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 ON 15 AUGUST 2019

In accordance with the Scrutiny and Overview Procedure Rules, the following decisions may be implemented from **1300 hours on 23 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.: 0319PL

Decision Title: Objections to Emission-Based Parking Charges and Diesel Surcharges for Permits

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. Consider the responses received to the formal consultation on the proposed introduction of emission-based parking permit charges.

2. Agree to introduce emission-based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges for permits as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.

3. Agree for officers to inform the objectors of the above decision and reasons.

Scrutiny Referral/Call-in Procedure

1. The decisions may be implemented **1300 hours on 23 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: 15 August 2019

Contact Officers: victoria.lower@croydon.gov.uk and 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 and 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

REPORT TO:	**Executive Director PLACE for key decision** **Not before 15 August 2019**
SUBJECT:	**OBJECTIONS TO EMISSION-BASED PARKING PERMIT CHARGES AND DIESEL SURCHARGES FOR PERMITS**
LEAD OFFICER:	**Steve Iles, Director of Public Realm, Place**
CABINET MEMBER:	**Councillor Stuart King, Acting Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport & Regeneration (Job Share)**
WARDS:	**All**

CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT/AMBITIOUS FOR CROYDON:

The emission-based parking charges contribute towards the aims of the Corporate Plan for a cleaner and more sustainable environment, and happy, healthy and independent lives.

The drivers for the emission-based charges are Croydon's Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22, which aims to reduce exposure to air pollution and raising awareness for those who live and work in Croydon, and the Parking Policy incorporating elements of the National 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, and the Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018, which prioritises public health and aims to reduce car dependency.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The required capital expenditure of £38k will be funded via a bid to Growth Board. The annual £110k revenue expenditure will be met from revenue generated from the emission-based permit sales. Revenue generated is expected to decline in future years as owners gradually replace vehicles with lower emission models for lower permit charges.
It is noted that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) is not a fiscal measure and does not authorise the authority to use its powers to charge local residents for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes.

FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: The decision in recommendation 1.2 is a key decision - 0319PL

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That in accordance with the delegation from Cabinet dated 25 March 2019, that the Executive Director Place, having consulted with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Regeneration (Job Share):

1.1 Consider the responses received to the formal consultation on the proposed introduction of emission-based parking permit charges.

1.2 Agree to introduce emission-based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges for permits as detailed in Appendix 1

1.3 Agree for officers to inform the objectors of the above decision and reasons.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed parking charges structure, see Appendix 1, is a means to influencing car ownership and use. It therefore has a role to play in addressing the borough's air quality and public health challenges.

2.2 The introduction of emission-based parking addresses over-arching national, regional and local drivers with an aim of reducing emissions in Croydon.

2.3 A Public Notice of consultation was given on 23 May 2019, inviting objections by 20 June 2019. The Notice and proposed parking permit charges are included in Appendix 2.

2.4 1,039 objections were received, equivalent to 10% of parking permit holders by quantity. The consultation has not identified any material objections which officers consider would invalidate the objectives for introducing emission-based parking charges.

2.5 The required capital expenditure of £28k in 2019/20 and £10k in 2020/21 will be funded via a bid to Capital Growth. The emission-based parking permit charges will incur additional expenditure and income. The costs of implementing the new charging structure will become operationally self-financing by year 2 and is expected to peak at £162k surplus in 2021/22. This surplus is expected to decline in the following years, as a result of owners gradually replacing vehicles with lower emission models for lower permit charges. It is noted that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) pursuant to which any such changes to parking charges would be introduced, is not a fiscal measure and does not authorise the authority to use its powers to charge local residents for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes.

2.6 This report details the objections and officer responses to these objections and recommends support for the introduction of emission-based parking charges and diesel surcharges for permits.

3 DETAILS

3.1 POLICY BACKGROUND

3.1.1 The introduction of emission-based parking charges addresses over-arching national, regional and local drivers with an aim of reducing emissions. The full list of these initiatives can be found in the Cabinet report of 25 March 2019 for the introduction of a Parking Policy, which can be accessed via the following link: https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/documents/s14463/Parking%20Policy%20report.pdf, however, some specific examples include:

- The National Clean Air Strategy 2019, with 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,
- 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 and reduce emissions already on the roads.
- The Mayor's Transport Strategy 2018, which prioritises public health and aims to reduce car dependency,
- Croydon's Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22, which aims to reduce exposure to air pollution and raising awareness for those who live and work in Croydon.

3.1.2 As the borough continues to grow in population and density the policy on emission-based parking charges 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.

3.1.3 The number of cars registered in Croydon grew from 132,572 in 2001 to 148,256 in 2016 (latest analysis). 10,000 of this growth occurred in the latter 3 years.

3.1.4 When demand for parking in a location now exceeds the available kerbside space, occupiers are faced with the choice of parking in neighbouring locations or giving up the car. Emission-based charges would help influence the choices of those who are able to give up the car. This includes owners of infrequently used cars, which most of the time obstruct access, and multiple car households, who take up more than a proportionate share of space. The emission-based charges would also encourage a switch to lesser polluting cars, which on average tend to be smaller in size and impact less on available space and public realm.

3.1.5 Every car journey starts and ends with a parking space. The parking charges structure is therefore an important means to influencing car ownership and use. Parking management therefore has a role to play in addressing the borough's air quality and public health challenges. Many elements of car ownership and usage 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 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.

3.1.6 The Cabinet report of 25 March 2019 set out that it was considered that the discount offered, relative to the highest charge band 5, must be sufficient to create a real incentive for a car owner to switch to a lower emission car – i.e. if the charging differential is too low then it would not, in itself, encourage a switch to a lower emission car. By this concept, the lowest charge band 1 must therefore be perceived as exceptionally attractive, while the highest band 5 must be perceived as high.

The proposal for 5 emission bands is a trade-off between system complexity and encouragement effect. 5 bands mirror what most London boroughs have chosen. The lower 2 bands represent zero emission electric vehicles and low emission hybrid vehicles respectively. The upper limit of 75g/km is aligned to the governments low emission car and van grants scheme (www.gov.uk/plug-in-cars-van-grants). Band 2 covers most Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEV), Range Extended (REX) hybrids and some Mild Hybrid (electrically assisted for a degree of energy saving) vehicle models. The weblink above demonstrates how some large car and van models will qualify for the reduced Band 2 charges.

In 2018, the government reassessed the CO2 emission figures for some so-called Mild Hybrids and Parallel Hybrid models, which have driver selectable powertrains and can effectively be driven permanently in petrol/diesel mode. As result, several of these models now figure above the 75g/km Band 2 threshold, whereas prior to 2018 they would have been below.

3.1.7 Band 3, for all permit types, currently covers the largest proportion of parking permits. The resident permit in Band 3 increases from £80 to £104 (30%), to reflect the objectives for managing kerbside space and air quality. The £80 charge was set in

2013. The ONS Retail Price Index has increased 15% since. The continual growth in car ownership has made space a premium within the parking congested CPZs, resulting in insensitivity to charges and worsening in parking congestion. The £80 charge is therefore no longer effective in managing space demand. Residents with multiple cars or infrequently used cars need encouragement in choosing whether they can do without one or more cars, many of which are parked for longer periods of time taking up kerb space where parking congestion affects access and impacts on public realm. If band 3 was kept at £80, then it would also not present a call or incentive for owners to switch to lower emissions.

3.1.8 There were 10,636 active parking permits at the at the end of 2018, as follows:

9,048	resident permits.
285	business permits.
107	all-zone permits (on-street only).
36	all-zone permits (on and off-street).
24	doctor bay permits.
475	council permits (e.g. Social Services home visiting staff).
411	neighbourhood Care permits (e.g. NHS care in the community staff).
80	statutory undertaker permits.
170	charity permits.
1,540	visitor permits (day permits issued over the 2018 calendar year).

3.1.9 Three parking permit types will not be subjected the emissions-charge banding:

1. 6-week temporary resident permit, which is issued while a resident is in process of moving house or changing car, and while the DVLA document for verifying the vehicle's CO2 emission is therefore not available.
2. Disabled companion badge, which in some circumstances is issued to support a disabled blue badge. The badge is exempt from parking charges, although its issue has a small administration fee.
3. Croydon Neighbourhood Care Association permit. This accounts for a small number of free issued permits (currently 6) permits, which are not vehicle specific. They are shared between about 300 charity volunteers supporting the disabled and elderly/frail in the community.

3.1.10 If introduced, the emission-based charges will be launched in three stages (the first 2 stages being the recommendation of this report):

1) Residents' permits – from October 2019, when a permit is next up for renewal in the 12-month period that follows.
2) Business and other permits, and Diesel surcharging for permits – from April 2020.
3) On-street (i.e. in public roads with pay and display bays) and off-street (i.e. in council operated public car parks) parking charges, and Diesel surcharging for on- and off-street parking – from April 2021 (NB: to be developed and consulted on at a later date, see 3.1.11 below).

3.1.11 The time window for consulting on a proposed Traffic Management Order for the introduction of on and off-street emission-based parking charges is not yet open and this stage of the scheme has some technical dependencies that are still to be established. It is envisaged this consultation will take place in 2020-21, in advance of its proposed introduction.

3.2 PRIOR ENGAGEMENT

3.2.1 A survey the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) in July 2017 found 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.

3.2.2 A survey on the future of transport for the draft third Local Implementation Plan (LIP3) in September 2018 found that 74% of 994 respondents are concerned about air quality in Croydon and 72% agreed that traffic levels should be lowered.

3.2.3 An engagement survey on the draft Parking Policy, in March 2019, described the objectives and timeline for introducing emission-based parking charges. In this prior engagement:

- When residents were asked open ended questions on the views and impacts from parking charges, and specifically highlighting emission-based charges:
  - 25% expressed concerns.
  - 16% expressed support.
  - 60% were neutral, neither concerned nor supporting.
- 11% of respondents expressed a concern that the policy on emission-based charges would impact disproportionally on low income residents, who cannot afford to replace their car.
- 3% were concerned about the diesel surcharge being unfair to owners, who in the past were encouraged to buy diesel.
- 3% were concerned emission-based would have a negative impact on Croydon and the High Street economy, including pushing affluent shoppers in big cars out of town.

The various concerns are considered in the final proposal and responses (section 3.3.2 below). As part of the approval of the revised charges, it is proposed, with a view to reducing the complexity of the scheme, to recommend to the Executive Director that the Council permit (mainly Adult and Children Services) and Neighbourhood Care permit (mainly NHS) be merged into a single Community Care permit; and to merge the two All-zones permits into a single one. It is also suggested that the visitor permit is reduced to 3 emission bands, to align with the future envisaged on-street charges structure.

3.3 STATUTORY CONSULTATION

3.3.1 A Public Notice was given on 23 May 2019, with a 4-week consultation period until 20 June 2019 (see Appendix 2). This is 1 week longer than required by the statutory procedure. The Notice details the proposed emission-based parking charges and invites objections. The communication of the Notice have included:

- Publication in the London Gazette on 23 May 2019.
- Publication in the Croydon Guardian on 23 May 2019.
- Email notification on 23 May 2019 to 96 interest groups throughout the borough, including the 3 emergency services.
- Email notification on 24 May to 13,738 current and past parking permit holders, who have provided their email address as a means of contact.
- Letter notification on 23 May to 310 permit holders, for who an email address is not held.
- 8 Tweets, spaced about 4 days apart.
- 1 Facebook post.

- 1 Your Croydon article.
- 1 Our Croydon article.
- 1 Schools Bulletin article.

The first 24 hours following the email communication generated the highest daily number of online survey responses, signifying that the 10,636 active permit holders were effectively reached. It is unavoidable that in a mass-communication, including a portion of historic email and postal addresses, some notifications were not read by the intended recipients. The emails were specifically designed to best avoid the triggers used by common junk mail filters. In other cases, the recipients are no longer active or have gone away. 162 of the emails were rejected as undeliverable.

In the consultation responses, 9 respondents state they did not receive the direct notification about the consultation. Separately, the project has received 3 contacts from permit holders raising concern over not having received the notification email. After verification and follow-up, 1 of the contacts acknowledged that the email may in fact have been received, but it wasn't noticed. Another acknowledged that a defunct email address may have been provided. The third contact did not follow up, but has responded to the consultation.

In the consultation responses, 1 respondent states an opinion that every household in the borough should have been sent a consultation letter about the permit charges, instead of just contacting permit holders.

3.3.2 Total 1,149 unique respondents replied end of 20 June 2019:

- 1,039 respondents object or are concerned.
- 62 respondents are in support.
- 48 respondents make comments that are neither an objection nor support.

NB: Multiple unique comments made by the same single respondent are separated and counted as multiple unique comments, including when the respondent made multiple submissions to the consultation. Multiple identical, repeat comments made by the same single respondent are counted as 1 comment. In total, 1149 unique respondents made 1167 unique comments.

All 1,149 responses, are available as Appendix 3 to this report in an anonymised format.

For purpose of making a meaningful report on the extensive consultation and its high number of responses, those statements that are highly similar are grouped into identical summary statements. These statements have been considered collectively and will receive officer comments. Other statements are unique and have been addressed individually below.

30 (3%) addresses have submitted 2 or more responses, from differently named individuals. All of these responses are accepted and considered as individual responses.

91 (9%) respondents have submitted more than one response. The multiple responses from each these 91 individuals are merged into a single response, for each individual, encompassing all of the points they have made. No comments have been ignored, but repeated identical comments from a single individual are counted as one comment, from one respondent.

55 (5%) respondents have provided insufficient address information to enable a reply. All comments in these 55 responses are accepted and considered, but cannot

practically be replied to. The respondents concerned have the opportunity to read the responses made in this report, which is placed in the public domain.

3.3.3 The statutory procedure is to invite and respond to objections. The 62 (5%) responses in support for the emission-based permit charges are noted, but do not require responses under the statutory procedure. They will nonetheless receive a reply acknowledging their contribution. Example responses in support of the proposals include:

- *"I agree with the proposal. We need to encourage the adoption of low/zero emission vehicles and do more to discourage the use of those that are polluting the air quality for residents"*. [ID 118]
- *"I want to support the scheme – it is an excellent idea"*. [ID 396]
- *"After looking at the costs of the permits I think emission based parking is a good idea. We have 2 cars in our family home, one of them registered before 2001. We will be getting rid of this car as we don't really need it, or drive it much. It is a higher polluting vehicle and it will save us money in the long run if we dispose of it and hopefully help our environment. Yippee. Well done Croydon Council"*. [ID 1015]

The 48 (4%) of responses that cannot be reliably interpreted as either for or against emission-based parking charges will receive a reply stating there was no point to consider. Examples of such other responses include:

- *"I have no objection to the policies that the council intend to impose, but how will this reflect on busses, taxis and emergency vehicles?"* [ID 420]
- *"My car is hybrid so limited impact"* [ID 440]
- *"My partner never has anywhere to park close to my house when he visits. I don't own a car, many of my neighbours have 2 or 3!"* [ID 691]

3.3.4 Tables 1 and 2 summarise the 145 similar and unique objections and the project officer's responses.

NB: Multiple unique comments made by the same single respondent are separated and counted as multiple unique comments, including when the respondent made multiple submissions to the consultation. Multiple identical, repeat comments made by the same single respondent are counted as 1 comment.

Table 1 – Top 37 grounds for objection, which more than 10 respondents have commented on. They are ranked in order of the number of respondents commenting.

Objections and officer's response
217 respondents (19%) commented: ***The Council is only doing this to generate income. It is a stealth tax, taking advantage of car owners.*** <u>Officer response:</u> Using parking schemes as a means to raise income would be inconsistent with the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. The charges are determined to meet the traffic management objectives for reducing the number of cars on the road and air pollution. There is no related experience that will help model the exact effects from the new charges on car ownership and the number of parking permits issued.

Surplus from parking charges are ring-fenced and, for example, contribute significantly to sustaining public transport fare concessions such as the Freedom Pass.

The new charges are considered necessary to influence the otherwise continuing increase in the number of parked and driving cars on the road in the Borough. Since the permit charges were last reviewed in 2013 there has been a 7% growth in the number of vehicles registered in Croydon. This has meant that there is an increasing pressure for parking spaces and drivers have become de-sensitised to the charges applied, hence reducing their effectiveness for demand management. The permit charges set in 2013 are currently too low for achieving the parking management objectives. This is evident in the number of respondents to this consultation saying it is too difficult to find a parking space. This results in residents circulating the neighbourhood in search for a parking space which inevitably adds to congestion and air pollution.

154 respondents (13%) commented:

The emission-based charges are unfair to those who cannot afford a newer car, which includes the poorest, elderly and vulnerable.

Officer 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 3.1.1. 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 disproportionally 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.

Surplus from parking permit charges are ring-fenced and, for example, contribute significantly to sustaining public transport fare concessions such as the Freedom Pass scheme for the elderly. The parking permit charges therefore indirectly support the portion of the elder population that do not have a car or who choose to use public transport.

The holders of 11,459 individual and 71 organisational blue badges issued in Croydon are exempt from the parking charges.

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.

128 respondents (11%) commented:

Oppose or strongly oppose the emission-based parking permit charges, but without providing any grounds.

Officer response:
The opposition is noted.

119 respondents (10%) commented:

The emissions charges are unfair to owners of little used cars, who offset by frequent walking, cycling or public transport use. Parked cars do not pollute. This is not polluter pay.

Officer response:
Firstly, the charges are not only increased for the high-polluting vehicles, but they are also substantially reduced for low-polluting vehicles. This presents an opportunity for people who use the car infrequently, to eventually lower their parking costs by choosing a lower emission model at their next car choice.

Cars are generally owned for purpose of driving. When the parked car is driven, it contributes to pollution. All car ownership therefore contributes to pollution, in various amounts. The adoption of lower emission vehicles amongst parked cars will contribute to improved air quality.

A sizable number of respondents in this consultation express concern about daily problems of not being able to find a parking space near to home. Infrequently used cars also occupy the over-subscribed kerbside space in residential roads. They therefore contribute equally to access difficulties and impact on the public realm. A number of respondents to this consultation say it is currently too difficult to find a parking space in their CPZ. The necessity that residents circulate the neighbourhood in search for a parking space adds to congestion and air pollution.

Cars that remain parked for longer periods of time, reduce the number of available parking spaces which indirectly increases the circulation of traffic which is searching for parking spaces. Some of these little used cars, and second or third cars, could be candidates for conversion to shared pool car uses or other alternatives to car ownership. The emission-based charges will help encourage this. The Council has a policy to support the expansion of car share schemes.

The permit charge must be an influencer for those who are able and willing to consider the alternatives to car ownership and the emission-levels in their next car choice. If permit charges were to be set at a lower level then it would not influence a sufficient number of owners in their next car choices or support the objectives as detailed in this report at section 3.1.1.

65 respondents (6%) commented:

Drivers are taxed enough already.

Officer response:
The continual growth in the number of cars on the road indicates that ownership is overall, becoming more affordable. Many elements of car ownership and usage costs are already being used to influence behaviours, including road tax, diesel fuel duty and differential congestion charges in London. However these are national or regional schemes, which tend to be moderated for the general national denominator and Central London. These measures are insufficient to help stem the number of cars on the roads in Croydon, where the number of vehicles registered in the borough has grown 7% since 2013.

The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 devolves responsibility to further reduce the damaging impact air pollution has on public health, mainly to a local level. The London Mayor's targets for car use reduction in outer boroughs are similarly devolved to local levels. Without the introduction of emissions-based parking charges it is considered that there would be insufficiency in addressing the public health concerns locally.

64 respondents (6%) commented:

Parking and permits are expensive enough already.

Officer response:

The proposed permit charges for the 2 lower emission bands are lower than the current pre-existing charges of £80, and this represents an opportunity to obtain a lower priced parking permit when next choosing a car. The other 3 bands serve as an encouragement to adopt cars with lower emissions or to reconsider non-essential car ownership.

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 increase, since the permit charges were last reviewed in 2013.

Many respondents to this consultation have expressed concern over the lack of availability of parking spaces, which would indicate that current levels of parking control measures are not achieving their objectives for managing access.

The permit charges set in 2013 are currently too low to support access and to encourage a switch to lower emission cars. The differential in the charging bands must be sufficient to encourage low emission and to discourage high emission. Narrowing the charging differential, to lessen the permit charge for high-polluting vehicles and second cars, would detract from meeting the parking management objectives. The new charges are required to influence a necessary change.

63 respondents (5%) commented:

Diesel is getting unfair press and owners were encouraged to buy diesels.

Officer response:
The diesel surcharge will only apply to vehicles that are more than 4 years old.

The national policy on favouring diesel started to progressively reverse in 2009, when the scrappage scheme was also introduced for older cars. According to the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, the growth in the registrations of new diesel cars levelled off in 2015 and has since been in decline. Diesel currently continue to have a positive role in wider CO2 reduction, in particular for motorway driving where pollution disperses more easily. Older diesel cars, however, contribute disproportionally to NOx in build-up urban areas.

The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 has devolved responsibility for further reducing urban NOx emissions mainly to a local level. The Mayor has introduced ULEZ in Central London and there is a requirement that the outer London boroughs implement local Air Quality Action Plans. NHS data shows that Croydon currently have the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 years) asthma in London. 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution. Failing to address NOx and particulate matter emissions from older diesel (and older petrol) cars in Croydon would deprive many local people of their ability to breathe safe air.

Several manufacturers currently operate diesel scrappage schemes, offering between £2,000 and £6,000 discounts. A national grants scheme for electric vehicles currently covers up to 35% (to max £3,500) of a car's price, or 20% (to max £8,000) for vans. This subsidy opportunity is available to owners of older diesel vehicles.

42 respondents (4%) commented:

The charges are unfair to the poor and vulnerable. People on low and high incomes all have an equal right to park.

23 respondents (2%) commented:

I cannot afford to pay the increased charges.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will cause me severe financial hardship. Forces me to sell my house. Forces me to resign from my job and claim benefits instead.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The scheme does not consider the car owner's financial status.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Are people claiming benefits and own a car going to be let off charges?

Officer response:
Any change to fee structures will have an impact on 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 permit charge will remain a relatively modest element of the total cost of car ownership. Compared to all other associated costs of owning a car, permit charges would be a minimal percentage of the overall cost.

41 respondents (4%) commented:

Unfair to residents living in a CPZ, while not addressing high-polluting cars outside CPZs. It is unequal and creates divisions in the community.

Officer response:
The CPZ represents a location where residents have reported significant parking congestion and requested that such congestion is managed. In non-CPZ locations, the congestion either does not exist to the same level or has not been raised as a concern yet and therefore does not need managing at this point in time. The Council does not implement CPZs where they are not necessary. In most cases the need for CPZs are within the higher density geographical areas and less so in lower density areas.

The next phases of the emission-based parking charges will address polluting vehicles traveling within the borough to public parking places in general, and not just in residential CPZs. These additional proposals cannot be immediately implemented, as they depend on the prior uptake in mobile parking payment technology, which is being addressed separately to emissions-based permit charges in CPZs.

40 respondents (4%) commented:

Residents have received insufficient forewarning and time to adjust, when considering that the normal car replacement cycle. The charges could wait until next time a permit holder replaces the car, to enable a fair choice.

Officer response:
The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 and the London Mayor's Strategy require further actions to reduce urban emissions mainly to a local level. These actions are required to start showing measurable results by 2021. Public Health (NHS) data shows that Croydon currently have the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 years) asthma in London and 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution. Delaying the new charges until the next car replacement would encourage a proportion of car owners to keep their current high-emission vehicle for longer. Failing to address emissions in a timely manner would deprive many local people of safe air.

38 respondents (3%) commented:

There are too few EVCPs (Electric Vehicle Charging Points) to support the transition to electric vehicles.

Officer response:
The Council is currently rolling out on-street charging points and plan to reach 400 public charging points by 2022.

The government currently offers a £500 grant for home charging points for category 2 and 3 plug-in hybrid vehicles, which are available to new low emission vehicle owners.

36 respondents (3%) commented:

Charging local residents is ineffective and unfair, when emissions are also cause by outsiders driving through or into Croydon.

Officer response:
The first phase of emission-base parking charges addresses the most parking congested roads within residential CPZs.

The next phases of the proposed emission-based parking charges will look to additionally address polluting vehicles traveling within and into the borough, to public parking places in general. These new proposed charges cannot be immediately implemented, as they depend on the prior uptake in mobile parking payment technology, which is being addressed separately to emissions-based permit charges in CPZs.

33 respondents (3%) commented:

Emissions need lowering, but this is the wrong way to go about it (not specifying an alternative solution).

Officer response:
The Council will keep an open mind and support emissions-reduction solutions as they are identified in all fields. New solutions could be considered for replacing the emissions-based permit charges. For the emissions and car reduction to show their required effects by 2021, however, the recommended emission-based charges cannot be delayed for yet unknown and unspecified alternative solutions to be developed. Private car transport is just one aspect of local air pollution, but a major contributor to local traffic and parking congestion.

The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 devolves responsibility to further reduce the damaging impact air pollution has on public health, mainly to a local level. The London Mayor's targets for car use reduction in outer boroughs are similarly devolved to local levels. Without the introduction of emissions-based parking charges it is considered that there would be insufficient measures to influence car ownership and to address the public health concerns locally.

32 respondents (3%) commented:

It is unfair to essential car users who work unsocial hours, must drive their children, are vulnerable, carry loads and live in hilly borough.

Officer response:
Any change to fee structures will have an impact on 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 permit charge will remain a relatively modest element of the total cost of car ownership. Compared to all other associated costs of owning a car, permit charges would be a minimal percentage of the overall cost. It is, however, important to seek to influence a choice in lower emission vehicles for essential and frequent car users.

The scheme does not automatically assume that the transport of children as being essential. The Third Local Implementation Plan reflects the Croydon local plan and the London Mayors Transport Strategy, including that all local Councils must help children and parents to use cars less and walk, cycle and us public transport more.

The proposed scheme has concessions for Blue Badge holders and care charities and others as detailed in paragraphs 3.1.9 of the report.

28 respondents (2%) commented:

I already pay my council tax and don't want more tax.

Officer response:
The parking permit charges do not form part of general taxation. They are introduced to influence and achieve traffic management objectives, which include air quality considerations which form part of the national air quality strategy. Any surplus from parking charges are ring-fenced to highways and transport schemes required by the provisions of Section 55 of the RTRA and, for example, contributes significantly to sustaining public transport fare concessions.

28 respondents (2%) commented:

Public transport infrastructure is inadequate, too pricy or too unfriendly to substitute for the car and will need improving first.

Officer response:
The Council has an ongoing programme of works with the Mayor, Transport for London, Network Rail and Train Operating Companies to improve public transport links to our local high streets, including introducing new routes to better connect Croydon's places and to increase capacity. More details can be found in the Local Implementation Plan:
https://www.croydon.gov.uk/transportandstreets/policies/third-local-implementation-plan

26 respondents (2%) commented:

It is unfair to residents who do not have private driveway.

Officer response:
Most homes in Croydon were built in a comparatively car-free age when house builders in denser populated areas did not need to consider space for private driveways. Traditionally there was a difference in the nature of higher density urban living and lower density sub-urban living. In the future as demand for homes grows there will be an intensification of our suburbs which will require forward planning to manage the parking infrastructure.

The lack of private driveways was not a problem at the time when most residential streets in Croydon were laid out. The problem has only arisen as result of an excessive increase in car ownership proportionate to the available road space. The solution today should look to stall or reverse the continued growth of the number of cars requiring a parking space and the impacts of car ownership relative to the impact on air quality as detailed in paragraph 3.1.1 above. The emission-based permit charges are intended to help residents re-consider non-essential car ownership.

25 respondents (2%) commented:

It just increases parking costs but does still not guarantee a parking space near to home.

Officer response:
As the borough continues to grow in population and density the introduction of emission-based parking charges aims to address overarching national, regional and local drivers with an aim of reducing emissions. Such charges would encourage a lesser reliance on cars and a switch to lesser polluting cars, which on average tend to be smaller in size and impact less on available space and public realm

The solution to better assuring availability to a parking space is to reduce number of cars requiring a parking space. This would mean that some residents and businesses giving up non-essential car ownership. Infrequently used cars and second and third cars are for example disproportionally occupying the over-subscribed space in residential roads. The residents who have a rarely needed car, including a second car, are candidates for considering the alternatives to car ownership. The emission-based charges will help encourage this.

23 respondents (2%) commented:

There is too much development being permitted in Croydon, which results in more cars.

Officer response:
Of the developments currently taking place across Croydon, the highest intensity projects are located close to transport and commercial centres. Residents in such developments will be within walking distance of shopping, leisure, work and public transport. The planners have therefore been able to restrict their access to permit parking bays and require more car share schemes. Although the number of residents in Croydon will increase, the developments will help dilute car ownership per head of population.

21 respondents (2%) commented:

The higher £300 represents 375% increase and is unreasonably high.

Officer response:
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. However, these vehicles add disproportionally

more to emissions in congested residential CPZ streets. It is therefore considered important to enhance the perception of the permit charge differential, to effectively influence car ownership choices.

18 respondents (2%) commented:

This will not reduce emissions. People need their cars and there will still be cars on the road.

Officer response:
The debate that the current proposal has spurred is already proving helpful. This is exemplified by a few of the respondents to the consultation declaring that they will now give up their cars. One respondent expressed thanks to the Council for its decision to encourage the respondent to give up one of the family cars.

A further phase of emission-based parking charges is being developed to address polluting vehicles traveling within the borough to public parking places in general (i.e. on and off street parking spaces), and not just in residential CPZs. These new proposed charges cannot be immediately implemented, as they depend on the prior uptake in mobile parking payment technology, which is being addressed separately to emissions-based permit charges in CPZs.

18 respondents (2%) commented:

Unfair to pre-2001 cars that have low emission or low mileage.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Raising permits from £80 to £300 for classic and historic cars is unreasonable.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Apply to vehicles registered after 2006 only, to avoid unnecessary scrapping of older cars.

Officer response:
Standards for measuring and declaring emissions were not introduced in a controlled way until 2001. The DVLA does therefore not hold verifiable CO2 emissions data for older vehicles. Older cars were designed to lower standards and generally pollute significantly more than newer cars.

Cars are generally owned for purpose of driving. When the parked car is driven, it contributes to pollution. All car ownership therefore contributes to pollution, in various amounts. The adoption of lower emission vehicles even amongst parked cars will contribute to improved air quality.

14 respondents (1%) commented:

High charges will put off people visiting Croydon and district high streets.

Officer response:
The parking permit charges proposed in this consultation do not apply or alter the parking charges for visitors to Croydon and the district centres.

A future phase extension to the emission-based parking charges will be consulted on separately.

14 respondents (1%) commented:

Unfair unless the Council contribute to replacing my car. Fund a scrappage scheme.

Officer response:
The Council supports the London Mayor's call for a national scrappage scheme to be funded by central government.

Several manufacturers currently operate scrappage schemes, offering between £2,000 and £6,000 discounts, mainly for diesel cars. A national grants scheme for electric vehicles currently covers up to 35% (to max £3,500) of a car's price, or 20% (to max £8,000) for vans. There is also a national grant available for home charges for plug-in hybrid vehicles.

13 respondents (1%) commented:

Emissions charges are not needed. There is no evidence that congestion and air quality is a concern. The AQI in Croydon is well within EU limits.

12 respondents (1%) commented:

Enough is being done to reduce emissions already and new parking charges are not needed.

Officer response:
The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 and the London Mayor's Strategy require further actions to reduce urban NOx and particulate matter emissions mainly to a local level. 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.

Public Health (NHS) data shows that Croydon currently have the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 years) asthma in London. 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution. Failing to address NOx and particulate matter emissions in Croydon would deprive many local people of their fundamental right to safe air.

12 respondents (1%) commented:

If the Council is serious about air pollution then it would shut down the Beddington incinerator.

Officer response:
The Council does not consider the emission-based parking proposal to be in

conflict to the waste service provided by our contractor, which operates an Energy Recovery Facility in compliance with the Industrial Emissions Directive and regulated by the Environment Agency.

Private car transport is of course just one aspect of local air pollution, but a major aspect of local traffic and parking congestion. Regionally, the London Mayor's targets for car use reduction in outer boroughs are devolved to local levels. Without the introduction of emissions-based parking charges it is considered that there would be insufficient local measures to influence car ownership and to address the public health concerns locally.

10 respondents (1%) commented:

I object because the scheme is not aligned with ULEZ. Croydon does not exempt pre-2006 vehicles and new vehicles purchased to comply with ULEZ.

9 respondents (1%) commented:

Croydon should adopt the ULEZ congestion charge instead.

3 respondents (<1%) commented:

I object because ULEZ is coming to Croydon in 2 years anyway.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Such moves should at least be London wide if not country wide.

Officer response:

The proposed scheme is not the same as the London ULEZ, which is a binary charge and is concerned with moving traffic. The London Mayor does not currently have any plan for extending the ULEZ to Croydon. The Mayor instead requires the outer boroughs to define and implement their own schemes, whether they call it ULEZ or something else and to use measures that that are appropriate for local conditions. The aim is a reduction in car ownership and use.

The Central London type congestion charging is very complex and expensive to operate. It would need to be joined up to a London-wide scheme.

Considering that every car journey starts and ends with a parking space, the parking charges structure is considered to be an important means to influencing car ownership and use in Croydon.

Table 2 – 108 grounds for objection or statements of concern, each of which have less than 10 respondents commenting. They are ordered and grouped by subject areas for easier consideration.

Objections and officer's response
2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Paying both the ULEZ in London and emissions permits at home is being charged twice for the same thing.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Both Vehicle Excise Duty and Fuel Duty already tax motorists for the CO2 emissions and efficiency. The proposed Croydon charge amounts to double taxation on this basis.

Officer response:
The national or regional taxation schemes alone are insufficient to help stem the number of cars on the roads in Croydon, which has on the latest data, grown 7% since 2013. The purpose of these charges are as detailed in paragraphs 3.1.1 to 3.1.5.

The proposed charges are about regulating context specific car ownership and use – e.g. someone parking in a congested residential street in Croydon does not necessarily drive into Central London and vice versa.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Council data shows that the volume of vehicles traversing the "ladder streets" between Addiscombe Rd and Lower Addiscombe Rd exceeds the number of vehicles owned in the area. Imposing parking permit charges is therefore highly unlikely to have a significant impact on pollution levels in the Inner Areas.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The claims are not supported by any evidence linking car ownership in the CPZ areas and the levels of pollution. In effect Croydon Council applies a form of "apartheid" in terms of services, charges and quality of life that favours residents of Outer Croydon and supports their life style choices.

Officer response:
The traffic count in the "ladder streets" is undertaken to help address the matter and monitor the effects. It is however wrong to automatically assume that the problem is majority through-traffic. It is well-established that when parking saturation exceeds 85%, then local traffic starts to circulate for finding a vacant parking bay. The Department for Transport quote a study suggesting that the average UK driver spends 90 hours/year (~4 days) searching for parking. Such number varies between locations, but it is reasonable to say that residents and visitors in the "ladder streets" make a not insignificant contribution to the traffic counts. Other respondents to this consultation tell that they too often have to drive around the block until a bay becomes vacant. The high rate of car ownership is a principal contributor to traffic circulation. The emission-based charges alone will not reduce car ownership to a level achieving 85% bays occupancy, to eliminate the needs to search for a space. But even a more modest number of residents choosing the alternative to the car will be helpful. And, if the vehicles circulating the area on average are lower emission, then this will have a more positive impact in terms of air quality than if that vehicle is of a higher emission.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will reduce car ownership, creating clearer roads for increased through traffic with no net effect on air quality.

Officer response:
The reduction in car ownership will contribute to a reduction in internal traffic and traffic circulating the congested roads in search for a parking space. This will reduce transport related air pollution. Through traffic tends to be confined to the artery roads, as opposed to the internal road network, and it is not considered that arterial volume will increase as a result of introducing emission based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges for permits.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

This is flawed. You are basing it mostly on C02 which is harmless to humans.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

The Council should help suppress NOx, instead of seeking to reduce CO2 emission. Leave CO2 to national and international agencies.

Officer response:
Although there is international consensus that transport related CO2 emissions contribute undesirable greenhouse gasses, they are not the primary focus of the Croydon emissions scheme. Greenhouse gas emissions are subject to international treaties, which in the UK are addressed nationally through various policy measures.

The emissions of concern to local public health are NOx and particulates. NOx emissions correlate to CO2 emissions – i.e. high CO2 emission generally means high NOx emission – except for pre-2015 diesel vehicles for which NOx tended to be significantly higher. CO2 is the only verifiable measure that is held on the vehicle registration document, which is the practical reason for using it as the banding variable.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Research shows that broadly half of the harmful air pollution emitted by vehicles comes from particulate matter emitted by brakes and tyres, alongside what is sometimes called "road dust", which can account for up to 90% of PM10 in certain urban environments. Every car contributes to this air pollution, regardless of fuel type or carbon emissions.

Officer response:
Although there is general consensus that the nation should be concerned about 'road dust', the health effects from particulate matter (PM), and particularly the differences between PM10 and PM2.5 (nb: particulate matter is described by its size or aerodynamic diameter which governs how far it can get into the air passages of the respiratory system), is not well understood. There is on the other hand evidence of a correlation between high NOx emission days and hospital

admissions for asthma related exacerbation. NOx and particulates tend to occur together from internal combustion engine road vehicles and are generally considered as a combined problem. The NOx element of this problem, the one confirmed to cause harm, is reduced from lower emission vehicles which is the focus of the proposed changes to parking charges.

The creation and disturbance of 'road dust' relate to car use, which largely relates to car ownership. It is expected that the emission-based parking charges will help to indirectly influence a behaviour change of car use. Many car journeys could easily be walked or cycled instead of driven by car. A subsequent phase will propose emission-based charges in destination parking places, which would further discourage car use – and the creation and disturbance of 'road dust'.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The argument that CO2 based parking charge will encourage people to switch to lower emitting vehicles is simply not borne out by the research. The VED was reformed in 2016 to capture the CO2 emissions in the 'first year rate', followed by a flat rate charge, is precisely because research showed that it is up-front price that affects purchase decisions, not the prospect of recurrent charges.

Officer response:
The proposed scheme is aimed at encouraging behaviour change for the next car choice and it will help overcome the inertia held by many owners of high-polluting vehicles, who know it is bad but do not hear enough about the consequences to consider the alternatives. Already at the consultation stage of the current proposal, respondents have commented that they will now give up their car or change to a lower emission model next.

To create a charging structure that mirrors the current Vehicle Excise Duty (VED) model, i.e. by introducing a significantly higher 'first year rate', when owners change vehicles, would most likely be unacceptable to local permit holders. This is because invariably the 'first year rate' will be higher than the previous year's flat 'subsequent rate'. This would easily end up as an argument for holding out against a switch to lower emissions. Residents need to perceive a reward, not a penalty, from choosing a lower emission vehicle.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Why complicate things?

9 respondents (1%) commented:

I have a car, what will it mean to me? How do I calculate the new charge?

6 respondents (1%) commented:

I need more details about the scheme.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

Visitor permits are becoming too complicated. How will I know the CO2 emission of my visitor's car?

Officer response:
The proposed emissions bands for this authority are a simplification of the VED bands. The number of bands have to balance incentive, fairness and complexity. Other respondents in this consultation in fact find the 5 bands too complex. The number of 5 bands was selected as a best compromise and which many other London Boroughs have also settled for.

The CO2 emission value and the banding is calculated automatically when entering the vehicle registration number, when applying for a permit or recording a visitor. All the driver has to do is to key in the registration number. The system collects the data electronically from the vehicle registration data held at the DVLA.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The emission bands should align to the VED bands. It is unfair to group majority of drivers into the increased middle band charge.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Proposed bands do not reflect the existing car tax bands. Why complicate things?

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I object that pre-2001 cars are not banded by engine size.

Officer response:
The proposed emissions bands are a simplification of the VED bands. The VED has two tables of 13 bands and differentials for the first and subsequent years. This would be a complex system to apply to parking permits locally.

The number of bands have to balance incentive, fairness and complexity. Other respondents in this consultation in fact find the 5 bands too complex. The number of 5 bands was selected as a best compromise and one which more other London Boroughs have also settled for.

3 respondents (<1%) commented:

If the car is zero road tax then it should be zero parking charges.

Officer response:
The road tax and parking permit charges address different objectives and cannot be automatically correlated. The national or regional taxation schemes alone are insufficient to help stem the number of cars on the roads in Croydon, which has on the latest data, grown 7% since 2013. The purpose of these charges are as detailed in paragraphs 3.1.1 to 3.1.5. The proposed emission charges in Croydon are about regulating specific car ownership and use – e.g. someone parking in a congested residential street in Croydon does not necessarily drive nationally and vice versa.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

I object because outside the operating times of a Controlled Parking permit zone, within the London Borough of Croydon, it is currently lawful without any financial payment required, to park most motor vehicles, owned by Residents, Businesses and Visitors of and to our borough, unless causing obstruction of the highway, anywhere and at any other time, on a space which is not a bay, for which a permit is required.

As a consequence of the greed of the council and unrequited cost to all those above, there would obviously be less revenue to Parking Services due to responsible motorists leaving vehicles in such places above, displaced to, for example yellow lines etc.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will cause parking displacement into non-CPZ roads.

Officer response:
The proposed emission-based parking charges do not alter the conditions for where and when a vehicle can park. The CPZ represents a location where residents have reported significant parking congestion and requested that such congestion is managed. Parking displacement into non-controlled roads is occurring already and will continue to grow in pace with car ownership. The proposed emission-based parking permit charges scheme is a long-term measure that will help this, while simultaneously helping to reduce emissions. Parking revenue is not a consideration with the focus on being on behaviour changes.

9 respondents (1%) commented:

Unfair that permit charge will increase for sub-100g/km cars and hybrids, which are just outside Band 2. Raise Band 2 threshold or introduce an intermediate band separating my car from big salon cars.

Officer response:
The upper limit of 75g/km is aligned to the government's low emission Category 1, 2 and 3 car and van grants scheme (www.gov.uk/plug-in-cars-van-grants). Emission Band 2 covers most Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles (PHEV), Range Extended (REX) hybrids and some Mild Hybrid (electrically assisted for a degree of energy saving) vehicle models. The weblink above demonstrates how some large car and van models will qualify for the reduced Band 2 charges.

The number of bands have to balance incentive, fairness and complexity. Other respondents in this consultation in fact find the number of bands too complex. The number of 5 bands was selected as a best compromise and one which more other London Boroughs have also settled for.

3 respondents (<1%) commented:

I drive long distances on motorways, including holidaying in Europe, for which a slow recharging electric car is unsuitable. All electric is not an option for me. The scheme discriminates against me.

Officer response:
The reduced £65 charge band does not preclude certain vehicle models that can be suitable driven for long distances on motorways. Although the recharge time can be an issue for some drivers, it is today not unusual to see vehicles that would fall into the £6.50 band travelling long distances on motors ways.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Why should a local resident pay an additional charge aimed at curbing congestion or improving air quality when, for instance, parents driving a short school run would escape this charge?

