressing air quality with the work we do, such as introducing pedestrian zones around schools to help improve air quality and reduce congestion.**
- Happy, healthy and independent lives – by preventing issues from becoming a problem and having an environment that encourages and supports healthy living.**

**Air pollution is an important and increasingly more high profile public health issue, contributing to illness and shortened life expectancy. It disproportionately impacts on the most vulnerable in the population, in particular the sick, young and elderly. Those at higher risk include those with existing respiratory problems and chronic illnesses such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. People who live or work near busy roads are at particularly high risk of exposure to the health harms of air pollution.**

**There are many national & regional strategies that have been introduced to improve air pollution and reduce emissions over recent years and months to help improve the public's health.**

**The proposal is to introduce a Parking Policy for the borough, which will cover a range of actions to be delivered over a 3 year period aimed at reducing vehicle emissions that will help address public health priorities, the impact of vehicle emissions and congestion on air quality, the need for a shift to more active and sustainable transport modes, and the growing demand for kerbside space;**

**In the context of all the above, it is clear that the introduction of a Parking Policy for Croydon can play an important role in helping to achieve Croydon's Corporate outcomes by enabling a collaborative approach to managing parking provision across Croydon. As the borough grows in population and density the policy aims to improve the environment by delivering actions that will encourage and enable a lesser reliance on cars, a change to lower emitting vehicles and better management of the demand on the kerbside and that will secure a healthy and safe environment near to schools.**

An earlier revision of this document was created, reviewed and approved on 14 February 2019, in advance of a Cabinet decision on 25 March 2019 to consult on the draft Parking Policy. This revision of the document considers the result of the engagement that ended on 5 May 2019 and will support a decision to implement the parking policy.

Analysis showed that 142 out of the total 183 respondents completed one or more of the equalities questions. Of these 135 responded to age questions, 136 to disability, 134 to gender and 130 to ethnicity.

**Section 1, Collaborative Working - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.**

**Section 2, Parking Management - Responses to this section of the policy reflected some elevated level of concern from the protected groups of Disability and Age. These relate to respondents saying there are not enough disabled bays; not enough is being done to curb illegal parking; and a concern that Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) may infringe on pavement space. All of these concerns are recognised and will be addressed in the policy (see section 5 below).**

**Section 3, Controlled Parking Zones - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.**

**Section 4, School Streets - Responses to this section of the policy reflect some elevated level of support from some protected groups. The greatest number in support of school streets was from the over 61 age group who were more likely to say it would be good for children and make parking easier for residents.**

**Section 5, Parking Charges – Of the respondents to this section, the disabled group showed some elevated level of concern for parking charges.**

**Section 6, Innovation and Technology - There was no standout concern nor support from any protected group regarding this section.**

**For detailed information see supporting document below.**

### **3. Impact of the proposed change**

**Important Note:** It is necessary to determine how each of the protected groups could be impacted by the proposed change. If there is insufficient information or evidence to reach a decision you will need to gather appropriate quantitative and qualitative information from a range of sources e.g. Croydon Observatory a useful source of information such as Borough Strategies and Plans, Borough and Ward Profiles, Joint Strategic Health Needs Assessments <http://www.croydonobservatory.org/> Other sources include performance monitoring reports, complaints, survey data, audit reports, inspection reports, national research and feedback gained through engagement with service users, voluntary and community organisations and contractors.

### 3.1 Additional information needed to determine impact of proposed change

**Table 1 – Additional information needed to determine impact of proposed change**

If you need to undertake further research and data gathering to help determine the likely impact of the proposed change, outline the information needed in this table.		
Additional information needed	Information source	Date for completion

For guidance and support with consultation and engagement visit <https://intranet.croydon.gov.uk/working-croydon/communications/consultation-and-engagement/starting-engagement-or-consultation>