Officer response:
The Council and TfL have a successfully evolving programme on encouraging parents and children out of the school run where it is not necessary; but there are of course many other types of unnecessarily short distance car uses. The prerequisite for short distance driving is that the travelling person has a car in the first instance. It is expected that the emission-based permit charge will help people re-consider non-essential car ownership and use.

In a next phase, currently planned for consultation in 2021, the emission-based parking charges would be extended to destination parking. This will help reduce short distance, high-emission driving to the most parking congested streets.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Concern that by being Borough wide the proposals fail to address the particular air pollution problems along and off the London Road running through Norbury & Pollards Hill Ward.

Officer response:
This scheme is an initial phase & is intended to influence an uptake in lower emission vehicles amongst Croydon residents living within CPZs south of Norbury and commuting by car through London Road in Norbury. The subsequent proposed phase of emission-based destination parking charges and the wider public opinions formed by the proposals are is also likely to stimulate an uptake in lower emissions amongst car commuters who do not live within a CPZ. The fact that the average emissions from cars travelling through Norbury is being lowered, would help improve air quality along London Road.

The Council is taking parallel measures to discourage the school run, which also contributes to peak time traffic in London Road, with currently proposed School Street restrictions in Abingdon Road, Norbury, and consideration to identifying other candidate schools in the area.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

The scheme needs to be combined with tree planting initiatives and creation of space for trees, including specifying mature trees as a planning requirement.

Officer response:
The Council has a policy on tree planting, although it is not directly linked to emission-based parking charges. The council's active tree planting program aims to plant 650 trees each year & this year alone it is expected to deliver 1200 trees.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will encourage people to concrete over and park in their front gardens which will have environmental impact.

Officer response:
Restrictions apply to making a pavement cross-overs and hardstandings for parking on private property, and these take into consideration road conditions, dimensions, underground services and surface water effects. The required works to strengthen a foot path and install a pavement cross-over tend to be extensive and, in many cases, may require prior planning consent and the associated cost is significantly higher than a parking permit charge. The Government's Planning Portal states that specific rules apply for householders wanting to pave over their front gardens, such as if the surface to be covered is more than five square metres then planning permission will be needed for laying traditional, impermeable driveways that do not provide for the water to run to a permeable area.

Residents who choose to install pavement cross-overs do so to secure access, not to avoid the permit charge and need to obtain permission from the council to drop the kerb and strengthen the pavement. The emission-based permit charge scheme has potential for helping to reduce the number of cars parked in a road, hence improving access and reducing the incentive for residents to concrete over their front gardens.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will discourage the use of public transport, because people need to drive to the train station and pay to park. Now they will drive to London instead.

Officer response:
The parking permit charges being consulted are not associated with parking charges at train stations.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

Cycling infrastructure is inadequate to provide an alternative to the car.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Why not put money into more cycle lanes instead?

Officer response:
The Council has a cycling strategy and is developing cycling routes. This will be done in addition to encouraging drivers out of the car.

3 respondents (<1%) commented:

Car share infrastructure is inadequate. Why do you not make it easier to park hire cars on an ad-hoc basis.

Officer response:
The Council's planning and transport plans include requirements and objectives for expanding the car share parking infrastructure, to encourage uptake in local schemes.

9 respondents (1%) commented:

It is unfair to introduce for residents first, while businesses and others can wait until later.

Officer response:
The first reason for phasing the residential CPZs first is that they represent the most parking congested streets in the borough. The growing amount of car ownership in the borough places particular pressure on residential CPZ. Many respondents to the current consultation raise concern that permits spaces are oversubscribed. High car ownership in the residential CPZs adds to air pollution, through internal traffic and residents circulating in search for a vacant space.

The second reason is that the technology for introducing emissions-based charges to other payment types and locations will need further development time. For the emissions and car reduction to show their required effects by 2021, the recommended emission-based charges cannot be delayed until all other charging modes are developed.

8 respondents (1%) commented:

This is a big burden on local businesses at already difficult times.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I am concerned about levels of traffic and the ability of small and micro businesses to continue in operation.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Parking permits are another tax on business with no legitimate benefit to anyone in Croydon. Taxes based on fake science kills business.

Officer response:
Business would become negligibly affected (in the range from positive to negative) by the scheme. There are just 285 business permits in use and each presents an opportunity for a permit charge reduction. The later phase of emissions charges proposed for destination parking comes with new Smart Parking technology, which has potential for better guiding drivers to vacant parking bays. This is designed to reduce congestion and air pollution from cars circulating for space; but it also looks

to make the visit easier. The reduced parking difficulties has potential to support traders and businesses in Croydon.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Does not address commercial vans parked in residential roads.

Officer response:
The emission-based parking charges are not intended to address this. The new Parking Policy 2019-2022 has an objective for reviewing and addressing the kerb side share between different road user groups.

9 respondents (1%) commented:

Too much stick, not enough carrot. Oppose the increases for the higher bands; but supports the reductions in lower bands, to help reduce emissions.

6 respondents (1%) commented:

Residents should have free permit in CPZs, not emission charges.

7 respondents (1%) commented:

30% increase in band 3 is unreasonable.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

Give free permits to residents and instead make the income from pay and display.

Officer response:
The decision to recommend emission-based charges is taken in context of demands from the community and over-arching national and regional policy. The differential in the charging bands must be sufficient to encourage low emission and to discourage high emission. Narrowing the charging differential, to lessen the permit charge for high-polluting vehicles, would detract from meeting the decision objectives.

The parking of vehicles needs to be managed as the demands for access exceeds available space in certain areas and furthermore aligns with the Council's duty under the Road Traffic Act 2004 to keep the roads open and kerb side accessible, while securing road safety.

The incentive is naturally present in the individual motivation to make choices in the interest of public health and neighbourly fair parking policy – i.e. not claiming any more than a fair share of the available kerbside space.

The deterrent of the cost will remain a relatively modest element of the total cost of car ownership. It has a symbolic effect, already stimulating a public debate about emissions and choices. The debate that the current proposal has spurred is helpful. This is exemplified by a few of the respondents to the consultation declaring that they will now give up one of their cars. One respondent expresses a

thank you to the Council for its decision to encourage the respondent to give up one of the family cars.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Why not make a meaningful reduction in pollution by only allocating one parking permit per household?

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Don't reduce the surcharge for the third residential permit, In fact, you should increase it.

Officer response:
The second permit surcharge is increased by 9% to £50 and the third permit has been withdrawn for new applications. Just 27 third permits now exist in the borough. These third permits are already in process of fading away and the higher surcharge is therefore no longer required.

It is already planning policy that new developments in high intensity areas where good alternative transport exists will have more severely restricted access to on-street parking permits.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Unfair on single car households. Restrict the number of cars per household outside CPZs instead.

Officer response:
The CPZ represents a location where residents have reported significant parking congestion and requested that such congestion is managed. Kerb side space is less of a problem outside CPZs. It is not within the Council's authority to restrict cars per household however the current measures are designed to encourage households to self-select their reduction in car ownership.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Second permit surcharge for 2 electric cars is a dis-incentive. It charges the second EV as a gas-guzzler.

Officer response:
The scheme has a two-fold objective, namely to reduce emissions and to reduce the number of cars on the road. An electric vehicle contributes equally to parking congestion in a residential CPZ. Nonetheless, the permit charge for an electric second car would be £56.50, whereas the charge for a gas-guzzling second car would be £350. Where a household essentially need 2 cars, then the incentive remains to make the second car lower emission.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I object because we have a number of cars at our home and need to park on the road.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will price one of our cars off the road.

Officer response:
The view conflicts with the comments received from many other residents expressing concerns that too many cars are parked in residential streets. The scheme must balance the needs of all road users.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Object because it will cause a switch from diesel to petrol. All recent science shows that diesel engines are environmentally friendlier.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Object because the scheme encourages a switch to diesel, due to its lower CO2 emission. Ironically diesel emissions cause more harm.

Officer response:
The national policy on favouring diesel started to progressively reverse in 2009, when the scrappage scheme was also introduced for older cars. According to the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, the growth in the registrations of new diesel cars levelled off in 2015 and has since been in decline. Diesel currently continue to have a positive role in wider CO2 reduction, in particular for motorway driving where pollution disperses more easily. Older diesel cars, however, contribute disproportionally to NOx in build-up urban areas.

The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 has devolved responsibility for further reducing urban NOx emissions mainly to a local level. The Mayor has introduced ULEZ in Central London and there is a requirement that the outer London boroughs implement local Air Quality Action Plans. NHS data shows that Croydon currently have the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 years) asthma in London. 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution. Failing to address NOx and particulate matter emissions from older diesel (and older petrol) cars in Croydon would deprive many local people of their ability to breathe safe air.

Several manufacturers currently operate diesel scrappage schemes, offering between £2,000 and £6,000 discounts. A national grants scheme for electric vehicles currently covers up to 35% (to max £3,500) of a car's price, or 20% (to max £8,000) for vans. This subsidy opportunity is available to owners of older diesel vehicles.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Unfair that my single car in band 4 will increase to £146, while a second gas-guzzling car in band 5 will be £96.

Officer response:
A second car in band 5 would attract a £350 permit charge.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Why not just keep band 3 at the original permit price of £80 and slowly phase it up to £104.

Officer response:
Many respondents to this consultation have expressed concern over the lack of availability of parking spaces, which would indicate that current levels of parking control measures are not achieving their objectives for managing access. The £80 permit charges set in 2013 are currently too low to influence car ownership and to encourage a switch to lower emission cars.

The national Clean Air Strategy 2019 and the London Mayor's Strategy require further actions to reduce urban NOx emissions mainly to a local level. These actions are required to start showing measurable results by 2021. Public Health (NHS) data shows that Croydon currently have the highest rate of hospital admissions for childhood (0-9 years) asthma in London and 7.5% of premature deaths in Croydon are linked to air pollution. Phasing in the charges more slowly would fail to address NOx and particulate matter emissions in a timely manner would deprive many local people of their fundamental right to safe air.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

If a 2009 model of a vehicle is in the same band as a cleaner 2019 model of the same vehicle then the scheme is flawed. There is no incentive to upgrade to a cleaner car.

Officer response:
The proposal has sought to strike a balance in the proposal - too many charging bands and the incentive to change is less; too few and the steps between bands can be more dramatic. The increase from £80 to £104 in the middle band 3, where most cars resides, should encourage owners to consider a model that falls into a lower emission when next choosing a car.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Objects because when buying a black cab 4 years ago the emission was determined by requirement to comply with TfL hire license terms.

Officer response:
The vehicle is presumably registered around the time of September 2015 and will be charged as other vehicles with similar emission levels from this time.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

The charges per band do not increase linearly and too polarised.

Officer response:
They are designed to be non-linear, to help enhance the perception of the differential and more effectively influence car ownership choices.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The £50 charge is in not proportionate to the £300 upper CO2 band. Because diesel vehicles tend to have significantly lower CO2 emissions than many petrol vehicles, the likely effect is that people driving around older, dirtier diesels could pay significantly less that those driving newer petrol vehicles. This make no sense from an air quality perspective.

Officer response:
The £50 diesel surcharge applies to pre-September 2015 vehicles only. This date reflects the introduction of a lower NOx emission standard. Although diesel prior to this date may emit less CO2, their NOx emission is not verifiably recorded to the latest low emission standard. Whereas NOx is harmful to local public health, the CO2 greenhouse gas has low direct impact on public health.

8 respondents (1%) commented:

Charges should be based on MOT certificate emission test measurement, not by the vehicle age.

Officer response:
The MOT emissions test measurements can vary according to environmental conditions and how busy the test centre is – i.e. how long it allows for the engine to 'run in'. Vehicles with emissions in the boundary between 2 charge bands could easily obtain different test results year on year. Also, identical car models may obtain different results at different test centres. Such a system would be open to an annual anxiety and potential disputes – some fairly and some unfairly. The DVLA emission record, although not a reflection of an individual vehicles state of repair, is a constant and is made under more controlled conditions.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

Unfair to penalise people with cleaner Euro6 diesel engines. How do you differentiate?

Officer response:
Vehicles registered from September 2015 when the Euro6 standard was formally introduced are exempt from the diesel surcharge. The vehicle's registration document from the DVLA states the date of registration. These vehicles are not differentiated from other vehicles.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Petrol cars must also be in the scheme, they pollute the air just the same. Why are they not included?

Officer response:
Petrol cars are in the scheme.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The scheme should be extended to charge for car length, where longer cars pay more.

Officer response:
This would be a practically difficult measure. Although the length of a vehicle may relate to parking congestion, it does not universally correlate to air quality.

7 respondents (1%) commented:

Vehicles that make repeat and multiple stop journeys such as busses, taxies, commercial vans and construction traffic cause pollution, not parked cars.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

Take dirty diesel busses off the road instead.

4 respondents (<1%) commented:

Charge diesel cars only.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

Emissions reduction should target those who can afford it such as big business replacing cars frequently.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Significantly increase business permit charges instead of increasing resident permits.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Consider other ways to improve air quality such as review transport links, smart traffic lights, reduce speed humps and reduce one-way systems.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Start instead with the biggest polluters not as it appears with the largest pool of payees. Look to the endless building sites with their deliveries, diesel generators, transient work forces. How is their carbon foot print offset? Do they bear any share of the load or are they as investors 'too important'?

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Alter the flow of traffic away from the most vulnerable instead.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

In fairness, charge motorcycles, mopeds and cyclists as well.

Officer response:
Becoming a greener borough will not be achieved by any one action. The proposal to introduce emission-based parking charges would form one part of a range of actions that are required at a community, borough, London and national level.

The per-person congestion and emission from a diesel bus passenger is already less than the per person effects from a car driver. Transport for London have a programme for converting busses to electrics by 2030 for further improvements.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

Charge or regulate the car manufacturers instead, for selling polluting cars.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Responsibility should be taken by government and the energy companies to tackle climate change, investing in natural energy (wind/tidal) and closing air polluting coal based per stations.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Unfair to be penalised for car brands not being up to scratch with their CO2 emissions.

Officer response:
The suggestion is outside the Council's authority. The Council supports the London Mayor in lobbying for national measures.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The Council has created the emission problem because 20mph zones cause congestion and run engines colder, less efficient.

Officer response:

Driving at 20mph is more fuel efficient than driving at 30mph, both in terms of air/road friction and engine temperature.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will force the export of dirty cars to unregulated countries, exacerbating the global problem. Needs a global, not local solution.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will cause sell-off of cars people cannot afford to keep, flooding the market and depressing their sales values.

Officer response:
The Council supports the London Mayor's call for a national scrappage scheme to be funded by central government.

8 respondents (1%) commented:

New replacement vehicles and batteries manufacturing will cause pollution.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will cause consumerism. The manufacturing of replacement cars cause pollution.

Officer response:
The purpose of introducing the emissions based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges is to address the issue of air pollution by putting in place measures that will help to achieve better air quality and improve public health in Croydon. National policies are in place to regulate recycling and manufacturing resources use.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

I rarely drive, but mostly use public transport instead. The new charges will cause me to drive more.

Officer response:
The comment reflects a minority view. The scheme could present an opportunity to replace the car with alternatives, such as car pool.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

With the prevailing S/W wind at 7m/sec the air in Croydon is completely replaced on average every 29 minutes. This is why the Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22 is totally flawed.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Those in the community who are concerned about air quality do not represent the majority of residents and they were deceived by the question not asked.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This affects a larger demographic and will not assist residents.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

There is currently no evidence that air pollution causes asthma; although it is likely to be a 'trigger' and can worsen symptoms.

Officer response:
Air pollution does not immediately disperse. The comments do not accord with NHS public health data, which report links between air pollution and childhood asthma admissions and premature death. Asthma related exacerbation, triggered by air pollution, can be a cause of death.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Every car driving on a given stretch of road at a given moment contributes equally to congestion, irrespective of its CO2 emissions. Follow that local residents should foot higher residential parking permits when there is no necessary link between the fact of their car ownership and local congestion.

Officer response:
The introduction of Emission-Based Parking Permit Charges and Diesel surcharges for Permits, are intended to encourage motorists to consider more active and sustainable forms of transport, or to switch to zero or low emission vehicles instead. Such behaviour change would reduce the overall demand pressure as well as help to drive improvements in our public health and air quality objectives.

6 respondents (1%) commented:

Object because was never asked when prior survey on air pollution and traffic congestion was conducted. Residents didn't agree to reductions.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

The council have not carried out proper consultations and do not have a mandate for this.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

There must have been a study on expected revenue, but it has not been made public.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

It's a survey so I'm expecting questions so you know my views.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I feel more discussion is needed before a decision is made.

Officer response:
The current consultation follows the statutory procedure under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, for inviting and responding to objections to a draft Traffic Management Order. Respondents are able to express their views. More than 100 unique views were received in this consultation.

More open-ended questions, and multiple options with scoring scales, were asked in the prior engagements on air quality in July 2017, on the transportation strategy implementation plan in September 2018 and on the parking policy on emission-based charges in April 2019. These prior engagements have helped define the proposal subject to the current consultation asking for comments and objections.

The revenue and capital consequences together with risks were reported to a Cabinet meeting on 25 March and the report is available as a public record (https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/documents/s14463/Parking%20Policy%20report.pdf). This report provides a 3-year medium term revenue and capital forecast of effect from all permit charges.

3 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will devalue houses and could hinder house sales.

Officer response:
House values are affected by a number of variables, including accessibility and the local environment. The emission-based charges are intended on help improve access and the local environment.

5 respondents (<1%) commented:

It is not the council business to try modify lifestyle and free choice.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

In a free country parking permits should be easier to obtain and cheaper.

Officer response:
The purpose of introducing the emissions based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges is to address the issue of air pollution by putting in place measures that will help to achieve better air quality and improve public health in Croydon by encouraging motorists to consider more active and sustainable forms of transport, or to switch to zero or low emission vehicles instead.

The Council has a duty under the Road Traffic Act 2004 to keep the roads open and kerb side accessible, while securing road safety.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I want to understand what you plan to spend the additional tax revenue on? Surely on improving air quality and green space.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

How can you legally charge me £300 to park in my road?

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

The scheme should only be allowed to recoup the cost of implementation. Introducing the charges is an unlawful use of power.

Officer response:
The Council has a duty under the Road Traffic Act 2004 to secure an effective and efficient road network. Local authorities have powers under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 to use parking charges as a means to manage the parking and traffic objectives, including air quality, which is has the duty to secure.

Any surplus from parking charges are ring-fenced to the purposes set out in section 55 of the RTRA and, for example, contributes significantly to sustaining public transport fare concessions such as the Freedom Pass.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I question the legality of using DVLA data to determine the short-term rent on land (vehicle bay).

Officer response:
The parking charge is not a rental fee. It is a charge introduced to manage the use of public highway or land and it implemented in accordance with powers under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984. Vehicle model CO2 emission data is public information. The Council will require the permit holder to verifiably provide a vehicle's CO2 emission figure, from the DVLA issued registration document, before being able to issue an emission-based permit.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I object because this proposes to charge people for parking in their own driveways.

Officer response:
The scheme is concerned with parking permits for on-street parking within controlled zones. It will not charge car owners for parking on their own driveways. However, there is no automatic right to park on any part of the street or pavement, which constitutes the public Highway.

8 respondents (1%) commented:

Proposed large Westfield car park will cause pollution. Policy is inconsistent.

Officer response:
The Council does not consider the emission-based parking proposal to be in conflict with developing Croydon's commercial centre.

9 respondents (1%) commented: ***I have a parking permit and have not received direct notification about this consultation.*** **5 respondents (<1%) commented:** ***None of the current permit holders were written to.*** **3 respondents (<1%) commented:** ***Letters were not sent to every household about the proposed charges, not every resident was given a chance to voice an opinion.*** <u>Officer response:</u> The statutory requirement for consulting on an amendment to a Traffic Management Order is to advertise a Public Notice in local press, which the Council did on 23 May 2019 as detailed in paragraph 3.3.1. It further advertised the consultation in Your Croydon and extensively on social media. The Council emailed 13,738 past and present permit holders who have provided their address for such communication and wrote letters to the 310 for whom an email address is not held. The recipients immediately started to respond to the online survey. The Council considers that residents affected by the proposals were effectively reached.
2 respondents (<1%) commented: ***Survey is limited to 800 characters, I have more to say.*** <u>Officer response:</u> The consultation was not limited to online submissions alone. The Public Notice that was provided on the survey site included the email and postal addresses for making unlimited length comments. Experience, which was validated following the first 582 submissions, shows that 50% of respondents made their comments in less than 300 characters and 80% in less than 500 characters. Of 1,146 responses received, 1,133 were submitted online. 13 respondents that had more to say submitted their responses by email or letter. The longest response accepted was 69,600 characters.
2 respondents (<1%) commented: ***My child will become a victim of knife crime on public transport in Croydon if you discourage me from driving them.*** <u>Officer response:</u> Compared to other London boroughs, violence, particularly youth violence and weapon enabled violence in Croydon has been falling at a greater rate in 2018/19 compared to the London average. The borough's new Violence Reduction Network will build on this success, adopting what is known as a 'public health' approach to tackling crime. This means local agencies such as the council, police, health

services, and voluntary and community groups, working together to tackle the root causes of crime, addressing issues such as poverty, education, health and housing.

The Council is also serious about child road safety. Children in cars can also be harmed in driving incidents and from air pollution.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Charges will have an unacceptable impact on blue badge holders.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

Charity permit is not currently vehicle specific. Charities are now forced to purchase the highest band to cover all eventualities.

Officer response:
The Blue Badge, its companion badge and non-vehicle specific charity badges for volunteers who visit vulnerable residents are exempt from parking charges under the proposed Traffic Management Order in the same manner which they historically were. This will not change under current proposals.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

Will Council and NHS vehicles get taxed as well?

Officer response:
The permits established for public services, healthcare professionals and community care charities permit parking in all zones. They can tend to involve extensive car travel across the borough and it is important to still encourage the relevant organisations to choose lower emission vehicles. The Council and NHS service functions are therefore also charged according to emission levels as other permit holders.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

I need to drive in my job to provide essential healthcare to children with asthma. Unfair that I have to pay for my parking.

Officer response:
If the essential role is performed in a professional capacity, then it would be reasonable to expect the employer to pay the Community Care permit. If the essential role is performed in a voluntary capacity, then a substantially discounted charity permit is, subject to application and qualification for such a permit, available.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

This will disproportionally hit the poorer North of the borough.

Officer response:
Permits apply where residents have requested controlled parking, due to parking congestion. Although the concentration of traffic tends to be higher in the North of the borough, CPZs are in fact distributed throughout the borough.

2 respondents (<1%) commented:

This will discourage visitors to residents.

Officer response:
The visitor permit scheme would operates as previously, but applying a -90% reduction on lowest emission vehicles and a +30% increase for the top band vehicles. This differential is less than for other permit types. The charge is calculated automatically when keying the visitor's vehicle registration number into the mobile permit app.

1 respondent (1%) commented:

CPZs should be significantly expanded.

Officer response:
The emission-based charges are not concerned with expanding the CPZs. The Council generally introduce a CPZ where residents have requested it in response to concerns regarding parking issues.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

You are the only borough as far as I know who charges for parking 24/7, not even in central London.

Officer response:
The purpose of introducing the emissions based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges is to address the issue of air pollution by putting in place measures that will help to achieve better air quality and improve public health in Croydon by encouraging motorists to consider more active and sustainable forms of transport, or to switch to zero or low emission vehicles instead.

The majority of charged parking in the Borough is in on-street parking bays which are mainly shared between permit holders and Pay & Display / Pay by Phone users. This maximises flexibility for drivers ensuring that there are opportunities for visitors and customers to local businesses whilst giving priority to resident permit holders. Charges are a necessity in meeting supply and demand.

The introduction of emissions based parking charges for on-street bays and public car parks is still being developed and when proposals are at an appropriate stage they will be open for public consultation.

1 respondent (<1%) commented:

There isn't enough parking on the council estate and you have not made it clear what the new charges will be for council estates.

Officer response: Parking places in private and public housing estates are not subject to the Traffic Management Order being consulted on. Parking on housing estates is normally managed by the landlord.
1 respondent (<1%) commented: ***Collect emission-charges from council tax instead.*** Officer response: The idea could have merit, but is too complicated for a timely solution. There would need to be a way to affirmatively tie a vehicle to an address.

3.3.5 The statutory consultation is primarily concerned with inviting opposing comments and objections. Parking permit holders and the wider public were notified extensively about the consultation. It must be considered that although the scheme will impact on 10,636 parking permit holders, only 1,039 have expressed objections or concerns. The other roughly 90% of permit holders are by default mostly indifferent, unconcerned, in agreement or otherwise unperturbed by the scheme.

3.3.6 Of those respondents opposing the increase in parking charges, many have simultaneously acknowledged that air pollution and parking congestion should be addressed. Only a comparatively small number of respondents say that air pollution and parking congestion is not a problem and does not need addressing. This agrees with findings from past engagements, in which a majority of Croydon residents recognise a need to address air pollution and the number of cars on the road.

3.3.7 In light of the comments and objections received and the matters detailed within this report, it is considered that the reasons for introducing emissions-based parking charges outweighs the reasons for not implementing them.

3.3.8 In conclusion, the consultation has not identified sufficient or material objections that would invalidate the objectives for introducing emission-based parking charges.

3.3.9 Subject to the Executive Director, Place agreeing to the recommendations in this report, each of the objectors will receive one or more responses based on the officer comments in Table 1 or 2, to address the total subject matter in the individual objection.

3.4 IMPLEMENTATION

3.4.1 Subject to the Executive Director Place agreeing to the recommendations in this report, Parking Services will work with their software supplier to upgrade the online permit application, review, printing and issuing processes. This work has commenced, with the detailed specification for the works already completed. The commitment to the expenditure with the software developer can only be committed to following a decision to proceed.

It is considered feasible to have the new resident permit module ready for testing and work processes development by 1 September 2019. This presents a tight but

achievable turnaround in debugging and training staff in the revised processes in readiness for 1 October 2019.

4 FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Implementing the recommendations of this report will commit the Council to £38k Capital expenditure over the next two years for the purchase of equipment and approximately £110k revenue expenditure each year to fund three new employee posts to deliver the service. The capital expenditure will be funded via a bid to Growth Board, the revenue expenditure will be wholly funded from the revenue generated from the emission-based permit sales.

1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations

	Current year	Medium Term Financial Strategy – 3 year forecast		
	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£'000	*£'000*	*£'000*	*£'000*
Revenue Budget available				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Income	0	0	0	0
Effect of decision from report				
Expenditure	54	110	112	114
Income	(65)	(185)	(274)	(247)
Remaining budget	(11)	(75)	(162)	(133)
Capital Budget available				
Expenditure	0	0	0	0
Effect of decision from report				
Expenditure	28	10	0	0
Remaining budget	28	10	0	0

2 The effect of the decision

The emission-based charges will be introduced in phases, anticipated to commence in October 2019. The new charges are applied at the time of renewal only – i.e. will have half effect over the first 12 months following introduction. The year 2019-2020 income effect from emission-based charges will be about £65k. The year 2020/21 considers the continued renewals of resident permits and introduction of other permit types and diesel surcharges, again on a gradually ramping renewal basis.

The following table details the revenue forecast by the different categories of parking charges. The table should be read in context of the number of permits issued in each category (see section 3.1.8).

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Resident permits	(65)	(120)	(124)	(113)
Visitor permits (days)	0	0	0	0
Business permits	0	(2)	(4)	(3)
Other permits	0	(41)	(91)	(82)
Diesel surcharge	0	(23)	(54)	(48)

The costs of implementing the new charging structure will become operationally self-financing.

The emission-based charges for on-street and off-street parking places remains to be developed and consulted on at a later date.

3 Risks

As permit holders switch cars to lower emission bands it will affect a reduction in revenue generated. The discounting for lower emission bands is non-linear, meaning that a, say, 5% switch into the lowest band will have greater than 5% revenue reduction effect. The forecasted reduction in revenue between 2021/22 and 2022/23 reflects a set of assumptions about changes in car ownership behaviour. The changes in car ownership will be gradual and it is presently impossible to reliably forecast the effects. The change can however be assumed to be gradual over multiple years, as opposed to sudden and immediately significant. This affords for timely adjustments to the policy and charges be made, if and when necessary.

4 Options

The required capital expenditure of £28k in 2019/20 and £10k in 2020/21 will be funded via a bid to Capital Growth.

5 Future savings/efficiencies

The later phases of emission-based charges include the development of new approaches and the adoption of new technologies, which are expected to be less resource demanding, more efficient approach to parking management.

6 *Approved by, Kate Bingham, Head of Finance on behalf of the Director of Finance, Investment and Risk and S151 Officer*.

5 LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The Head of Litigation and Corporate Law comments on behalf of the Director of Law and Governance that Sections 6, 45, 46, 47, 49, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) 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.

5.2 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.

5.3 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.

5.4 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.

5.5 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.

5.6 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.

(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 The changes and perceived complexity with the emission-based charges will increase the number of enquiries and processes involved in the issuance of parking permits. A review of the activity index calculates that 3 additional FTE posts will be required initially, to enable the introduction of emission-based permits. This number can be reduced over 12 to 18 months, as the transitions from the old to the new charging structure has settled and the self-service portal has been fully upgraded.

The posts must be in place at least 1 month in advance of the new charging structure commencing, while capacity for completing prior induction and training exists.

6.2 There will be an HR impact in terms of recruitment and this will be managed under the Council's policies and procedures.

Approved by: Jennifer Sankar, Head of HR Place & GSE on behalf of Sue Moorman, Director of HR

7 EQUALITIES IMPACT

7.1 An overarching Equality Analysis (EA) has been undertaken in respect of the Parking Policy and its associated action plan which includes a specific objective to introduce emission based parking charges, and this EA has subsequently been reviewed in response to the consultation. The EA identified a potential negative impact on the people living with a disability who showed some elevated level of concern for parking charges and some concern about insufficiency in the parking bays accessible for the disabled. To note, disabled Blue badges and disabled companion badges are both exempt from these proposed charges. In Croydon there are 11,459 individual and 71 organisational blue badges. To mitigate the impact, the EA concludes that the council will adopt either the Disabled Parking Accreditation or London Plan, whichever is the highest standard for the provision of disabled parking bays various locations. The Parking Policy and its associated action plan also has objectives to deliver School Streets, which will afford eligibility of carers and relatives to drive during the restricted hours, to visit the vulnerable. The proposed change will improve air quality & public health for all residents and visitors by implementing parking related measures.

Approved by: Yvonne Okiyo, Equalities Officer

8 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

8.1 The emission-based parking charges are designed to contribute to the Air Quality Actions Plan.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT

9.1 There are no foreseeable impacts on this.

10 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED DECISION

10.1 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.

10.2 Although the proposed charges will impact on 10,636 parking permit holders, only 1,039 have expressed objections or concerns during the consultation period. The other roughly 90% of permit holders are by default mostly indifferent, unconcerned, in agreement or otherwise unperturbed by the scheme.

10.3 In light of the comments and objections received during the consultation period and the matters detailed within this report, it is considered that the reasons for introducing emissions-based parking charges outweighs the reasons for not implementing them.

10.4 It is the recommendation of officers that emission-based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges for permits (as detailed in Appendix 1) be introduced as a measure to help address air pollution.

10.5 The statutory procedure is to respond to objections to inform the objectors of the above decision and reasons.

11 OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

11.1 The alternative option of not implementing emission-based parking charges would result in the Council failing 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.

11.2 An option could be to wait and see if national and regional drivers alone are enough to make a difference in improving air quality for Croydon but realistically this would take far longer to achieve any significant improvements and in light of an estimated 205 deaths a year in Croydon that are attributable to air pollution, this is not a viable option.

CONTACT OFFICER:

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

APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix 1 – Proposed emission-based parking permit charges and diesel surcharges for permits for approval.
- Appendix 2 – Public Notice, displaying the emission-based parking charges structure.

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

- Equalities Analysis for Parking Policy (July 2019).
- Total responses to the Emission Based Parking Charges consultation
- ED Place Key Decision report Parking Policy (https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/0419PL-Parking-Policy-KeyDecisionNotice.pdf)

APPENDIX 1

Residents parking permits (annual, 12 months) – From October 2019

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£6.50	£80
	Band 2	1 – 75	£65	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£104	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£146	
	Band 5	>225	£300	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£300	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£50	£46
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£150	£225

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third residents permit is no longer available for new permit applications. The third permit is available on a renewal basis only.

Business parking permits (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£50	£382
	Band 2	1 – 75	£100	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£400	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£500	
	Band 5	>225	£750	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£750	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£50	Nil
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£150	£178
Surcharge for a fourth permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£500	£528

* Implemented on renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third and fourth business permits are not available at addresses within the Croydon Central CPZ (i.e. the North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones).

Business parking permits (quarterly, 3 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£16	£123
	Band 2	1 – 75	£32	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£130	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£160	
	Band 5	>225	£240	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£240	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£16	Nil
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£48	Nil
Surcharge for a fourth permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£160	Nil

* Implemented on renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third and fourth business permits are not available at addresses within the Croydon Central CPZ (i.e. the North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones).

Diesel surcharge on parking permits – From April 2020

Date diesel vehicle registered	Proposed new surcharge (1/2 day)	Proposed new surcharge (3 months)	Proposed new surcharge (6 months)	Proposed new surcharge (12 months)	Pre-existing charge
From September 2015	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Before September 2015	£0.50	£16	£30	£50	Nil

* The diesel surcharge is applied to any permit type, new application or renewal, whatever the charging band and in addition to any other surcharges already being applied.

Resident's visitor permit (half day) for inner zones (i.e. **t**he North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones) **– From April 2020**

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£0.30	£2.00
	Band 2	1 – 185	£2.00	
	Band 3	>185	£3.00	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£3.00	

* Diesel surcharge also applies.

Resident's visitor permit, (half day) for outer zones (i.e. all permit zones within Croydon not listed above) **– From April 2020**

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£0.20	£1.30
	Band 2	1 – 185	£1.30	
	Band 3	>185	£1.90	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£1.90	

* Diesel surcharge also applies.

All Zones on and off-street parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£100	£980
	Band 2	1 – 75	£300	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£1,000	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£1,300	
	Band 5	>225	£1,600	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£1,600	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies. **This permit replaces the All-Zones on-street annual permit, which is being withdrawn.**

All Zones on and off-street parking permit (half year, 6 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£500
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies. **This permit replaces the All-Zones on-street six month permit, which is being withdrawn.**

Doctor's bay parking permit, initial (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£400
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Doctor's bay parking permit, subsequent (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£6	£40
	Band 2	1 – 75	£18	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£60	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£78	
	Band 5	>225	£96	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£96	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Community Care parking permit (half year, 6 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£30	Nil*
	Band 2	1 – 75	£90	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£300	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£390	
	Band 5	>225	£480	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£480	

* This new permit replaces the Neighbourhood Care (NHS) and Council (Social Care etc.) Permits. Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Statutory Undertaker parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£480
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Charity parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£10	£80
	Band 2	1 – 75	£25	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£85	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£105	
	Band 5	>225	£160	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£160	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Appendix 2

PUBLIC NOTICE

CROYDON COUNCIL

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STRUCTURE OF CHARGES FOR PARKING PERMITS IN CONTROLLED PARKING PERMIT ZONES

The Croydon (Parking Places) (Further Provisions) (No. K16) Order 2019

1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Croydon Council propose to make the above Traffic Order under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended by the Traffic Management Act 2004 and all other enabling powers.
2. **The general effect of the Order would be:-**
   a) **to introduce emissions based charges for all parking permits and a diesel surcharge, as detailed in the Schedule to this notice, which would apply throughout all Controlled Parking permit zones within the London Borough of Croydon.**
   b) **to amend existing Traffic Management Orders to include the new charges.**
3. Copies of the proposed Order, of all related Orders and of the Council's statement of reasons for proposing to make the Order, can be inspected from 9am to 4pm on Mondays to Fridays inclusive until the last day of a period of six weeks beginning with the date on which the Orders were made or, as the case may be, the Council decides not to make the Orders, at the Enquiry Counter, 'Access Croydon' Facility, Bernard Weatherill House, 8 Mint Walk, Croydon, CR0 1EA.
4. Further information may be obtained by telephoning Parking Services, Place Department, telephone number: 020 8726 7100.
5. Persons desiring to object to the proposed Order should make a statement in writing of their objection and the grounds thereof on the "Have your say" page at www.croydon.gov.uk. Alternatively write to the Parking Design Section, Place Department, 6th Floor, Zone C, Bernard Weatherill House, 8 Mint Walk, Croydon, CR0 1EA or email Parking.Design@croydon.gov.uk quoting the reference PD/CH/K16 by 20 June 2019.
6. The Order is intended to introduce emissions based parking permit charges and a diesel surcharge. The changes are intended to encourage motorists to consider more active and sustainable forms of transport, or to switch to zero or low emission vehicles, helping to drive improvements in our public health and air quality objectives and achieve a cleaner and more sustainable environment.

Dated this 23 May 2019

Mike Barton,

Highway Improvements Manager,

Place Department

Residents parking permits (annual, 12 months) – From October 2019

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£6.50	£80
	Band 2	1 – 75	£65	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£104	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£146	
	Band 5	>225	£300	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£300	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£50	£46
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£150	£225

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third residents permit is no longer available for new permit applications. The third permit is available on a renewal basis only.

Business parking permits (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£50	£382
	Band 2	1 – 75	£100	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£400	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£500	
	Band 5	>225	£750	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£750	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£50	Nil
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£150	£178
Surcharge for a fourth permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£500	£528

* Implemented on renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third and fourth business permits are not available at addresses within the Croydon Central CPZ (i.e. the North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones).

Business parking permits (quarterly, 3 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£16	£123
	Band 2	1 – 75	£32	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£130	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£160	
	Band 5	>225	£240	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£240	
Surcharge for a second permit at the same address, whatever the charging band.			£16	Nil
Surcharge for a third permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£48	Nil
Surcharge for a fourth permit at the same address, whatever the charging band. [note*]			£160	Nil

* Implemented on renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. The third and fourth business permits are not available at addresses within the Croydon Central CPZ (i.e. the North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones).

Diesel surcharge on parking permits – From April 2020

Date diesel vehicle registered	Proposed new surcharge (1/2 day)	Proposed new surcharge (3 months)	Proposed new surcharge (6 months)	Proposed new surcharge (12 months)	Pre-existing charge
From September 2015	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Before September 2015	£0.50	£16	£30	£50	Nil

* The diesel surcharge is applied to any permit type, new application or renewal, whatever the charging band and in addition to any other surcharges already being applied.

Resident's visitor permit (half day) for inner zones (i.e. **t**he North, N1, South, East Outer, East Inner, E2 and West permit zones) **– From April 2020**

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£0.30	£2.00
	Band 2	1 – 185	£2.00	
	Band 3	>185	£3.00	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£3.00	

* Diesel surcharge also applies.

Resident's visitor permit, (half day) for outer zones (i.e. all permit zones within Croydon not listed above) **– From April 2020**

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£0.20	£1.30
	Band 2	1 – 185	£1.30	
	Band 3	>185	£1.90	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£1.90	

* Diesel surcharge also applies.

All Zones on and off-street parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£100	£980
	Band 2	1 – 75	£300	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£1,000	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£1,300	
	Band 5	>225	£1,600	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£1,600	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies. **This permit replaces the All-Zones on-street annual permit, which is being withdrawn.**

All Zones on and off-street parking permit (half year, 6 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£500
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies. **This permit replaces the All-Zones on-street six month permit, which is being withdrawn.**

Doctor's bay parking permit, initial (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£400
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Doctor's bay parking permit, subsequent (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£6	£40
	Band 2	1 – 75	£18	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£60	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£78	
	Band 5	>225	£96	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£96	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Community Care parking permit (half year, 6 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£30	Nil*
	Band 2	1 – 75	£90	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£300	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£390	
	Band 5	>225	£480	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£480	

* This new permit replaces the Neighbourhood Care (NHS) and Council (Social Care etc.) Permits. Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Statutory Undertaker parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£60	£480
	Band 2	1 – 75	£180	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£600	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£780	
	Band 5	>225	£960	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£960	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

Charity parking permit (annual, 12 months) – From April 2020

Date vehicle registered	Charge Band	CO2 emission (g/km)	Proposed new charge	Pre-existing charge
From March 2001	Band 1	<1	£10	£80
	Band 2	1 – 75	£25	
	Band 3	76 – 165	£85	
	Band 4	166 – 225	£105	
	Band 5	>225	£160	
Before March 2001	n/a	n/a	£160	

* Implemented on a renewal basis. First time permit admin fee applies. Diesel surcharge applies.

PUBLIC NOTICE END

Total responses to the Emission-Based Parking Charges Consultation, 23/05/2019 to 20/05/2019

ID	Comments and reasons for objecting
1	I have a car and park in the Borough.
2	The car I drive is one that is not exempt. It is ridicously expensive to live in this borough already without the added costs of paying more to have a permit where you live and pay more to park. I do not live where it is required to have a permit and I do not dirve very often but for people who have to commute by car it adds to their monthly expenditure. It appears to be just another way to make money off of working members of the community.
3	Interested in future policy decisions.
4	Drivers are already heavily taxed . Most need vehicles to work and get around a very hilly borough to be able to shop, see friends and relatives, get to the doctors, hospital appointments etc. but do not have a bottomless pit of income to fund yet more tax for the same thing, The poorest, oldest and less able will be heaviest hit. Unnecessary cost to those that can ill afford and bureaucracy The poor, those that cannot walk far so need a vehicle but do not qualify for a blue badge , the elderly and those with young children will be heaviest hit
5	I own a car from 2004 bought at the time because of its extremely low emissions; it is exempt from the new Central London emissions charge. I have noticed that you have based your charges upon the car's age and not only upon its emissions. This is potentially unfair to those owners of cars bought since 2001, but which have low emissions.
6	I think the high parking charges in Croydon puts people off visiting.
7	We have commercial vans parked in a residential street, this must have an adverse effect
8	I live in croydon and I do not agree with it. This is too quick.
9	While I would like to see air quality in Croydon improved, I feel that this is not the right tool. It penalises those who drive older cars - primarily those with less income - and encourages purchase of newer cars, and scrapping of older cars which are still working, increasing waste. I would prefer to see higher charges for second and third cars (third cars in particular). It would also be better to improve public transport such that car ownership falls.
10	I'm objecting because me and my family pay £210 a month for council tax and why should we be then penalised for paying more money on emissions!
11	This is another way to penalise those of us who cannot afford to upgrade our cars

12	Because I'm a car owning Croydon resident. I think the proposal is a great idea! Well done for proposing a progressive policy that will no doubt attract many negative comments.
13	Parking schemes were introduced to secure public parking for local residents, which they are obligated to pay for. To tax them even further is completely unfair given the sheer amount of traffic that comes into Croydon from outside the residential parking zones. This is an appalling way to penalise people who cannot afford to replace an older car. I live in Croydon and the way that the traffic has been thrown down my road to appease other residents is extremely unfair and now to add insult to injury, the Council is now proposing to penalise people for owning a car. This is not going to reduce emissions, its a money grabbing exercise which is going to cause further hardship.
14	I am not happy about the confusion between the responsibility to provide parking space to help movement around the Borough of Croydon, and the feeling that lifestyles should be encouraged to be modified. If I choose to mainly eat all my meals at MacDonalds but to eat at the Ritz once a month that is my choice.. I would not expect MacDonalds to recognise me as an occasional Ritz diner and levy a surcharge every time I visit them to potentially limit my ability to visit the Ritz. National policy is to charge suitable taxes for Diesel, Petrol and electric personal vehicle propulsion. and parking charges based on what might use the parking space are step too far. I agree that we should all take our community duties (not adding excessively to pollution when driving) into account when selecting our next vehicle. However, there are many other reasons for selecting a particular vehicle, including the possibility of having a vehicle for long distances that kept available close to a person's home, with most local journeys done by public transport. The 2001 registration breakpoint does attack owners of heritage vehicles (which tend not to be driven far, and can include steam driven vehicles. Also the system of needing a mobile app to pay for parking means that an extra level of difficulty has been added - with the mobile telephone needing to be charged and hold funds before the car is driven. Non mobile users will be prevented from using parking spaces
15	An ill-considered knee jerk reaction to pollution issues, taking the easy way out for a set of captive audiences. A resident with a drive will not pay for a heavy polluting car, a neighbour with a Council permit with a much 'better' car will have to pay. How ridiculous. Accepting that there are no easy answers, but these sort of solutions merely serve to pay lip-service in order to react. Would be interesting to see the FULL environmental impact of all of the technology that will be required IF the Council actually progresses to try and 'emission charge' in parking areas.
16	What is the impact for low income blue badge holders with diesel cars who live in the area but have to drive for heallth reason, e.g, chemotherapy treatment.
17	I'm sick of being manipulated by an agenda created by international finance and emanating from the UN via my local Council. Quote: "These proposals are in response to feedback we've had from our communities who have told us that they are concerned about air quality, and that traffic levels should be reduced*. Everyone wants good quality air and to move around as feely as possible but we do NOT want new taxes imposed for no obvious reason nor to have the cars that we were recently encouraged to buy because of their superior qualities (re carbon emissions) now defined as a threat that must be taxed out of existence.

18	Why must residents who already pay to park their cars outside their homes be further penalised? Lorries and taxis are moving across the borough throughout the day, and idling traffic is proven to cause unnecessary pollution. I have owned a car (my first car) since 2004 and bought it precisely because it had a low emission count: how come my environmentally-sound decision which has proved wise (I haven't bought a new car since 2004!) is now to be penalised? Surely some kind of tax on the more polluting cars bought new would be wiser? I use my car only minimally now - to get to my parents in Kent and my husband's parents in rural Somerset - but it makes no sense to get rid of it after all this time, Why tax cars in precisely the position where they cause no pollution?!!!
19	1) I see this as discriminatory to those who are unable to afford newer vehicles 2) Considering your business permits went up from £100 (or £70 for renewal) to over £400 I'm wondering quite what you're planning with this one!!!) 3) The reduction to 20mph was supposedly to reduce emissions - perhaps this should be measured over time?
20	This is a tax against the people who cannot afford newer cars.
21	penalises the poorer community that may not be able to afford a newer car. speed humps increase fuel consumption increasing pollution why not remove them and the 20 mph limits both of which require a lower gear, burning more fuel increasing pollution
22	Is emissions data going to be taken from number plate records and will this take into consideration annual mileage, changing emissions as vehicle ages, etc. Will there be an incentive to move towards ownership of greener PHEV or Hydrogen vehicles? Are there plans being considered to move buses and trains as much as possible to a greener fuel source? (I know this isn't strictly relating to the scheme!)
23	Objecting only because it's pointless & just another money making scheme. We have the low emission zone and ulez why squeeze any more money out of people who cant afford new cars to begin with? This dont affect me but think of all the people it will affect being forced to get rid of their car because they no longer can afford to drive it or take their family into London. Parking should be based on paying for the space you take not the emissions it takes you to get there.
24	Local resident
25	I feel that this is a money making scheme and fail to see how cash will clean the air ?i also think you will force motorists to sell diesel cars they will then be exported to countries with no emissions laws and further exacerbate global warming thus adding to world problems! And as we only have one sky and one planet I fail to see how cleaner air locally will solve anything it will just push the problems future afield? This is problem that needs to be tackled globally not just locally and certainly not by fleecing cash out of motorists AGAIN! I would like to add I don't drive and have NEVER had a license so my motivation is not personal.
26	Motorists already pay considerable taxes on the purchase of the vehicle, Insurance to drive the vehicle, Road fund licence to drive on the road and then additional tax, possibly the highest in the world, to put fuel into the vehicle. Additional charges to park on ones own property would be disgraceful when one considers the considerable tax burden of the Council Tax.
27	I am a resident of Croydon and also a car user.

28	This response replaces my previous response where the design of your system was unclear. Owners of any cars generally do not make the purchase more than once every 5 years. Your proposal will financially penalise people for making a decision in purchasing that they could not have known would cost them. This smacks of a back- door attempt to increase revenues and to do it in an inequitous way. We all know councils need to raise additional funds but why arbitrarily penalise owners of diesel and old cars over expensive low emission new vehicles? Your proposal would be a double whammy in addition to the mayor's rushed and unfair emissions tax. The poor would be disproportionately affected - well-off people have bought expensive new low emission vehicles.
29	Concerned that elderly residents, most of whom have old cars, would be priced out of Croydon parking
30	i support the scheme, as part of the necessary response to air pollution and to climate change. Vehicles need to be used much less and alternative modes of travel used instead. this is especially so for those vehicles that are high polluters. Fewer vehicles on the roads will diminish congestion allowing buses to be more reliable and freeing road space for those who need to drive because of disability, for emergency services and for cyclists. Contrary to what some in the motoring lobby say, walking , cycling and using public transport are not just 'lifestyle choices'; those on low incomes or who cannot drive, do manage without a car, but suffer the ill effects on health and wellbeing of emissions from the cars of the better off , as well as from commercial vehicles, an unfair outcome.
31	I believe charges based on vehicle emissions when the vehicle is parked are unjust and unwarranted. Vehicles do not produce emissions when parked. Vehicle tax (Road Fund Licence) includes a substantial charge based on vehicle emissions anf fuel tax also takes emissions into account, i.e. the higher the fuel consumption, the more tax is paid by the car owner.
32	Because I am a pensioner, I own a car over 12 years of age, need a vehicle for transportation and cannot afford any more taxes/ charges from my income on top of the existing council tax of £248.00 per month.
33	I am in favour of residential parking permits
34	Concerns over fairness, parked cars don't pollute, using cars does.
35	Simply because it is unfair - it is a tax on the poor. It's not fair on those people who cannot AFFORD to buy a new car. Whilst there are valid reasons for this, i.e. climate change, it is another poverty tax - those for whom money is no problem and can afford to replace their car & buy the most up-to-date climate efficient car will pay less, whilst those people who can't, who are in LOWER PAID jobs, or have NO MONEY, will have to pay more, all because they CANNOT AFFORD to buy a new car! How is this fair? It is yet another penalisation of those who are not rich. This is fundamentally NOT fair and another higher tax just because you're not wealthy enough to buy a new car.

36	My reasons for objecting to this proposal are based on the fact that this proposal will primarily be used and implemented as a means to generate funding as opposed to reducing emissions. Furthermore the Croydon area is in dire need of continued investment and development. I believe this proposal will hinder the development as this will drive away investors and make the area less attractive to live. This is something that has seen across the country when all councils thought it would generate funds by introducing high street parking charges whic has subsequently become a major factor in the death of the high street further reducing jobs and income generation across councils.
37	I'm concerned it is too soon to penalize people who bought diesel cars when we were all incentivised to buy diesel.
38	As a household we have a couple of cars that would be charged due to age and therefore would be priced off the road and unable to get to work.
39	We purchased a diesel car on the advice that the government gave that it was better for the environment! We cannot afford to change our vehicle or pay an increase in parking on our single income!
40	I want more details
41	I strongly disagree with this policy as it would have a detrimental effect on a daily basis with family and friends visiting this household. This is a clear attempt to raise the parking permit fees for residents that live in Croydon hidden behind the excuse of emissions! I can understand this scheme for visitors to the area but increasing the Band 3 rates for residents when we all know that the vast majority of cars fall in this category is a blatant excuse to claw more money from residents. It's impossible for all residents to just up and change their vehicles to something practical that falls in band 1 or 2 between now and October, so why not just keep band 3 at the original permit price of £80 and slowly phase it up to £104 within a REASONABLE period of time.
42	Parking and air quality is not of concern in my area, is this just another council money making scheme?
43	I object because charging people parked in a bay is not a polluter pays or wholistic policy. The referenced documentation does not justify. A mix of interventions including Road user charging would be. Pollution is not just tail pipe emissions. The council need to consider the environmental impacts of shortening the lifespan of vehicles. That speeds need to be smoothed through the borough to reduce emissions. Be them tyre wear, brake dust or energy usage. Consideration as to source of energy in its creation and distribution are also required. All these issues need to be considered in a wholistic planet based approach
44	I'm a Croydon resident
45	My car is used for business purposes with relation to the local health service and is needed to transport bulky equipment
46	I am a resident and think that it is outrageous that Croydon are now planning on charging more for local residents. The charges are not even a few pound here and there, it’s a great deal of money and a huge jump on top of what we already pay for a parking permit. I understand a charge for travelling into London but to live in a suburb of London and be charged these extra fees is frankly shocking. I am totally against this charge.

47	This is just another way for the Council to make more money from hard working people. There is no need to any surcharges for emissions and this is just another way for the council to receive funding since they realised that the ULEZ charge in London pulls in around £220,000 a day in revenue. The pollution is not so bad in the croydon borough that this needs introducing. I objected to the central London one but I suppose it is far more densely populated. Stop robbing people and give back to those paying council tax!!
48	I strongly object to the fact that drivers are to be penalised for driving older cars and not on engine size.
49	Ownership of petrol or diesel or electric vehicles is not necessarily a bad thing. Excessive use is. So ALL environmental charges must be equitable to ALL road users and NOT a POLL TAX on wheels. I am NOT a car user.
50	What are the charges being proposed? To improve environment and damage to the planet why have all plastic bags not been banned in Croydon. Could it be because there no revenue In it for the spendthrift council that is croydon. Why have trees been removed to.make way for dropped kerbs in favour of vehicles. Why are so many people idling engines in the borough without penalty? If CC is concerned about the environment combat so many things that would create revenue as it seems the concerns are based on how much money can be made from any scheme!
51	We pay more council tax as it is. You will be pricing vulnerable people out of driving when they might HAVE to drive. Totally unfair and is clearly a profit tax
52	The proposal will unfairly penalise a resident who, like me, has only one car registered. My current car is Band 4. The charge will increase from £80 to £146, an increase of 80%. A second car in Band 5 would cost only £96, 50% less than I would pay for my permit, which is clearly ridiculous. -Where there is only one car registered, the charge should be a lot lower than proposed -If there is more than one car registered, the car with the highest emission rate should always be charged as the first car. Otherwise it will be possible to “flip” the applications, such that (worst case scenario) the first car could be band 1, charged at £6.50, and the second could be a Band 5 car charged at £96, rather than the £300 it would cost as the first car. The proposals are also unrelated to usage.
53	Why residents charges 1st? If you have a zero emission car does that mean free parking?
54	I comment or object as a resident of the London Borough of Croydon.
55	I think it is a very good scheme but, as usual it is half baked. The solution is to REDUCE the number of cars on the road and the way to do it is to have a system of charged based on the number of cars per household. Furthermore, controlled parking should be expanded dramatically throughout the borough. Ashling, Parkview Fernhurst and other road leading to the tram stop road in Addiccombe should all be Controlled Parking zones. I think it would be an interesting exercise if the council took the time to identify the number of households that have more than two cars.... Why has this not been done before?! IT IS COMMON SENCE.

56	Although on the surface the scheme appears to be relatively reasonable - who doesn't want cleaner air - I think that the majority of car owners within Croydon will be found to have vehicles which will incur a higher charge due to people simply not being able to afford and run newer, more 'eco-friendly' cars. I think the majority have several places to visit in a short space of time and already can't rely on public transport; whether it be due to the cost of buses, trams and trains, multiple trips and the length of the journey around the houses. The parking issues in S.Croydon are frustrating: it's a struggle to actually get in metered bays when in S.Croydon, all side roads are full with the spread growing outward and unwanted but charged bays aren't necessarily the answer.
57	I support measures to reduce vehicle emissions locally and wish my views to be known
58	I live in central zone, low waged with an oldish car. Essential car user as I need to be able to reach my elderly mother frequently. If I have to pay even more to have a visitors permit it will be more difficult. I would love to a) be able to afford an electric car and b) have somewhere to charge it nearby. But the reality is there are no local charging points and I would have no right to park ahead of others if they are installed. Many on street charging points would be needed as we do not have driveways or garages.
59	Outrages! We pay taxes for almost everything.....what not.....oxygen?
60	A 30% increase in Levi on even economical cars is not justifiable; and falling in line with other boroughs is not a justifiable answer.
61	I have an existing parking permit.
62	As part of the Croydon community, I feel it's my duty to give reasoned comments to our communities policies. Penalising citizens for the car they drive, even if they cannot afford a newer, cleaner car, without any policy to help those change cars is unjust. It means the more affluent people who can afford newer cars will continue to drive. While poorer citizens will have to stop driving. For this reason the policy is unfair on some community groups and I object to it.
63	I live in Croydon and am so impressed by the redevelopment taking place. However, a downside to this has been the amount of cars driving in and around the town centre by East and West Croydon train station. This has had a notable effect on the quality of the air in these areas. I would support emission based charges and hope it may encourage more people to cycle and get healthy
64	The emissions scheme/ permit based charging is affecting a large demographic of residents who are being penalised at an extraordinary level. £300 for one house hold is equivalent to two months council tax payments. You are delirious if you think you can pass this. Your permit requirements are not assisting residents - your main issue is over developing in the area and burdening residents with new costs to cover it with no future thought on the impact infrastructure requires. Where are your feasibility studies and reports! Your green policy is a joke, you are squeezing in housing left right and centre taking green space away - yet there's brownfield sites everywhere. You are penalising average joe with a family who need a car for shopping/life but can't afford a new hybrid car.

65	Proposed charge for Residents Parking Permit of £300 for a vehicle registered before March 2001 is TOO HIGH. My vehicle is a 1997 Toyota Carina E 1.8 with a CO2 emission of 151 g/Km. This compares favourably with the Band 3 (from March 2001) with a charge of £104 and yet my vehicle is being penalised with a charge of £300 purely because of its age and not its CO2 emission. This is UNFAIR and needs to be CORRECTED.
66	I am a resident in Croydon
67	The introduction of resident parking charges of any kind is deeply discriminatory against any resident who does not have a driveway , garage or other personal parking area on their property. It will be detrimental to residents who have to rely on motor transport due to disability or age, and will inevitably cause problems for those who of necessity rely upon deliveries and cab services.
68	I question the legality of variable pricing on car parking spaces dependant on asset class and emission. Even if it were transparent to the end user through digital pay and display, using the dvla data to determine the short term rent on land (vehicle bay) does not seem equitable nor inline with government guidelines for councils charging policies. There is a social-economic argument to why Croydon should not employ this policy. Less accessibility into rural parts of Croydon will “kill” the high street which is needed for people to access goods and services locally. Many cars in April 2020 will still have higher emissions. Those people who are able to afford to change their cars, might do so, but if they do, they probably don’t care about the increase in cost.
69	Resident with parking permit
70	To try to save our town from further profiteering by local councils reducing our freedoms.
71	I think this is a terrible idea and will make life much harder for people who live in the affected area. Most people don’t have electric cars yet so this is nothing more than a money-making scheme. If you really want people to drive electric cars then you need to persuade them to do so at the point of purchase of a new car when their old one is beyond repair eg a government grant?
72	I feel as a diesel owner, that I have been unfairly targeted by poor government advice. I purchased my car new in 2010 when governments were actively encouraging people buying diesels. I now have extra charges to park outside my own home (which I cannot do because the council prefer to give out business permits to an over capacity residential street) and drive through London... Plus the other charges of owning a car. Why not target uber drivers who sit with their engines running all day and increase reliability of trains to encourage use of public transport??!
73	Support the initiative to improve air quality in Croydon
74	Reduction in pollution is needed.

75	I suppoort the council's intention to base fees on car emissions. However, other factors should also be incorporated into the charging strucuture. Car-length – It can easily be argued that a person with an estate car should pay more to park on the kerb given that they occupy around 1.20 times the kerb space needed by a small saloon. For example a BMW5 estate is 4.95m where as a Nissan Micra is 3.99m long. Car-width - many of SUVS are exceptionally wide and this limits the available road width when they are parked on the kerb. The cost of parking permits should factor in the car width to discourage ownership of wider cars so road amenity is improved for road users. The widest commercially available car in the UK is the Range Rover Discovery Sport at 6'6" (1.98m)
76	Concern about climate crisis and specifically about appalling air quality and the damage to health especially the health of the young, old ,disabled and all vulnerable members of our community.
77	There needs to be time to allow adjustment. Some diesel cars were/are considered very Green and tax exempt meeting Euro 5 criteria, electric/hybrid cars are £10,000 more than traditional fuel cars....that is much more than most people can afford. There is no affordable alternative. I have a green diesel, bought in good faith that it was the right thing to do- now the goalposts have moved - i want my next car to be electric but that is not yet feasible for ordinary workers...
78	In a free country people should be relatively free to drive their cars. It's telling that some of the best paid councillors in London, want to punish people who can't afford new cars or their own driveways. We should stop these proposals, and make is cheap and easy for people to register for parking permits in the streets near their home, regardless of the vehicle they have.
79	Residents already pay to park outside their own homes and on many occasions there are still not enough spaces so parking becomes extremely difficult. Increasing the cost for residents to park when they already pay a hefty sum is extremely unfair. In addition the residents may park for the majority of the time with their engines turned off and get public transport to work which would be better for the environment. Charging business permits on the other hand would make more sense as they are using their cars and travelling into the town centre which may increase pollution. I strongly object to increasing the charge for the residents permits.
80	When you buy a car information about its greeness or emissions ia not readily available. Neither is information about pending proposals that are likely to leave you out of pocket available
81	The scheme is characterised as "Polluter Pays", but could also be described as "Residents who don't replace their cars unnecessarily or who can't afford a new car pay". Environmental damage can be caused by rampant consumerism as well as emissions, and reduce, reuse, recycle is also a valid response. Charity permit: If volunteers use their own cars, it's difficult for the charity to buy anything other than the most expensive permit to ensure everyone is covered - which is a 100% increase in this cost for them - doesn't seem very fair.
82	It's rediculous to penalise people who cannot afford to buy new or change cars!
83	Live in Croydon and hence participation
84	Concern for the environment
85	Although I feel that improving air quality is important, I feel that diesel car owners with old cars should not be penalised as it was the government who encouraged people to buy diesel cars all those years ago.

86	Controlled parking is slowly creeping further and further across the borough. I object as this scheme will be expensive and the cost will keep rising, penalising and isolating households with pensioners and low income families feeling it the hardest. The government has imposed changes against cars and smoking etc. so there is no need for additional action. Why not consider less costly solutions? It is clearly a money making scheme that will limit parking and therefore visits e.g. from friends, family and carers, displace the problem onto other nearby roads and further reduce spending in the local economy. Multiple occupancy households and larger families still won't be able to park their cars or have parking permits.
87	yes as I already pay for a parking permit
88	Im shocked and disgusted by this...This is mainly in response to all the tower blocks you are putting up and anxiety with how your going to manage the parking.
89	Parking permits are already expensive without you adding this on.
90	Whilst I agree that something needs to be done to improve the air quality in the borough, I feel it is unfair to penalise drivers (yet again) by hitting us in the pocket; we recently had to pay for parking permit which is another expense that was not exactly welcome. I have a vehicle but only use it mainly at the weekends, so am not a heavy user. I am not in agreement with this proposal.
91	I have a parking permit. In principle I think this is a good idea, although with any detail about the proposal it is hard to comment. However, as part of this proposal it would be good to know what the council's wider strategy is for encouraging the use of low emission vehicles (as well as reducing vehicles) - i.e. what infrastructure for electric vehicle charging is being proposed?
92	I strongly believe that the charges are unfair on working class people who are already struggling to make ends meet.
93	I have a vehicle and pay for residents parking and strongly object to this proposal. Many people who work in this borough depend on there cars and to put this price up will increase financial difficulties in many households on top the council tax which has also gone up. This scheme will punish the many and it underlines the council's core objective which is gentrification and bending to the will of the wealthy. This town needs better parking enforcement and facilities and to many flats are being built with no parking provisions.
94	I am Diesel car owner that would be penalised. When I purchase my car diesel cars where being recommended and car tax incentives for being better for the environment. That has changed but I am.left with a car that is costing me money that I cannot even sell because of a.the envirmatal changes. Effectively I am being penalised for following good advice
95	I am concerned about the charges that I will incur and if it’s affordable
96	I live in Croydon and already have a parking permit that i pay for yearly and most of the time i cant park any where near my house. Its not fair to charge more because you own a car. Its just a way of taking more money from us .

97	the current push for emissions reductions is laudible however, the charges are being applied to those least able to absorb the cost. large companies operate fleets of brand new cars, the public in general, the self employed and small businesses actually support the environment in a larger sense by getting the full working life from vehicles. as it is far worse for the environment to make a new car than to run an older one. I operate a 2012 astra for a ,mixture of personal and self employed use. it has start stop technology, gets approximately 49mpg and is in the £30 tax bracket thanks to emissions tested to the best advice at the time of manufacture to 119. at the current time I (and i am sure many others in this time of uncertainty) cant afford to replace this.
98	A car parking space is the same whether the car is petrol or diesel. We already pay for permits to park our vehicles. This is just another way for the council to make more money and is ridiculous. The buses tfl run in croydon probably contribute more to the air we breathe than a parked car !
99	The permits, already expensive, will go up for the majority of drivers. This appears to be a price increase being implemented under the guise of being emissions related. There must have been a study of the expected revenue, to ensure the council did not lose money, but this has not been made public, probably due to to the face that it would show up how much extra residents would be charged.
100	I don't drive my car everyday and feel that it's not fair if I drive my car once a week. And it is parked up outside my house for the majority of the week.
101	I strongly disagree as a local resident. Even the current system does not work how it supposed to. We can't park in the nearby for the permit fee after 5PM because cars with no permits fill up all the roads in the nearby. And now we are forced to pay much more (as the ridicolous rents, council tax and all the other expenses make impossible to purchase newer car, the condition of the roads are so terrible, I pay 4-500 pounds every year just to make the undercart system mended after the potholes,) having even less chance to get a newer car for a whole family. If this is introduced, we are leaving Croydon with immediate effect. And a PARKING CAR has no pollution. This system is unfair, this system is discriminating, this system makes poor people even poorer.
102	Because your always f'in around with people's lives
103	What would be the situation(like my own) where a persons car's emission is within the acceptable levels? I currently pay £80 per year for my permit. Would this go up?
104	It's just another tax on a permit that doesn't even guarantee a parking space at our own homes. We've asked for residents parking only on Derby Road for years and yet since Sunday trading commenced Derby Road has become the go to parking place for vehicles that should be encouraged to use a Car Park...It's even worse now by a number of places of Worship have opened without the necessary parking places.. A tax on higher emmission vehicles is a tax on the poorer driver who will not be able to afford the "newer" hybrids until they fall in price (10 years or so in the future). We seldom drive these days as we are unable to get back near our own home... If you plan on operating this scheme I suggest you tax "all" car owners in the Borough not just those unlucky ones who live close to shops.

105	This is a blatant attempt to increase revenue. All bar one band (other than electric cars) will result in a significant % increase. My car (1390cc) will just get into Band 3 (165g/km C02 emissions) but I will still see a 50%+ annual increase in the cost of a permit. The council now operates a monopoly on parking since the introduction of the CPZ - I have to pay the annual permit fee if I want to park my car anywhere near my house. I believe that the proposed new charges are an abuse of power by the council. Of course I wish to see air pollution reduced but taxing car owners for parking their vehicles outside of their own homes is not the way to achieve that goal. If the council were serious about air pollution they would have campaigned against the Beddington incinerator.
106	I want to know the proposed cost for resident parking permit
107	I am a local resident. I am not opposed to the scheme however I would suggest that a reduced parking permit price be offered for residents with a low emission vehicle as opposed to increasing current prices..
108	There are a lot of roads in Croydon which require pay and display/permits. I feel that this costs a lot to road users in the area so an additional charge is ridiculous.
109	I am a current permit holder who will be seriously affected by this [same address and surname as 6184248]
110	The scheme is utter nonsense and just another way for the council to squeeze every last penny out of you, the cost to park my current car will be in excess of £450 according to your new charging scheme, that's ridiculous how can any working human being even afford to pay something like that just for PARKING outside my own house.
111	I believe that this will put up my parking charges unfairly. I actually produce very few emissions because I drive very little - just a couple of hundred miles a year - but my 2010 car will attract a higher rate of parking fee. This can only be fair if based on the actual emissions produced over the year.
112	I am proud to live in a Borough that takes air pollution seriously. I think it is totally acceptable to introduce this change at our pockets expense. I am sure this will hurt many people financially, but there is a bigger picture to see and I am really very pleased to hear that you are acting upon it.
113	I use my car to commute from home to work, once at work, my car remains in the car park for 8 hours. At least twice a week, I walk to work from home, therefore I am already reducing the use of my car. I have some concerns about the new scheme as follows; - Will the extra money produced from the new scheme be used to help with the improvement of pollution - Why are the motorists once again being targeted for the cause of pollution when they already pay an extortionate amount of money each year to drive on the roads for which they were designed for
114	Give my opinion about the charges. I don't think we should do that, also because when a car is parked it doesn't pollute at all. A flat rate is more than reasonable and we shouldn't do that only to increase the price. Not everyone can afford a hybrid or electric car and in croydon there are not so many charging points anyway.
115	Because it's stupidity. Stupidity shouldn't be entertained. Having already been hit with ELEZ charges by tfl, my family and I find it confusing to why this should even be considered in the Croydon Borough. What would the changes help on the future and how much would change if so? A lot of families would have no choice but to become even more poverty stricken because of more income for our government. Please put into perspective the families and ratio of people who will be impacted negatively.

116	As a resident living in a controlled parking zone I feel that the proposal hits residents twice. We have to pay to park in our own street, now we have to pay more. Looking at the proposed figures my resident permit will rise by £24 per year.
117	I think that people like me on a low income, that cannot afford to regularly upgrade their vehicle will be penalised further with this charging system.
118	I agree with the proposal. We need to encorage the adoption of low/zero emission vehicles and do more to discourage the use of those that are polluting the air quality for residents. Environmental taxes are also a great way to help fund local government services, especially given the large number of accessible alternative modes of transport in the borough. I'm sure there will be plenty of positive knock on effects such as an increase in walking and less strain on local healthcare.
119	Resident parking permits are already high especially when the only time I get to park on or anywhere near my road/house is at the weekend there are also other drivers in the family who too face the same situation and if they wanted to park their cars by their home have to pay silly money to do so
120	I'm small business owner and already have difficulty with costs of running small business is constantly raising up. I have to park my van on the street and use the van to carrying goods . Parking in Croydon is already expensive and difficult so please don't make even worst.
121	A system based on emissions is wholly unfair. I purchased a veichle taking into account all the costs involved. For you to now say permits may cost more or less based on a variable I can no longer control is unreasonable.
122	Resident
123	I currently hold 2 permits on a road that will be affected. My husband works to provide for a family of 5. I only work voluntarily as due to having arthritis and being deaf I can't commit. My vehicle is used rarely, I currently travel a lot on public transport to get a child to school, volunteer and as my role as governor in a school. If these changes take place you will force me to drive everywhere as 1) I couldn't afford both and 2) we are not in a position to buy two new vehicles. This will mean our permits could go from £200 a year to £700 Yet again the council are being harshest to those more vulnerable and/or in areas where people are more disadvantaged, the very people who are more likely to have older cars that don't meet omissions. I seriously object
124	[… business name …] is a business established in Croydon since 1977. We employ 12 people. We are forced to pay incredible sums to government both national and local through vat and business rates. We are also forced to pay for parking in the road outside our business premises. Parking permits are another tax on businesses with no legitimate benefits for anyone in Croydon. They exist to bolster the coffers of Croydon Council .The proposed parking tax and tax on parking diesel vehicles is another sign of a local authority looking to any means to rip off residents and businesses in Croydon. Businesses like mine drive the economy. Taxing businesses to death with stupid schemes like this based on fake science kills business. We are not an unlimited recourse for Croydon to fleece.
125	I think in principle it is a good idea for the health of all in the borough, it is just wanting to know specifically what details will affect the residents. I for example have a 1.6 litre petrol car. First registered in 2012. Is there going to be an age limit on the cars in the borough, or will information be taken from MOT emission information.
126	I am asmatic and concerned about the air quality in the area. I am also concerned about the level of traffic congestion in the area. I agree.
127	counter intuitive to achieving the objectives of the council.

128	Strongly disagree. Just another money making scheme. We shouldnt bother working may aswell sit on benefits. Council trying to rob us even more.
129	This is clearly being used as a method to increase the revenue for the council by increasing the fees. There are many things the council could do to stop emotions increases, but adding to a parking permit will no reduce any emissions just the revenue for the council.
130	Overall there is a need for this to go forward. Does this mean there will be more resident controlled areas being set up ? Is the revenue drawn in to the local authority going solely to be used to put back into the project and how is this going to be done, monitored and cost evaluated, further is this going to be transparent and open for the residents to have sight of. How is the local authority going to identify the costs of the permits to residence. Are disabled badge holders going to be exempt from the charge.
131	I am very supportive of the proposed changes but I am concerned about the pricing structure as it does not incentivise the use of some environmentally friendly cars. Many people who rely on on street parking cannot use plug in charging for their cars at home without running cables across the footpath. The reduced cost permits should be available to those with low emission, small hybrid cars too to encourage their use too.
132	Cannot really see any reason for another charge or surcharging, I depend on my car for commuting and an extra charge only take another piece of my incoming which I am already on low income, it doesn't matter for the rich with higher incomes but does affect people on low income!
133	Iam objecting because I see this as more of a money making scheme that financially just effects drivers . As a resident I already pay to park. This will only increase this change.
134	I object strongly to the proposed scheme. I own a very low mileage 1.1cc Ford Fiesta which was made in 2002. I live in West Croydon and do not have the privilege of off-street parking. I work for a local charity and do not earn a high wage. It seems grossly unfair that I should have to pay an absolutely huge increase in parking charges (for a residents permit). Those on a high wage (who can afford a new car) and those who have a company car (which will always be a new model) are on average the people who drive more and they would benefit from a huge cut in parking costs while those who are less privileged are penalised. I do not use my car to get to work and I would be penalised for this. CARS WHICH ARE PARKED ARE NOT EMITTING ANY POLLUTION.
135	All proposed charges are based of penalise and milking drivers, and make money out of them. The UK is the biggest rip of of charging driver in Europe. Instead of coming with better solution from Government and councils the UK citizen became the easiest target for all kind of penalties and charges. You have milked billions through the years from us with no safety and quality roads in the borough, Just give me more money. You're the only borough as far as I know who charges in central Croydon for paring 24/7, not even in central London? It should be no more charges.
136	i am a local business owner who could be highly effected by this new proposal
137	I want to know what formula will be used to calculate the charge? My car is a small petrol car which I use very rarely, it is used 1-2 a month to go during weekends outside to the countryside. How this change will impact my tax?
138	I live within Croydon and own a car

139	I feel like this is a money making exercise and has little to do with actually caring about the environment. My car is old. I rarely use it except for long distance journeys, approx. Once a month, generally in the summer. I'm not in a financial position to buy a newer vehicle and I don't use it enough to justify the cost. On a daily basis I walk at least 7miles and usually travel by public transport. I already pay a high premium to park but always struggle to find a parking space. There are other environmental issues, which the council seem to ignore.
140	I think it's an unfair charge for people who have older vehicles - especially pre 2001 vehicles where the charge will be £300, probably more than the value of the car.
141	I am a resident in croydon who recently just purchased a new car and would like to know how the proposed changes will affect me financially.
142	I object to the scheme as I own a diesel car and will end up paying the council yet more money.
143	I have access to a car and parking
144	I object to this extra charge as I believe that Croydon council is taking liberties with motorists, we already pay enough for our parking permits and even though the council has made an absolute fortune out of the motorist through the permit scheme, the council tax was still raised, where is all this money going, certainly on street cleaning the roads are filthy.
145	To assist in Croydon's mission to become a more environmentally conscious South London Town. My only comment would be that in a borough of lower income families, it doesn't pay to penalise those who have had to make choices because of their financial situation. E.G. the car they could afford is an older Diesel model. It'd be fantastic to see some provision/options put in place to support those who do fit this category/s to enable them to switch and make a sustainable choice to help the borough. Driving a Diesel has become a 'dirty' option in the last year to 2 year based on further research findings, this cost on families who have a Diesel asset (Car/Van) has been huge, slashing it's value instantly and now making it increasingly difficult for them to sell/shift for a replacement.
146	As a diesel car driver, I am being penalised. The government said to drive diesel as it was better, so I bought a diesel car. Why should I pay more than other users in Croydon. I should be able to park and drive my car as other users will be able too. How will this be implemented for at other moods of transport coming in to the borough. Parking is a premium on my street as Cornerstone house users fill all the resident parking spaces and at weekends all 5 religious setting fill the road and surrounding roads, parking in dangerous ways. Will this be sorted by the introduction of system.
147	Local resident, received email on the consultation. Own two vehicles using the permit scheme. Very good idea. Any incentive to move people towards a greener solution is always welcome. No objection at all.
148	We live here
149	I am a car driver who lives in Croydon and will be affected financially yet again just because i have a car!
150	Why should people be penalised for owning a car that previously they were told diesel was better than petrol. Also, by introducing this it means that people ware financially worse off in a already struggling economy.

151	My Comment is that, you have just increased the council tax for the 2rd year in a roll, when I brought my house 7 years ago the council tax was about £1,370 per year. Now its over £1,700 for a band D property, but during this period, the council services has not got better, Coming to London Road the street is full of rubbish. This is other Tax on families that are feeling financial pressure. As a result of the increase in the council tax. I strongly ask for this proposed tax (BECAUSE IT'S Tax). you may call it Emission-based charges. if its to be introduce, the council to give the resident of Croydon a 12 months period to either change they car or cars. Or sell them. The council should not be making life difficult for it resident's.
152	I wholly object to this proposal. The documents you supply are very vauge on what you will be doing. You are basically imposing a fine of up to £960 per year just for parking a desil car built before 2001. This is absurd. The documents speak in large parts about how bad air affects health. The only area I could find that explains what you spend the money on is this: 1) Tackling emissions from servicing and freight vehicles – which also includes tackling our own fleet 2) Reducing exposure to air pollution & raising awareness for those you live and work in Croydon. If I understand correctly, you will be using money to primarily buy yourselves new vehicles and TV adverts. This is not acceptable and I urge you to find another way to fund this half baked plan.
153	I have a diesel car and would be charged more than others. If I don't have a permit I don't have to pay any extra, as many people do and park after hours of parking restrictions. So I am being penalised for pay for a parking permit I will have to park where thier is no parking restrictions.
154	As the scheme is fucking insane - you have clearly lost the plot and are no longer fit to govern.
155	Because it’s unfair what you are trying to do. We already pay a lot and mostly of the time cannot even park as too many cars in between the small the small car park.!
156	Concern about air quality.
157	as with Sadiq Khan's ULEZ, there has not been a measure of before and after effects of the tax. Also, there is an obvious hypocrisy of black cabs with engines on all day polluting the environment both in London and also the East Croydon area. Whilst I agree in tackling emissions, if you do not provide research and HOW you are going to measure this and at what periods those levels will be tested again, then this is another stealth tax.
158	I am a local resident who currently has a car with a car parking permit
159	I live in the borough, I commute through the borough by public transport and I have a car.
160	I have been commuting to Crawley from Selhrust for the last three years by car as it’s not possible via train etc due to very early starts or late finish. Commuting by car is financially beneficial for me even after paying the yearly parking permit. I’m 23 years of age and increasing the charge for people just making a living or simply owning a nice car for example based on what comes out of the exhaust and increasing the permit charges based on emissions is unfair. Not everyone can afford to go out and buy a swanky electric car for example.

161	I just completed your online survey, I would suggest extending the limit on the main question box as I wanted to spend more time explaining… this is an issue I feel very strongly about as I purchased a Diesel car using the best knowledge available to me at the time of purchase, with start stop, emissions of 119 and I average an mpg of 48mpg between London and motorway… and am now feel I am being systematically penalised for my purchase and expected to replace a perfectly good car, which being self employed and requiring it for work I am not easily able to do let alone afford. Sorry, the alteration in the ULEZ has hit me and now to hear that my local council will be penalising me for my attempt at being eco friendly is a bit upsetting… I would suggest that october of this year is too soon and a delay even to next year would make this feel less like a crusade against those who have done nothing wrong. My issue in part stems from the fact that at the same time I bought my 2012 2l diesel astra a friend bought a 2008 2l petrol BMW which he gets approx. 32mpg from… and is not getting hit with any charges of any kind, despite the fact that his emissions while admittedly currenty believed to be safer are never the less being produced in much higher quantities…. [same respondens as online response ID6184171]
162	I am a current permit holder
163	I have a parking permit and assume that prices will go up and that this is way for the council to make money at expense of residents. Objection. Appears to be a way to increase costs to local residents who require cars for no additional benefit. Sadly, a typical council response.
164	Strongly oppose this money orientated scheme. My car is already subjected to Car tax, Ulez, congestion charge and upkeep of the car and I only drive mainly on weekends. I bought a diesel car because of the communication from the informed or not so informed government. Also, purchasing the now preferred electric car is ridiculous as not sourced with in UK so does not appear to be sustainable for the future. I need compensation now in order to purchase another car! I am not made of money and do not condone highway robbery!!!! What about all the building work going on and the fines, dust generated by these organisations? If you bring g this in then at least base in usage or something that does not impact everyone in the same breadth as that is unfair.
165	I own two older cars, both of which require permits
166	I'm objecting strenuously to the proposal, as I consider it being a money making venture.
167	Resident
168	I feel more charges are unfair as I have lived in my road for 17 years and now have to pay to park there. It is a residential road, not a main road so the air pollution is to a minimum as it is. Extra charges are not affordable to a single parent household .
169	I object to this scheme as people simply don't have the extra money to be charged extra for having these cars. Not everyone can afford to go out and get a new car to avoid these charges yet get penalised for it. [same address and similar response as 6185337]

170	Parking is already expensive. The cost of living is going up but pay isn't. This will only seclude communities and individuals who are already struggling financially.
171	I object to this scheme as residents already pay and contribute a huge amount, added expense is not necessary.
172	I have a permit and I am highly concerned by the increase from £80 to £300 per year - something I cannot afford!
173	This will not stop vehicles with high emissions parking/using the road. So I will have to pay approx £200 per year for the pleasure of trying to park in my road.
174	I strongly object to this as yet again Croydon Council and the Mayor for London are try to extract as much money out of car drivers as possible. I for one cannot afford to buy a new car, I have my car and that is all I have. Think about those older people who have no option to stick with the car they have. Some of us do not have the finance to buy new cars every time the council or the Mayor decide to change things on a whim. If a brand new electric car is bought how am I to charge it? There are very few charging points. There are none in my road or for roads anywhere near my road. It is disgusting that is another council money making scheme and the people behind this should be ashamed of themselves.
175	I object, as I am fuel-efficient and only use my car for long-distant journeys. Just because I pay for a parking permit does not mean that I have to pay extra for the privilege of owning a car which is less harmful to the environment due to it's low NO2 emissions. Additionally, I only travel off-peak times as I never like to sit in traffic. I also don't commute by car. You should be charging those that do frequent short-journeys e.g. school run, as they do more harm as the engine uses more fuel when cold, and they are the ones that sit parked with the engine running idle. You should charge those that use their car between peak times and are the ones causing congestion, or commute.
176	My voice must be heard.
177	I will be affected by the proposed changes.
178	There is another way to control poluttion and that is to stop allowing so many private housebuilders to erect multistorey buildings.
179	Is this just another stealth tax, we as a local business in Croydon for over fifty years, it's one thing after another, does Croydon council want local business or a ghost town or a local community.
180	This is a local scheme that will affect where I live. I object to the proposed plan to impliment a low emission to the area.
181	There should be more incentives to encourage people to invest their hard earnt money into buying a more expensive but, low emission car.
182	Increasing prices is not a way to decrease air pollution. Croydon council should instead ban diesel cars. People driving diesel cars will absorb the extra charges an continue driving diesel. What abot those who have their own private parking space. This doesnt discourage them to switch to cleaner cars. There should be scheme to help diesel owners switch to cleaner cars.

183	Don't have money
184	I believeCroydon residents who need cars to live and work should not have to pay more for their parking permits.
185	I understand the air emissions control are important but why punish drivers i.e. common people! there is already a controlled parking in most of the Croydon area and Council wants to penalise gullible drivers for no fault of theirs. Will Council be ready to take on car manufacturers and impose surcharges for selling such cars? Council is just interested in making as much money from common man. If you want real cost savings then do a reduction of wages for top bosses. This is indeed a shameful proposal from Council.
186	I drive and I feel I deserve a say
187	I cannot afford to change my car to avoid yet more Tax
188	Vehicles contribute nothing to emissions when parked this is simply a way of getting more money out of residents, put charges onto central Croydon car parks as this is what contributes to the increased air quality issues not residents parking by their houses. Do more to sort out the condition of the roads and number of resident spaces before you look for easy money making schemes under the guise of being greener
189	Objecting because this will be Brought in too soon, rather then giving people an opportunity to save up so they could buy the relatively expensive “green” cars.
190	To stop local authorities to strip down the poorest residents. The UK is NOT ready for this changes. Small number of residents can afford buying new vehicles. Number of charging points for electrical vehicles is very small. Nearest to me is around 2miles away. Most of wall to wall houses cannot benefit from driveway, That means: the occupiers wont be able to charge their cars near home. Again only wealthy people wont be hit by this tax.
191	Linking to emissions in principle is positive - I would like to comment that the 'parking' restrictions in certain streets mean that those who pay for a permit still struggle to have access to parking bays - for example restrictions on my street only exist Monday- Saturday 9-5 - this means a number of residents do not purchase permits but just part outside these hours and those who do not work 'regular' hours are penalised as they are unable to a space due to pay and display sales. It would make more sense if this is linked to emissions to make the use of permits more compulsory for all residents and limit the spaces or make this more restrictive for pay and display. I am concerned about Croydon's overall approach to parking is more geared toward revenue that managing parking. congestion
192	We object to the scheme. We live in the Centre Zone in Croydon. During the day it is almost impossible to park due to the amount of non-permit holders using the spaces around the station. Most of the issues with emissions is from these parking users coming and going throughout the day and congestion from through traffic, rather than the permit holders - if we leave our space, we are unlikely to get another one so we (and most other permit holders) rarely use the car. It is unreasonable to charge permit holders based on emissions when they are not at all causing the problem.