### 3.2 Deciding whether the potential impact is positive or negative

**Table 2 – Positive/Negative impact**

For each protected characteristic group show whether the impact of the proposed change on service users and/or staff is positive or negative by briefly outlining the nature of the impact in the appropriate column. . If it is decided that analysis is not relevant to some groups, this should be recorded and explained. In all circumstances you should list the source of the evidence used to make this judgement where possible.			
Protected characteristic group(s)	Positive impact	Negative impact	Source of evidence
Age	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.	Potential negative impact for older age group due to frailty. But the draft policy intends to mitigate this risk by implementing measures to exempt such people and this will be consulted upon. Overall we expect the positive impact of the policy to outweigh the negative impact due to a reduction in air pollution in a person's health.	Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Disability	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures. Positive – the policy can potentially enhance accessibility.	Potential negative impact on people with disabilities &/or long term health conditions, But the draft policy intends to mitigate this risk by implementing measures to exempt such people and this will be consulted upon. Overall we expect the positive impact of the policy to outweigh the negative impact due	Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22 Blue Badge Scheme Croydon Observatory

		to a reduction in air pollution in a person's health.	Disabled Parking Accreditation scheme, in association with Disabled Motoring UK.
Gender	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Gender Reassignment	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Marriage or Civil Partnership	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Religion or belief	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Race	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Sexual Orientation	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.		Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22
Pregnancy or Maternity	Positive – as aim is to improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.	The School Street operational policy gives schools the authority to exempt parents in latter months of pregnancy from the driving restrictions.	Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22

**Important note:** You must act to eliminate any potential negative impact which, if it occurred would breach the Equality Act 2010. In some situations this could mean abandoning your proposed change as you may not be able to take action to mitigate all negative impacts.

When you act to reduce any negative impact or maximise any positive impact, you must ensure that this does not create a negative impact on service users and/or staff belonging to groups that share protected characteristics.

### 3.3 Impact scores

#### Example

If we are going to reduce parking provision in a particular location, officers will need to assess the equality impact as follows;

1. Determine the Likelihood of impact. You can do this by using the key in table 5 as a guide, for the purpose of this example, the likelihood of impact score is 2 (likely to impact)
2. Determine the Severity of impact. You can do this by using the key in table 5 as a guide, for the purpose of this example, the Severity of impact score is also 2 (likely to impact )
3. Calculate the equality impact score using table 4 below and the formula **Likelihood x Severity** and record it in table 5, for the purpose of this example - **Likelihood (2) x Severity (2) = 4**

Table 4 – Equality Impact Score

<b>Severity of Impact</b>	3	3	6	9
	2	2	4	6
	1	1	2	3
		1	2	3
	<b>Likelihood of Impact</b>			

#### Key

Risk Index	Risk Magnitude
6 – 9	High
3 – 5	Medium
1 – 3	Low



**Table 5 – Impact scores**

<p><b>Column 1</b></p> <p><b>PROTECTED GROUP</b></p>	<p><b>Column 2</b></p> <p><b>LIKELIHOOD OF IMPACT SCORE</b></p> <p>Use the key below to <b>score</b> the <b>likelihood</b> of the proposed change impacting each of the protected groups, by inserting either 1, 2, or 3 against each protected group.</p> <p><b>1 = Unlikely to impact</b>  <b>2 = Likely to impact</b>  <b>3 = Certain to impact</b></p>	<p><b>Column 3</b></p> <p><b>SEVERITY OF IMPACT SCORE</b></p> <p>Use the key below to <b>score</b> the <b>severity</b> of impact of the proposed change on each of the protected groups, by inserting either 1, 2, or 3 against each protected group.</p> <p><b>1 = Unlikely to impact</b>  <b>2 = Likely to impact</b>  <b>3 = Certain to impact</b></p>	<p><b>Column 4</b></p> <p><b>EQUALITY IMPACT SCORE</b></p> <p>Calculate the <b>equality impact score</b> for each protected group by multiplying scores in column 2 by scores in column 3. Enter the results below against each protected group.</p> <p><b>Equality impact score = likelihood of impact score x severity of impact score.</b></p>
Age	2	1	2
Disability	2	2	4
Gender	2	1	2
Gender reassignment	2	1	2
Marriage / Civil Partnership	2	1	2
Race	2	1	2
Religion or belief	2	1	2
Sexual Orientation	2	1	2
Pregnancy or Maternity	2	1	2

## 4. Statutory duties

### 4.1 Public Sector Duties

Tick the relevant box(es) to indicate whether the proposed change will adversely impact the Council's ability to meet any of the Public Sector Duties in the Equality Act 2010 set out below.