193	I live in Croydon and am in a parking permit zone. I object to the proposed scheme - what about all the people who drive into / through Croydon? It is the driving that causes the pollution and not the owning a car. I only use my car occasionally (1-2 a month) so cause little pollution even though it is an older car. I have just had parking permits imposed in my road so am already facing and increased cost for no benefit. Over the past year there has been a spate of "keying" which has ruined the appearance of the car - why would I want to spend a lot of money to buy a new car for it to be vandalised?! I mainly keep a car to be able to visit my family who live a way away, Buying an electric car would not be possible at the moment as it wouldn't be able to manage the distances involved.
194	I own 2 diesel vehicles, both for social domestic and pleasure use as they are more cost efficient to run for me and my family and feel we already pay over the odds for parking outside our own home so an increase PLUS diesel surcharge would be ridiculous.
195	I am concerned that residents will be charged more for this. When we already find it difficult on some days to even find a parking spot in our own streets when we have already paid for parking.
196	I have already been priced out of driving in to London because our diesel car does not meet the ULEZ standards and now you want to penalise me for parking my car. I've spent the last 5 years paying for my car and I cannot afford to replace it and, as a working DJ, I cannot lug my equipment around on public transport.
197	Personally feel like it's a way that Croydon Council can make even more money out of residents. Where do you expect every day people to find these extra funds from. Please answer me that? Please don't say it about the environment - feel that's just an excuse.... Every year the council try and make even more money from residents in one way or another. Our wages don't go up but everything else does and then you want to do this too.
198	I am a permit holder for the south croydon zone
199	I'm objecting as this tax effects the poorest in those that are just getting by, anyone who has a low emission vehicle prior to 2001 is unable to afford a modern vehicle at very least should be emissions banded to give them the same charging structure as a modern vehicle. These cars are their lifeline and hence a blanket high charge against a car that has good emissions that are at a sensible level, being blanketly charged such a high amount is completely unfair to those owners whom have no offroad parking and are honest residents whom make the effort to be paying parking permit. Your charge devalues their cars from sale and they will be in a new levels of stress emotionally and financially and forced update when they may well already have small engine and efficient vehicles.
200	This will not reduce emissions as people still need their cars. All it will do is force people to pay the charges and as a result have less disposable income to spend in other sectors of our community.
201	I live in Croydon and work in the borough too. I personally am concerned that the authority will simply use this scheme to raise more revenue and ultimately increase the cost of parking outside our homes. Although I personally drive a car with low emissions, I object to the scheme. Those that drive cars with bigger engines already pay higher road tax...this just feels like a scheme for Croydon Council to levy higher taxes on their residents.
202	Objecting, these changes will hurt working class people in the pockets. Why doesn't the council give existing permit holders time (like maybe 3 years) to adjust. In the meantime it could start implementing these charges on to new permit applications. We bought our supposedly green diesel car (

203	There is not an issue with traffic or parking on Lower Road or Little Roke Avenue so a CPZ is not needed. The residents have also not been told about the proposed emission based charges either so while trying to charge us to park outside our houses is outrageous, it will be made even worse/ more expensive by the emission charge too. The only potential problem with park will be as a result of Croydon Council granting planning permission for the houses on the St James Hall site, The current residents should not have to financially suffer because of this decision.
204	We already have to pay a large sum to park outside or near our properties. More should be done to stop large lorrys driving up the road.
205	As a resident with two vehicles, one a diesel van used for work I am concerned I will be charged more in this new scheme simply to oark outside my house.
206	It costs residents enough for parking permits to park outside our own homes as it is. To increase this charge simply because of the fuel type of your vehicle is quite frankly ridiculous. We pay enough already in road tax, why keep penalising is constantly.
207	I have a residents permit.
208	I am a Croydon resident and a petrol car driver so I would possibly benefit as I am exempt from the London emissions charge, but I object to the scheme as we are paying large amounts of council tax which keeps rising. The residents permits are already a high charge and many people and families in the area are already struggling to live. This is going to put further pressure on households. Having people pay even more money is not going to make the air cleaner, it is a ridiculous idea.
209	You are making changes that will disproportionately effect poor people. You already take stupid amounts monthly and then also charge people to park outside of their own bloody homes! Nobody knows where our money goes, nobody is accountable. Stop fleecing us.
210	Live in a permitted area
211	My concern is are you going to put up ALL parking permits under the the guise if this scheme? They are already really expensive.
212	As a resident of the local area whose vehicle is essential to working and earning a living, it's important for me to voice my opinion and concerns.
213	As there is already an emissions zone in central London. The use of cars in outer London is more of a need than in central London.
214	Because it's not fair on the public who need a car for work. We already have to pay so much for insurance, tax, MOT and service. Plus why should it just be diesel cars who get penalised. If your going to do this it should be all cars not just one type. This is discrimination, it can't be one rule for one and one for another.
215	As a resident and car owner I feel this scheme is unfair. You are essentially taxing the poorer residents (who do not have off street parking or a newer car) by increasing their parking charges even more.

216	I believe the scheme as it has been proposed unfairly penalises residents of the borough who may not be in a position to change their transport options easily and is more advantageous to businesses who have a higher ability to pay.Rollout should apply to business users first before impacting those who have chosen to live in the borough. If the council were serious about reducing pollution they would tax the biggest polluters (e.g lorries, taxis, buses) before penalising residents. This is especially frustrating considering the council allowed the huge incinerator in Beddingron and all of the related traffic to go ahead without challenge.
217	I live in Thornton Heath and have a residents parking permit.
218	I live in Croydon and drive a car
219	This does not take into account how often I use my vehicle (which is very rarely as I don't commute via car) and simply punishes me for having an older model when it is not always so straightforward or economically sensible to trade in for a newer model. It would make far more sense to tax people based on how often and where they drive their vehicle I.e a low emissions charge zone around the centre of Croydon during peak times. I want to understand what you plan on spending the increase tax revenue on? Surely this should be earmarked for schemes to improve air quality such as added green spaces?
220	Is this another stealth tax?
221	You increasing the charge for vehicles parking at there home address. However vehicles going through the area are not charge and they are coursing congestion and C02 emissions
222	Firstly, are all residents in the borough going to be treated equally, i can think of numerous roads where there are no restrictions imposed on residents based on parking, yet i am assuming and only assuming at this point that residents with slightly older vehicles will be charged a greater amount to park outside their property. Surely motorists pay enough, they are being targeted when they tax there vehicle based on emissions now you want to extract more funds for the same basis. Owning a certain group of vehicles no matter what category they fall in is no basis to formulate parking charges for the privilege to park in your area, these issues are dealt with under the taxing process and government.
223	Drive a London black cab, had no choice when buying this vehicle 4 years ago to ply for hire licensed by TFL.
224	I object for this to be implemented. I think there are other ways we can reduce emissions in the borough. Why do we need to tax our residents more we are suffering already with low levels of income and now you want to tax us more for using our car.
225	we do not already have enough parking bays on my road that i live in and now to be charged for emissions is unacceptable - how much will these charges be?
226	I do not object at all as I feel that Croydon Council need to follow the ULEZ system implemented by Central London
227	I already pay a considerable amount in council tax and have to pay for a permit to park my car outside my own home. I appreciate there is a need to reduce emissions, but can this not be done through cycle to work schemes or other business targeted projects such a lift sharing incentives? Penalising people who live in Croydon and need their cars is unfair.

228	The Council may impose parking zones in my area in the future. And I want to have a say in case it comes to pass. The government once stated that diesel was the way to go to save fuel and many folk went and bought diesel vehicles. These vehicles are still in very good condition and to impose draconian charges to try and force people to purchase new vehicles is unfair.
229	This is an extravagant charge to add to people who are already struggling to make ends meet. Everyone pays council tax & now you want more money for this scheme. You should take into account that people may not have the means to pay for this scheme, it is another way of getting more money out of people. Once again it is the little people that suffer.
230	I'm very upset by the proposal. How is it logical to charge residents based on their vehicle's emissions when the car is parked? You have no idea how much I use my car and how much pollution I admit. I have a [… rare car model…] currently, not particularly eco-friendly (181grams per km), but then I offset by cycling to work and working from home. I do most of my miles outside the M25 on business trips. Then you'll have a Hybrid UBER doing 100,000 miles putting way more pollution into the local area and paying way less for their parking permit, I walk my dog every morning to Norbury park. I agree the polution is bad crossing the A23. This isn't local residents. This is vans, lorries, cars commuting down a narrow-ish street. Seems like a money making exercise...
231	I both live and work in Croydon and whilst I feel that the aim of the scheme is noble, the implementation will adversely impact the poorer people in the borough, such as myself. I live in a small flat with on-street parking. My car is used for supermarket runs, travelling to various camping holidays and for some child care when I'm able to look after my child, this means I have an old inexpensive petrol car which does less than 5,000. The new parking permit scheme would see me essentially "taxed" by the council merely for owning a car, one which is useful enough to me that I keep on the road, but not in constant daily use. I cycle and or walk to work in West Croydon on a daily basis and feel like I only use my car when I have to. Why can't you implement some sort of Congestion charge?
232	I am commenting because my family, having two cars for work (delivery) and for care visiting, and being in a very dire financial position, thus using old cars as we can't afford newer ones, are likely to be heavily financially burdened by these new rules. Basically I do agree, air pollution absolutely needs to be reduced drastically, however I think it is unfair to implement these rules on existing permits. They should only apply to new permits and when there is a change of cars. In that case one can consider the permit prices when choosing a car. Now we are confronted with a situation we can't avoid without suffering high additional cost (as either the permits are going to be terribly expensive or we'll lose a lot of money when going for another car.)
233	Money making scheme. Not everyone who actually has a diesel car can afford to change their car or pay the new charges. Buses and coaches that constantly drive through the area use diesel are they going to pay everyday or they'll get a discounted rate for them hmm. This council takes so much money yet, you can't fix pot holes in the street just drawing marks around them.
234	This is an ill-thought-out policy, which will do nothing to improve air quality. The biggest contributor to poor air quality is diesel particles. Whilst everyone needs to reduce CO2 because of its warming impact on the climate, it does not impact air quality which is the stated aim of this policy. In fact, diesel cars cause the most pollution which has shown to cause harm and ironically these have stated lower co2 emissions (although manufacturers claims on this cannot be relied upon). Your policy actually encourages people to switch to diesel, which have lower CO2 emissions and therefore will reduce air quality. This is a lazy attempt to raise more money that conflates CO2 with air quality.

235	I am strongly objecting for this so called 'green' measurements . All you want is to put another charge on residents pretending you care about environment and people. You are taking advantage of poor not very educated residents that would silently agree with anything the Council is deciding behind close doors. Council of Croydon like many other is a private entity and is following their own agenda. So let get this right as follow : Council is looking to introduce a charge and surcharge because Communities complained about noise pollution and air quality. Whoever is this Community doesn't represent us the majority of the residents and is not our VOICE. That survey is also deceiving because the right question was not asked. I am limited to 800 characters and it is a lot to say.
236	You are enforcing further taxes on drivers for having diesel cars , which will not change the level of cars on the road just add a further cost for drivers to upgrade vehicles to petrol or pay your diesel taxation. So are you as the party looking to bring in this toll , going to bring in an incentive and help scheme towards deposit for replacement petrol vehicles
237	I am objecting as not everyone is ready for the additional cost in changing their cars. Atleast not until when the whole of London as be classified as such.
238	This is rather ridiculous as it entails an increase of nearly 400% for someone like myself who uses a car for long journets only outside of London
239	What about people that reside in roads without parking bays who cause just as much pollution dont have to pay anything, When they drive their vehicle they are causing just as much pollution.
240	I bought diesel based on Government recommendations so don't want to be penalised. There is a schedule for introducing electric cars and this seems just another way of cashing in.
241	Because it adversely affects me
242	Air quality in the borough is not determined by cars parked outside residential premises but by those who use their vehicles on a regular basis both within and from outside the borough. Charging more for cars based on some measure of pollution is unfair as it will penalise those on lower incomes who cannot afford to upgrade their vehicles and those who only use their cars occasionally. The measure will appear to some as simply a revenue-gathering exercise rather than an effective method of reducing air pollution. Even a free parking permit will not offset the £1,000s in extra cost for a new electric vehicle.
243	I object due to: Already paying for a permit despite not even being able to park on the road i already pay rent for. So many new properties have gone up close to my street that people who do not live there tend to park on this road which leaves myself no choice but to park elsewhere. The current crime rate us high and croydon council will not be paying for a new car if mine was broken into or stolen. Due to the size of the borough, us it not fair to raise prices of those already paying to park due to hundreds more simply driving through the borough.
244	Because we have already been forced not to use our car in London. And now you're suggesting that we can't use our car locally either. I cannot afford a new car and I can't afford to not have a car to travel between work. [same address and surname as 6184524]
245	The quality of my life and my family in Thornton Heath and Croydon, where we spend most of our free time. I object to the scheme, as the quality of my life in the area would be heavily compromised by this. We have a baby and hopefully a second one soon. All families like ours need cars to move in areas with limited tube and public transportation with step free access. First you must provide higher standard public transport; then you can start penalizing private transportation. If every council adopts this, you'll create distortions and break families that live in far away boroughs. Don't do it please!

246	Living in the area and opposing the idea. Council tax is already so high. The bills just to live in the area are getting out of hand.
247	This is another scam for Croydon Council to fleece the residents in Croydon for more money so that they can occupy the most expensive offices and mismanage our money. No doubt if this goes through, they will stay true to their nature and bully and threaten residents for money and if they are really struggling financially, they will steal their cars.
248	This proposal discriminated against porter and older households in the case of the elderly there is a dependence upon car use that cannot be afforded on a fixed income if the charges are increased by this extent.
249	Local resident and this is not an emissions based charge for parking permits as it does not take in to account the driving done in the borough and therefore the emissions generated. It is actually a tax on local residents for wanting to park nearer their homes. Further it is a tax on the poor who cannot afford a new care that emits less pollution.
250	The outcome will affect me as I am a permit holder
251	I bought my car new in 1997 will the extra charge have to be paid ? How can you legally charge me another £300 to park my car on croydon roads I already pay road tax my car which I bought new in 1997 and is in as new condition has lower emissions than all diesel cars and has only done 30,000 miles.
252	I am objecting to the scheme as I own a diesel car and live in Croydon. It is not fair unless the council would like to provide me with a petrol or hybrid car
253	Residents should not be penalised for parking outside their own home. This is another tax on drivers without any considerations for the many other options the council can do to improve air quality such as review the poor transport links across the borough, lack of use of smart traffic lights, reduce speed humps and reduce one way roads causing congestion.
254	I agree that pollution has to be reduced. But it should be the same for everyone. It should restrict number of cars per household. The vast majority of households with 3+ cars live outside of parking restriction; your are proposing to charge only permits holders. Our household has only one car an use it occasionally therefore it is unfair to charge residents for parking and not others that have 3 cars outside their house and pollute the air more then us.
255	I object to the implementation of an emission based car parking permit scheme. 1) It is illegal - the scheme should only charge to recoup the cost of implementing the scheme and not as a means of procuring additional funds. 2) It does not address the problem of traffic pollution - It is vehicles that make repeat journeys or multi-stop journeys such as buses, taxis, commercial vans and construction traffic, not parked cars, that pollute. 3) It is political suicide - I will be voting Liberal Democrat at the next council election if this goes through.
256	I believe the proposed changes are unfair
257	It is unfair to those like myself who hardly use their cars and mostly commute and travel via public transport also its in a sense, especially, penalising those who have diesel cars.

258	I don't earn enough to afford the EXTRA charges on top of all my other bills. I strongly object to residential surcharges Why not put extra money into defining and updating the cycle lanes
259	Because I will be financially penalised by this new idea & I would like the council to understand that they already make the lives of residents difficult enough when it comes to parking. Consistently allowing planning permission for houses to be turned into flats means there are less places to park. New residents are able to afford luxury flats so can afford low emission vehicles. So it's win win for them.
260	A lot of businesses in east croydon have diesel vans and this would impact on local businesses who may decide to relocate out of the area. Permits are expensive enough already and lots of the pay and display bays in the surrounding streets are empty due to the cost of parking.
261	It is an unfair tax on those like us who have an older car and no chance of off street parking. Not everyone can buy newer cars every 3 or 4 years. My partner has a freedom pass and whenever possible we use public transport. We only use our car when absolutely necessary. Next year the Government are threatening to do away with the freedom pass therefore our car would be even more necessary. Our car is over 12 years old and well maintained. I think even more people will concrete over their front gardens to use as car parking if this goes ahead and that is not good for the enviroment.
262	I live in croydon and have a parking permit
263	Believe it to be unfair. Is Croydon in the ULEZ? Not so long ago the Government requested that motorists switch to diesel. On people switching to diesel the price of fuel went up. Now you are penalising people who own diesel cars for parking legally. Suggest you don't penalise residents who pay for parking, but have 24 hour parking enforcement personnel who penalise those who park illegally after proscribed times. Make parking enforcement 24 hours.
264	As a resident of Central Croydon it seems that we are being taxed for parking outside or near our on homes and now another surcharge for pollution caused by traffic coming into or through Croydon. I hope you will be charging owners of mopeds and motorbikes as well. It also seems that users of polluting buses will not be charged for using diesel buses constantly driving in and around Croydon, Local residents parking is an easy target because we are trapped , Why don't you put more effort into chasing non payers of council tax , but I guess that is too much like hard work and costs money. Also will council owned vehicles get taxed? They seem to enjoy free parking …. Just another stealth tax for hard working people.
265	Too costly
266	I have a parking permit. The price shouldn't be higher than current for hybrid cars. According to proposal my hybrid car will still cost more than current amount. This doesn't seem fair as I have paid extra for a low emissions car. I suggest the range should be cars under 90mg co2 for band 2
267	Because I drive a car and motorcycle and unfortunately I reside in this borough. There is no reason to charge vehicles based on emissions. Croydon already pick and choose who gets a PCN. Target filthy diesels for sure, but us petrol owners. No, I do not agree with this. Why should my car have to pay more than someone who has the money to buy a larger, but slightly cleaner car... no way. Youre forgetting that not everyone (especially in thornton heath) can afford to be getting a newer car.
268	It's another tax the council is grabbing from the car paying residents, this council has done nothing to help car users just take money especially when they say one thing on a proposal letter, then when they set it up it costs more and there is nothing that can be down about it

269	Its ridiculous and nothing more than a money grabbing scheme. You already milk us dry as it is leave some of our hard earned money for ourselves
270	New emission charges for Croydon Parking Zones: These new charges are unfair on residents, especially those in the outer Croydon areas e.g. South Norwood. We have 1 vehicle permit for the South Norwood zone, and there are never enough parking spaces in this area for the amount of legal permit holders in the area. More focus should be put towards drivers parking illegally in these spaces without permits, or on double yellow lines, blocking roads, or on the pavements. So many times we have had to narrowly avoid other cars parked on corners and on hidden bends because there are not enough spaces available. On top of this, the London ULEZ zone will soon be expanding to include the southern London area, and in time, Croydon, and therefore drivers would be paying the same charge twice.
271	I think it's about time this plan is implemented
272	Because it will impact me and my family
273	As I pay enough for a year parking and most bays have been suspended since I've purchased my permit
274	I live in the Coulsdon Central parking permit zone and the prices would increase based on the new proposal - I would therefore object. The price of visitor permits would also increase and, in addition, relies upon myself and any visitors (including tradesmen) knowing their CO2 emissions in order to select a band and get a permit, by the look of it. This seems like an unnecessary complication being added to an already faffy online system. Having looked up which vehicles might benefit from a reduction in the price of a parking permit, I note that it is mainly hybrid or electric cars - very few people have these yet and it is not my intention to get one for a number of years until I know that the infrastructure and technology is properly in place to support these.
275	I would like to make an objection to the scheme. Whilst agree with it on principle but the implementation brackets look to be too broad and counterproductive to the end goal. I personally drive a hybrid car and bought it under the pretence it was better for the environment and doing my part. What is infuriating is that my car produces 80 C02. g/km but its put into the same banding as BMW 6 series M sport 152 C02 g/km. Now could you please defend charging someone the same even though the cars are completely different? I would suggest an intermediate bracket of 76-100 charged at the current rate, then a next bracket 101-165 at the new rate. [same address and surname as 6184786]
276	I believe it is terrible you are trying to find ways of getting money out of people in one way or another.
277	The parking permit cost is only just affordable for me personally. With the new costs Croydon Council plans to implement the cost will almost double for me, I do own a car which is essential for me to be able to work. There has been no factual evidence submitted with the proposed price increase of the emission levels specifically in Croydon or the specific parking areas in Croydon for the proposed price increase. Until recently, the government recommended newer diesel vehicles with an engine shut off when the vehicle is in neutral, I purchased one of these vehicles which comes with a lower road tax, now this will carry a higher cost in the proposed scheme!

278	I have a car and pay for parking in my street. While I support some form of emissions based charging to improve air quality, I do not feel that the residents permit is the best place to do this. It does nothing to limit the emission that contribute to poor air quality, as it doesn't focus on the driving of the cars. While I don't believe my car does not fall into the category for the extra surcharge, given I do not drive my car frequently I contribute far less to the emissions in Croydon than someone who drives on a daily basis, and, therefore, being charged a surplus just to be able to park my car in the street I live (or indeed borough given the extent of the residents permit zones) in as I do not have a garage seems an unfair penalisation and does little to achieve this scheme's aims
279	The permits are dear enough now they started of at 5 pounds
280	Im not sure how taxing parking permits based on emissions is going to reduce traffic? Would the new initiative mean if you pay zero car tax you'd pay zero parking charges? I think proposed measures may have greater affect on traffic volume & air quality if they were applied to business & other permits as people who drive a short distance for work may think twice & businesses can probably better afford the likely hike in rates. Therefore applying charges to residents first, who have little choice about parking is unfair & unreasonable. This action would substantially hit families with restricted incomes as they probably own older cars with higher emissions. I think it is preposterous to charge for parking on private land, if this is what is meant by the longer term proposal?
281	Air quality is absolutely fine. We don’t need to punish with this the residents Residents struggling basic food for their children hence thinking about air is not a priority
282	Objecting to the scheme as the there is no electric charge points on the street Your are telling us what we can and cannot buy a car when the technology/car manufacturers aren’t improving options and costs. A sugar tax style on the car manufacturers instead of me not buying my bags of sugar
283	This is an outrageous proposal and ill conceived, it's another way to raise revenue from drivers. My diesel van, 2006, is used once a week if that and normally I am straight out of Croydon, How on earth would my contribution affect air quality? I can't afford a new van and so will have to fork up to to £350 just to park near my house, I can hardly move out, I am a sitting duck for this ridiculous charge which ends up effectively being a tax. Once you have 3000 cars coming in and out to Westfields, the scheme you actively encourage then surely you got a pollution problem there? I guess that scheme will never happen so there is some good news. Also, for the amount of revenue you generate from parking tickets how about fixing the pot holes b4 charging helpless residents?
284	Parking already limited in SN. I live alone so not having a permit would make me anxious in the winter. I live right by the football ground. I look after small grandchildren in the school holidays. I think I pay enough already
285	I reside in Croydon and have asthmatic friends
286	To contribute to ongoing debate. an objecting it

287	I'd be interested to know how the respective bands were calculated. For example, would a Ford Focus or Astra from 2009, be in the same band as a 2019 Ford Focus or Vauxhall Astra, which emits less CO2? If the answer is no, that's good. If the answer is yes then the scheme is flawed, as it doesn't incentivise motorists to upgrade to newer less polluting models. A scheme such as this should be designed to encourage people to upgrade to newer cleaner vehicles, and not an excuse for the council to try and raise extra revenue.
288	I am objecting the scheme as I cannot afford to change my car and so feel I should not be punished with higher parking rates just because of the car I currently own
289	Local resident with one parking permit (for W zone) for a diesel car (registered in 2007). Interested to learn about and comment on proposals. I don't enjoy paying more for a parking permit but I do appreciate the need to reduce pollution. £50 surcharge seems a significant increase with little warning. The surcharge might deter people from purchasing diesel cars in the future but for those who bought them believing they were better for the environment, it seems punitive and will not improve air pollution caused by our vehicle.
290	I am objecting to this scheme, because it is just another way to take advantage of car owners. I have been refused a permit because i leave in a multi story building, and for over 2 years i have had to pay daily to park on my street where i live, which costs over £1500 a year. Car owners who live elsewhere and have a permit have the privilege of parking on my street why i cant. Now you want to further punish us with an emissions surcharge, which you claim has been based on response from Croydon residents. When was that consultation done? and can the reports be made public. This platform will not be enough for me to share my painful concerns on how the local authority has treated residents especially in relation to owning a car. This proposal is unfair and unjust.
291	I oppose this as apart from money making no other purpose is obvious out of ot and will impact more if you are poor
292	Should the council be protecting local residents and reducing/penalising the amount of traffic that enters Croydon (increased emissions), rather than charging increased parking tariffs for residents to park outside their homes in a 'permitted' parking bay? I commute daily into London, however my wife with a child 17 months and another due in July due use the vehicle to go to various playgroups/hospital appointments/family & friend visits, where public transport is not always suitable. (Not buggy friendly. When pregnant women is having to lift her own buggy up and down stairs, it's shows there is still a London/country wide access problem). Bottom line, charging the residents a tariff to park where they live is not the correct or viable way to reduce emissions, as most need their vehicles.
293	Freedom of choice. While I broadly support the concepts behind the initiative, to introduce a scheme on EXISTING vehicle owners is unreasonable. A change in tariff at the point of vehicle change, where decisions to influence a vehicle purchase can be made, would allow a more fair roll out of the increased charge. Residents with older/diesel cars will be unfairly impacted by a change that they could not foresee at the time of vehicle purchase. Residents do not have disposable incomes to purchase a new vehicle and will incur excessive annual charges that we cannot reduce, without having several thousand pounds of investment for new car. Rather, where a resident applies to makes a change for a vehicle, or a new (rather than renewal) permit is issued, at this point the increased charge could be levied.
294	I am a resident in Coulsdon and I am very unhappy with the new scheme which is being proposed. It is highly unfair for residents who cannot afford to buy new cars or cars with high emissions. They shouldn't be penalised further.
295	To complain about the severe hike in the proposed parking charges

296	I am a resident of Croydon who has voting rights and the council have not carried out any consultations that I am aware of and do not have a mandate to cause even more residents to pay more monies to the council and to make Croydon a no go area for drivers. The centre of Croydon has already suffered from disastrous parking and anti vehicle legislation. You will have nobuisnesses in Croydon at this rate
297	We have one car it is diesel and old the government encouraged us to buy diesel as it was supposed to be better for the environment. Now we are being penalised because the same government including you as the Local government are also punishing families who are already struggling in this environment.
298	There are several questions related to what is proposed. We all agree that something has to be done related to air pollution in the Borough, however, there is the question of what the Council is doing related to parking spaces in all the new developments that are authorizing. We know that they are trying to force people to use a better way of mass transportation, but it is unfair to build a lot of departments and at the same time to get rid of parking spots and spaces to make more buildings. Second, it is my firm belief that a lot of air and noise pollution comes from the use of motorcycles, which to my knowledge, are not subjected to the same rules and are not targeted as a high pollution vehicle when the reality is other. There should be something that can be done in that respect,
299	I'm commenting, because I have a permit for my car and would be interested to know what the charges will mean for partner and I.
300	I am cynical about what this is all about. Another way of taking money from people. There are other ways of improving air quality surely. There are ways of reducing air pollution or improving air quantity rather than taxing residents more. This is not fair way of improving people's life
301	It is bad enough that I have to pay to park in the street in which I live but now you expect me to pay a lot more for the privilege depending on the car that I drive. Why should people who live in controlled zone parking areas be the only ones to pay for improving the environment, what about those who don't or have off street parking , their cars have equal emissions to mine and in a lot of cases worse, all Croydon residents should be treated equally not just those who are unfortunate enough to live in a controlled zone
302	I have a car. I want cleaner air in Croydon
303	I object becasuse people who own older cars are least able to afford £300 charge, so they may park car in away from home to avoid paying charges, therefore increasing pollution elsewhere. Also I understand TFL will be briniging in ULEZ to start at south circular which will be additional daily charges. Will these charges apply to blue badge and mobility cars? Croydon is on the edge of urban London and so I feel further discussion about options should be reviewd before any decision is made.
304	seems to be a knee jerk reaction to the ULEZ tax which as usual affects those who are not rich enough to constantly upgrade their vehicles to greener models. I drive a diesel which I was advised to do by the government who quickly back tracked and declared diesels to be bad for which now I will be punished by increased prices. my car is used only at the weekend so I do not contribute greatly to the pollution and congestion for which I will be forced to pay for. look at thornton heath clock tower for pollution and congestion,whoever redesigned that junction increased both threefold. I know this reply wont be taken into consideration but I will say it anyway.

305	I strongly object to the council applying emissions charges on residents parking permits as it is not fair to the people who do no have to pay residents parking permits on their streets. More of the richer area of Croydon don't have residents parking permits imposed on them by the council, yet its the richer areas who have the most upper end gas guzzling cars. Croydon council are making the situation worse by making the areas where they are imposing more and more residential permits (e.g. North Croydon) even more congested by building more affordable housing. It is not fair to leave these people who can barely afford a home - with additional charges while the rich part of Croydon have the luxury of not having residential permits. It's fairer to charge ALL residents.
306	Parked Vehicles give off zero emissions! As a resident of London borough of Croydon, I have not been spoken to regarding this issue. I fail to see how air quality will be improved by these charges. Do all current revenues raised by permit parking, go towards cleaner air?
307	Because its just another mo ey maker for the council. Pure scam. Pricing poor people away from driving
308	Why should we that have had parking permit bay's enforced on us outside our property, that we did not want, be penalised. And everyone else that parks freely on the street and pays for no permit and no diesel surcharge on permits- becauce they don't have to buy them! This is victimisation isn't it? It's just another cash cow on us residents and car owners
309	Objecting as maybe it would make a difference
310	I feel that the less fortunate cannot afford to buy newer cars that have lesser emissions, but as always will now pay a further premium by way of a parking permit cost, when as motorists we are already paying car tax to drive on the roads anyway. I also not that the proposed parking permits brackets are not broken down as car tax brackets, so the wider major of vehicles owners will find themselves in this brackets, and therefore allowing Croydon council to just further increase the cost of parking. Drivers should not always be constantly priced off the roads on to a very poor public transport service.
311	Parking for residents is expensive enough already and there are not enough spaces of a size suitable for todays vehicles
312	I don't want to pay for it. I can barely afford to have my car as it is.
313	I think placing an increasing financial burden on motorists is wrong. The residents parking permit has risen in price well beyond inflation and by adding weekends and Bank Holidays to parking restrictions you are forcing family and friends to pay to visit. Enough.
314	This would affect me as I'm a car owner. I would hope that the low emission vehicles would be exempt from the charges. I'm also concerned about the air quality so generally support charging high emission and diesel vehicles.
315	Im a resident and this affects me. I am objecting to the proposal.

316	There isn't enough street parking on the council estate I live on so I choose to have a permit as this will normally mean I get a space in the estate car parks, not too far from my property. It seems to me that you want to penalise the residents that do this and just make more money for Croydon council. Also from the information you have provided, you have not explained or made it clear what the parking permit charges will be for council estates.
317	I thoroughly applaud the scheme tho' was concerned to see that a surcharge will be placed on diesel vehicles. I hope that not all diesel vehicles will be charged the same and that recognition will be given to EU diesel vehicle standards OR to DVLA tax rates.
318	I am objecting to this scheme as I am a diesel car owner and uses it for commute daily. The new charges are just too much and unbearable. We already pay enough taxes and bills won't be left out with any money to buy food going forward, the way the government is taxing people, outrageous.
319	As a Croydon resident who pays their council tax, im astounded you feel it is totally acceptable to squeeze yet more money from the working taxpayers in this borough for yet another money making scheme that will line this councils pockets... Its difficult enough for people to live in and survive London prices without you lot bleeding us dry further.... No wonder people are leaving croydon in their droves we're all fed up....
320	Because we are already road vehicle tax. And different cars have different tax band. I dont see the logic why even parking a big truck on the road will cost you more money if its just sitting outside with yhe engine off. If there us a heavy truck passing down the road probably yeah. But not woth the parking. I thinj this is just a money making scheme for the council to collect.
321	Seems too much tax on older vehicles / diesel based vehicle with zero consideration for financial status of the owner of vehicle
322	Think this is a tax on poorer people
323	The scale of the charge increases are beyond excessive and are unacceptable considering its not about use but about keeping a vehicle. At this point keeping a vehicle that incurs the increased cost and surcharge does not apply to those owners of the worse offending vehicles who do not need a permit for parking.
324	Live in the borough
325	This policy appears to be already be a Done deal' without any correspondence to householders. I cannot find any details on the rating of vehicles 1-5? Households with no facility of parking on their property are penalised versus houses with a driveway? Therefore it hits those of lower incomes who in addition are likely to have an older car. As a labour council (which I'd rather it wasnt) is directly affecting the very people who voted you in the first place! You couldn't make it up.
326	We pay enough for parking / driving already. I need my car for work (Forest Hill) and with the ULEZ zone extending to the S Circular (I work park 20yds into the Zone). Yet another charge is ridiculous and yet another way for the council to fleece its residents. I do not agree with the proposed charge

327	I feel Croydon Council benefits from the stealth tax on motorists in Croydon. There is already a fee paid for a permit, followed by the public paying at the pay and display. The revenue this generates followed by the fines to motorists. Croydon council is constantly squeezing the motorist ! Therefore I object to these proposals. Why not give the residence free permits and continue to make a profit from the pay and display ??
328	I want a cleaner air quality in the borough and a fairer system for those who spend extra to afford a hybrid or electric vehicle
329	I don't want to pay extra for somewhere I have been parking for less/ free. My grand parents will also be affected.
330	I'm objecting because it's just another way of increasing the price of the permit without actually making any difference.I still need my vehicle for work and can't afford to change it, so have no choice but to pay. I think I would have more respect for the council if you just put up the price, like you have done every year since you started the permit scheme ,rather than trying to hide behind a so called environmental scheme. What about the other thousands of cars parked on Croydon's roads??, will they be charged a diesel surcharge for parking??
331	Pay enough already
332	I find it unfair to penalise people with euro 6 Diesel engines, simply got owning a diesel car.
333	It seems like another money making scheme when i already pay for a parking permit. How is this going to save the environment exactly when all you are doing in just charging extra for someone who is already driving and parking a diesel car? The buses still run on diesel, this seems insane to me.
334	For heavens sake, there are no govt schemes to compensate diesel car owners. As a disabled person this is the only way I can afford to travel. Get the streets clean first before anything else. Currently we own a car we can afford- it may not have the best emission rate but it's what is affordable. My husband and I have invisible disabilities as well. Maintaining a car is expensive, using public transport is impossible as we need to get to the hospital, shop and get to work which involves visiting various parts of London. Penalising us as older, disability and financially lesser off by taxing parking is outrageous and a human rights transgression. The Council can't manage it's rubbish collection efficiently yet you intend to penalise us? Unacceptable.
335	This scheme has come to my attention as I am within the proposed CPZ in South Croydon. It was therefore mentioned on the letter from the Council. I was shocked to learn that the Council proposes to penalise those who are the least well off in our Borough and therefore cannot afford a newer car with charges of up £300 per year and a great deal more for local businesses whilst the wealthy can park their cars on their drives free of charge. The proposals will affect numerous normal, hard-working households in the area who are already squeezed by the high cost of living in London. Further, retail is suffering throughout the country and the Council should be looking to help, not hinder those who are running businesses and creating jobs in the local area.
336	You have invited me to comment

337	I am a resident who cares about the environment. I am also the owner of 2 vehicles- one electric and one petrol. I care about our environment and believe we must put strategies in place to force change. We own 2 vehicles - 1 electric and 1 petrol. I would be happy to pay more for my parking permit for the petrol vehicle if needs be. However, we are fortunate to have off street parking in order to charge our electric vehicle. Without a huge investment in onstreet chargers in residential areas that work reliably I can not see many people committing to electric vehicles. There would also need to be something to ensure that the people that rely on them have access to them when they need- ie not ICEd and an oversupply that mean there is always one available.
338	Interest in the environment, support the proposal.
339	I have permit that is essential to provide healthcare to children suffering with asthma. Although I whole heartedly agree in reducing pollution I cannot do my visits throughout the borough without using my car and feel it is unfair to be personally charged for providing a vital role to the community.
340	Lack of spaces for permit parking on my street due to paid parking
341	Because I object to this, how on earth do you expect people to survive when you are trying to tax them through the nose? [same address and IP as 6185139]
342	Residents should not be punished with this retrospective charge for vehicles already bought.. this is just an indirect tax on vehicles.
343	I am already paying for a parking permit. Just because I have a disele engine car, why am I paying extra when people are parking on my road without a permit, if this is the case I will not renew my permit. People don't want to be paying more [same address and diesel car as 6184377]
344	I live and park my car on croydon.
345	I object to the council thinking of introducing these proposals to a deprived borough. It is disgusting
346	Local resident deeply concerned about the environment and parking costs in Croydon for residents.
347	It makes no sense why parking permits need to pay this surcharge and emission as we are paying for parking and not driving. How is the car polluting when it's parked and engine turned off.. Wasn't parking permit payment is to pay for the cost of the bay and monitoring and controlling who parks.. Its for parking not driving.. Why resident permit is hit first when all drivers should be paying this even though there really isn't that much pollution compared to other parts of London.. Is this a con to make extra money.
348	I'm objecting to the scheme because the scheme will double the price of current parking permit. We only use our car at limited period. This scheme will affect people with old cars who cannot afford new cars. The additional cost will penalise that category of people. I wish this is taken into consideration.

349	I live in Croydon and I have a parking permit. I think it's unfair for people who have older cars that run perfectly well and can't afford to upgrade..
350	All recent science shows that Diesel engines are more environmentally-friendly than petrol engines. As not everybody can afford an electric car, a surcharge for Diesel would only encourage purchases of petrol cars, therefore damaging the environment. Also, many cars are used very little, so the characteristics of their engines have nothing to do with the amount of emissions they create. For example, my family never uses the car around Croydon town, and only uses it once every couple of months to visit grandparents in the countryside.
351	Its clear that the real reason for this is you think you can get away with charging more money for parking permits!! You have unlawfully given me two parking tickets that i could have taken you to court and disputed but you didnt even have a telephone number i could call to dispute, you have been designing your services to penalise people to make money and make it impossible to complain successfully about it. In the email you sent out that could have easily been missed by me (and others) you have given no indication of how you would charge people. Presumably the base price will remain the same and you will just up the price for any vehicles you think have an engine too large.. I am only writing this as i want to help others who you are trying to scam out of more money!!
352	Concerned about volume of traffic in area and speeding / bad driving in area + would like improved public transport to relieve congestion e.g more stops on Thameslink e.g Thornton Heath Would like to see more traffic calming methods on roads with regular accidents and speeding offences, e.g Brigstock R Would like to see fewer cars on road.
353	This is a sad example of the council making easy money from people with cars. Lost revenue from fewer car owners paying road tax and as CPZ areas increase, there are fewer cars actually parked in the zoned areas, so again lost revenue to Croydon Council. By simply charging in CPZ areas and not on non-CPZ areas is a smack in the face of those residents already paying for a permit to park. With all the extensive building work going on in and around Croydon, the council should look at charging those gas guzzling trucks, lorries and vans.
354	I am concerned because we were given false information by the government and encouraged to buy diesel vehicles, and after doing so, we are now being punished for following the government's advice. I object to the scheme. We were encouraged to buy diesel by the government, and after doing so, you now want to punish us by charging us to park outside our house and get more money out of us because your funding has been cut. Shame on you.
355	I am a resident I object to the proposal
356	We already pay nearly £200 a year to park outside our houses (assuming someone else hasn't already parked there) as well as road tax, insurance, etc This has nothing to do with emissions, it's simply lining your pockets again I and I assume all residents will oppose this all the way. And why isn't it all cars if it's emissions related? Not just the poor sods who already have to pay yearly to parking in the streets outside our homes?? I assume people will driveways will pay nothing So much for '"emmissions"
357	I live in a permitted zone and object to this change. It is way for the council to get more money - my brand new car (which is replacing a 15 year old car) would be charged double the existing cost of the permit. It isn't like people who live in these areas can just go and change their cars to lower emissions options and if we want to park outside our own houses it seems we have no option but just pay more. Seems like a way to get more money from residents and make it look like something is being done to help with emissions (when the reality is that it is unlikely to make any difference other than give the council more money). The scheme is penalising those of us who aren't wealthy enough to afford a driveway too which seems highly unjust.

358	I pay my resident parking permit for parking my car in my zone.. How is my car polluting when my car is parked and engine turned off.. I don't see why resident permit holders need to pay for emissions and diesel surcharge when using our parking bay.. Our bays were introduced late 2017 and you have stated that the reason for paying for the permit is for the service of monitoring and cost of the bays (even that seemed unfair). And now you wish us to pay extra in order to park our car. If your truly concerned about high emissions than all cars should be charged not just permit holders and ban diesel cars in Croydon .. It wasn't long ago govt was saying to buy diesel cars and now diesel is no good.. it shows that this is not genuine cause but rather a easy money grab targeting residents who already pays for residential parking. . Therefore I am opposed to this proposition. [same respondent as online response ID6185063]
359	Making people pay extra for having a diesel car is not lowering air pollution. This can be achieved by encouraging people to drive less rather than making people pay for parking their vehicles.
360	I drive a petrol driven Honda Jazz. NOT DIESAL I maintain my carbon foot print by using my Freedom Pass for most journeys
361	I object because I think it just another money making scheme to extort money from an already financially stretched residents
362	Why are those paying for parking permits being targeted?? Surely any charge should be applied fairly to all Croydon residents who own vehicles. I already pay to park outside my home, pay car tax and also council tax and now you are proposing to enforce a further charge on me, when joe bloggs, living just a few streets away can park outside his own home for free and not be targeted for an extra charge, I would be intrigued to here how the council justifies this! Thanks Croydon council, for giving me the incentive to clear out my garage. I will be parking my car in it, in order to avoid both parking permit charges and unfairly applied emission charges.
363	I am a resident in Croydon and believe the proposed policy for emissions penalises the least well off in our borough. Those who cannot afford new cars and require a car for basic work and family life purposes will be penalised. I would not expect this from a Labour council. It is apparent that it only serves for the council to gain extra income at the expense of those struggling with living costs in London.
364	People already pay enough to drive. Car insurance is basically a legal con in some ways. Parking permits are not fair. I pay 80 pounds to park outside my house. But when i get home from work. people without permits park in the marked bays. They then leave just before the charge applies at 9am. forcing me to get up and move my car into the bay to avid a parking fine.Car tax, fuel and maintenance cost are also very high. As for the emissions. what people are complaining? there are not cars driving through the town centre in croydon. just on the big main roads. Croydon is not polluted. the only busy time is rush hour.The travel system is great. Apart from Buses that cause more traffic and kick out loads of horrible fumes. Being a cyclist i know this all to well. I don’t want this charge!
365	I am objecting to this scheme because its a subject of interest to me as stake holder. The parking permit payment at the moment its enough finacial burden so introducing additional fees is not welcome.
366	As a Croydon resident I have a right for my opinion to be taken into account in any implementation or not of this scheme. I believe the existing measures for diesel cars being phased out is sufficient. In addition, hybrid/electric cars are and will be the 'norm' going forward. Also, not all cars are used all day every day and many are commuting etc by public transport. I feel this is a tax and another burden on local residents when the council tax has increased while services provided have been cut. School runs (with car engines running) throughout Croydon would be the place to focus if emissions are your concern.

367	I object to this scheme as it fails to consider the poor and the elderly of the borough who have had their car for years and can't afford a new car but are reliant in their cars as a lifeline. We already pay high court cil tax for a poor service. I have no faith that this money will be used as stated. Furthermore, older cars will soon be off the road but the tax will still exist. Secondly, I object as I have a car that is older and I can't afford to replace but use to transport my elderly mother. This is a second Family car and my husband uses the main car for work. The permits are already expensive. We simply having recently purchased a new home afford to pay this o top of our council tax. Maybe the council should stop providing free wheelie bins and charge Viola for everyone they d
368	I would like to be more involved in my community and the decisions taken. I believe that while it is better to incentivise people to adopt a greener lifestyle - that those who are reliant on parking permits for work and family should not be penalised without support of some kind.
369	Diesel vehicle owners are already paying too much prices on fuel, road tax, insurance, Congestion charges etc!! Why are exposing them with more prices as if it is their fault making Diesel vehicle. It should be Governments who should be taking responsibility for issuing licenses to vehicle manufacturers for not making more electric vehicles and keeping prices low!!
370	The proposal seems to target car owners without supplying any real alternative as to how they get around as the public transport only works if you are traveling to central London via the trains or central Croydon via bus. There are lots of people who need to get to other locations who will be penalised by this proposal
371	Objecting - more nonsense charges that hard working people cannot afford
372	unfairly targeting permit holders only. Emissions caused by all car owners in the borough so if applied should be done so universally. Road tax costs already based on emissions and now council wants to inflict an additional penalty charge on permit holders only owners. What does the council spend parking penalty charge income on? Spend that on emissions. This is an ill conceived idea. Strongly opposed!
373	Want to participate in a social issue
374	Cost implications, permit costing enough every year.
375	I am the owner of a two year old diesel car which is within the emmision limits specified by the EU. I hardly ever use the vehicle except to do a weekly shop. At all other times it is not used. I would strongly object to this proposal especially as croydon AQI is well within EU standards. I will object most strongly to this proposal because it is quite clearly a stealth tax and should be kicked into the nearest recyclable waste paper bin and forget about it. The AQI in Croydon is between 20 and 60 pm (today is 52) and well within EU limits. I have a two year old deisal car and only use it once for a weekly shop and not used at other times and meets emmision standards.. Put a charge on buses, lorries, cars dropping kids off at schools and very busy parking areas like near the council offices. I will object strongly about this. This is clearly a stealth tax and should be forgotten about. If you want to increase prices just simply increase them without all this clap trap. The AQI in Croydon is well within EU limits. Charge extra at busy parking areas like outside the council offices and London Road or buses, trucks and lorries using Davidson Road. Don't punish the residents for foul air.
376	This is simply extortion! Where is the published research evidence of poor air quality in Croydon and what is the incidence of health problems eg asthma that can be directly attributed to poor air quality? What is the evidence-base for Croydon's decision to introduce this charge? We already

	pay an Emissions tax based on our vehicles. Its called 'ROAD TAX'. If its not bad enough that vehicle owners are targeted enough for Revenue in the form of Speed cameras. and Illegal Mobile speed traps. Now they want to target us for double road emissions tax.
377	I have just checked and my mum, who relys on her car, will have her permit cost increased to £300 per year!!! SHE CANNOT AFFORD THIS! To be blunt, this could make her homeless!!
378	You are going to make the poor pay more you are trying to keep the poor off the road and make it for the rich only
379	This is just another way to make money from those who drive legally, those who live from our tax money doesn't even bother to have car insurance and drive in Croydon. We requested to have controlled parking to avoid doggie mechanics parking all broken down vehicles on our roads and now just because we are in your stupid databases, being penalised. Some people Living in our road just park in next road where there are no restrictions and come back in the evening park out front of there homes and your stupid scheme just penalise those who need the parking when they finish work and come home at night.
380	To give my view on how ridiculous this scheme is
381	I am a Croydon resident who will be affected by this scheme
382	We followed government advice and purchased a diesel against our own wishes, we are now being punished for it.
383	This is just another way for local council & government to squeeze more money out of people. The impact on local business and families will be huge. More cost to people is just going to push people over the edge. The London LEZ is due to be extended in 2021 that will provide people enough time to replace vehicles, the time scale for this is way to soon. People need time to prepare and save for the additional costs involved.
384	I am objecting to the proposed new parking charges because this scheme targets residents who do not have properties large enough to park off road. If you are concerned about emission levels in Croydon then you should levy charges from every Croydon resident for every vehicle registered to their property. This should include the whole borough not just the controlled parking areas. What is the levy to be used for? It should be ring fenced for environmental improvement, not to balance the accounts deficit.
385	I am a resident and car owner
386	I have a diesel car, which has less emmisions than my old petrol car (alot less)!!! which is why my road tax is only £20 a year whereas my old car was £380 a year due to emmisions! i only drive my car at weekends as i work in the week, so the emmisions i am using are very low yet i am being penalized for having a low emmision car and not driving it and needing a parking permit to leave my car parked outside my home!!!!!!! its disgusting.....maybe think about charging people that dont live in croydon who drive to work instead of using public transport.....there the ones rasing the air pollution, not people living here
387	I object to this strongly.many Local residents will be unable to afford the additional charges, where will they park their vehicles? If you cannot afford to change your vehicle or work vehicle what do you do ? It's a stealth tax . It could also hinder house sales

388	I am a resident of Croydon who drives infrequently
389	I feel that this proposed increase penalises certain members of the community, for example older people or poorer people who have a car an cannot afford to replace it for a newer one. It also unfairly penalises people who rarely use their car, their doesn't appear to be any distinction between someone who drives 20,000 miles a year (and therefore causes a lot of emissions) compared to someone who has a car and uses it once a month (and therefore doesn't). In both respects it's a very unfair proposal and is a unnecessary tax on people who are less well off. I'll thought out schemes like this make me lose faith in Croydon Council and would make people not want to live in this borough.
390	I feel this is probably going to be introduced in the North of the borough first where the less wealthy live. This is another tax on the poor, penalising those who least afford a permit or able to purchase newer vehicles
391	It's unreasonable to further penalise people who may not be able to afford to buy a newer car. Plus, if a car is parked, it is not creating any emmissions! Road tax already takes into account vehicle emission charges, this is unnecessary. [same address and surname as 6185216]
392	I'm a resident in Croydon and interacted in how the council changes policies. I am concerned with the timing of the program and not giving people who have these types of vehicles time to financially plan an alternative. Surely it would be better implemented as a whole both resident and business at the same time as the ULEZ zone goes to the 205/406. Also there needs to be clearer rules in place, e.g what is an inner/outer zone? Does this apply where there are no parking bays? Do the council plan to put parking bays everywhere? What about people who come to visit? Will this have an even bigger impact of the High street not getting enough business if and when Westfield comes? Overall not enough information on the practicalities or how it will work in a daily basis.
393	This is clearly a taxation on the poor, and just another money making scheme by Croydon Council. The rate of building and the number of cars being introduced to Croydon is causing the increase in pollution, there is increased traffic on the roads, and bottle necks of traffic due to poor traffic planning. This needs to be addressed properly in the first place. Look to the number of cars that park without permits they are the ones increasing pollution.
394	Areas affected have not been identified
395	I agree with global warming but taxing cars is not the answer, and is just another way for Croydon Council to cover their debts. This seems like a tax or a money making scheme.
396	I want to support the scheme - it is an excellent idea.
397	Two fold really, firstly at a time when motoring is becoming almost prohibitively expensive and yet public services are being cut I find it curious that this measure , on the balance of probabilities, has been construed as public health issue. Rather it stinks of fund raising , it's virtuous guise bears almost no scrutiny. If you wish to improve air quality in Croydon start with the biggest polluters not as it appears with the largest pool of payees. To whit the residents. Look to the endless building sites with their deliveries , diesel generators, transient work forces, How is their carbon foot print offset ? Do they bear any share of the load or are they , as investors 'too important'. Alter the flow of traffic away from the most vulnerable, I have ran out of space I could go on
398	Interested to see if this affects everybody as we don't have parking permits in our road as yet.

399	Whilst I am in favour of measures to reduce air pollution from vehicles, the proposals being consulted upon are, I consider, encouraging the scrapping and replacement of older ultra low or zero emission vehicles. I own a 1998 Lotus Elise which has a manufacturer certified CO output of just 0.36g/km and NOX output of just 0.076g/km. Versions of this car that were manufactured after March 2001 would qualify for Band 1 residents parking rates with an all zones permit costing just £60 compared to £960 for my pre-March 2001 registered car. If I were to scrap my car and buy a new one to avoid the higher charge the emissions released and energy consumed in scrapping the old car and manufacturing a new one would be substantially greater than if I were to carry on using my current car.
400	I need to use my car on a daily basis for site visits around Croydon, I am concerned that charging will add to my outgoings which currently already exceed my income
401	It's silly. ULEZ is enough.
402	Because I will be greatly affected by this scheme, should it go ahead.
403	Parking charges and permits are already expensive in Croydon! You can't even park outside your own house! Disabled bays which aren't in use are not being monitored by the council
404	I like in Croydon and own a diesel car. My car is a diesel car which is exempt from ulez. I do not see any reason why I should be made to pay more to park when my emissions are lower or equivalent to most petrol engines.
405	Obviously, because I have a Car ,and I'm concerned about the cost,you will impose on me..!¡!!!. R
406	Everyone was encouraged by the government to buy diesels to help reduce the CO emissions and yet again we are being punished for following the advice of the government.
407	I strongly object to more charges being put on Croydon residents. I was born and bred in Croydon and have seen over the last 15 years charges going up and up and i fear residents will soon be pushed out of this borough. Do you think with the building of Westfields and all the lorries and work going on in Croydon is good for the atmosphere. NO it is not but the residents and businesses in Croydon can pay for this. Well i for one have had enough. council tax going up, rent going up, parking charges going up and now more charges.I feel this council just needs to make more money off of the backs of its residents. a few years ago my parking space charge went from 3.60 to £7 how was that justify-able . but this is already going to go through so i suppose i am wasting my breathe really.
408	There is already too much council tax on everyone. When people are buying cars, they are not informed. For example, anyone who bought a diesel car in the previous year was not informed of these charges. There is already ULEZ charge to travel into London and on top of it, if the council starts implementing such taxes on people, the council will not be a harmonious place to live.

409	I'm appalled that the council finds any excuse to make more money out of families!Therefore I feel I must take action and make my voice heard.I'm a home stay mum who has no access to ANY benefits because apparently my husband earns2much.I need my car to take my child to lessons that are difficult to reach by public transport.I need my car for my mental health and feel I can go wherever I need, whenever I need without further stress caused by public transport(no space for buggies,waiting for ages to get on a bus in any weather condition,being stuck in traffic which can be avoided by taking shortcuts,long journeys,changing several times, etc.)I need my car.I just can afford it.If you add any further charges I'll loose my freedom,my relatively stress free style.I don't agree to this scheme!!
410	I live in a permit parking zone. In it's present state it is completely ineffective as the street is half empty during the day but a parking space is rarely available in the evening, when parking is free. Rather than punishing drivers of cars you deem unsuitable, why not incentivise drivers of cars you approve of? Personally, I think it is already unfair that I should have to pay to park in my own street, especially when I rarely can. Both my neighbours have drives for their cars. Will they be penalised too? I find it hard to believe that this proposal is anything other than an attempt to raise revenue rather than any genuine environmental incentive. What should 1000's of residents do? Scrap their vehicles and buy new ones?
411	It is a unfair tax on people who can't really afford it and it is hard to see who (except for council coffers) would benefit for such charges coming in. In addition it will cripple the businesses that still operate within croydon at a time when a lot of businesses are going bust. Croydon council should think about the consequences of such a charge!!! I have as a resident!!!
412	The reason I am interested is that as I am registered disabled and have a Blue Badge and drive a 2018 motability car which is renewed every 3 years, I wondered if and how the scheme would / could affect me?
413	I live in the borough and am concerned how this will affect me financially
414	We already have road taxes in place reflecting emissions banding and similar schemes being introduced relating to driving into respective emission free zone. All of which is at the very least defendable as while the car is running the impact of emissions can be explained and therefore discouraged through a tax charge respectively. Introducing a new tax for parking is indefensible. A residentially parked car is not having any emissions impact being switched off at home on the street. Especially where the local council would need to justify charging a cost for. It is almost blatant as being setup as a new revenue source for the council to manipulate an already stretched argument to surcharge on emissions while showing zero improvement on local roadways, cycle lanes or public transport routes
415	Residents will have to pay more just to live which is already a expensive with people living in poverty
416	I live and drive in Croydon and feel strongly that the proposal is short sighted, based on flawed information, does not solve the problem of pollution and discriminates against those who cannot afford to purchase a new vehicle. It also supports the over use of planet resources by encouraging new car builds
417	This scheme will adversely affect the less well-off. We are already compliant as we regularly drive into inner London so have had to buy a compliant vehicle, but it is ridiculous to expect everyone who lives in Croydon to be able to do that.
418	We can not afford all these charges and I need to drive to and from work, if this goes ahead I will have to resign from my job and claim council and social benefits because of council greed

419	Too much to write but a) fed up with policy of trying to tax motorists off the road, b) people will simply convert front gardens to more concrete which will have an environmental impact, c) you are stopping visitors coming that may have larger or older cars, d) I have plenty more just ran out of time.
420	I have no objection to the policies that the council intend to impose, but how will this reflect on busses, taxis and emergency vehicles?
421	I pay enough to park outside my own home . My council tax has also gone up . Let alone car tax insurance. Another money making scheme from Croydon council !!!!!!
422	I AM OBJECTING TO THIS SCHEME. WE HAS A PEOPLE ALREADY PAY FOR CLEAN AIR BY A VERY LARGE NUMBER OF WAYS FIRST OFF. IS THE LEZ ZONE THEN THE LONDON CONGESTION CHARGE THEN BY WAY OF ALL VEHICLES ARE TAX ON EMISSIONS OUT PUT AND NOW THE NEW LONDON ULEZ WHEN IS ENOUGH A ENOUGH?? YOU CANT JUST SAY O WELL WILL TAX YOU BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT IT IS JUST ANOTHER TAX. A WAY OF THE COUNCIL MAKING MONEY. THIS HAS GOT TO STOP. IF YOU WANT TO HAVE CLEAN AIR THEN MAKE ALL THE BUSES BIN LORRIES AND OTHER COUNCIL VEHICLES HYBRID OR FULL ELECTRIC. DONT TAKE IT OUT ON THE POOR. AND THINK HARD ON THIS I ALREADY PAY FOR MY 2 VEHICLES ROAD TAX £600. PER YEAR PARKING PERMITS JUST SO I CAN PARK ON A ROAD LIVE ON £256. TO GO IN TO LONDON LEZ WAS £ 11.50 PER DAY NOW £23. PER DAY TOTAL £ 1500. THINK !!
423	I don't think residents should be penalised for where they live and if they own a car. Surely it is enough that they have to pay for a permit anyway. I do not live in a permit zone but I think it would be more fair if a congestion charge/pollution charge was put in place to enter Croydon area. There is plenty Of public transport going into and out of the city.
424	I am objecting to the scheme because as a resident we pay enough money for the permit alone and to then add another charge on top of this impacts households that are already struggling financially. There is no thought to individuals circumstances and it's all about making money.
425	Financial. Unfairness
426	Many businesses are still adjusting to the ULEZ, & the rising costs due to the uncertainty of Brexit, & whilst this scheme or schemes like this are both inevitable & important, this is too big a burden on local business at this time. Penalising those who have the least - currently leaving untouched those who can afford off-road parking. Whilst the environment cannot wait, nor the health of our kids, we must consider everything in balance & make progress where we can - this scheme takes the simplest of routes to change whilst penalising those who can least afford it. Consider a fairer tax to all vehicles, reduced taxes to ultra-low emission vehicles, improved legislation for electric scooters, improved access to & affordability of public transport, secure bike parking at train stations 1st.

427	In favor of implementing a scheme to reduce air pollution and ease congestion. Following concerns - Why is the charge increase rolled out to residents first. Business are actively polluting the air to generate income so should be the first to pay - Scheme seems favor residents who have a driveway or garage. Residents who live in flats or terraced houses are hit but are most likely the groups of residents who use their vehicles the least - No joined up approach with ULEZ. New vehicle purchased to compile with ULEZ, scheme does not recognize this - No real outline of how this money will be used to actually reduce the congestion or pollution, cycle paths, greening up the area etc. Electric vehicles don't solve congestion - Does not address frequency of use, everyday vs once a week drivers
428	I own a 21 year old car that I don't use regularly, due to a Euro6 compliant company van. Over the course of a year, I'll be omitting less pollution than a new car driven daily, yet I'll be paying more. Where is the logic in that? Visitors to Thornton Heath high street can park for free 50 metres away, or just illegally park, because the Council has completely lost control of enforcement in the TH CPZ, not to mention blue badge fraud that's not investigated. Business owners without permits are parking all day in pay and display, loading and disabled bays due to corruption amongst Civil Enforcement Officers. Nobody I know is aware of the consultation that you claim 74% of people agree with, just like the underhanded way the 20mph speed limit was forced upon us. Labour taxing the poor again
429	Croydon residence
430	This appears to be the Council jumping on the green bandwagon in order to raise Council income. If any additional revenues are being generated from this (this has not been made clear) will it be set aside in order to fund new 'green' projects? I suspect it will just be added to the bottom line of the Council and absorbed, and no new initiatives delivered
431	As a tax payer I believe I should have my say
432	I have a diesel vehicle, that is required for work, I have no opportunity to replace this due to income constraints. I will just park on the road and not in a residents bay to avoid the charge. The time frame is far to short to allow for people to budget for replacements. I strongly object it does nothing to ease congestion or pollution just revenue collecting.
433	Because it's a joke. Mere money making scheme
434	It concerns me
435	My concerns are Primarily about what its going to cost as a Motorist & as a Borough Resident
436	I am a resident of Croydon and concerned about the emissions the borough produces especially given Beddington Lane

437	I own an older diesel-engined car, which I have had for more than ten years. As I now live on two fairly modest pensions and have very little by way of savings, I cannot afford to replace it. At the time that I purchased the car, the government was encouraging drivers to buy diesel-engined vehicles, even though the problem of particulate emissions had been known about for years. I therefore consider it unfair that drivers who find themselves in the position that I am in should be penalised for following what was government advice at the time. Although it has not been mentioned at this stage, I am especially concerned that these regulations may be extended to cover areas not currently subject to parking regulations, such as the one where I now live.
438	There is very little about motibility vehicles/disabled drivers/blue badge users and how you plan to vehicle use as necessary in an affordable fashion. Also very little indication for groups of people like these who may be heavily reliant on benefits etc.
439	I am concerned that this may lead to higher charges. Obviously cheaper cars give more emissions so are you then going to charge people with these cars more? So if your rich enough to own the better cars you pay less! Also, I mainly use public transport. My car is only used at weekends. So I shouldn't be charged more due to emissions when I am already actively being responsible.
440	MY CAR IS HYBRID SO LIMITED IMPACT
441	I am the owner of a 2016 Ford C Max diesel car and believe this is just a money making venture for Croydon council; as the car is completely inoffensive whilst parked. [same address
442	Objecting - we already pay high permit rates, surely this cumulatively should be able to help combat pollution in the area, carbon foot print offsetting, maintaining green areas/increasing footprint of green area. We already have congestion charge, ULEZ and introduction of more affordable hydrid cars and greener commercial vehicles. I unfortunately feel this is another money making scheme for an already cash strapped council.
443	To ensure fairness to all. Diesel was endorsed by Government. Many people followed that endorsement by buying diesel. It was obvious that government misled the people at that time. Yes diesel has now been found to be when not used correctly is not good for air pollution. So are cows and airplanes! As are many forms of production of plastics. I would agree to small duty to be charged, but this is a small drop in a polluted ocean to resolve this issue.
444	we have 2 vehicles within the zone 1 of which is a high c02 emitter 1 isn't - incentives need to be given again to owners of older cars again to inspire them to change - also further incentives are needed not to drive a car at all. Note that my council tax bill is around £2100 pa and the only direct benefit I get from this is refuse collection which I could arrange myself for about a tenth of the council tax bill.
445	I'm already penalised for owning a car and have to pay to park on my own street, now the council want to impose more charges on top of everything we have to pay which has included increases of up to 5% on council tax each year. There are properties and streets that are lucky enough to have their own driveway/garage and even free parking on their roads, yet we do not have any of those luxuries and still have to pay a yearly charge. I've lived in Croydon my whole life and to be honest the council should be more focused on sorting the town centre out rather than trying to take more money from those already struggling. I have not noticed an increase in traffic but I have noticed a decrease in footfall in Croydon.
446	I believe that this is just another way of Croydon council to percicute the poor motorist who have the miss fortune to have to use the pothole ridden roads in this area.

447	No letters have been sent to every house hold about these proposed charges, not every resident is being given the chance to voice their opinion...very underhand, just another way of lining your pockets yet again and pushing something through quietly. The actual real evidence relating to air quality is being suppressed, none of the real evidence supports these changes, it's all been hyped up to meet a agenda. I bet if everyone goes on to electric the costs will still be charged as the manufacturing of batteries etc give off more emissions than diesel and petrol combined. It's not justified, again the poorer who live in these areas are being penalised. I have never been sent questionnaires about air quality! We pay enough to park in our residential areas as it is!
448	I object. I live here and drive here. Still annoyed at the 20mph speeds around and waste at all the money time resources putting signs up. You drive to the road condition.
449	This is a penalty for those who have diesel cars. The alternative is to buy a new electric one which is unaffordable. I object to this scheme and suggest the borough look at allowing low emissions buses or Electric / dual power only Taxis and minicabs in the town.
450	Yet another money making project that hits local residents. When I moved to Croydon in 1989, no parking permits existed and parking was free. Croydon then decided to introduce the parking permit for local residents, this has steadily increased over the years in cost. Having been a Local Government Officer, these projects have one objective and that is to fill up the finances of the local authority because of the Government cut backs. Yet again, this latest project is for exactly the same reason INCREASING INCOME which never gets spent for the benefits of locals. It's always the locals that get hit in the pocket.
451	If the Council approves this, I absolutely urge it to simultaneously rationalise the parking zone in this area. The parking zone extension decision a few years ago included only Croindene Road, Lloyds Avenue and parts of Southbrook Road and Upwood Road. The result has been patchy implementation with Colebrook Road, and the other half parts of Southbrook Road and Upwood Road which remained free suffering enormously although they are geographically NEARER to London Road and Norbury station. If Abington Road now becomes a pedestrian zone, the aforementioned streets will become an irrational enclave of free parking "bits" and thesuffering of their residents a fully blown disaster. The Council should thus implement this properly and rationally by including those streets too in the parking zone.
452	I agree to a cleaner in environment, but don't agree on more charges . It's all about making money .
453	I object. It is a cynical money grab and a back-door tax. The argument that it will reduce emissions makes no sense.
454	Reduce air pollution
455	I object the additional diesel based charging as i already pay my road tax which covers my car to be on any public highway, I will be charged on my road tax so why should i be charged again further by the council? Also, this is just another way for the council to make more money from its residents I am more than happy to pay for a parking permit and also accept the recent increase already advised but charge even higher for diesel cars is one step to far

456	A) It's completely regressive and puts an unfair burden on those who can least afford it whilst doing little to improve air quality or climate change B) It does nothing to alleviate the problem of over congestion of our local parking spaces Point A The council seem to living under the myopic delusion that it's very easy for people to exchange their vehicles for cleaner ones - until recently the government ENCOURAGED people to buy diesel cars!! Please be aware, a parked diesel car produces ZERO emissions. If you truly cared about air quality, what matters is the amount and the way the vehicle is driven not just owning one. However as I suspect this more another revenue raising exercise from the council attempting to cover for their total financial ineptitude in managing their books!
457	It's a money making scheme designed to make the poor poorer
458	You already tax this borough heavily. Just another money making scheme by Croydon council. We have been asking for better controls on parking. But you pass the buck to TFL
459	Local resident appalled by the proposal
460	I wish to know why my car, which I chose because it qualifies for ULEZ, would be subject to a diesel surcharge in Croydon because Volvo built it before your arbitrary date of September 2015. This penalises those who have chosen a cleaner car that was ahead of its time. I wish to object to my Euro 6 diesel car being classified as a 'dirty diesel' and subject to higher charges. I would be penalised because my car was ahead of its time by being a Euro 6 in 2014. I bought it specifically because of its cleaner engine. My car qualifies for the ULEZ zone but you consider it to be a 'dirty diesel' because it was registered before September 2015. Your standards are not consistent with existing standards in greater London. If Transport for London can tell the difference between 'clean' and dirty diesels, why can't Croydon ?
461	The parking is expensive enough in Croydon. The residents and businesses of Croydon deserve better. Croydon already has some of the highest Parking charges. There are not enough buses/ alternative travel options to compensate.
462	Firstly this is not central London. Traffic or congestion is not bad. I have lived in Croydon basically my whole life. Looks more like a money making opportunity. Secondly, unless there is a bursary to drivers having to change their cars this is a ridiculous notion. Most in Croydon can afford to pay an addition charge to permits charges they already pay. Thirdly you have just extended your roads with permit within the last 12 months! Now you want to add another charge.
463	This is disproportinate and unfair to local residents who use their vehicles occasionally. It also dispropotionately affects lower income and disabled residents who aren't able to afford less polluting vehicles. e.g raising permits from 85 to £300 for classic and older vehicles which are part of British Cultural Heritage is frankly scandalous. No evidence has been provided to show how much this scheme will reduce air pollution and the achievable levels it intends to bring about. Already with the buses and other heavy goods vehicles being used by the various construction projects contributing a large amount of pollution let alone the heating and ventilation systems of the new build buildings, this is frankly a rip off.
464	I dont think its fair this is a poor borough we can not afford to buy new cars its just another tax on the poor.

465	I'm objecting to this proposal as I've never been asked the question about air pollution or to much traffic in the area. Was this asked to car owners or non car owners? If you are penislizing permit holders what about all vechiles driving through Croydon and the streets that have no permit restrictions why are they not being penislized? What will the extra money per permit be spent on? How have you reached the increased figure per permit? Seems very unfair on car owners.
466	We pay enough money for psrking in Croydon , including permits to park outside our homes. These charges that are being proposed will only effect the people who cannot afford to upgrade their vehicles to newer models. It appears that the less financially able residents of Croydon (those who cannot afford homes with off street parking) will once again have to pay the most.
467	As a resident of Croydon I am concerned about levels of traffic and the ability of small and micro businesses to continue in operation.
468	Croydon resident for 59 yes, homeowner and resident parking permit user. Though reducing emissions and attempting to reduce air pollution in laudable. The reality is that for most working class families the ability to change/afford newer vehicles is not a reality due to cost. We pay enough in taxes of all types throughout our lives and to look at using an already overcrowded/cramped and under invested public transport system as an alternative is laughable. Parking fees should be reduced and not increased as has been the case year on year to date more responsibility should be taken by government and the energy companies to tackle climate change more effectively investing in natural energy (wind/tidal) and closing air polluting coal based per stations. I am opposed to the council proposal.
469	I am writing to express my views concerning the changes that are being proposed in your notice. I am not happy with the idea of a tax on Diesel vehicles, simply because it was the government, a few years ago, who encouraged the public to buy diesel cars, stating that they were much cleaner than petrol cars. How can we be encouraged to do something and later on be taxed for complying? I am also with the continued focus of taxing cars when the price of public transportation continues to increase. If you really want us to curve the use of our cars, you should make public transport less expensive and more accessible. It seems that your efforts always end up in additional taxes with no real benefit to the public.
470	This is another expense which is going to make it harder for families within our Croydon community after substantial increases to Council Tax rates and recent introduction of permits required to park I the local area.
471	Whilst I understand your reasoning behind this scheme and I think it is a good idea. My partner and I are residents who commute into London by public transport everyday. This obviously means our cars are parked in Little Roke Road during the day. I do not see why we should now have to pay to have our cars parked by our house. It seems a little unfair we are being punished because we commute.
472	I would like to object to the scheme, like other's I'm concerned about air quality, however to issue surcharges only to residents in permitted areas is discriminant behaviour, Some may require their vehicle for disability reasons. The basis for this is; the roads in parking permitted areas are open to use by any driver. The essence of parking permits are to be able to park your car when not in use, when not in use the vehicle is not emitting any pollutants. Furthermore the government pushed for diesel vehicles and need to take responsibility for the increase of those vehicles on the road. This also won't effect the borough as a whole, 74% of respondents in the survey were borough wide not just permitted areas, how would this elate the concerns of those outside permitted areas?

473	Unfair taxation against poorer resident. Compare to the old parking permits, the charge for the band 3 & 4 are significantly higher. The band 1 & 2 are almost impossible to have unless you have electric or very new hybrids. The electric cars are still highly expensive and not many charging point in Croydon Coucil. Therefore, people will have to bear significant increase of charges for having normal car for daily use. If you are targeting conterminating diesels, please arrange more pollution reduction policy such as ULEZ introduction to Croydon rather than Parking permit charge.
474	Local resident
475	objecting to this as its hard enough finding the money to pay for permit as it is and to now have it increase substantially all for the air quality as people have complained , which I understand is a big issue but I just don't see how increasing our permits is going to help and in what way !!!
476	This proposal is the worse idea possible. As a Croydon resident it will directly impact on me financially as I am the owner of a diesel vehicle. The possibility of changing my vehicle isn't financially viable for me nor would be the option of paying a surcharge in a low emission zone. This is just another tax generating scheme. More expenditure in an already high cost living expenses economy. The bottom line is I fear the scheme will come into effect regardless of the impact it'll have on households in the borough. No matter the rational objections. Tackle the aeroplane flight path. Or make our streets cleaner. Address the extensive fly tipping within the borough. Create better green spaces for kids to play. Service and maintain the parks and play facilities. Don't penalize residents.
477	Highly likely to be taxing the poorest drivers (that cannot afford new and admittedly cleaner cars) the greatest amount.
478	Concerned about extra costs
479	We get charged enough anyway to permit park in our road and cannot always get a parking space even though we pay every year for parking permits for two cars. My husband works shifts so it means sometimes he comes home from work at midnight and all the spaces have gone in our road and some surrounding roads, as people who have vans park in our road for free after 5pm.
480	I strongly object to this. We've only just started paying to park outside our own house. Now you're proposing to more than double the charge. It's offensive that you treat people so carelessly, particularly bearing in mind that years of austerity have left most people far worse off and receiving much worse services, locally and nationally. You cannot just keep expecting ordinary people to pay up. Some may be able to afford a car with lower emmission charges but most will not.
481	I have a 2004 family car that will fall within the upper band of your new proposed charges. A leap from £80 to £300 seems extortionate and not proportional. I drive irregularly and certainly don't feel that I am contributing to air quality. I'm not convinced the there is a direct link between parking and air quality. Would not a closer link between driving/usage be more appropriate. And/or less of an immediate large leap in charges given this will have a big impact on families?
482	Write it in simple English so that we can fully understand what you are proposing
483	I object to this as parking permit prices are already extremely high. Certain residents of the borough such as students like myself will not be able to afford these prices.

484	You are penalising people who legitimately pay for a permit. You have to fair and charge all cars. Permits are not cheap. These permits do not even guarantee a parking space. I am very annoyed after the government encouraged people to buy diesel cars that we are now being fined. . My father has cancer and depends on the car. I now have to pay to take him to Guys hospital for treatment and now you want to charge me as well just to park outside the house.
485	I live in a permit area in Coulsdon and pay to park outside my house that I own.
486	I am writing to object to the proposed emission based charging for permits ref PD/CH/K16 I understand that the quality of our air is important as I have a child with asthma but I do not see nor understand how charging more for our permits is going to help with air quality and in what way !! As a resident like many others we have to find the extra money each year not only to pay for our permits but to also pay the increase in car insurance and car tax to be able to use our cars on the road legally and to now have this information from yourselves that you want to bring in this new proposal is ridiculous as we are now looking at an increase just for one permit of £24 extra a year and I'm sure the council will put this up each year too. I am sure there are better ways of dealing with issues of air quality without having to penalise the residents who live in this borough the way you are proposing . we recently had to replace our car due to mechanical failure and in one aspect I'm glad as we would be looking at a lot more money if this hadn't of happened , I rely on our car daily to get not only my children to and from school but to get to my medical appointments as I have mobility issues that change from day to day . I hope that there can be another way to help resolve the issues that not only our borough has but others too in a much better and effective way without having to penalise us the resident in the way you have plans for . [same respondent as online response ID6185575]
487	I am a resident and own a vehicle. I firmly object to an emissions based scheme as this would be a form of double taxation for owners of private vehicles
488	1. Less affluent households struggle to own newer vehicles like ourselves. This would result in further financial constraints on us and many other local families. 2. Already pay higher road tax for owning older/diesel cars. 3. No incentive/bursary/support is offered to assist in purchasing 'the correct vehicle type'.
489	This seems to be another money grabbing scheme from the people who cannot afford newer cars. Its is outrageous that we have to pay it to drive in london. But to pay it in croydon is ridiculous.
490	I own a car and have a permit. The amount I need to pay would be an additional £104 per year in addition to permit amount and congestion charge. I can't afford it as it is and now it may go up! The government should be investing more in greener cars and not penalizing drivers. I'm not rich and could not afford more money on my car when my wages remain the same. I need my car to pick up my child from work and could not reply on transport due to the times I finish work

491	I strongly agree that something needs to be done about the appalling air quality and traffic levels in Croydon
492	General charges regarding parking and residents parking are already at a high level and in general Croydon s parking agenda is killling off businesses and stopping people from visiting Croydon when the Tiwn is at its lowest point due to the Non Westfield project which seems to have killed the shopping area making Croydon a virtual ghost Town.Further Additional charges will Kill it
493	I feel this unfairly affects the poorest people who need vehicles for work. We were told until recently that Diesel cars were the ones to buy by the government. Not everyone is able to go and replace the car, and as diesel cars are now becoming worthless, they cannot be used for deposits either. This is another tax on the poorest people, the ones who need vehicles the most, and will be the ones who struggle to afford it. Charging more for emissions is an easy way out, yet solves nothing.
494	Public transport in Croydon is awful - the Southern trains are still terrible (no action seems to have been taken) and the buses are absolutely disgusting. Buses are packed - bus drivers will stop to talk to people they know, or purposefully drive slowly during peak times. Driving is the only other option when commuting a long distance to work - where you are not relying on a failing train company or the messy overcrowded buses. People should not have to pay more because the alternative provided by the government is not good enough.
495	I'm a Croydon resident and parking permit holder. I object to this scheme as it effects those mostly who are not in the position to by a new or newer vehicle. Liviving in a area were parking is scarce and at a premium for bay ect. I and people of a similar situation as me will virtually priced out and probably hend up being fined more regularly.
496	The pricing structure for 2nd car residents parking where both vehicles have < 1g/Km CO2 emissions should be changed because it is a dis-incentive. My family has 2 cars as both my wife & I need a car for work and because our children are in different schools in different parts of the borough. However, we both do relatively low miles. This year I updated my car and decided to buy a fully electric car for all the same reasons you are introducing the scheme so I am very supportive of the scheme in general. However, If we update my wife's car to an electric car we will pay the same as a gas guzzler yet we need 2 permits because we only have 1 offstreet parking space to charge 1 car at a time.
497	As a resident, I pay an extremely high amount of council tax and for resident's parking permits, so to now have to pay more I think it is disgusting
498	How the hell can you make a emission-based charges for parking permits holders if the vehicle is parked it's not producing any emissions and a diesel surcharge on top of that.This is just daylight robbery. I hope croydon council are going to diesel surcharge british transport for there buses polluting the air.Lets start by taking all the diesel buses of the road in croydon anyone think about that or is it just £££ signs your are seeing.
499	The parking permits are high enough at the moment. This is just another excuse to increase the charges
500	I can barley afford life right now. This is disgusting and I can't bare life and your stupid ideas for taxing the poor in society. Can just about afford the rent of my bed sit. Thanks for screwing us again. ????

501	Unfair and more notice is need. We pay council tax and to park outside our own house. The least the council can do it keep a lid on the amount we pay.
502	I live in Croydon and do not believe more taxing is a solution to this problem
503	It doesn’t reduce emissions cause people will pay and drive and park
504	Resident of CPZ with car in household. Therefore subject to costs and impact. While the motivation behind the scheme is sound, it doesn't reflect actual emissions from vehicles because not all vehicles are used equally. That is unfortunate as it means the less polluting can be paying.
505	Hello This initiative appears to be just monies related rather than looking after the environment. The local authority appears to look after monies making methods rather than creating more parking spaces or having our streets more secure and crime free.
506	Because yet again it is the hard working rate payers who are HIT. Who subsidise the can't work, won't work lazy good for nothings of Croydon society. Living off the Tax and rate payers but, who still manage to GAMBLE ON HORSES, SMOKE CANNABIS, DRINK ALCOHOL abuse the Housing system being ONE parent families on BENEFITS. Diesel was the dream fuel promoted by the Government and the car industry. It isn't the Scientific evidence that's wrong about diesel but, the lies by Governments. So why then victimise the working classes who are trying to scrape a living. Get the Government to pay for your clean air campaign. They waste enough money just like the Council. What's going to be done about the Transport system (buses, coaches) Stop paying out BENEFITS you'll save money.
507	I purchased a diesel vehicle in 2014 based upon government advice at the time that diesel cars were cleaner than petrol engines. Furthermore, croydon council making Addiscombe court road no entry has meant longer journey times for me and increased fuel consumption and thus pollution. There are better ways to clean up the air than penalising drivers. I already pay to park. This is a blatant revenue generating scheme.
508	If you want to charge residents based on emissions then you should be taking into account the mileage/use of the car. This is much more important than the C02 emission factor. In your new proposed scheme a pre 2001 car that drives 1 mile and back to Tesco once a week will be charged almost 50 times more annually than somebody with a newer car that uses it constantly. And now that I've scrolled further down the page I see from April 2020 prices will increase by roughly 1000%. This is absolutely unacceptable, and there is no chance this can be sanctioned. You are literally taking the option to own a car away from people. This is ludicrous. If this goes through I will refuse to pay both this and Council tax.
509	I am objecting because you are proposing it too early. You should give us more time to change our diesel cars to hybrid or electric. We already have too many expenses. I am paying more in car insurance just because my post code is CR0.
510	Charging drivers money to drive a car when they already pay council tax and parking permits is somewhat unfair. It’s just looks like a money making scheme that will ultimately make no difference to air quality but a difference in the councils tax. Spend the money on improving public transport and the quality of the roads!
511	Always difficult to determine the 'truth' behind the schemes in as much as it often seems it is just another way of the council extracting money from not well off people. When the scheme in my road was introduced I made comment as to why the scheme had changed. The response I got was that half road and half pavement parking would endanger folk as the slabs would be broken making it dangerous. Now people park on the slabs and consequently break them endangering pedestrians not least the handicapped that live in our street.

512	I am objecting as I live in the emissions zone and also drive a diesel car - 2010
513	It is unnecessary. Centralised government has decided to tax diesel cars because they emit bad stuff. When parked in a car park, your side of the business, they are engine off. This is a shameless, obvious and frankly typical attempt by croydon council to take yet more money from the hard working people of Croydon (parked there to go to work I suspect) to spend on things that will not benefit the highest contributors.
514	Parking is already a nightmare. We can never get a space outside our home. Council tax is already through the roof. We need the car for work, drop off the kids. Yes there is traffic but putting the limits down to 20mph hasn't improved that. Maybe the roads should have been made wider instead of widening the pavements. Are you going to be helping the families replace the cars that are older than 2015? I don't remember being consulted in this matter.
515	This is just ridiculous, I believe this is just a ploy to collect extra money. Emission! How does extra charges reduce emission, perhaps the system just wants us to do away with cars. In my opinion, it is very uneccessary
516	Concerned about the underlining rationale of this scheme, I don't see how this will have any impact on traffic or air quality as most car journeys are taken because there is no viable alternative. It is obvious that the majority of cars will fall on and above band 3 making this just another tax. A revenue generating scheme. Cars are already taxed based on their emissions, this obviously isn't a consideration as it doesn't benefit local councils. As standing traffic is the primary cause of pollution we should focus our efforts to improve flow. Traffic improves dramatically during school holidays, so why not implement school bus routes? If you are serious about air quality come up with viable alternatives instead of the typical knee-jerk reaction.
517	These schemes discriminate against less well off residents who cannot afford a new car. For example my school teacher daughter.
518	I have a diesel car and was encouraged by this so called government to changed to it. Now slowly finding reasons why I should not have and feeling the cost of the Governments mistake. Now my council wants to put more of a squeeze on me.
519	I have a vehicle and live in the Croydon area. We already pay a significant charge to park outside our house. We rarely drive into London but when we do, on a through route, we have to pay a Congestion Charge a Dart Charge and - soon - an emissions charge to drive. Our vehicle isn't used frequently so whilst we could conceive paying an emissions charge when driven we ought not to be charged a further charge just to park outside our house. At such times, the vehicle is not generating any emissions! In the majority of cases we use public transport. Occasionally we need to drive and therefore need a vehicle for those times. This is punitive and unfair for people who have no choice but to own vehicles.
520	Own a car - understand the reasons for doing this, but object to the short notice of implementation. Allowing car owners 2-3 years time to plan/save for new car etc. would be fairer.
521	I object to this scheme as it is unfair that there is no charge to people with a garage or those who have off street parking. Although my car is a diesel it is not used very often as I travel to work via public transport so I'll be charged for a car which hardly makes any pollution per year as compared to someone with a garage or driveway who uses their car on a daily basis. It seems that you are victimising the poor and once again hitting the families with the lowest income. If you want to introduce these charges you must charge all cars parked in the borough not just those that have to purchase a resident parking permit from you. You should quadruple the business parking permit charge and leave the residents without fear of not being able to afford their next meal.