Advancing equality of opportunity between people who belong to protected groups

Eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation

Fostering good relations between people who belong to protected characteristic groups

**Important note:** If the proposed change adversely impacts the Council's ability to meet any of the Public Sector Duties set out above, mitigating actions must be outlined in the Action Plan in section 5 below.

## 5. Action Plan to mitigate negative impacts of proposed change

**Table 5 – Action Plan to mitigate negative impacts**

Complete this table to show any negative impacts identified for service users and/or staff from protected groups, and planned actions mitigate them.

Protected characteristic	Negative impact	Mitigating action(s)	Action owner	Date for completion
Disability	Potential negative impact on people with disabilities &/or long term health conditions,	Policy Action plan for adoption of the Disabled Parking Accreditation or London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for the provision of disabled parking bays various locations.  Policy Action plan for implementing School Streets, which will afford eligibility of carers and relatives to	Parking	BY Nov 2019  Upon adoption of the Parking Policy

## Equality Analysis

		drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable		
Race				
Sex (gender)				
Gender reassignment				
Sexual orientation				
Age	Potential negative impact for older age group due to frailty	Policy Action plan for implementing School Streets, which will afford eligibility of carers and relatives to drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable.	Parking	Upon adoption of the Parking Policy
Religion or belief				
Pregnancy or maternity		Policy Action plan for implementing School Streets, which will afford schools the authority to issue eligibility to drive during the restricted hours when needed during pregnancy.	Parking	Upon adoption of the Parking Policy
Marriage/civil partnership				

## 6. Decision on the proposed change

Based on the information outlined in this Equality Analysis enter **X** in column 3 (**Conclusion**) alongside the relevant statement to show your conclusion.

Decision	Definition	Conclusion - Mark 'X' below
No major change	<p>Our analysis demonstrates that the policy is robust. The evidence shows no potential for discrimination and we have taken all opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations, subject to continuing monitoring and review.</p> <p>Analysis of the engagement results has found that no individual protected sub-group stands out as having responded negatively to the proposed policy. There has been some elevated concern about insufficiency in the parking bays accessible for the disabled; not enough is being done to curb illegal parking; and a concern that Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) may infringe on pavement space. All of these concerns are recognised and mitigated in the policy actions plan (see Section 5). We will adopt either the Disabled Parking Accreditation or London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for the provision of disabled parking bays various locations. School Streets operational procedure is amended to formalize eligibility for carers and relatives of the vulnerable, and for pregnant school parents.</p> <p><b>If you reach this conclusion, state your reasons and briefly outline the evidence used to support your decision.</b></p>	X
Adjust the proposed change	<p>We will take steps to lessen the impact of the proposed change should it adversely impact the Council's ability to meet any of the Public Sector Duties set out under section 4 above, remove barriers or better promote equality. We are going to take action to ensure these opportunities are realised. <b>If you reach this conclusion, you must outline the actions you will take in Action Plan in section 5 of the Equality Analysis form</b></p>	
Continue the proposed change	<p>We will adopt or continue with the change, despite potential for adverse impact or opportunities to lessen the impact of discrimination, harassment or victimisation and better advance equality and foster good relations between groups through the change. However, we are not planning to implement them as we are satisfied that our project will not lead to unlawful discrimination and there are justifiable reasons to continue as planned. <b>If you reach this conclusion, you should clearly set out the justifications for doing this and it must be in line with the duty to have due regard and how you reached this decision.</b></p>	
Stop or amend the	<p>Our change would have adverse effects on one or more protected groups that are not justified and cannot be mitigated. Our proposed change must be stopped or amended.</p>	

# Equality Analysis

proposed change		
Will this decision be considered at a scheduled meeting? e.g. Contracts and Commissioning Board (CCB) / Cabinet	Meeting title: Date:	
This decision will be considered after a formal consultation.	TBC after consultation but by October 2019	

## Supporting Documents:



Parking Policy Survey  
analysis summary 201

## 7. Sign-Off

Officers that must approve this decision		
Equality lead	Name: Yvonne Okiyo Position: Equalities Manager	Date: 16.07.2019
Director	Name: Steve Iles Position: Director of Public Realm, Place	Date: 16.07.2019