522	As a resident I feel that I should communicate my feeling on council initiatives so that the Council is aware of how the people it represents feel about it's actions. When cars are parked they are not emitting hazardous emissions so I don't see how any policy re parking permits affects emissions. A better policy would be additional revenue from a charge similar to that in Central London. I.e taxing all car use. However I am opposed to all these extra charges on car users as a) not all users can afford to replace their car to mimimise the charges and b) some users are reliant on their cars and public transport is not an option.
523	I am a homeowner in the area and will face a huge increase in my permit price despite rarely driving and already paying extra road tax for co2 emissions. This proposal does nothing but make more money for the council. the alternative is to purchase a car with low co2 emissions which will cost thousands so its a lose lose situation for residents like myself who are increasingly worse off in this economy and charges like this just make things worse. to charge a car based on its expected co2 emission instead of how much it is actually is driven also makes no sense as a car with high co2 emissions driven 1 day a month is better than a car with low co2 emissions that is driven every day yet the parking charge is more
524	I am supportive of this proposal (though no details are here) as I am concnred about climate change (emissions from traffic) and air quality
525	Vehicles are already taxed based on their emissions. This seems to be a money making scheme by the council as adding on these charges to parking permit holders will only infuriate them and mean people parking in other areas. Most people using the car parks park there to then get on the train / use public transport into London and other areas. By adding on these costs it will discourage people from using public transport when costs will be the equivalent of driving into London, creating more traffic and air pollution.
526	I think the onus should be on businesses not residents - this is not the wealthiest borough and is likely to hit the poorer residents the most. Not everyone can afford to change their car or to buy newer more efficient vehicles whereas businesses can. Businesses profit from residents in the borough. People need cars for all sorts of reasons and residents should not be penalised for not being able to afford a better car.
527	It's a bloody disgrace and a rip off to local residents and nothing to do with air pollution I pay more than enough to park on my street why should I be expected to pay more It's the councils way of ripping local residents off. The council tax we already pay is exploiting the local community as the services you provide such as cleaning streets closing local libraries etc is not value for money. I really believe you are taking money from people who don't have it to fund other things in the borough - it's a disgrace and I will continue to campaign about if it comes into effect. Also it would not surprise me if you have not made the decision already and pretend to consult. If that was not the case why would you be implementing so soon. Taxes are going but wages aren't
528	I object to the timing of the introduction this does not give people time to take action. It is also a tax on the poor who can't afford new vehicles. Why is there a need to add an additional charge for a second permit irrelevant of emission levels. This just feels like an additional tax. Also this does not address the levels of pollution due to poor traffic management within the borough.
529	There needs to be more bands. Charging someone more than what you charge presently for emissions below 100g/km makes very little sense. Can understand a gradual approach over a few years. This scheme will be harsh on people who are not well off. I would also like to see an gradual introduction of a Diesel surcharge.

530	I object to the proposals to base permit charges on emissions. Drivers will already be affected by the introduction of & later extension of the ULEZ, extending this to parking at home means double impact. I can't afford to replace my car & when I purchased it it was considered a low emission diesel in very low tax bracket. I agree that people should be doing their bit however, incentives to support the replacement of polluting vehicles would seem more supportive & sensible than financially punishing people who would likely make "better choices" if they could afford to. I rely on my car to undertake duties in my role for the council but do leave my car at home & walk/ use the bus whenever possible. A more expensive permit cost would further reduce my chances of affording a greener vehicle
531	As a resident of Croydon who has and pays for a parking permit, I want to object to the proposal
532	I believe it is just a revenue generating scheme.
533	I was forced into permit parking, due to the amount of dumped cars in my road, when bays were put in who ever measured them must be blind, as they are all different sizes, then the poles were put in the wrong place so all moved....at a cost !! Then we got no pay and display ticket machines, it costs extra to pay online, very unfair. Now you have the cheek to charge us first for cleaner air, now fuming charge everyone at the same time and the cost is ridiculas.....
534	Strongly disagree with resident parking charges changing. Seems strange to charge residents who might park but not drive out their vehicles regularly thereby not producing air pollution more for parking.
535	I do not have the facility to park anywhere else than on the street. The parking permits are expensive already and I think making people with old cars that are their only way of getting to work pay more will make more people have to give up cars and maybe go back on benefits due to being unable to afford the parking permits and therefore unable to get to work and hold down a job
536	I object. It's going to penalise those who simply cannot afford a new car.
537	Then price increases this year on council tax and general permit parking also people can not afford further increases. It's seem like Croydon council is out to make more money from the Croydon residents
538	I drive a car and i live in Croydon. I object to this scheme on the basis that as a resident, I pay council tax for services which includes environmental maintenance. If I pay to park, I expect that parking charge to cover all necessary costs. If I drive into central London, I will pay congestion charge and/or ulez charge. I do not expect to be penalised again by my home borough!!!
539	I live in a controlled area and drive a diesel vehicle. I don't believe it is fair to further tax residents who live in the area and already pay hefty parking permits when most of the pollution is caused by people driving to and through the controlled zones.
540	I am objecting to this tax. Emissions from cars are not always fixed, so a on the spot check of emissions would not be an accurate way of assessing emissions of cars. Also, potential emissions cannot be planned for and necessary changes to reduce emissions is not always immediately and conveniently rectifiable so it is not a fair tax to impose on people. Also, this scheme should be reserved for the vehicles which are the largest emitters of emissions in the first instance as they should be held accountable i.e. large goods vehicles of multinational corporations rather than the everyday tax payer.

541	I disagree with the idea of charging residents extra for parking permit if the traffic is high volume in their area. The charge should be applied to people using the road to travel, not residents who live in a heavy traffic area!
542	My husband was encouraged to buy a diesel car some years ago and now he is to be penalised for owning a diesel car. This is not fair!
543	This scheme applies a blanket charge to all vehicles no matter what mileage is driven per year which significantly affects the emissions that pedestrians or other road users are exposed to. I drive between 500 and 2000 miles per annum and use my bicycle to commute Mon-Fri in order to reduce my emissions. This scheme does not take these factors into consideration and I would experience a 25% increase in permit charge within the first year of permits being introduced on our street. It looks as though the vast majority of car owners will experience a significant increase in cost of permit raising, increasing the income for the council - how can this be justified?
544	I believe we already pay enough for a permit and we are not in london. Alot of people live in Croydon to travel to work via train and only use there cars on weekends
545	I do not own a car, so hire one when I really need it (to get me to a funeral in rural Derbyshire, for example, which is why I had one this week). Because I live in a flat, I can't get visitor's permits, so I have to pay the extortionate parking fees and move the car after 4 hours. Having spoken to representatives at Croydon council, there appears to be no alternative. Mostly, in the summer, I have to hire cars for 3 days or more as that's the car rental company policy (and the cost is much cheaper than well-known companies). So my question is, if you are so concerned with pollution, why do you not make it easier for people to use cars on an ad-hoc basis, which surely means less, overall car use? If you're going to be anything, please be consistent,
546	It unfairly penalises those who are not in any financial positional to be able to purchase a low emissions car.
547	This is a flawed policy that will impact those who can least afford the new and as yet unfeasible/expensive vehicle technology which is being promoted. Those who can afford a £35k+ electirc car will benefit the most from these new charges! Rather than just using a stick to influence behaviour why not also include a carrot, e.g. means tested subsidy for new vehicles. If low emission vehicles such as pure electric cars are being promoted, will there also be the infrasturture provided for curb-side charging while parked? Also, will this be cost neutral? Or is it an attempt to raise money for council coffers without transpancy over the motives? If the existing parking permit zone is to ensure residents can park close to their residences, why is there a charge for a permit in the first place?
548	I am strongly objecting to the scheme. The extortionate price increases for older and diesel vehicles will only bring about further financial burden to poorer families who cannot afford to purchase or finance a newer vehicle. Personally I will see a nearly three fold increase in the cost of my permit for the vehicle I drive. I do very little driving in and around Croydon and am mainly only using my vehicle on longer runs out of town. The air quality in the town has gotten worse with the increase in amount of speed bumps and the more widespread 20 mph zones; these speed restricting methods force a driver to change up and down gears more and generally run in lower gears at higher revs, which is actually producing greater emmisions. Where is the revenue generated from this going to be spent?
549	As I cant afford a low emissions car or to pay extra cause of this I also cant afford to be without a car

550	I drive less than 2000 miles a year in a 2004 1.6l Ford Focus. This is a type of poll tax for owning a car that I cannot afford. Why will I pay the same as someone who drives 20000 (10x) miles in a similar car and therefore pollutes 10x more? [same address and surname as 6185920]
551	If you are going to introduce a scheme such as this - the council needs to provide electric charging parking spaces in all resident parking areas. Bearing in mind that most properties are flats and do not have parking on their property - if you are going to penalise then you need to make owning an electric vehicle more accessible.
552	I object... if this is a clean air tax then why not tax fuel at source. The more you pollute the more you pay. This tax is purely a tax on owning a car and hits the poorest members of society who cannot afford to buy a post 2001 car. Disgraceful stealth tax!
553	It's not fair to be penalised for car brands not being up to scratch with their co2 emissions
554	Parking scheme
555	Local resident impacted by proposal
556	The justification for this scheme is not clear. Allusions are made to improvement to air quality, and the 'polluter pays' principle but given the consideration that cars that are parked without the engine running do not produce emissions, it is not clear how emissions are linked to parking costs. No indication is made as to where the revenue will be spent; the obvious place being on alternatives- preferably dutch standard cycling lanes but also provision for massive expansion in Croydon's charging point provision. Much more detail in independent research for supporting information is required. This appears to be a well intended scheme but one which may end up being a tax on poorer citizens which will achieve no value for air quality improvement
557	Resident of Croydon
558	I am a Croydon resident who owns a car and has a current resident's permit. I strongly oppose the addition of a further charge based on emissions - this is a matter that is being managed by the London Mayor across the city. I object to my local council taking further action which could be seen as a sneaky method to raise additional revenue.
559	Democracy
560	I live in the borough and object to the poorest residents being taxed

561	You wasted money on cycle only roads, then on 20 miles an hour roads, which everyone ignores.. These 2 must have cost a fortune for the council tax payer, So now you have come up with this scheme, where you can earn money off of the permit holders. I am 77 years old, and reliant on my car to get out and about and to carry my shopping. You suggest I cycle, HA HA, I have never been able to ride a bike, or get a bus. You do not tell me, which bus is going to stop at my address, or how you have persuaded TfL to change the bus routes to stop at my house. Nor have you told me how I am expected to afford to replace my car. You have told me that you will increase your income, which is obviously the reason for doing this, you have to find some way to pay for your failed schemes.
562	Object - this scheme is punishing though who require to drive for work purposes. This initiative won't reduce the amount I use my car, merely cost me more in terms of general living/working expenses
563	I do not believe the charges are for " The changes are intended to encourage motorists to consider more active and sustainable forms of transport, or to switch to zero or low emission vehicles, helping to drive improvements in our public health and air quality objectives and achieve a cleaner and more sustainable environment." Because if this is the case what about richer people who have off street parking in wealthier areas? They probably drive more to reach central Croydon yet will not be penalised for their emissions. So this is an extra increase and charge aimed at harming the poorer residents who have a car. Biased and unfair.If it was about emissions then charge everyone driving in Croydon. I have a low emission car so pay no gov car tax yet under your proposals I would pay £104.
564	Its disgusting a tax on the poor you should be ashamed, most people are not fortunate enough to have driveways or garages and have to park on the road. We have mortgages, bills and are not fortunate enough to be able to upgrade our cars on the whim of the council. I have seen my parking go from free to £80.00 and now you want to charge me £350, Working for the government my pay has increased by 1% for around a decade and your bills exceed this and now you want to increase parking by nearly 400%
565	We already pay enough in Council Tax and other charges, so I am sure that Croydon Council can find another solution without laying extra charges on residents within the borough. Also, it is going to his low income households more than others, as higher earners tend to change their vehicles regularly, whereas, low income households tend to have a vehicle foe years once purchased. I would suggest that if you are looking to lower omissions, you lobby parliament, or the particular regulator concerned, to bring it in nationally via MOT testing.

566	I understand that my life and circumstances are of no importance to the council but as you are once again intending to cause me more expenses which I cannot afford I am writing to make my inconsequential points regarding the proposal to introduce emission surcharges to Croydon Residents. I understand that to have my concerns considered (although I do not believe in a consultation period which already has an implementation date provided) you need my details which are as follows : Car : Ford Mondeo TDI 2008 – xx08 xxx A few years ago when the government was recommending that everyone buy diesel cars as they were the most environmentally friendly, my father bought his first diesel car. He maintained it well and a couple of years ago when he decided it was time to downsize he kindly gifted me his car as I was in need of a new car to get me to work but did not have the funds available to buy one. As a diesel it provides excellent fuel economy and has enabled me to keep my job and afford to continue to travel to work. Now that the country has changed its mind about the diesel engine I am expected to trade in my car for a more eco friendly version, however, I find that the value, running costs and reliability of my car cannot be matched if I sell my car to replace it with something the country now find less offensive. On top of the struggles many of us are currently experiencing with the costs of living increasing faster than annual pay rises the local council keep coming up with more plans to make life more expensive, difficult, generally uncomfortable and miserable (still it's one way to ensure that the statistics about mental health of 1 in 4 people having problems becomes true). How do you expect me to afford these extra surcharges just because my father listened to the government's plea to stop buying petrol cars and move to diesel? I don't know who is the influential person on the council who is so set on becoming the mayor of London or making a name for themselves that he/she is trying to implement everything possible to follow London's lead and be recognised but their career plans are turning my life to misery. I have a good job and manage my own life although I do receive a single person's allowance on my council tax and free prescriptions because of my diabetes I do not need or ask for any other support or benefits. We have seen many changes in Croydon over the last few years many of which I do not consider improvements or enhancements, although I do consider the activities arranged at my local park a really good step to name one of the positives (I am not a backward dinosaur unable to accept change). I do not like to complain for no reason and accept that my choices may not be everyone's choices, however, when it feels that I am to be financially persecuted for a decision the government got wrong (recommending the purchase of diesel cars) I feel I must speak up. I know that my protest will be pushed aside (for the greater good) as it has become apparent that the little man is no longer important we are just here to be lied to, cheated on, trodden on and crushed to further other people's careers and foot the bill. If we don't approve, agree or have the funds we must be bad or mad and incapable of understanding the intricacies of the important decisions which must be made on our behalf. I am disgusted by the condescending attitudes of politicians and media using scaremongering tactics and financial penalties to compensate for all of their bad decisions. When the banks got it wrong with PPIs they were forced to pay for the mistakes they made but when the government do the

	same thing the answer is to make the saps that listened pay penalties for being stupid enough to believe in the advice supplied. No business would get away with this behaviour and are required to hold liability insurances to cover the losses suffered by the duped customer. Instead of charging residents for the mistakes of the government we should be left to enjoy our cars until they naturally need replacing or compensate us to replace them with something which will provide the same needs at the same costs. In recognition of the fact that my concerns will inevitably be overridden and the new charges enforced I hope that these final requests may at least be considered. As the cost of permits is rising to such a degree I would hope that you will be offering a monthly instalment plan to make the payments for our parking permits which will at least allow us to spread the burden. I would also suggest that when the new flats at the top of my road are completed that the new residents are not allowed to buy residents parking permits as there is not enough space in our small area for the existing number of residents and they will have the advantage of off street parking within the complex. I regularly find myself having to park several streets away from home and do not expect to pay more money to receive less facilities.
567	I live in CROYDON and so does my mother, aged 85.
568	As a retired resident of 35 yrs and owner of a pre 2001 vehicle which is vital for me to visit doctors, shopping etc.. I feel an Increase for a permit to £300 is a direct attack on poorer residents unable to afford a newer vehicle.
569	I currently hold a parking permit. I cannot afford for the parking to increase it isn't fair that we have to pay to park outside our own homes when other people can park for free. The cost of the permit has increased year by year there should be a weekend only option at a reduced cost or the first permit should be free. To be able to park for free like other residents in our area I would have to park elsewhere outside someone else's house and risk my car being damaged by disgruntled residents. My car is a necessity for the job that I do so giving up the car would mean giving up my job which isn't an option. Money is stretched already and increasing the permit costs adds extra pressure on me.
570	I am a resident. Wait a minute...this is it? This is the survey? Looks like this is the field for the comment itself--not just the field for the reasons for making a comment. Anyway. I would like the road outside my house to become controlled parking, in order to prevent the local car dealers from using our road as a showroom for their taxed vehicles. Doubling the residents' parking charge will make that local petition impossible. So looks like controlled parking will not be the remedy for this particular corrosion of the public realm.
571	I am a Croydon resident. I object as this is just another way of getting money out of people. Along with the ever increasing council tax and parking penalty charges
572	A parked car does not omit emissions. I can not see the connection. A moving car omits emissions. I had an old car which I recently changed. My new cars C02 omissions are under 100 so I do not have to pay road tax at the moment, this will change in time. This increase that is proposed is over 25%, far to much. So for me whilst driving I am not charged for any omissions, but whilst parked the council want to charge me for C02 omissions that are that are not being omitted. Wheres the logic. So I do not agree with this proposal. You are penalising all people that pay for parking permits, and all those people that park freely pay nothing for C02 emissions. Nonsense. Think again.
573	Take emissions charges from the huge revenue you receive in parking fines and council tax

574	The low emission charges that the government has recently brought in already address the issues that this charge seeks to deal with. I cannot see how charging people extra to park on a road that they are already paying to parl on will be beneficial. Croydon already has charges cars to park. I believe that this scheme is seeking to make more money out of drivers, who have seen the cost of owning a car ride extortionately. I am totally against this scheme.e.
575	I am a Croydon resident and object to this scheme.
576	I chair […organisation…] which represents 2,600 residents in this part of […] Croydon. Whilst we accept the principle that the polluter pays, we have reservations about the proposed scheme which is in our view regressive. Residential parking permits are used most in those parts of the Borough where there is less off-street parking. These tend to be less well-off areas and residents there will tend to use older more polluting cars. So the proposed scheme will impinge particularly on the less well-off who will pay more than those who can afford newer vehicles.. Moreover the environmental costs of constructing new cleaner cars to replace older cars needs to be taken into acccount. The Council shd work with the Mayor of London and other Councils on a broader strategy.
577	I am a Croydon Resident , and I object to this charge, as I am a trades person and usemy vehicle on a daily basis to get to jobs with tools, public transport is not a viable option . [same address as 6186075]
578	I purchase an annual Residents Parking Permit - currently for a diesel vehicle. If this scheme is ultimately introduced I would like the option to change my permit to another (non-diesel) vehicle without any additional admin charge. I am unsure if this is already possible or not, but it would be helpful if this was explicitly explained at the time of implementation and/or in the renewal notification letter. Thank you.
579	Objection Looking at the main aim which is to reduce emissions hence improving air quality and with the vast majority/percentage of households in the areas effected having no driveways how are they supposed to charge an electric vehicle in the evening, unless more charging points are installed? This looks like a money making excuse.
580	I represent a business in the local area
581	I ma a parking permit holder
582	This seems a rather large and targeted increase on those not fortunate enough to have off-street parking. I notice from the “Cabinet Report Parking Policy 20190325” that a significant percentage of Croydon residents are concerned about air quality. As a Croydon resident I would not disagree with this statement at all. However…….why is this charge only being levied on people who are forced to park on the street and therefore require a permit? Surely the parking permit charge is to pay for wardens who police the parking in Croydon. If air quality is the concern, then why isn’t everyone in Croydon who owns a car being charged based on the car they own rather than just those forced to park on the street??? (Have also sent a separate email to the address in the public notice.)

583	At present I own a VW Polo 1.2 Petrol, which produces CO2 emissions of 107g/km. According to the Public Notice that means I am in Band 3 (76-165g/km) and should have paid an existing charge of £80 if I've read correctly. I bought my permit in January 2019 and was charged £110. Why was this? Was this due to the admin fee? Assuming I am correct I would have only had to pay £80 next year, but shall be charged £104 if the new scheme is enforced. A 30% increase by my calculation. This seems a rather large and targeted increase on those not fortunate enough to have off-street parking. I notice from the "Cabinet Report Parking Policy 20190325" that a significant percentage of Croydon residents are concerned about air quality. As a Croydon resident I would not disagree with this statement at all. However…….why is this charge only being levied on people who are forced to park on the street and therefore require a permit? Surely the parking permit charge is to pay for wardens who police the parking in Croydon. If air quality is the concern, then why isn't everyone in Croydon who owns a car being charged based on the car they own rather than just those forced to park on the street??? As an example, my VW Polo 1.2 Petrol, is a relatively efficient vehicle and something I can afford. My next-door neighbours have two 4x4 vehicles and are able to park off the street. One of these is a Range Rover Evoque and assuming it's a petrol model, a quick search on the internet suggests it has CO2 emissions of between 143g/km and 188g/km. So, they not only pollute significantly more, but they shall pay no contribution towards cleaner air in Croydon under the proposed new scheme, despite being bigger contributors to the problem in the first place. In addition, why does anyone living in the inner city require a 4x4 at all? I would add to this, there seems to be plenty of young men in Croydon who are driving round the local streets, (at great speed I may add) in high performance sports cars and thereby contributing significantly to CO2 emissions, but again, if they can park on a drive way they will not be charged under the proposed new scheme. Again, why? Drivers already pay car tax according to the emissions of their cars, so this would mean those forced to buy a Croydon parking permit would be charged twice for the same reason. How is this fair? Were public transport more time-efficient and affordable I would happily use it, but the fact it is, it isn't and therefore I need a car. If I could afford a hybrid or all-electric vehicle I would buy one, but these cars are considerably more expensive in the first place making them unattractive. I don't believe the increased cost of a parking permit is going to persuade people to buy hybrid or electric cars due to this large difference in cost, so this amounts to nothing more than a stealth tax from what I can see. I honestly live in a first-floor flat so I might have difficulty charging a vehicle from one floor up! Why doesn't Croydon council suggest everybody in the area pays an extra £10 -20 in their council tax or car tax etc. per year towards building some air filtration units that can be sited by particularly busy roads where CO2 levels are a particular concern? That way everybody contributes and everybody gains the benefit. [same respondent as online response ID6186087]
584	I only use the permits for my visitors and I cannot guarantee that there vehicles will comply with the proposals.
585	We all want emissions reduced but variable parking permits are not the way to do it. The areas in Croydon where lots of people have gas-guzzlers are outside the permit zones and/or are likely to have private drives and they will not be affected. On .the other hand the person who can only afford an older car, possibly used only a weekends, and lives in a controlled zone has no option but to park on the street. Thus it's quite unfair and you are penalising those likely to be least able to pay. Car licence charges are already varied according to emissions which system catches everyone. If the Council doesn't think this is enough they should be campaigning for the differential to be increased.

586	This proposal is completely unfair, unreasonable and exploitative of local residents.The reason for introducing these proposed charges is flimsy at best.Yet again the local residents are being punished and particularly those who have older cars-I would love to buy a brand new, low-emission car, but this is unafforable to me and many others. It is disproportionate to ask some residents to pay only £6.50 for a years permit(92% reduction) and yet others £300(275% increase), plus a diesel surcharge. Quite often you can't even find a space to park your car and yet the council has failed to do anything to rectify that, despite lots of campaigns about this. It is very interesting how something that causes a financial gain can be fast tracked through so quickly.
587	we pay enough for parking permits at the moment. and we cannot always get parked in our road as it is and is very frustrating.
588	I have a parking permit, which I purchase from you. And this seems to be another money making project for the councils coffers. As we don't sit in our cars parked up with the engines running. It seems that its always the motorists that have to fund nearly everything for the council. I am not very happy about this Idea. What about the free parking round the corner from our road, they must be making more emissions than the controlled parking as theyr'e always full up. And if I have paid for my permit until February 2020 why should I pay more. I am not at all happy about this.Because then it will lead to congestion charges as well, where will it all end. Its a disgrace.
589	I am commenting because as a resident with a parking permit I will be directly affected by the proposed introduction of this scheme. I am objecting to the planned timescale over which this scheme will be introduced. This gives residents less than 6 months to consider changing/giving up their vehicle. Many residents will have financial commitments towards paying off a purchase loan for a vehicle, and the very short timescale proposed would directly disadvantage these and other drivers, most likely those in lower income bands who have to pay for their own transport, rather than have company cars. The short timescale will mean, if residents have to sell their car, the local market will be flooded with cars that are more expensive to buy permits for and their value will drop disproportionately
590	I have a 2010 manufactured car with less than 30,000 miles on the clock. I think having to pay £300 to park my car near my house when I generally do less than 2,000 miles a year is outrageous.
591	Unhappy at any increase in parking charges. They are too dear in any case.?
592	I have a company vehicle, which I need for work. I cannot dictate which vehicles the company buys or when they buy or replace them. I have to buy my permit. The cost of replacing a vehicle could mean making an employee redundant in many small to medium sized companies. If you were really committed to reducing polution, why not make a meaningful reduction in polution by only allocating one parking permit per household, and banning cars from dropping off school children immediately outside schools. We used to walk 20 minutes with our children from home to school. If cars could not park with engines running outside schools that would reduce polution.
593	1.The additional cost to existing resident parking permit. 2. Would there true reflection/the VRM for the intended cost? Yet to see this in council tax payment and services provided. 3. The council should start with the cleanness and proper sanitation of the borough...this includes fly tipping, littering, recycling and provision of safe and secure children park in west croydon. Majority of council payment is used in refurbishing and regenerate other part of croydon except west croydon. Myself and my children no longer feel safe to use our local the wilford park due to our last experience of assault. 4. As always, its an additional source of revenue to the council not resident.
594	To stop it from happening we pay too much
595	Because we can’t rven get parking in our homes without paying for rent, parking and council tax and more and you want more money. I don’t care about this money scheme for the council and you should allow us to park freely in our own town.

596	Residents parking Permits are just Pa blatant revenue raising exercise. If Croydon Council is so concerned about the environment, stop cutting down trees and building enormous blocks of flats on green spaces in Kenley. Trees are the lungs of the habitat. Our local MP claims that there are enough brown field sites in central Croydon to meet housing requirements for the next 13 years. So why is it necessary to destroy the surrounding green suburbs?,
597	This is nothing short of a poverty tax. How can you justify enforcing this on one of the poorest areas of the borough, when we already pay to park outside out own homes? It will go NO WAY to improving air quality because none of us can afford to buy new cars, let alone hybrids, so you are just going to add to the financial pressure we are all under. We are all living hand to mouth as it is, give us a break for gods sake.
598	I find that Croydon Council surveys are generally skewed in their design and aim to push through the policy with the wording of the questions leading to a specific answer. Generally the only people who respond to surveys are those supporting the proposal as could be seen with the landlord licensing scheme, 20 mph limits and others. I am against the proposal, I feel that it is another way to get money from the local population and not of any real benefit.
599	I live and park in Croydon
600	Croydon is not a wealthy borough, many residents and small businesses have to survive on incomes below the national average. With costs of many services rising faster than incomes a surcharge on parking permits based on emissions becomes a tax on the poor, they cannot afford hibrid or electric vehicles, often left with no option but to buy second hand vehicles at low prices. And if people are forced out of business by further costs, the result is LESS income for Croydon council! For this reason I oppose the scheme.
601	I object to this scheme as it is just another stealth tax on residents and also parked cars do not contribute to air pollution!!! The principle is 'the polluter pays'. Introducing further costs to residents parking will just encourage those effected to park in other roads where a permit isn't required thereby placing an addition burden on those residents who will be unable to park near their homes. The addition 'tax' on diesel vehicles is also unjust as Government encouraged people to purchase diesel vehicles because of their fuel efficiency. instead of investing money in quick fixes, invest in expanding the tram system and stop family homes being converted into flats.
602	I would like the Council to explain how this scheme makes any sense. One thing is to charge something like the Congestion Charge, when you are charging for high emission vehicles when they are actually being used and driven around a certain area. How do you explain charging higher for vehicles that are simply parked? For example, we have a car which we use twice a week only, and based on this nonsensical scheme, as it is classed as Band 3 would be charged £104 a year. Now maybe you have a "cleaner" car that is used much more often and therefore with a much higher emission overall which is paying less a year for parking. So what is the scheme trying to achieve apart from raising more money to the Council? What study was made to support this scheme - please share it.
603	Objecting against the scheme as it is just another way of making more money. Where would you be putting the extra money made. You are also penalising people who have old cards who can not afford to update their car.
604	I am not sure I can afford the new charge of £104 as it looks like I'm in band 3. What happens as I have a blue badge is that taken into consideration. I just feel that everything has gone up or going up, soon it will be too expensive to live. There are a lot of people on just pensions or pensions and pension credit when is this all going to stop. I understand about wanting the cleaner air and the environment but what will Be next. I certainly can't afford a new car.

605	The nature of the policy is discriminating and is therefore unacceptable on this point alone. It singularly targets residents that do not have the luxury of off-street that either live in or are under threat of the Council's Controlled Parking Zones
606	I think the hike in permits and visitor parking is excessive. I am concerned that this is simply squeezing the ordinary person who will be hurt by this excessive increase. I understood from those overseeing the CPZ and from the consultation that the annual fees and metered parking was pitched to cover costs of implementing CPZ and parking. This will no longer be the case. I don't want to pay these draconian charges. I would like you to look instead at other ways of addressing pollution and carbon emissions than making working class people pay by stealth. Look at bringing in a scheme similar to the bikes that you can short term car hire, thus reducing the need for CPZ and is kinder on the environment, I & others would be happy to give up owning a car if a workable scheme was implemented
607	My partner has arthritis brought on especially by cold weather in her feet. We have a very small car which was made recently soly for getting her out to get food shopping and generally getting out of the house to visit relations. She is [age provided] and I am 65 and as time goes by our mobility gets worse. In the winter she will suffer extreme pain walking on pavement and waiting for bus. That is why we bought a very small car. We are also pensioners with limited cash. I think this is very unfair as she can not use public transport. This is just another ridiculous tax on poor people who have to organise their lives around unwanted illness. This is totally unfair.
608	1. I was not advised of this scheme prior to purchasing my diesel car in 2013 2. Boris promoted the benefits of diesel cars hence we purchased one.therefore a reasonable scrappage scheme for those who listened to the buffoon and have lost out on value of car. 3. I already pay more tax for this vehicle 4. Due to the Ulez scheme I am already penalised for driving in town if I wished to 5. This is an ill thought through scheme, unnecessary speed humps increase emissions 6. Many many more vehicle charging points should be available before anything like this is considered 7. Elderly and disabled people rely on the independence of having their own vehicles which they can drive to supermarkets 8.. Sounds as though I'll be charged for parking my OWN car on my OWN drive. It's an absolute traves
609	Pensioners don't use their cars much and because it is hard to live on the pension, they cannot afford to change their older car for a band 1 or 2.. It is not fair to charge £300 for a older small car before 2001. Permits should be issued by looking at the MOT certificate for emissions and not by year. Then some have classic cars what of them. This scheme is just is set up to grab money from old folks. Help Trump to stop the pollutants like China and the far East that is destroying this planet through their carbon footprint. Our planet can heal itself we don't need Borough Council pointing to old folks small cars. [same adress as 6187042]
610	I live in West Croydon and pay for a parking permit. I drive a 15 year old car, which I maintain well. Although it would not qualify for the ULEZ, the charge for parking would increase from £80 to £146. I am a partially retired junior civil servant on a limited salary and can ill afford to replace my car. For me, this idea represents a huge increase in costs at a time when my income has reduced against inflation for the past 10 years. While I have sympathy with the desire to reduce pollution, charging residents for parking will not reduce the pollution caused by people driving through the town. I believe this plan is unfair and will hurt the poorer residents disproportionately.

611	Being a car owner, which is essential for work and family matters. It's well publicised that Croydon Council are having a funding crisis, cutting services while increasing councillor salaries and expenses. In my view councils should be run as a public service rather than a business. Introducing a new "charge" to motorists, who rely on their vehicles to earn a living is often seen as grossly unfair. Motorists are treated as "cash cows" to be constantly milked. However there is a strong need to reduce vehicle journeys and pollution in large towns and cities. This new charge MUST penalise the largest and most polluting vehicles and the revenue MUST be re-invested into directly tackling pollution (rather than introducing traffic calming measures which clearly do not work).
612	I object to the new emissions parking permit which the council is wanting to introduce.
613	I severely object to the introduction of this scheme. This is not even close to enough of a notice period to introduce a penalty for the type of car you are paying to park! There has already been the introduction of the ULEZ charge in London which will be extended in two years. Unless the council is prepared to contribute towards the cost of a resident switching their vehicle to something more eco friendly, it should not be a factor when considering parking charges.
614	I object totally for this idea. Why should permit holders be penalised again for not having off street parking. Emissions are being changed in October 2021 so why is the council getting involved now.
615	I have an 2009 diesel vehicle and a 2004 petrol vehicle that I pay for each year. This on top of other Council costs I struggle with as it cannot be paid monthly must be paid directly. I don't mind the parking charges as they are, however to add an extra cost to my household will be the breaking of it.
616	I am a resident in the East Inner Area and concerned about the levels of pollution in Croydon. I would be keen to see the introduction of charging to reduce emissions in the borough. However feel this must go hand in hand with providing far more electric power point charging stations, secure bike parking hubs and also the providing more spaces for car clubs to encourage more people to ditch their cars. If the additional money from the surcharges were to be used for this purpose (or to fund other items which could be used to help reduce the impact of emissions e.g. more trees or greenery separating roads and pavements) then I'm in favour. If it's just a tax which will be spent on other things then I wouldn't see that it would benefit the whole to the fullest of it's ability.
617	My concerns are regarding the demographic of Croydon residents. Given that we have a high proportion of lower income residents who rely on their vehicles for work, especially those who work unsociable hours will have older cars, what would the provision be to help these residents. Generally, those working nights in care homes, the porters and such like in hospitals, those working nights in 24hour warehouses etc, would not earn enough to pay for new cars, or a significantly higher residents parking charge.
618	This is an additional tax which unfairly targets resident's who don't have off street parking and won't have a choice other than to pay. It won't reduce emissions or improve air quality as it will do nothing to reduce the amount of vehicles using the borough. It's just another means of extracting cash and will probably encourage some to not buy a permit at all . Why charge residents first before business?
619	See what the idiots are up to
620	My elderly parents and i have older vehicles-we all rely on out mobility to assist them and my elderly aunt. We just won’t be able to afford the charges

621	I have a residents permit and live on a busy permitted road.
622	We barely use our car so we are not contributing to air quality problems in Croydon. This is just another money-making scheme to get money from us for doing nothing. You need to find a way to charge people for emitting pollution - not parking their cars and using them for only essential journeys.
623	I have strong reservations regarding the introduction of this proposed scheme which I consider to be a tax on the poorer and less well off residents who cannot afford a home with a driveway or a newer lower emissions car. The reality is that many people like me with older cars only use them occasionally and so the emissions produced, maybe less than those with newer lower-emission cars who use them more. I don't choose to park my car in the street, I have to, as when I purchased my first home 4 years ago, I could not afford a home with a drive. I don't choose to drive an older car, I simply can't afford a newer one. Wherever possible, I don't use my car, but sometimes I need to. The proposed increases for higher band cars are outrageous. All cars produce emissions!!!
624	Absolutely object. It's a joke. You are charging people extortion rates to park their own cars, not drive them. What about people than can't afford to upgrade them, not have decent public transport near them? What about the Incinerator on our door step that Croydon Council endorses? What a bunch of jokers you are with your absolutely incoherent policies on pollution and emissions. It's just another money grab from Croydon Council.
625	Parked cars do not produce emissions so why use parking as a means of reducing emissions. This plan omits 1. vehicles not registered in Croydon but passing through 2. vehicles within Croydon that do not require a parking permit 3. vehicles registered outside Croydon that commute into the area This is designed to push people towards non-carbon based fuels but that is not possible for most parking permit owners. Even if I could afford/justify an electric car how would I charge it? Like many permit holders I do not have the space or possibility of charging an electric car & a cable across the footpath would not be allowed
626	Because I am a resident and am I entitled to have an opinion. This is only a way of getting more income! The rest is window dressing! Why charge more for off street parking? Disgusting! And by the way I have a near zero emission car, (plug in hybrid)!
627	The penalises people who can't afford newer vehicles
628	It is now well established that Diesel emissions are more harmful for the environment and health than petrol emissions. Therefore it seems reasonable to introduce higher tariffs for Diesel vehicles and maintain the current tariffs for petrol vehicles, provided the the emission levels have met MOT criteria.
629	Diesel emissions are now known to be more harmful to health and the environment than petrol emissions. In light of this it seems reasonable to introduce higher tariffs for Diesel vehicles, but to keep the current tariffs for petrol vehicles, provided they meet MOT criteria. Maybe a reduction for hybrid vehicles?
630	Plan takes very narrow view of environment, penalises those of us with low emission old vehicles, is regressive and potentially confusing. Such moves should at least be London wide if not country wide.
631	To support poor people who do not have the funds to change their cars

632	1. The charges are not in line the governments 'Toxicity Charge' policy (effective from 8 April 19). This scheme only includes cars registered before 2006 as "London's most polluting cars". However, based on Croydon Councils proposal I'll potentially be charged £300 per year to park a 2008 car which is not justified 2. The charges per band do not increase incrementally in even proportions e.g. the different between band 4 and 5 is more than 50% 3. Road permit holders are residents of the area and should not be paying more than visitors who park on the road 4. There is no clear rationale on what the extra profit from these new charges will be used for, in particular how will it be used to reduce pollution as it's claimed to be in aid of?
633	I own a diesel vehicle, which I use twice a week for work purposes (the other days I will use a train or lift share) and this means, given the likely introduction of emission charges in October, I will be charged £350 to park in my street. My wife has an older car (pre 2001) which is used twice a week and would require a second vehicle permit and would most likely incur a cost of £350. A combined cost of £700 per year for parking our cars is totally unacceptable to us and most ridiculous of all, it will still not guarantee us a parking place. We have three vehicles in total, meaning we will have to park one vehicle in another street, therefore causing inconvenience for the residents of that street and more commuting for us (and creating more emissions!).
634	I drive a diesel car . The government couple years ago promoted more diesel cars
635	I am totally against this Proposed Emission based Charge as it totally discriminates against persons who have and drive diesel Cars. Croydon cannot control the WIND BLOWING ACROSS ITS BOUNDRY FROM OUTSIDE PERIOD. We don't live in a Box Sealed off. It appears its another way of just sucking the residents out of cash by jumping on the band wagon flying the emissions flag now. Parking Permits are already well over charged and the last thing a resident wants to see is more money being sucked out of them. Are you really saying that petrol cars do not emit emissions How are you going to stop the Wind blowing from other boroughs into Croydon with emissions. Answer is you cannot. So whats the point of us paying more for Parking. This exercise is a total waste of time and National Policy is made on the hoof. This is also counter productive as many persons who do not live in the Parking Permit Zone Area still drive diesel cars and they will not or cannot be charged. Please stop this nonsense charging business and become more Fairer. For once you can reduce the Parking Permit Charges instead of Jacking them up all the time.
636	unfair charges again on residents we cannot all afford new cars
637	Are we to assume that the many thousands of residents who are lucky enough to have off street parking or those others in the borough who do not have any restrictions parking in the street will be exempt? What about daily parking from commuters outside the borough? I only drive less than 3,000 miles a year but I do have mobility problems and require a car to get around for shopping and family visits etc. Don't forget, it was the Government who encourage us to buy Diesel cars.

638	To oppose unfair charging on diesel cars. I do not agree or endorse this in anyway. How do you plan to use the money to make air quality better? This is purely a money making exercise and should not be implemented.
639	I object to this proposed change. As a resident of Northbrook Road I would be impacted by this change and as I drive a car registered in the year 2000 it would more then triple the current charge (which i already struggle to pay). If this goes ahead I would not be able to afford the permit and would be forced to sell my car, this would severely impact the quality of my life. Why penalise hard working people? You should be taxing rich corporations more not innocent people. Please do not make this change.
640	if you have not got a parking permit in some roads in south croydon when you can not park in your zone where are you going to park
641	Croydon resident
642	Croydon resident. Croydon council have so much work to do cleaning up the streets. Enforcing illegal parking on double yellow lines and driveway parking where there is no drop kerb before that start attempting to tax residents under the guise of improving air quality. There are far better causes to invest tax payers money in the borough.
643	I want to co-create a place where I live
644	I object as I feel that by introducing the charge it will encourage/force people to drive to work instead of taking the train. If the costs of my parking permit go up it will become unaffordable.
645	Another excuse to charge us more money, complete PR BS that our council are getting very good at. Perhaps they could explain last year traffic changes in the East Croydon /Addiscome area (prevented traffic from bypassing A232 / Addiscombe Grove on to Lebanon, Addiscombe Court, Canning and Clyde Roads. Ohh but I guess they were thinking about the children when they forced all the traffic up past the Two primary Schools on Cherry Orchard Road and caused grid lock on what was already a busy and narrow roundabout junction at the interchange of lower Addiscome road.
646	I thought the amount of car tax we pay is based on emissions and car engine size. Surely a parking fee is just that - a parking fee, why relate a parking fee to the car's emissions? What next, will the petrol price we pay be based on car emissions?
647	I object to the new charges being imposed on residents as it is yet another stealth tax on residents who are already paying Council Tax.
648	As a small business based in Croydon with 2 work vehicles which will not comply with the current regulations the increase in parking charges will be another cost we have to absorb in an already tough market. I understand the need for cleaner air but you are going to end up putting a lot of small business in financial peril, the cost of vans/trucks which are compliant are currently out of the reach of most small business. On another note to increase parking charges on meters/car parks in the town centre whilst the new westfield development is not certain to go ahead will almost finish off the already struggling high street shops. You might as well say Croydon is closed for business.

649	I have just read with great concern the plans to introduce emissions based charges for parking permits in Croydon. How likely is this to go ahead? As I drive a car registered in the year 2000, it would more then triple my parking charge. This is something I simply cannot afford and would force me to sell my car with no means to buy a replacement. [same respondent as online response ID6186450]
650	Although I am happy that Croydon Council is taking steps to improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions through emission-based charges for vehicles in the borough and I agree with the "polluter pays" principle I have a number of concerns about the current proposal. The proposal envisages an initial roll out of emission-based charges only to residential permit holders commencing in four months' time, in October 2019. Meanwhile proposals for charges for the majority of Croydon's vehicle owning residents have yet to be developed and have a much longer and vaguer timescale for implementation (i.e. beyond 2021). This is unfair and penalises residents in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's). I am the owner of a pre-March 2001 petrol car and will therefore face a £300 per annum charge, despite the C02 emissions of the car falling into band 4 (£146) of your proposed charging structure. I need to own a car but use it very little, averaging less than 3,000 miles per annum, using Croydon and London's excellent public transport system wherever possible. Therefore, I appear likely to be penalised for my decision to retain an older vehicle and use it as little as possible. Whilst I understand the need to introduce charges of sufficient scale to impact future vehicle buying decisions, the scale of the proposed charges and the speed of their introduction would result in me being charged a significantly higher amount that any of the neighbouring boroughs, as detailed in your 25th March Cabinet Report, all of whom seem to take a less aggressive and fairer approach to older vehicles. Your 25th March Cabinet Report highlights the adverse effect that diesel vehicles have on air quality and yet, if I understand correctly, the proposed surcharge will have a maximum cost of £50 and then only for pre-September 2015 registered vehicles. Since diesel vehicles have lower C02 emissions, I would suspect that many owners of pre-September 2015 diesel vehicles that have significantly higher adverse impact on air quality than my car will end up paying less. Finally, I would like my next car to be a low emissions vehicle, ideally electric. Or to not own a car and to hire a vehicle when needed. However, neither of these two options is practical in a CPZ, with on street parking and yet, at the present time, you are seeking to influence vehicle purchasing habits of just this group of Croydon residents. In summary, I don't believe that your current proposal is fair, nor does it result in the "polluter paying". I suspect it will have little impact on air quality and C02 emissions until rolled out borough wide with the infrastructure in place to adequately support electric vehicles.
651	I live in Thirsk Road, SE25 […] and would say that it is not the Residents' cars which are causing the problem, but the huge number of vehicles which use it as a cut-through between Grange Road and Whitehorse Lane to avoid the congestion at the bottom of Grange Road and the High Street. A good percentage of residents in this road do not use their vehicles on a daily basis (in fact some do less than 1000 miles per year), but due to the age of the residents they need to have transport. Their vehicles are regularly serviced and maintained which is more than can be said for the large number of cars, lorries and vans which use the road as a short-cut. The emissions from the chimneys of the food shops in Whitehorse Lane which back on to Thirsk Road must prove more of a concern.
652	concerned about pollution in croydon
653	It's a survey so I'm expecting questions so you know my views.

654	I am objecting this scheme as it will create more financial issues in the families that ready pay council taxes.
655	Public interest - object
656	Concerned about the changes Croydon Council are proposing.
657	I am resident and dont need another out going - Croydon council are already making it hard enough to park locally, council tax is high enough as it is without another cost and we only have one car in this household and it is under 10 years old
658	We deliberately purchased an office in an area outside of central Croydon where it was free to park There are no car parks in the vicinity Most of our staff drive into the office and live in places where there are no viable alternative means of transport This means that we would probably end up selling our office and moving out of Croydon completely
659	It's very unfair for residents such as myself who have religiously paid for a permit for years but work outside of normal working hours. What about all the residents that don't pay for a permit, take their cars to work all day and come back in the evening to occupy a bay for free (making it difficult for permit holders to get a space)? How are their emissions being taxed?? It's completely unfair. How can you justify an emission tax for a parked car? I am a pensioner and the current cost is already a lot to manage. This is discriminatory against permit holders! You're not holding pay as you park drivers accountable!!! I'm furious about this.
660	Because I need
661	Ihave had my car from New ,have had it serviced every year since ,it i s my life line & part of the family ,I bought it in 2003 ,in immaculate condition,I cannot afford to buy a new car ,so why should I pay this for looking after something that I treasure,and thought would keep me going for many many years.
662	Parking permits in Croydon are already expensive enough. Not everyone can afford to upgrade their cars and you will be hitting the least well off if you implement this policy,
663	Supporting the scheme to help improve air quality, tackle climate change and promote the use of greener motor vehicles.
664	Professional interest and concern for residents, emissions charges in the form of discounts for clean cars are a good idea, increasing charges on older cars unfairly penalises poorer parts of the community who may not be able to afford a newer and cleaner vehicle.

665	I disagree with the charges because annual parking is already expensive. This is another tax on car users especially fo those on low incomes and penalises the less wealthy in the borough . The majority of people with high emmision cars are wealthy and will tend to live in affluent areas like where I live in Sanderstead - where parking is free and they have drives and garages anyway. Why doesnt the council lead by changing all their council own vehicles to electric? That will make a differenc and show the Council's commitment to change. This is just another money raising scheme devised by this Council on the back of saving the world. I don't use my car during work hours - so why am I being penalised for not using my car. If I am paying more due to emmisions it would encourage me to use my c
666	My family live in Croydon and already pay a huge amount for the "privilege" of parking near wghere they live!
667	i do not agree with the proposals
668	I live and work in the borough and am concerned about local air pollution.
669	I pay tax, road tax, insurance and over-inflated diesel prices. I only bought a diesel car because the government said they were better than petrol engines, and look how that turned out!!! I cannot afford to but a new car and I object strongly to being penalised for parking my car with the engine off!!!
670	I live and work in Croydon and I have an older vehicle and am not in a position to purchase a new one
671	concerns that you will penalise families on low income who generally have older vehicles which generally have higher emissions
672	Croydon resident
673	If there's too much traffic it's because there are too many people in the country due to the national government's lax/erroneous immigration policies and inadequate border policing, with both main political parties at fault. If the council yet again targets decent, hard working car owners, many of whom need our cars to be able to earn a living, I suggest that all those affected club together and seek a refund from the government. Secondly, it is well know that trees and greenery are an excellent way to control pollution. Yet this council's policy and that of any Corbyn government, is to continue to destroy that greenery, by building on it or by proposing to tax those same victims out of their homes and gardens. The same short sighted, band wagon, erroneous policies as the 20mph limit.
674	I happen to frequently have the need to park in croydon.

675	I believe that this needs to be phased in. We have only just had the ULEZ introduced which drivers are still trying to make adjustments for. For Croydon to jump on the band wagon seems like just an opportunity to make more money out of residents. Already, you have increased the number of streets across the borough that require parking permits. The reason is unclear as they are in the N1 Region over 15 minutes' walk away from any high street. Croydon need to get the basics right first such as collecting rubbish on planned dates. Helping residents recycle green waste rather than charging them. Effective traffic management to reduce pollution. Effective enforcement of residents burning their rubbish at all hours.The reason why many people got diesel cars in the first place was based on scientific backed government advice that said diesel was more environmentally friendly than petrol. When found not to be correct, the people are left to suffer and get no help or compensation for this fact. Only more charges imposed on them. I appreciate that an initiative needs to be introduced to improve the air quality, but this feels rushed. Why are charges always imposed rather than incentives?
676	Totally unfair,unrealistic
677	I live and drive in Croydon. It seems odd that you would charge people a different tier to park in Croydon based on the emissions of their vehicle. It will not deter vehicles such as LGV/HGV that need to travel through Croydon or operate a business. If you look at statistics with respect to licensed vehicles you can see that LGV and motorcycles make up the highest proportion of registered vehicles on our roads: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/608374/vehicle-licensing-statistics-2016.pdf So my question is how will adding a tiered emission system reduce emissions from HGV/LGV (worst offenders)? We already have a ULEZ zone which is coming into effect in 2021. I say, another cash cow/money spinner for Croydon Council!
678	I am writing you regarding the controlled parking zone in Little Roke Avenue as I have been living at number […] since 2010. In my opinion there is no need to introduce a controlled parking zone for this road, the mayor problem for the residents is to turn at the back of the cul de sac road rather than find a parking space. Many elderly people live in Little Roke Avenue and we are all worried that emergency vehicles such as fire engines and ambulances are not able to turn at the end of the road as a result of this truck parked unsafely. Therefore, instead of introducing a controlled parking zone, we would really benefit from an extension of the double yellow lines and force the owner of the lorry to use to his own parking garage at the end of the road.
679	Increase in residents permits appear to be biased towards wealthier residents who can afford electric cars. I have a very small low powered new car but will pay 25% more. Wealthy residents can have a large electric car but pay less. This will appear to be favouring wealthy residents.New charges for community care permits - atrocious. Cars are essential to care being delivered to elderly, sick and vulnerable residents - this feels immoral. Both of these changes go against inclusive values and ensuring residents are treated fairly - this could cause a massive backlash on the council's credibility. There are better ways of raising more funds via parking than this - base it on the size of a vehicle, rather than purely on emissions.
680	I live in Croydon. Unlike the london congestion charge zone, i have no choice but to drive in the borough, so i believe i will be penalised for choosing to live in the borough. I think it is unfair to expect residents to pay for the emission based charges Croydon are proposing. As a resident in the area, i am unable to move out of Croydon and am not able to afford the extra charge this new proposal will make.

681	Air Quality is a major crisis both for our planet, our country and the health of the residents of London. I'm supportive of this initiative but note that not only should the least polluting vehicles receive significant subsidies but that the most polluting ergo (pre-2015 diesels) should receive 200/300% increases in their chargeable rates.
682	I object to the scheme as it impacts on older vehicles, many of which thier owners cannot afford to pay. Another tax on the poor.
683	I object because I see it as a stealth tax punishing people with older vehicles. Not everyone can afford to replace their car regularly and people are already penalised on emissions via road fund licence. The pollutants involved in manufacturing newer vehicles outweigh running an older vehicle until it becomes unfeasible to repair.
684	This is not right and i object.
685	Interested in fairness for drivers. Concerned about spiralling costs for drivers and whether this would impact the ULEAS proposed expansion in 2023. Also, think ay start date should be consistent between residents and business in the area.
686	Unjust taxation. Why should every diesel car user pay the same? I only use my car once a week to drive to the coast but there are thousands of cars which drive around Croydon/Surrey everyday. Also there are hundreds of cars which do not pay for a parking permit because they commute to work and avoid the 9am-5pm charge. The only real fair tax is on diesel fuel. The more you pollute the more you pay. And/or a cash incentive to scrap a diesel car. But creating a new tax of a few pounds is not a disincentive. If you want it to work, double the parking permit charge for diesel cars every year from today. It's too late to change the world in small steps, bold big steps must be taken today.
687	Objecting to the scheme as the costs are too high, considering wages have not increased in line with, cut backs from central government & higher cost of gas & electric are already putting a huge strain on family budgets. Introduce a scheme that does not penalise residents instead get central to fund or provide good intensives to change to an electric vehicle. Focus charging visitors & business vehicles and after a year or two start to focus on residential properties
688	I am a Medical Student living in Croydon at my parent's home. I drive a diesel car everyday and this is my only way of getting around London and to my placements at hospitals scattered around Greater London. I feel that a scheme such as this, although good in intention to reduce air pollution would hurt people like myself, a student, who is already paying a lot for driving a diesel car. I pay a higher Road Tax, I pay for the ULEZ zone and I have to pay for a higher insurance premium. Adding a surcharge for diesel and high emission cars would just be another 'blow' to diesel drivers. In my honest opinion, I don't see charges being the best way to discourage usage of high emission vehicles and diesel cars. But rather incentives should be introduced for low emission cars.
689	I live in the borough and want to have my opion noted by the council.
690	Resident
691	My partner never has anywhere to park close to my house when he visits. I don't own a car, many of my neighbours have 2 or 3!

692	Objection - paying for parking is expensive enough without penalising residents for the kind of car they have.
693	I write in objection to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone of Little Roke Avenue in Kenley. Reference: PD/CH/K16. The road has many spare car spaces during the weekday working hours. I own one car which I share with my family and we commute to work on public transport during working week hours, I feel it is extortionate to charge us for a parking permit for this time of day, in addition to the road & council tax we already pay.
694	This is ridiculous, we already have to pay higher road tax and higher fees to drive in some London areas. Why should you we to pay even more to park on our own doorstep when we are already fighting for what little space there is, there are so many flats around me that have been given permission to be built without any dedicated parking, this is impacting us greatly.
695	There is hardly any traffic on out street, it is residents only. The fact that this is being proposed makes it seem like a money making scam by the council to introduce permits and charges to residents in an area that doesn't need it
696	I am writing as a resident of Little Roke Avenue, postcode CR8 […], I wish to object to the proposals to introduce a controlled parking permit zone/scheme on our road. The fact that this has even been suggested for our road is ludicrous as the road is very narrow and only residents park here there is no outside traffic. We have no need for a permit zone in our area. [same respondent as online response ID6186931].
697	The pricing for older cars will only encourage people to scrap them and replace them with newer ones. It is wasteful and causes more environmental damage to keep manufacturing new cars than to maintain older ones. You should not penalise people for driving cars manufactured before 2001. Also if the aim is to improve air quality, the scheme shouldn't be based on CO2 emissions. Particulate matter, SO2 and NO2 levels are the pressing issues for health being damaged by air quality. Diesel engines are responsible for much of these pollutants, yet the diesel surcharge is relatively small compared to the £300 being proposed for a small petrol car from 2001.
698	Aldough emissions and pollution is a concern making people spend money on new car and scraping a old one is pollution too. If you want to introduce this it should only apply to cars registered after 2006 that is when cars started to have restrictions on emissions. I can not by a new car nor pay 300.00 a year
699	We live in the Central Parking Zone so that we can use public transport or walk. We use our car mainly to take recycling to the tip or to go out of London. We replaced our car recently and purchased the lowest emission vehicle we could find which is suitable for a family. We only pay £30 per annum for our Road Fund Tax (against £290 for our previous vehicle). You are proposing a tax for us in excess of £100 per annum. Why do you not tax people who drive in Croydon or all other people who park in Croydon. We deliberately chose to live in an area where we could use public transport and we are being penalised for this. Why not raise extra revenue by collecting more money from people parking illegally and exceeding the 20mph speed limit. You would make more money and not antagonise voters.MUl
700	I have a permit and I have strong views about the proposed charges and the way it discriminates against people living in areas with expensive one-street parking but lets others in the affluent parts of the borough park for free. The charges only apply in parts of the bprough. If you have, for example, a 4 litre diesel in many areas you can park for free. I have a 1 litre, modern car with low emissions yet I will pay £104 for a permit while the government rewards me with a very low level of raod fund licence. The French authorities recognise it as Category 1 (the least polluting

	vehicles). It will hit the poorest in the borough who tend to have older cars (but that is what you expect from the modern Labour party). [same address as 6186987]
701	I am concerned that the introducation of a parking charge for residents and workers within Croydon is unfair. It will hit the poorer families and low paid workers the hardest. Croydon is a driprived area and has a large percentage of families and workers on low incomes. Many of these people need a car but can only afford to run older cars because thay simply cannot afford to buy a new electric or newer diesel (post 2015) car. This polict will disproportionately affect people from pooorer families and disadvantaged groups, older vulnerable people, people with disabilities and people from ethnic backrounds.
702	I am in support of Climate change however I object to levy a tax on motorist. The government got it wrong again - over 5 years ago promoting diesel car as being cleaner! Today it is not environmental friendly - and the public have to pay for their bad decision again. This is not fair! I drive a petrol vehicle and cannot afford a electric car and felt government decision will be forcing me into financial arrangement (possible debt) to get an electric car to be compliant or to avoid this extra tax levy!!
703	Objection : As a resident and a parent, I am concerned about air quality & traffic emmissions, but disagree this is the right action at the moment. Of more concern are no 'permitted' /no parking ticket cars.. There is a pollution problem/safety concern on Albert Rd & top end of Portland Rd. Over the last few weeks there apppear to have been more non-permit cars/vans who have not paid for a parking ticket than cars with permits (feedback from local residents). These are frequently cars parked with engines running (& school during school hours). Often cars parked on pavements Albert Rd/Portland Rd until late at night - when paid for parking not needed. It is these unpermitted cars that are causing most pollution in our area. Residents park & go home, Non-residents appear to linger/pollute.
704	Its unfair, discriminating against older people rely on their or their carer's vehicle, also against those on low income who cant afford a house with a drive or garage. It is totally against RPI increases to tout for an almost 400% increase with inflation running at less than 4%! It is NOT an antipollution measure. Parked cars do not emit pollution. Do something about those who leave diesel engines running, which you fail to enforce or publicise. If you are serious about reducing on street parking, encouraging public transport use, introduce Resdents Only parking zones, which of course ypu wt do because it would be antethetical to back-door cash raids on the poor, like this. The "Consultation" has been non-existant. Disgraceful.
705	There is enough tax being paid as council tax and Government car tax so please no more cunning tactics on the tax payer to pay more. Woodville Road should be not included for residential parking or parking meters.
706	Biggest issue is the lack of resident parking spaces in Central Croydon itself - a lot of parking spaces around Drummond road, where two Pay and Display car parks were are now in such high demand that it is getting impossible for local residents to park near their own residences during busy weekends, and so much public demand to avoid car parks like the Centrale one, that there's arguments over parking spaces on Frith Road and Keeley Road. I would welcome more carrot-based incentives to go for a cleaner vehicle (e.g. on street electric charging points), which would be more of an incentive to go for a cleaner vehicle, than a purely stick-based approach of charging based on emissions.

707	The proposed introduction of emission-based charges for resident and business parking permits do not address the problem of traffic pollution - It is vehicles that make repeat journeys or multi-stop journeys such as buses, taxis, commercial vans and construction traffic, NOT PARKED CARS, that pollute. It's ridiculous that Croydon Council are proposing to impose more charges on local-council-tax-paying residents and businesses for other people, who do not live in the borough, an emission based charge. Are Croydon Council vehicles electric? e.g. refuse collection lorries, construction inspectors etc. Why are Croydon Council workers living outside the borough & driving into Croydon not charged an emission-based commuting & parking charge for polluting the borough ?
708	I'm a car permit holder. I am against increasing car permit holder charges based on vehicle. Despite having a family I don't believe taxing car holders is the solution. We are already paying huge duties on fuel so those with inefficient cars are already paying. Secondly road taxes already take into account the vehicle class and emissions. Thirdly we are restricted on where we can travel due to the ULEZ zone. So there is no need for a fourth tax. Also it isn't easy to change vehicle, it costs over £10000 for an efficient vehicle - very few can afford that so are forced to pay the tax. There are other ways to improve air quality - such as planting more trees or air filters in schools. If vehicles are to be taxed it should be the large scale fleets - like the vehicles of the big supermarkets.
709	I live in the zone were the council have proposed a increase in parking permit charge because of owning a diesel. No consultation letter was given and increase of charge is ridiculous as 1. I already have to pay to park my car outside my house and 2. the proposed increase is too much above my means as we have already had to get rid of one car to reduce costs.
710	Less well off older pensioners like me have an old car that I use infrequently, however the local bus services stops at 20:00, so I use it sometimes in the evenings after 8pm.
711	I am a resident of Croydon and I live in a charging zone. The proposals are based on a desire to reduce emissions however they are unfair as the increased charges to park cars will only impact people living in charging zones. Those outside can own as many high polluting cars as they like, driving them all day long without suffering any penalty, as can councillors who get their permit for free and the 8,000 people encouraged to drive from outside the borough and park at the new shopping centre when it is built. If you want to apply a charge apply it fairly to everyone in the borough, such an a congestion charge not just a select few living in the poorer areas. This is not a policy I or many other Labour voters thought a Labour council stood for.
712	The government advised drivers to buy diesel car a few years ago. These drivers are now being penalised through no fault of their own
713	I chair a local residents' association. Some of our residents feel the Council is anti-car and does not realise how much some people, not all of them well-off, rely on their cars and need to be able to park them, and what a burden it would be to replace vehicles or adopt different travel-modes.
714	I rent privately with 2 children ,my rent is 1200 a month before any bills i cant afford to buy a new car struggle already to to pay everything each month , i have yo have a car to work and you wany yo put the price up im not sure what you use the £80 for at the moment there is so many pot holes around.
715	I suffer from severe asthma, I live by 3 schools and parents regularly park in our road which is permit zone and leave their engines idling

716	This is clearly another money grabbing exercise by this disgraceful Council dressed up as being environmentally friendly. By increasing the cost of parking, you are scaring people away from Croydon. Your residents and on-street parking and car park fees are already excessive and put people off of visiting and shopping in Croydon. Think on about removing all parking fees and thereby encourage people to reside within, visit and shop within this Lovely Borough of Croydon.
717	Fed up with Croydon Council ripping off the residents
718	The council has made no effort to tell residents about this scheme and are clearly trying to sneak it in under the radar. I whole heartedly object to this stupid scheme an premise that it will reduce emissions. I might live and start my journeys from central Croydon but why am I paying the cost for all the people who enter Croydon and avoid fees and penalisation?
719	I am a resident and pay for a parking space. The proposed move punishes a handful of Croydon residents to effectively push up money in the pot for the council over other poor and conflicting developments it has in the borough. I object in the strongest terms. This penalises people with small children/old people those with limited finances that rely on a car. I think to introduce it to the the pay as you go parking in the borough for all is fine. But to disadvantage people that need this service is completely unfair. I may not own a “green” car due to finances therefore you want me to pay MORE in parking. It is a false economy. take away the council staff privileges for this if it you want to be green not just SEEN as such. 800 crts limits my voice. Typical ccc won’t let me have a full say
720	Looking at the proposed charges it is quite clear that once again the council is making Croydon a pretty unpleasant place to stay. I drive a self charging hybrid yet it appears my annual parking permit will increase. Only all electric vehicals will benefit from your proposal. This plan is utterly unfair when some of us are doing our bit, you appear to want to crush the poorer people instead of helping.
721	Charging the poor end user does not reduce congestion- it just increases the income to the council to offset its budget from the already high council tax payer and tiny government funding levels. I am a business owner that requires a van to run my business. If an electric vehicle was available that met my needs I would invest in one. Why penalise me for what the motor industry has failed to address.....where are the charging points to support your claim of a environmental friendly borough.
722	I feel this scheme penalises owners of older cars who may not drive many miles but access car, such as those who care for disabled or elderly relatives.
723	I object to the proposed scheme as it penalises residents who have pre 2015 diesel cars who Don’t use their cars often and are not financially in a position to purchase a new car. The cost of electric/hybrid cars needs to be reduced drastically to make them more affordable. I mainly have my car for visiting family throughout the uk and in France and rarely use the car for local journeys as I walk or cycle to most places in the borough and this will penalise residents for owning a car and paying to park somewhere near their home as especially in Midhurst Avenue there appear to be far more permits issued than available car spaces. The proposal will lead to a loss of freedom for the elderly and lower income families who cannot afford to replace their cars for a newer model.

724	Pollution is too high in Croydon. I think adding the charge is a good idea
725	I believe is unfair that the council is thinking to introduce the charges on such a short notice. People who have bought their diesel cars in good faith have been the victum of large corporation who deceived everyone Now on top of ULEZ charges we would need to pay this which is an additional burden on pocket
726	I live in Croydon but I don't own a car. I feel that the amount of cars and pollution in Croydon is more than what it should be.
727	I am a driver and I am interested in knowing more about your proposal.
728	Concern for families with children only able to afford older vehicles
729	My husband has a company deisel car so has no choice what he drives. The council tax has already gone up so this seems like another money making scheme.
730	It's a tax on the public to raise more money and will stop people coming into the borough to shop at what is left of the shopping centre
731	it affects me
732	I want the Council to take serious and practical action to improve the air quality in Croydon. Simply ripping off residents will do nothing in that regard. Instead of snivelling to Viridor I suggest that the Council does something useful to lessen the number of polluting vehicles on our roads
733	I hate to state the obvious, but this is plainly a hugely regressive tax that will hit poorer households (those with older cars, and those with no access to a driveway) the hardest. As a Labour member, it's thoroughly embarrassing to see the council come up with a plan such as this. When you draw up policy, could you please give some consideration to the rampant inequality in the borough and try to think of ways of making it better, not worse?
734	OBJECTING COMPLETELY. Call yourself a Labour Council - you are hitting the poorest areas most. The rich don't live in working class enclaves which is where many of the parking restrictions operate. We can't afford to move to posh, rich areas where front gardens are so large that residents can park on their front driveways, garages or wide roads, unaffected by this tax. I don't earn enough to pay tax, where do you think I can get so much more money from to fill your coffers and pay for YOUR FREE PERMITS? Disgusting. You make me sick to my stomach. It was introduced as a £10 pa admin charge. Now the poorest are sitting ducks. Tax everybody - don't come after us on SPURIOUS emission grounds (parked cars, no emission) when the new shopping centre has 3,000 CAR PARKING SPACES. Don't do it.
735	It is unfair for those residents that cannot afford to change their vehicle. Also on top of these charges, Croydon residents and business will have to worry about the fee for Ulez zone coming in 2020 after London. Look like more and more people will be unfairly hit by this change
736	Objecting because Council Tax is already too high, and we pay a fair amount already for resident parking already. We cant afford to pay more charges

737	Emissions charges are always passed on to the driver. To really reduce pollution a stategy to tackle it a industry and government level would be more effective. Its lazy policy to always pass these kinds of charges onto the population (ELEZ etc.), who have no control over the vast majority of the pollution produced in this country,(stopping the green deal, burning of fossil fuels for energy).
738	Persons with order cars will hit hardest. They are the ones that do not have newer cars
739	Too much of taxation
740	Not all of us can afford updated cars, following government advice purchased my Nissan Diesel and as I am retired this was my last affordable car.Cannot agree with this penalising charge for no fault on my part.
741	I object most strongly to Croydon Council's proposed introduction of emission based resident and business parking permits for the following reasons: The justification for this proposal is very weak. If asked everyone would agree to wanting cleaner air and less traffic! The question is how to do this! This proposal won't achieve this – it will simply force residents and businesses to pay more to purchase permits to park their vehicles! There are already many schemes in place across the country to tackle these issues. For example graduated Vehicle Excise Duty (based on CO2 emissions levels), and subsidies (recently cut) towards the purchase price of new electric vehicles. In addition the vehicle manufacturers are introducing cleaner engines in diesel and petrol cars as they make the hugely expensive transition toward electric powered vehicles. We don't need Croydon Council adding another scheme to add additional costs to hard pressed motorists. These proposals are highly regressive making no account on ability to pay. It is most likely that poorer residents and small businesses will be using older second hand vehicles with higher emissions and not have the financial ability to trade up to new or newer vehicles to avoid the high parking permit charges. What is needed is the following: More public transport to reach those who do not live on bus or train routes. All new building in Croydon to provide off street parking spaces assuming 1 space per adult. Refuse planning permission for converting existing family homes to small blocks of flats More electric charging points These proposals are wrongly thought out and need to be abandoned!
742	I feel that this emissions based parking scheme will punish the poorest and most vulnerable. the people that cant afford to get new cars on a regular basis will suffer the most. Those that can afford it, the richer, will not notice. rather than extra tax (which is what this . extra taxation. currently taxed on fuel. taxed on that tax (VAT) having to pay for a permit in the first place),, for once think of something that isnt punitative
743	I wish to strongly object to the proposed increase in parking permits from the current £80 to £300 per year. If it wasn't for my neighbour informing me of this proposed increase I wouldn't know anything about it and therefore wouldn't be able to log my objection. I have not received any letter informing of the proposed increase! Another stealth tax and a huge increase, yet another that affects the less well off. Most poorer residents live in terraced houses or flats, where as the more affluent live in houses with parking spaces. You state that the increase is to reduce the amount of vehicle emissions but you ignore the fact that parked cars make no emissions. [same respondent as online response ID6196973]

744	With the prevailing S/W wind at 7m/sec the air in Croydon is completely replaced on average every 29 minutes. This is why the Air Quality Action Plan 2017-22 is totally flawed. So like others I am wasting my time in a futile attempt to persuade Croydon Council not to introduce ever less agreeable and more taxing schemes that make residents lives a misery. I appreciate this will almost certainly be pursued regardless of public opinion. Most residents in Croydon drive old cars because they haven't enough money to buy a newer one. They'll have even less chance now. The idea of a Labour local authority Introducing a tax on older vehicles tells me they've lost their way. Especially as the only new vehicles in Croydon seem to be council vehicles!
745	I object to your proposal to charge for off street parking whether petrol or diesel. This is just another chance to fleece the motorist for more money. The government is already trying to remove diesel cars from the road, any more taxes you introduce will really affect the less well off in the community. Plus I have already paid more to get my cars off the road and create parking spaces off road.
746	We are not made of money it will cost the average family a small fortune
747	Because I believe that the charges are an unfair tax designed to target the poorest and most vulnerable. By increase the charge and extending theCPZ the council is essentially pricing out some people from owning cars with this stealth tax. This would be fine if the council truly wanted the borough to be car free but the huge new car park at Westfield and free permits for councillors means this is simply not the case.
748	I am concerned that should car parking permit charges rise I won’t be able to park anywhere near where I live. I already pay a substantial amount of money annually to be able to park my car nearer to where I live.
749	I live in croydon and would like to see a cleaner greener and healthier town. This scheme should also be used to build more electric charging bays and points and promote use of those.
750	This idea of charging for residents' and business parking permits based on vehicle emissions simply doesn't make sense. When a vehicle is parked, it doesn't give off any emissions. This proposal is for a scheme which is purely punitive. I suspect that it's designed solely with raising revenue for the Council in mind. This scheme, if introduced, will not improve air quality in the borough. In addition, the punitive nature of this scheme is most heavily focused on retrospective punishment, e.g. there will be higher parking permit charges for petrol cars bought before 2001, diesel cars bought before 2015, etc. Why weren't the owners of these vehicles informed about this scheme at the time of purchase of their vehicles? By the way, for the ULEZ/LEZ, it's 2006, not 2001. Why 2001?
751	There is no free parking anywhere near my home so I must purchase a parking permit. I feel the permits for residents are already very expensive and there is not enough parking in this area as it is. I dont understand the need to increase charges if there will still be difficulty finding parking due to all the spaces being pay and display as well as permit holders. I would be happy to pay more if some of the parking spots were reserved for permit holders only so that I can be guaranteed parking near my home.
752	I live in a road with permit parking and have not received information on this proposal. I do not see how charging us more to park cars we already own will help reduce emissions. There is a parking issue, but this is down to lack of space and the number of properties and increasing number of flats being built rather than with the existing vehicles. Whilst we do have public transport on the doorstep it doesn’t work for all. We need more information on how charging us more for parking the same cars in the same streets will benefit anyone other than the council (we’ve lived in our property for 15 years).
753	I object most diesel cars emit clearer emissions than petrol cars
754	Object- Lorries emit more and pollute more than cars

755	Croydon don't give a damn about emissions The streets are a disgrace since the new rubbish bins were introduced This is all about us paying for these bins The council tax is extortionate we also have to pay for permits and you are building flats after flats with no access to parking. Shops are suffering
756	I think it's a great idea to charge polluting cars more than electric ones because obviously we all want to see a cleaner Croydon. People who say it's penalizing those who drive polluting cars are missing the point -- it's MEANT to penalize them. Or, to put it another way, it's meant to reward those who buy clean cars. People in this community are suffering from the effects of pollution, and their health is far more important than someone's 'right' to drive a polluting car.
757	I am a parking permit holder who you have conveniently not notified directly about significant increases in parking permit vagaries. I object to an increase in the parking permit. I don't have another option near my property to park my car in the parking zone. I have Crohn's Disease and my car is important to me as it makes my life easier travelling. I use public transport where possible but I also need the use of a car.
758	I don't want the less well off in our communities to be unfairly disadvantaged by this scheme which I fear will be the case as they will have the older, less efficient cars
759	I live in croydon. I do not have parking at my property so have a residents parking permit. I do not drive every day. Some weeks I do not drive at all. If I can, I travel by public transport however I do sometimes need my car for work and leisure where public transport access is limited or non existant. As a low user of my car I feel its unfair to increase my parking permit charges. I am concerned over air pollution in croydon and would like to see more trees and plants planted on the roads. I think car park charges should be increased and public transport made cheaper and more frequent. This would encourage people out of their cars.
760	This is an unfair additional cost to those of us who cannot afford to buy new low emission orelectric vehicles
761	The proposals discriminate against the disadvantaged,older and poorer sections of Croydon residents. It seems unfair to link the hike in charges to the questionable pollution levels generated by car manufacturers. As older cars have long outlived the pollution associated with manufacture, vehicles more than 10 years old should be exempt. To encourage residents' acquisition of less polluting vehicles, the council should sponsor a scrappage scheme, encourage local dealer to give generous discounts and favourable finance terms to residents disposing of a high polluting cars. Many of the polluting diesels were originally purchased at a time with encouragement from the then labour government.
762	Is this not just another money making scheme for croydon council to penalise residents of croydon ? Most residents use their vehicles to and from work to earn an honest wage only to pay a large amount to different low emission schemes I dont see how charging extra to households who already have to pay permit fees will help with emissions What about streets that do not have to pay parking as they have no parking restrictions Do they not contribute to emissions?? I live very near to Jubilee Bridge where a constant flow of traffic proceeds all day and night does that not affect emissions ?
763	This Council is the most disgusting self-serving collection of con artists and have to be opposed at any and all times. They DO NOT HAVE THE PUBLIC GOOD at heart and as a consequence do not have the support of the greater majority. They are clearly misleading the Public and take every oportunity to either avoid or ignore any and all Public opinion, other than that expressed in Labour support areas. This 'scheme' will simply generate a large amount of cash which, like a considerable volume of council tax payer's money will be squandered on grand ideas that produce nothing of any use to the Public they are SUPPOSED to represent and protect.

764	There are many newer diesel cars now which meet the euro 6 standard. How will you differentiate between these and older vehicles which do not meet euro 6 standard for the purpose of charging? Also business and industry need to be targeted as well to reduce pollutants. I agree that things need to improve but the motorist should not be treated as an easy target and cleaner vehicles should not be charged the same as older vehicles.
765	I live next to an area where are just too many filthy deisel cars:the pollution is bad.
766	Because Croydon Borough Council and TFL have a single minded approach to tackling air quality based on the easiest targets and solely aimed at revenue generation. LBC and the London Mayors office are allowing the biggest polluters in London to continue to pollute our air because they have the biggest lobby and their allowance in maintaining their levels of pollution is being subsidised at a pollutant levels by reducing easy target private individual polluters such as residents, and not manufacturing, business and the biggest of all HEATHROW AIRPORT and RAIL. Pure money revenue generation Why tax stationary vehicles when surely they do not have engines running whereas moving vehicles have engines running.
767	Any new charges must be introduced on a fair and equitable basis which allows time for owners of older diesel cars to replace them on a reasonable and affordable timescale. Should be linked to Government subsidy since this option was actively encouraged by Government for many years and the health aspects incorrectly ignored. A minimum timescale of 5-7 years would be appropriate.
768	I object to people being used as a source of extra cash just because they drive a diesel car and are an easy target, It would be different if government had got their own house in order first by ensuring all buses and taxis conform to emission targets, Instead, a low emission zone is introduced EXCLUDING the worst offenders like BUS COMPANIES AND TAXIS who MAKE PROFIT FROM THEIR POLLUTION and are the main source of the problem, I am also concerned that shoppers may choose to avoid Croydon and buy elsewhere to avoid being ripped off by the charge. Our shops and businesses are already under enough pressure and may not survive causing the decline of the town and unemployment. ALSO , i do not believe it is the intention to use all revenue raised by such a scheme to control air quality !
769	You are planning on increasing my permit cost from 80 - 300 pounds which is an increase of 300 per cent. I can understand charging resident double for a diesel car which would be 160. I was just would like to know where you came up with the costing from. Currently I use public transport most of the time for work and all local trips as we are lucky in Croydon to have a good transport system. Although travelling by bus can be a bit of a rough experience. I do not have the funds to purchase another car and do not wish to finance one either. I will therefore have no other choice but to pay for the permit of my car, however this will mean that I will use the car for more journeys not less as I will have to off set the additiional cost against what I pay on public transport.
770	I am one of those who was persuaded by the Government's argument that Diesel cars were better for the environment. I feel that is unfair to penalise us for their change of mind. I also believe that electric cars do not eliminate pollution and are not the solution to the environmental issue. There are consequences resulting from the extraction of lithium for their batteries. Creating electricity to recharge the batteries is not pollution-free. It simply moves the pollution from our roads to the power stations. To encourage this change, we are being NIMBYs. (Not in my back yard). If the take-up pf electric cars is rapid, the National Grid will not be able to cope with the surge in demand to recharge cars on people's return from work.
771	Because this proposal is very unfair, and will impact on those with low incomes, as these are the people less able to update their vehicles. Also this scheme does not take into account how the vehicles are used. A low emission vehicle used every day will cause more pollution than an older vehicle used only once a week or fortnight. This scheme seems yet another plan by Croydon Council to raise money and further the councils plan to reduce car use by stealth. [same address as 6184730]

772	I am a resident on a road where permits have just been introduced. I have a car that was manufactured in 2000, I use the car rarely but it is the only way to get to visit eg my parents as they live far away in a rural location with no public transport. It passes required MOT emissions tests. It seems very unfair that I use the car rarely but will be paying far more just to park outside of my house, People in the next street (which doesn't have permit parking) could be driving around Croydon all day in far more polluting cars but be paying nothing. This is wrong, If you want to introduce a system then it should be based on how much people are actually driving their cars and how much pollution they are actually causing not on this random approach that you seem to be taking.
773	I object because this scheme serves only to apply punitive charges to inner area residents; is likely to reduce car ownership creating clearer roads for through traffic and thus drawing more traffic into inner residential roads (as happened before). It is highly unlikely to have any material impact on air quality. The council should concentrate on applying measures to dissuade residents of outer areas from driving and encourage the use of public transport. This measure has no impact on the high level of delivery vehicles that appeared on the streets. This proposal looks too much like earlier cynical attempts to use parking permits charges to raise council funds.
774	Resident in Croydon and concerned about the air quality in the borough
775	The scheme is unfair in that it is loaded against owners of older vehicles who are very likely on lower incomes and would buy a newer car if they could. The costs are higher for them and they can afford less. It would be fairer to have a flat rate and accept that the intended incentivisation of the purchase of newer greener vehicles won't work. People on low and high incomes all have an equal right to park.
776	Frankly a spectacular example of opportunistic revenue raising. Why both 'emissions' and 'diesel'? I presume monies raised will be hypothecated so as to better address these 'reasons'/issues? Re 'reasons' - in the real world one is simply unable to replace a vehicle (often purchased on a financing option) within such a short time-scale - one is similarly unable to avoid the Councils proposals, thus substantiating the opportunistic rationale. One would be prepared to understand the proposals if other options had been explored eg sending parking enforcement to Whitgift Avenue in the two hour window at the end of the school day - parents illegally park with engines running, often for one hour plus (I have raised this previously with but with a singular lack of success). So not in support.
777	Because I object to the scheme
778	I strongly agree with the proposal. The council have introduced charges for garden waste collection and Landlord Licensing. This is a no-brainer. Climate change and clean air is a key issue

779	I am a resident of Exeter Road, Croydon. I am writing directly to you on the current consultation for emission-based changes for resident parking permits as the feedback online does not allow sufficient space to give a full response. I feel the proposed scheme is very ill-thought out and is applying charges randomly and not necessarily to those causing the most pollution. In my case I have an older car (year 2000) and so my understanding is that I would have to pay the maximum amount for my residents permit. However, I do not use my car every day, and not even every weekend, and when I do use my car it is to drive out of Croydon on longer journeys where public transport is not available. Given the limited amount of miles completed, even though it is an older car I cumulatively generate less emissions than someone with a newer car that uses it every day for lots of short journeys. Have there been any studies into how many cars from outside of the permit zones drive into / through Croydon everyday? These cars are contributing to the air quality and so should also be contributing if any charge is to be applied. They would be unaffected by the current scheme and so would continue to contribute the same amount of pollution. It seems very random to only target those streets that have parking permits, and certainly the prospect of this wasn't included in the consultation last year on the expansion of the parking permit zones that has just happened. It is a very different prospect telling people that their annual permit will cost £80 compared to trying to get such a scheme through by telling them it will cost up to £300. Just because you have a parking permit does not mean that you generate lots of emissions. You should be targeting those that are actually using their cars (whether or not they are also required to have a parking permit). I would also like to know why this potentially significant change to the permit charge rates has not been directly communicated to all the households that would be affected by it. If you want to get responses to your plans then this should have happened, or is that why it hasn't happened? I would be interested in hearing your positions on this proposal.
780	Taxation through the back door
781	when I hear some people will be paying £20 per year for an annual permit and others paying over £500, I think that's disgusting. i'm a;ready paying extra £350 per year road tax coz my vehicle cost is over £40K list price. its for national governmnets to make these kinds of policies not local governmnet dictate people's choices with extremely punative measures. Why are you discouraging car ownership. I dont want my child stabbed by an animal on public transport in croydon. Something you seem to be doing little about. disgusting behaviour. The streets are filthy and you dont take strong enough action against it.
782	Its daft. If all Croydon parking spaces had residents parking then there would be a valid air quality argument, but only a small fraction do. Not only that the ones without residents parking are very often the users of larger and more polluting cars.

783	It will penalise those on lower incomes who cannot afford to upgrade their cars or who do not have houses with off road parking. It is an outrageous increase in cost and is so unfair to the less well off in the borough
784	The infrastructure is nowhere near in place to encourage people to buy low emission vehicles and the costs are far too high. While people who have their own parking at their home will not be affected, people on low incomes who have to park on the street will be unable to charge electric vehicles. It would make more sense for the council to firstly change all council vehicles to electric or low emissions to set an example. This proposal will hit low pay Labour voting people more than the Tory voting people who can afford houses with drives who are therefore unaffected. Bad news for a Labour council.
785	I do not see why i am being penalised, by adding to my resident permit for emission, when i do not own a vehicle. I have a visitors permit, and presume this is included in your scheme as this has not been made clear. So my visitors who owns a cars will also pay this fee so it appears like a double whammy. I also seem to be deemed responsible for their emission polluting the air even though i do not drive or have a car. It does not give me an incentive to continue with a resident's permit when this scheme is put in place, as in no doubt the fees may increase yearly.
786	I live near East Croydon and I would like the air quality to be improved
787	I live near East croydon station. [same address as 6190830]
788	The changes should be in line with those of the ULEZ, i.e. concessions to those who already have permits for older cars, but have a surcharge for the certification of the engine, not the emissions. That is to say, older diesel engines produce very little in the way of C02 emissions, but their particulate and NO emissions are far worse than similarly aged petrol engines, This will give those with older vehicles a chance to move over to newer vehicles, in the same graded approach that the ULEZ is taking.
789	Because I own a business in Croydon and object to the proposed scheme
790	I will be affected by the change
791	My comment relates to the year of manufacture of the vehicle as to which emission limit it falls into. It is not fair or just for a vehicle to be charged based on its emission level alone. Many vehicles were manufactured to regulations and standards that were not put into place or into law until after they were built. Charging for emission levels retrospectively places a burden onto owners and drivers who had no choice if the new emission rules were made after they bought their vehicles. If you wish to set emission limits then the limits must be based on an implementation date that reflects when the vehicle was built to the standards and regulations of its time and not an arbitrary blanket date that unfairly penalises residents who were unable to make a choice on low emission vehicles.
792	Poor people, like myself cant afford anymore charges, We pay INCOME TAX, NATIONAL INSURANCE TAX, COUNCIL TAX, TV LICENSING TAX, ROAD TAX, MOT, CAR INSURANCE, LIFE INSURANCE, HOUSE INSURANCE, MORTGAGE, VAT and MORE, If you run a business then there are more taxes like, CORPORATE TAX, BUSINESS RATES , NATIONAL EMPLOYERS CONTRIBUTIONS and MORE - We have to put a stop to this nonsense taxing
793	Petrol cars must also be in the scheme, they pollute the air just the same. Why are they not included?

794	My objections are somewhat obvious. You want an emission charge based on parking permits. Parked cars do not emit emissions. Cars need to charged on mileage then on the emissions, in that way the people will pay on the amount they used their cars then on their co2 or nox value. [same address as 6185819]
795	Is there any evidence this will reduce pollution? The majority of cars driving through croydon are almost certainly not the minority of road users who live within croydon parking zones. What about residents who live further out (outside of parking zones) who drive into croydon? This feels like an attempt to justify charging residents more.
796	parking issues in the council
797	I am a resident in the controlled zone & I have a new diesel car. [same address as 6185427]
798	I do not object to the principle of reducing pollution on Croydon's roads but I do not think your proposed method will have any effect other than to raise revenue for the council. This proposal would penalise the poorest in the community who cannot afford to buy a newer car. If it is to have a meaningful effect it should be a mileage-based charge. This will penalise the low usage driver
799	Hi, I am an active resident in reducing global and local emissions. I understand your reasoning to increase emission charges for residents, but this is not the best way to do so. It will mainly lead to residents paying more but not changing their vehicle choice. For example, I require a car for my job as a Physiotherapist, I need my car to get to patients' houses. You state the increase in emissions charges is to get people to take a more eco friendly mode of transport, but this is just not possible in order to get to my patients. You also say it will encourage us to switch to a zero/low emission vehicle, again this is just not possible as most people cannot afford a new car. If this is what you want, you need to invest in a scheme to help residents afford zero/low emission vehicles.
800	It seems that car owners are just used as a cash cow, being an easy target. Parked cars do not cause pollution. Cars moving slowly or stuck in traffic cause pollution. Thanks to the awful one way system we already have to take a one mile diversion in already congested roads to head north or west from our road. The best way to reduce pollution is to ease traffic flow. Not to hinder it. This scheme also unfairly hits the poorest residents, who cannot afford the latest vehicles and do not have access to off street parking, How many zero emission vehicles can park on the street and get charged up? Regarding car park charges, best way to kill the town centre and send shoppers to Bluewater or Bromley you could come up with! It's already in dire straights.
801	I object to having to pay even more money to the council.
802	It is an unnecessary charge and another way of taking money from the general public. Money is already tough for the majority of people living in the borough
803	Residents of Croydon already pay one of the highest council taxes in London and it increases annually. An additional expense will not reduce the pollution as people will continue to use their cars. Whilst I recognise that pollution is a serious issue, charging residents to park their cars in addition to controlled zones seems excessive. The transport links in Croydon are already underwhelming and are struggling to cope with the new flats that are being built with wreckless abandonment for the infrastructure in place. Some residents rely on the vehicles to get around especially the elderly and the disabled. Feels like a money grab and statistics show the end will not justify the means. People are already struggling financially and Brexit will have further impact.

804	I think this is a ridiculous idea and a tax disguised as an “eco” policy. Frankly it is an outrage.
805	Most of my family are drivers and dont need to be paying out more money than they already are just to park a car when the engine is not even running. To me this doesn't make sense.
806	I'm a pensioner in a flat with no off-street parking. I use public transport or cycle for most trips but I need my car occasionally. I use an older vehicle because it's cheap to run. I don't use it a lot and I can't afford to replace it with anything new or almost new. People who can't afford new cars and who don't have off-street parking are going to be penalised. This inevitably means lower-income groups, who are probably most of those who live in properties without off-street parking (or without enough off-street parking, where they are flats or multiple occupancy) - of which there are plenty in Croydon. The better-off who can afford new cars and who have off-street parking will escape your proposed 'penalty' charges . The less well-off shouldn't be hit hardest. This is most unfair.
807	local resident opposed to any emission charges
808	As it is South Norwood has been messed up by double yellow lines,We lost all the stores because customers could not pull up.Know the Council wants to tax hard working people who make the bough strong by taxing us more.So they can waste public money by miss managing the public funds and we have to pay for them.They have ruined Most of Croydon and want to even make it worse.This will devalue the property prices as it is a extra tax on residence in Croydon,Specially South Norwood.They moved the police station from South Norwood.They are stopping Crystal Palace football club from making the stadium bigger by asking more money from them in redeveloping the area.The Council has done nothing for South Norwood.But keep taxing hard working people who need a car to make a living.
809	Objecting - this is going to have the greatest impact on the poorer people who cannot afford to upgrade their cars and work vehicles. [same address as 6184684]
810	We pay enough as road users so this is just yet another cost!
811	The proposed charges would impact on people who have older cars and cannot afford to buy new ones. I strongly object to the Council's punishing measures that would not do anything to ameliorate air quality. A Council that accepted an incinerator on its door step has no right to dictate to residents. A car less world would be ideal but transport is too expensive and elderly people need cars.
812	I want to give my opinion as I live in the Croydon Borough. Whatever decisions are made, will most likely have some effect on me, as I do own a car. I would prefer if the parking permit charge system for all cars, remains the same as it presently is. Emission based charging may make the system complicating, and difficult to understand.
813	I strongly object to the scheme when for most Permit Holders the cost is going to increase, I already pay to park in a street where I live, where I am lucky to find an available space especially outside of the 0900-1700hrs Monday to Saturday. There is something in a name 'Parking Permit' which suggests you only want to park a vehicle - therefore not having any affect on emissions! There are no electric points in my street even if I was lucky enough to be able to afford a new electric vehicle. Why such high increases? If the Permits were to increase I would want to see all zones being 24/7 Permit Holders only or Pay & Display. Why should non-residents park at no cost outside of the current parking restrictions when as a resident I could be paying up to £300 to park!

814	Feel that this scheme is wholly unnecessary. Recently there has been a massive hike in areas that now require permits to park when there never used to be. Croydon is not continually busy... only at peak times which is a standard for many metropolitan areas. Westfields is supposed to be coming to the area... you want to encourage people to travel and live here, businesses and all. Not penalise people and this is what it is starting to feel like. I don't need to see another gentrified area of south London that forces its residents to have to overhaul their lives in order to live here.
815	I wish to strongly object to the proposed increase in parking permits from the current £80 to £300 per year. Another stealth tax and a huge increase, yet another that affects the less well off. Most poorer residents live in terraced houses or flats, where as the more affluent live in houses with parking spaces. You state that the increase is to reduce the amount of vehicle emissions but you ignore the fact that parked cars make no emissions.
816	Curiosity
817	It just seems unfair to have to pay extra for having a diesel car. There are so many more serious issues in Croydon that you should be trying to resolve rather than charging the residents for this unfair tax We will have no alternative but to sell the car or alternatively move out of the borough
818	Its just another money making scheme and will hit hard working/low income families and pensioners the hardest. There must be other ways to increase revenue and cut carbon.. Although council has to pay for its bad investments in other projects (the collonades for example) somehow..
819	I am opposed to Croydon Council's plan to increase parking permit costs by 275% - an unafforadble tax on Croydon's elderly residents, those on low-incomes and those who rely on their vehicles for work.
820	Objecting as this will increase my cost of parking to levels I can't afford.
821	The proposed emissions charge.
822	I have an […classic…] Motorcaravan and I cannot afford to replace with a newer comparable vehicle. The plans seem to take no account of how much I use the vehicle - the Van meets my needs for longer journeys and holidays but I make almost all my local journeys by cycling. I use a folding bike which I can take it in the Van when I go to another town and again use the bike for shorter journeys. Also the scheme does not take account of actual emissions (I don't know all details but the MOT test shows my Van to have CO figures very significantly inside the required limits). Vehicle age might be a simple way to tax people but I am not sure it is fair if emission reduction is really the goal I fear it has the effect of penalising those with less money to buy new vehicles.
823	This is a revenue raising exercise hitting people who probably cannot afford a newer car and I don't remember thus as one of your manifesto pledges. You will also be hitting the small businesses in the area financially.

824	I am a resident and car owner affected by the proposals. I have 2 cars one of which is a company provided vehicle and which I have personal use of. The cost of permit parking in Croydon is already high compared with other areas and the proposed charges are going to hit those people who can't afford a newer vehicle the most. Car owners already contribute hugely via tax on petrol and road tax, as well as the London congestion and emission charges. Parking is a necessity not a luxury especially in an area like Croydon with lots of older property which doesn't have parking for obvious reasons. Additionally the Council seem content to allow redevelopment of property in central croydon and new builds without sufficient residents parking which puts a further strain on existing residents parking.
825	Concerned at the cost of changes to me as a resident
826	These charges are a massive increase on current charges and will particularly penalise the elderly and low-income residents who can't afford to buy a new vehicle to fit the new rules. It will also hit those who rely on their vehicles for work, like those in construction or working as drivers. Until the council can offer charging for electric cars in every parking place, it is not justifiable to penalise non-electric cars parking there. Croydon already has the highest parking charges in the area and combined with the ridiculous delays in developing Westfield, the council is ensuring that shoppers and visitors go to Bromley or Wimbledon rather than coming to Croydon, thereby killing the life of our town centre.
827	I am concerned as I am not sure our family can afford up to £650 for 2 cars. We changed from diesel so that we reduced pollution however we cannot afford to buy newer cars nor to move to off street parking. This feels more like an additional tax on poorer residents of the borough. It is difficult to park and it will hurt even more if it costs more. We try to use public transport or walk as much as possible but with my disability I get very tired and if I did not have a car there would be a lot of times I don't go out.
828	My objection is why do I have to pay earlier then the scheme is intreduced
829	I am a resident. I have an old car which I hardly use. I cannot afford a newer car nor do I want one. Mine is small and reliable...surely its more harmful to the environment having/producing more new cars..especially in my case??
830	I pay enough tax on my vehicle without adding to it. This is a money grab. Although not affected by this ridiculous scheme I'm sure I will be when u realise how much revenue it raises. This has nothing to do with polution
831	This is another example of Croydon Council money grabbing under the pretext of environmental concern. If you were genuinely concerned about the environment you would not have the approach you do to planning applications particularly those involving green spaces. This tax will hit the less well off who need to drive because of age and mobility issues.
832	ITS JUST A WAY FOR LABOUR TO GET MONIES TO REDUCE THEIR DEBT
833	I have a classic car
834	Environmental. Fully support any measure to reduce emissions in Croydon.

835	Residents parking should be uniform. So I will object to the new scheme
836	Everything since labour got in has hit hard working middle class people with an increase I have yet to see what my council tax has done Now they want to increase parking a disgrace
837	It's unfair and penalises your residents. Essentially any additional taxes need to be raised from people making decisions on what car they have now. Not retrospectively. Also richer residents who can afford your charges have drives. By taxing present residents you are introducing a retrospective tax, you should not act retrospectively and penalise your residents. To charge additional because of emissions is wrong, you do not decrease pollution. The basis for doing this is unfair why are you only expected to pay in a residential parking zone area. What additional benefits or disadvantages does this make. Why not introduce mass resident parking in ThorntonHeath/ Selhurst / Norbury where congestion and pollution is greatest? This is unfair and penalises people who have the wrong car either for work, because of blindly believing the government who encouraged Deseil.
838	It does not make sense to me why you propose to introduce charges to residents before businesses. You need to focus on better transport links to encourage people not to drive instead of adding another charge to residents who already struggle to pay annually for parking permits.
839	I object to this scheme as we have lived in our home in Croydon for over 12 years & cannot afford to move . My partner is on a low income working as a teaching assistant in the borough and I am self employed and on a very low income. We have two young children both under 14 and because they are at different schools within the borough over six miles away from our home in Sanderstead and we have to maintain two cars as other transport would just not work for them . Last year we had the parking zone enforced in our road and now we have to find a considerable amount of extra money to park our cars near our home. Our cars are 10 year old cars as we have no way of paying for new cars. We could not afford any further increases in parking costs as we struggle to pay the current charges imposed
840	1 You are not giving us any reasonable time to plan for this change. 2 It should be at least 3 years so we can get some value out of our current investment in our vehicle. 3 You are not taking into consideration the mileage covered within the borough of the vehicles. I work in West Sussex. 4 My mileage in Croydon is low! I know many neighbours who are struggling on low wages who need their cheap cars who cannot afford this! I am approaching retirement so am I now supposed to go into debt to buy a new car because OVERNIGHT you have seen a way to cover your losses and make a small fortune out of us? Where is your long term planning? You said you surveyed the people of Croydon! When ? Why did I or my neighbours get one? The first I heard about this was through the Conservative Party!
841	Own a car that would be affected.
842	We cant afford additional payments to the council ontop of the Council tax. My car i use 3 times a week and the rest of the time i and my wife walk to and back from work. I dont use the car unless required or at weekends.
843	This has NOTHING to do with air quality. We already pay road tax to cover emissions. This is a tax on the people who live within Croydon CPZ. This will gentrify the area open only to the affluent.

844	Just another way of getting more money out of residents when services are already being cut left right and centre. Some elderly residents for example can not afford to pay 300 per year for a permit if their car is pre 2001. Totally unfair and hitting people who are most likely to be elderly or on a low income. Everyone would have a new, efficient car if they could afford it - if they can't they certainly can't afford a massive parking permit hike.
845	The scheme as very little to do with air quality and is about raising funds (stealth tax) and shows that the council have very few ideas of there own.
846	We are already paying high road tax. It is essential to have a car for ensuring my 82 year mother gets out, I look after her. It will place an extra burden on me to ensure I have the means to ensure I can provide transport to safely take my mother out. There are hardly any cars on the surrounding roads during the day. So it negates the argument that there is greater air pollution on our streets. Most people use their car to get to work so only few cars are around during the day.
847	This is another stealth tax on motorists and takes no account of the economic impacts or the blot on the perception that Croydon could be a great place to live. It will also encourage the loss of gardens to create private parking facilities to avoid these appallingly high charges.
848	Because I believe the introduction of these increased charges will cause severe hardship for the owners of these older vehicles who may well rely upon them for getting to work. The proposed increases are disproportionately high. People don't choose to keep these older vehicles, they cannot afford to replace them with newer vehicles.
849	I am concerned that people with an older car, that may do very little mileage per annum will be paying too much. An older vehicle does not necessarily mean higher emissions. Vehicles with higher emissions are already paying more road tax.
850	Because I think it is very unfair to make people pay such prices to park in their own street. The people who are less well off are the ones most likely to be affected.
851	1. I object to this scheme as it will unfairly affect low earners and poor people, and the elderly who will cannot afford new low emmission cars. 2. I object to this scheme as there are no plans here to help people who live here as opposed to those visiting. 3. I object to this scheme as there is no accomodation of "historic" vehicles, those vehicles over 40 years old.
852	I know that those who will suffer the most under these proposals are those who are struggling to keep their heads above water. Those are: families whose older children live at home because they can't afford to move out; white van man who runs his own small business; people whose accommodation doesn't have off street parking; people who can't afford to change their car . This won't affect those in the wealthier South of the borough but those in the poorer, overcrowded North will be clobbered. People need to be incentivised not clobbered with fees they can not afford. The Labour Council has become so caught up in their own rhetoric that they've forgotten their own basic principles of protecting those most vulnerable in our society. These proposals will penalise people who are struggling to get by. It won't be those in the wealthier South of the borough who will suffer from these proposals but those in the overcrowded much less affluent North. Those that will be clobbered are: families whose older children can't afford to move out, people whose accommodation doesn't have off street parking, people who can't afford to upgrade their vehicles; white van man who is struggling to keep his business afloat. The Council should be offering positive incentives to change not clobbering those who are not in a position to make changes. This Council is notorious for allowing housing developments without sufficient parking thinking that it will decrease car usage without providing sufficient alternatives.

853	1. Lollipop Ladies My daughter in law tried to get Lollipop ladies re-instated for Oasis Academy. She failed due to “cost”. My son and she have now moved to Dunbar where my grandchildren attend the local primary school. In Dunbar they have Lollipop ladies not only near the school but further afield so that children can cross roads safely on the way home. Money from any emissions scheme should fund this sort of service. 2.I am in favour of encouraging walking and cycling and facilities for this should be improved and coordinated with other boroughs (to encourage cycle to work for example). Monies raised should be used here. 3. We should discourage the taking of children to school by car and ban schoolchildren from driving to school (this probably only affects private schools).
854	Croydon Council continue to bleed their residents but offer very little in return, this is just another ploy at extorting money from vehicle drivers and has no basis. Drivers already pay a fortune in parking within the borough. A parked car is not emitting carbon into the atmosphere, therefore cars that are parked should be welcome. IF a driver is having to drive around looking for an affordable place to park, that vehicle is contributing more polution than a car that is already parked. I am now HIGHLY AGGRIEVED at consenting to residents parking being implemented on our road, the council said this would be to our advantage..... we were conned! In the meantime our streets are still shamefully littered, noise pollution continues to build and the so-called 20mph zones are being ignored.
855	I live in East Croydon and pay for an annual parking permit. My car literally stays outside my house all week apart from a weekly trip to the supermarket and my weekend trip to Brighton where I stay Friday and Saturday. I don't understand why I would be penalised by paying for an increased parking permit for parking outside my own house where I already pay Council Tax. The people that should be penalised are those that are driving into Croydon from outside the area to work/ shop/ park or to commute as they are the most polluting vehicles vs those that are mostly static. It seems a fast track way to generate income for the council. My car parked outside my house is causing minimal pollution vs those that are driving into the area every single day.
856	I live in New Addington, Croydon. I object to these new charges for the following reasons 1. Its a money making scheme disguised as an environmental concern. 2. There is no pollution emergency in Croydon. Show how Croydon measures to other places in London in terms of pollution. 3. I do not bring my car to Croydon Town Centre because its very expensive to park already and so do most people who live in the suburbs of Croydon. Any additional charges cannot be about pollution. If its about pollution ban cars from the town centre. ANY ADDITIONAL CHARGES ARE ONLY ABOUT MAKING MORE MONEY. 4. This consultation is not genuine nor called for. When elected representatives become the ruling class and pretend to be concerned about the people's welfare they should ask their own families first.
857	Residents that have lived in the Borough of Croydon for some years are being targeted by this unreasonable price hike. There are no electric charging points on residential roads in the centre of Croydon. With Westfield upto 3000 parking spaces are available this makes a mockery of the Councils emission reducement to hike up parking charges.
858	I used to travel into Croydon to shop but no longer do so due to the excessive parking charges. It is not surprising that the shops are closing if its easier to buy things online and get them delivered at no extra cost. Diesel cars was encouraged by the government - most cannot afford to change cars frequently so having bought one it will be a while before it can be replaced. Diesel and petrol both cause pollution just different types see http://www.air-quality.org.uk/26.php why pick on diesel cars. Croydon has very few electric points to charge electric cars. Alternatives such as train are expensive even if one person is travelling - happy to give example. need frequent and cheaper alternatives to using a car which are not there at the moment.
859	It is clear that the increased charges will affect the least well off - those who cannot afford to replace their old vehicles. The result of this introduction would make the poor poorer!

860	I am concerned about local air quality and agree with the principle of the scheme, and commute (to near Brighton) by train as much as possible (at least half the time). As an automotive engineer, I have a good understanding of vehicle emissions and feel that the diesel surcharge is unfair and based on bad press rather than fact. Due to the location of Croydon, many residents commute longer distances out along the M23 & M25 motorways, where driving a diesel is beneficial in terms of fuel economy and CO2 emissions. Like many, I am not able to afford a newer vehicle now, and electric vehicles do not have the range I need. My efforts to reduce car usage are not reflected in this charge, and it should be consumption-based instead. Electric vehicle charging points should be introduced faster.
861	Where's the scientific evidence that emissions charges in other boroughs have improved air quality & aren't just to increase revenue? What percentage of vehicle drivers using Croydon's roads use parking permits? Increasing permit charges will only affect them & not all drivers, so may not significantly reduce emissions & is discriminatory by penalising only a select group of motorists. Many people can't afford to change their car & it's unfair to penalise them & treat them differently from the more wealthy who can afford to change or have vehicles provided by employers. Pay & display parking charges - not all drivers have Smart phones or an App so it would be unfair to only collect charges this way. Provide more cycle lanes, improve public transport & create more pedestrian-only zones.
862	I own a diesel car registered in SEP 2014. Consider carefully the outcome you want to achieve: (1) Introducing a supplement for me to park in Croydon Car Parks will likely change my behaviour to purchase more from the internet therefore depriving Croydon Retailers of my custom and contributing to the death of the High Street - simultaeneously this would increase emissions by requiring more delivery drivers on the road - currently I 'click & collect' where possible so have random purchases when i am in the town centre. (2) if the object of the exercise is to change behaviour and price older cars with high emissions off the road then on-street parking charges should be applied equitably to all cars falling below the required criteria - no discounts for more than one cars at an address.
863	I have a diesel car and I can't afford to buy a new car
864	I need more understanding on how these proposed controls impact air quality etc. From what I can see, parking permits only make things more difficult for residents who may not drive to work and receive visitors. I cannot see the benefit of the current strict parking controls in my area.
865	This is ridiculous. Not only as a tax paying citizen working long hours to pay my way and having to pay to park outside my house u propose this. I will campaign and fight this. Totally unfair I use my car to get to work to pay my way. I claim nothing. Not happy.
866	My main objection to this increase from £80 to £300 for cars registered before March 2001 is that is seems quite exorbitant to be justified. This seems especially so as compared to the other stated London boroughs, with only Lambeth having charges of a similar nature with these being based mainly on the engine size, while Sutton and Merton only charging £150 & £90 respectively. The other main objection that I have to this new scheme, is that at present the North Zone parking permit holders have to not only got to compete with other such holders, but also with the constant daily flow of shoppers who have equal rights to park down any of the roads in this zone -- so there is a doubling up of revenue, which I would have thought would mitigate against such a steep rise to £300.
867	This is not about air quality and this proposal would make little or no difference to air quality. It is simply a new way to make those who use cars pay more tax. The policy statement makes clear how the Council intend to use parking charges to deter car use and this is an improper and unlawful use of their powers.

868	Very unfair on those with older cars and those with less disposal money. Surely it could be introduced gradually to give people a chance and is it just a way of getting money!
869	My reasons are a point of affordability and the fact that i live in a residential area this is just another stealth tax
870	Another form of indirect taxation. Permit management already overpriced. Directly attacks poorer members of society. Option ofCar use essential in the suburbs for descent standard of living.
871	We need ot reduce the number of vehicles on the road and linked to this must be increased public transport
872	I'm not fortunate enough to have a driveway to park my car. It is not right that someone with a more polluting vehicle than mine does not get penalised just because they can park off road. The proposed system is completely flawed. This is clearly not about emissions, but about creating more revenue for the council. My road has only just seen residents parking implemented despite objections from residents, and already Croydon Council want to make changes to the scheme and increase prices.
873	Parking permit fees cost a lot as it stands. To increase further, this is an inexcusable means for Croydon Council to squeeze yet more money out of its poor residents. I am totally against this ridiculous scheme!
874	My objection is largely based on the unnecessary council spending by the left wing labour party to pay excessive wages to their staff and council officers, and subsiding by an increase of 285 percent increase in the parking charges. It is a left wing / communist trend to over charge the hard working men and women in Croydon and pay their people increased wages. In recent years there is a high amount of people begging on street corners. They should find jobs instead.
875	This is discriminatory against lower income households and those who cannot afford to replace their vehicle. The ability for residents (myself a resident of C Zone for 27 years) to be able to continue to park without further charges at their own home should NEVER be dependant on their ability to have the latest vehicle . Its' a disgrace that this council is yet again considering penalising the less fortunate of their community by applying a charge which will further push people into poverty and financial hardship.
876	We pay enough to park already, there is limited parking already Car users already pay road tax If they stop cutting down forests around the world, we wouldn’t be in this urgent mess. Planting 100 tress for every old trees that gets cut down or dies will help. Planting more plants to absorb pollutants in city areas will help.
877	the scheme appears complicated and expensive to manage. the outcome is to improve air quality and environment for the benefit of all. the scheme is modelled around parking of vehicles. a parked vehicle does not produce pollution. a simpler method is to model it on vehicle type and actual usage. this can be done centrally using existing databases and tools. types of vehicle can be discouraged by road tax (annual or other). the actual usage (that is the polluting bit) can be controlled by fuel charges and an annual fee based on mileage done. this can be measured at the annual MOT. as new technology rolls out real time mileage can be measured and charged.

878	I have received no notification, nor have any of my neighbors that this is happening. I speak on behalf of me and my neighbors. The cars on this road do not release any emissions when they are parked!! so adding an emissions tax to stationary cars is just plain stupid. These cars are used for recreational use. Because we live in London the train is easier for traveling into the City. And a car is "only" for driving out of Croydon/London to the countryside (we do live in a suburb! by the way, not in the the city). We tend to do long distance travels to Slovakia and trips around England and to France. With an electric car (maximum range 300miles) to slovakia 1136 miles (20 hours driving) it would cost another 30+ hours just in charging time. And even a hybrid would cost more as on the motorway a the battery would be of no use and just a dead weight. Our car is a recent car 2011 a Renault 1.6 petrol Scenic we would already be on the higher scale band 4. This level has not been put fairly for a recent cars which are still current technology and current emission standards. The government wants to ban diesel. But you want to ban petrol! The band 4 level should be the current price the existing permit £80 Also a this new emissions permit law should not be done now. It should done in a suitable amount of time of 10+ years in line with the zero emissions laws coming into effect in 2040. This is to allow people to have time to change to new hybrid cars. As for many people have already purchased a new car can't afford to purchase a new car just because you change a law. If the council was to make it a lower emissions zone and force people to use electric cars they should install electric charging points. As I have noted 1 person with an electric car on our street that has his electric charging cable across the street. This is a extremely dangerous trip hazard! A low emission zone cannot be forced unless you install electric points on our road. And enough time is given inline with Londons date set when all cars should be zero emissions in 2040 Hybrid cars get a lower emissions band. Even hybrid cars need charging at a charging point. There is no safe way of charging a car nor any charging points on our road. As most cars are parked here (no engines running) there is no emmisions from that car. If you really want to reduce emmision you should have signs saying you should switch of engine while waiting... like taxi drivers or mummy waiting in there cars at the local Whitgift school. The is purely an extra tax to the residents of croydon this act will not reduce this emissions in the town. This is a tax for parked cars. And must not be allowed to go ahead. I notice these references if these charges are to go ahead suitable charging point must be installed at every parking space to allow people to charge their cars to reduce emissions.

	9.5 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. 9.6When 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. I object to these plans. And these new rules "cannot" go ahead. [same respondents as online ID6201165]
879	I am a concerned local resident. The proposals could mean that residents would be forced to pay 275% more for a parking permit to park on the street outside their homes and 30% more than at present for a ticket to park elsewhere. This is extortion and will affect the elderly and low-income residents in particular, who will not be able to afford to replace their older cars to avoid the surcharge on cars more than 18 years old.
880	I don't see why car owners and drivers should be taxed more, as we already pay tax on fuel, and road tax, for which most of the roads are full of pot holes and not maintain properly, and don't see why we should be taxed more for driving in our town. Or to have to pay more for parking just because I own an older car.
881	I'm objecting to the scheme because I'm a Croydon resident and a car owner.
882	Croydon recident
883	Few years ago government were supporting diesel car and we bought one in good faith so why shell we suffer If you want to penalise than charge General Motors. I object to increasing the charges for diesel cars! [same address as 6187160]
884	I have a residents parking permit
885	The scheme does not give credit for hybrid cars, whose benefit of part time zero emissions electric is most felt on city roads such as Croydon’s. The charges should be reduced for hybrid cars over their pure petrol/diesel cousins

886	I object to the scheme as followings 1. Those with off street parking will not attract the charge. This is unfair. 2. This could lead to more gardens converted into parking making the street scene more ugly and leading to greater water runoff into the drains leading to flooding. 3. Council vehicles will not pay (plus Police, Bus, Ambulance and Fire) as most are parked off road but they still pollute Croydon air. 3 Residents outside the zone do not pay which could be said to be unfair. 4. The taxing of no emission vehicles means that this a charge to make money as they do not pollute. 5. NHS vehicles will be charged leading to more NHS financial difficulties. 6. Black cabs will not pay as most owners live outside zone but circle the East Croydon station polluting the Croydon Centre.
887	I feel that as a diesel car owner I am being unfairly victimised as I bought the car when we were all told that diesel was better for the environment. I can't yet afford to change my car as I am not rich enough to do so on a whim but have to save for years, yet you now want to penalise me for making a good decision years ago based on current advice then. Obviously now we know that diesel cars cause different problems to air quality than petrol but it is unfair to penalise me when I cannot change the car that I drive. I'm trying to save for a new cleaner car but the more you penalise diesel car drivers the longer it will take us to save up for a different cleaner car. Your proposals are therefore prolonging diesel car use - and your taxes will cause more diesel pollution, not less.
888	I am objecting to this scheme as already paying for parking permit and due to less amount of wages and paying high bills is not fare on middle class people
889	It is not right to make people on low income who are already struggling pay higher permit charges as they are the ones who have older cars
890	I have an old car and cannot afford to buy a newer one.
891	I live here
892	I am a resident of Croydon and I drive a car. We have a number of cars at our home and need to park on the road.
893	I do not agree with these emission based charges on the basis that these should not be introduced until Croydon Council have provided sufficient electrical charging points in the borough to enable residents, in particular those who do not have driveways, to move to more efficient electric or hybrid vehicles. At present this is impossible for most residents in my local area as I believe there are only 2 charging points within a reasonable driving distance from my home, both in shop car parks and both of which are regularly not working.
894	I have sold my car to use public transport only. But my partner is self employed builder with a large van. It's for his business and he already has to pay extra tax/ pay at council dumps
895	Enough tax is paid both council tax and road tax. If local government wishes to increase their income then they should reduce salaries paid to politicians
896	I feel it is unfair as it will penalise the owners of older vehicles which are generally younger people or the less well off.

897	As a resident of Croydon parking is an integral part of croydons development. It is unreasonable to Impose diesel premiums when All party goverments promoted it. It is also contradictory against global warming as it encourages OLD petrol in preference to new diesel which are inefficient and emits High CO2 levels. This along with the imposition of 20 MPH zones, in areas which it is not needed, causes pollution as cars are inefficient at that speed and do not disperse the pollutants so well. I TOTALLY OBJECT as this is just another cash cow for the Labour council supporting ill thought out policies introduced by a disastrous London Mayor.
898	I know that while I own a car this will affect me but hopefully it will encourage delivery firms like Sainsbury's etc to u see electric vehicles.
899	I object to scheme because I believe it is too punitive and regressive. The scheme unfairly target those who are prohibited from updating their vehicles due to financial constraint. I understand the need to encourage the population to choose less polluting options for their transport. However I believe changes like this need to be introduced in a more gradual way to give people a chance to adjust. Those living in a CPZ have little choice on this proposal. Also the fees suggested appear to be too high when compared with other boroughs.
900	The goal of cutting emissions is sensible but there is no cited evidence resident's vehicles are the primary source of concern. Rather, this appears to be another particularly transparent additional regressive tax on some of the poorer borough inhabitants living in central ward. It damages wider council credibility to disingenuously position this as environmental protection.
901	I strongly oppose this scheme. I have a small childminding business which I have had for last decade. I bought a diesel car 6 years ago in good faith that it was environmentally friendly. Dieselgate happened for which I was never compensated for. The Ultra Low Emissions affects my ability to shop or travel to friends in the London Area (they do not live near railway stations). The Emissions charge sounds like a good idea but in these austere times where public service budgets are being slashed now is not the time to be adding more charges to businesses that are already experiencing squeezed margins.
902	As a non car owner no axe to grind. I regard the proposals re emmissions and parking as draconian, unwarranted, unfair, A punitive tax on the car owner. If ever implemented unemployment must rise. Driving cars of the road , age etc. The lower paid car owner often driving an older but well maintained vehicle,travel to and from work can hardly afford the existing charges, and will be in no position of affording those proposed. If ever comes to fruition unemployment must rise, older cars forced off the road. Getting to work? It's just a deliberate well orchestrated attack on all car owners particularly those owning the older vehicle. Simply an ill thought out money grabbing scheme designed to fleece the public raising more questions than answers.
903	Because it is yet another stealth tax, that not only costs the motorist money it also devalues their vehicle.
904	The parking and taxing policy disproportionately disadvantages people who are not rich. If you are rich you can pay for parking, if you are rich you can get round emission charges by buying an electric car as people do in the congestion charging areas (poor people do not have this luxury to buy more than they need), if you are rich you can buy a house with a large drive (if you have to buy a small flat or rent a terrace house you have no choice to buy your way out of this unfair proposal). This is so unfair on anyone who cannot buy there way round it. Air quality? Tell people to buy diesel (and poorer people did if possible because second and third hand diesels are better value and more economical to run then the politicians change their minds and tax the diesels they told people to buy!

905	I`m objecting the scheme because we will have the ULEZ introduced in the coming 2years anyway, And it is too much restrictions in london at the moment. We are families with kids we need time to change our cars and way of life to adapt to the coming restrictions. October 2019 is too soon for the residents in Croydon to be charged. this will add more financial restrain on us at the moment.
906	It will disproportionately affect the poorest living in streets with no chance of charging points for electric/hybrid vehicles and no money to purchase such a vehicle. These people often work when public transport is not available.
907	Would like to object. Its just another tax. People who are trying to earn a living by going out to work are finding hard enough to pay bills without all these extra costs. What happens to people who are claiming benefits and own a car are they going to be let off charges? It comes down to people who are honest and trying to work for a living who are not claiming benefits. Its unfair. What happens to visitors are they going to pay a parking fee on what car they own ? How is this going to work.
908	I am concerned about the air quality in Croydon/Thornton Heath where I live and work.
909	I am very concerned about the air quality in Croydon/Thornton Heath where I live and work
910	I strongly feel that too much financial pressure is being waged on vehicle drivers. Naturally the older (generally) vehicles (being targeted) are nearing the end of life, but are still critical to their owners. These policies are bringing increased hardship as their asset(s) are being made worthless. If the government are serious about this there should be a solid scrappage scheme.
911	I believe the scheme will do little to improve air quality and is simply a cynical way for Croydon Council to make money. If the Croydon Council was serious about reducing emissions it would have installed many more charging points for electric vehicles across the Borough to encourage people like me who park on the road to own an electric vehicle. In 2018 I was thinking of buying an EV and contacted the Council to enquire about the possibility of installing charging points and was fobbed off with a factually incorrect excuse about lamp posts not being beside the kerb - there are at least 50 in streets near me. Consequently I bought a Mini and now the Council is proposing to charge me over 25% more to park! Instead of ripping us off do something real to reduce emissions.
912	I object to the scheme as it will increase the cost of my permit. I am unable to afford to replace my car for a less polluting model because I lost my job a few years ago and the pension I was able to access early does not cover my living costs so I am running through my savings. I need my car as I care for my dad, who is 92 and lives five miles away. My actions save the public purse a massive amount of money and I am now to be penalised for continuing to need my car to do this
913	Croydon Council's proposed Parking Charges are very excessive. Your proposal to increase charges by 275% for a parking permit outside my home and parking ticket prices increasing by 30% are not acceptable. Most poor and elderly residents who happen to own a car registered on or before year 2001 are also going to be penalised by an automatic payment of £300 which again is not acceptable for poor people in the neighborhood..
914	I believe the council had gone overboard on this. Parking charge is for parking in a public space. When a car is parked its engine is turned off. Is the council trying to use scare mongering tactics and use it to increase its income. The Council has several other areas to concentrate
915	I drive a company car and have no decision over what I drive

916	The scheme will impact on me financially and put extra burden on my financial situation. I rely on my car for work (diesel) and such a scheme (surcharge) would add extra cost to my car outgoings: - Parking permit - Car Insurance - Road Tax - MOT - Repairs and maintenance - Fuel Please have this in consideration as a lot of residents do not have the privilege of paying any extra costs. Many thanks
917	I strongly object to residents paying more to park outside their own homes. Despite not owning a car and using public transport to travel around London, I feel it highly unfair to continually pass on unfair charges to residents. I think it will unfairly impact low income families and older residents who can't afford to upgrade their vehicles.
918	I agree with trying to reduce Croydon's traffic and improve air quality but I cannot quite see how emissions based parking charges will do this. Residents already pay to park. Increasing the charges is easy but hard on the motorist and in my opinion won't have the desired effect. Those people with older cars probably fall into category where they just cannot afford to buy "cleaner" vehicles. It is already expensive to run a private car and there are people whose only means of transport is that car. Others that use cars with higher emissions possibly fall into a category that will just pay as the vehicles they are using have a high purchase price. It seems that some can and won't and others can't so there will little or no effect on traffic or air quality.
919	I already pay UK car tax based on the co2 emissions of my vehicle. If this is enforced I shall pursue my legal position given that this will consistute an additional tax to address the same national concern.
920	To ensure incompetent councillors can't run roughshod over democracy in our area. The scheme discriminates against poorer residents who can't afford low emissions vehicles and those without offstreet parking. This is simple an unfair tax.
921	I object because although I have a new car with low emission, you are proposing to still penalize me you have not made any distinction between new and older vehicles, this seems another revenue generating idea, like when the resident permit increased from £36 to £80 per year
922	Parking is a nightmare in croydon borough. I live in Coulsdon and family homes are being developed into flats without next to No parking to go with it.
923	Cannot afford newer car. Cannot manage buses trains etc
924	I'm so upset that once again this Labour council want to tax the poor of the borough whilst the rich who live in the suburbs don't have to pay to park outside their homes and won't be charged the omissions tax either. I feel so let down by you.You are agreeing to any planning however much it ruins residents lives and now this. This borough isn't worth living in now. I'm one of the many who want to, and will as soon as I can, move away.I now see why you agree to so many new houses with no parking as this was your plan, to add this tax to as many unfortunate people who have to live in the center of town as they can't afford the suburbs houses with their free parking and no emissions tax. I can't believe we voted you in as we thought you were the party to help us. I won't vote for you again.
925	The council are penalising the poorest in the Borough. Charges are high enough now.
926	Strongly oppose any possible “improvement “ that is actually increasing charges for any parking that will not increase air quality but only decrease the quality of life of residents without a high income. Strongly baffled by the bizarre introduction of building out bus stops into the road preventing cars from passing stationary buses causing traffic jams and more pollution to all residents especially children waiting at bus stops. Totally stupid idea.

927	The reason some of us have old vehicles is because we are not fortunate enough to be paid high wages! I'm sure there are many residents who would love to own a newer vehicle, but, like me, it is far beyond our means. I have had cancer and rely on my vehicle to transport myself and my daughter who has mobility problems. You would happily make it impossible for me to retain my car and, as a result, leave my daughter even more housebound. The council's greed knows no bounds! I'm sure no councillor is worrying about the impact on their life from this decision! I want to know WHO was consulted - it sure as hell wasn't me or anyone I know! Was there any direct mention of these increased charges, or just back door questions about traffic levels and pollution?
928	By implementing this scheme you are forcing those who are financially unstable and unable to change their vehicle by penalising them. Also how many new housing developments for both Social Housing and owner occupiers that have planning permission state no vehicles are allowed as no parking spaces have been omitted from the plans. Croydon is part of Greater London the main Brighton Road leads directly onto the M23. This idea is based on pure ideology not idealism.
929	Not fair on elderly or lower income families that may own older cars.
930	Penalty charge for parking that hurts the poorest most - not good labour policy!!
931	Stop targeting the poor. If there's going to be a tax, make it for everyone - this is discrimination.
932	People, including ourselves, cannot afford either a new car or the outlandish charges you are proposing to park our car using a residents permit if these charges are implemented. We have purchased residents permits every year for as long as they have been in effect in our road. They have constantly gone up in price but the newly proposed costs for a permit for people like us, with an older car, which actually gets used very little, is ridiculous. The amount of money you will want for a residents permit for our car is more than the car is worth. Absurd and punitive.
933	It is unfair to a large portion of Croydon's low income families who can't afford a new vehicle which complies with your regulation changes. This is just another scheme to increase the council's coffers taking advantage of fashionable headlines and will do nothing to improve people's lives if they are left with no vehicle as a result of these ridiculous charges being imposed. I object.
934	Concerned about these retrospective penalties for motorists and amid a general lack of sensible parking and continued lack of appropriate parking for all of the many new flats and new builds being permitted.
935	Because when a car is parked, it is not creating any emissions at all. So to charge for it is a stealth tax. The government can just add the tax on fuel at the pump. This is just a way for the borough to create morerevenue for themselves.
936	I am user of street parking becouse I live inside West Parking Zone in Croydon.

937	Objecting to the scheme: I have received no notification, nor have any of my neighbors that this is happening. I speak on behalf of me and my neighbors. The cars on this road do not release any emissions when they are parked!! so adding an emissions tax to stationary cars is just plain stupid. These cars are used for recreational use. Because we live in London the train is easier for traveling into the City. And a car is "only" for driving out of Croydon/London to the countryside (we do live in a suburb! by the way, not in the the city). We tend to do long distance travels to Slovakia and trips around England and to France. With an electric car (maximum range 300miles) to slovakia 1136 miles (20 hours driving) it would cost another 30+ hours just in charging time. And even a hybrid would cost more as on the motorway a the battery would be of no use and just a dead weight. Our car is a recent car 2011 a Renault 1.6 petrol Scenic we would already be on the higher scale band 4. This level has not been put fairly for a recent cars which are still current technology and current emission standards. The government wants to ban diesel. But you want to ban petrol! Our car is a recent car 2011 a Renault 1.6 petrol Scenic we would already be on the higher scale band 4. This level has not been put fairly for a recent cars which are still current technology and current emission standards. The government wants to ban diesel. But you want to ban petrol! The band 4 level should be the current price the existing permit £80. Also a this new emissions permit law should not be done now. It should done in a suitable amount of time of 10+ years in line with the zero emissions laws coming into effect in 2040. This is to allow people to have time to change to new hybrid cars. As for many people have already purchased a new car can't afford to purchase a new car just because you change a law. If the council was to make it a lower emissions zone and force people to use electric cars they should install electric charging points. As I have noted 1 person with an electric car on our street that has his electric charging cable across the street. This is a extremely dangerous trip hazard! A low emission zone cannot be forced unless you install electric points on our road. And enough time is given inline with Londons date set when all cars should be zero emissions in 2040 Hybrid cars get a lower emissions band. Even hybrid cars need charging at a charging point. There is no safe way of charging a car nor any charging points on our road. As most cars are parked here (no engines running) there is no emissions from that car. If you really want to reduce emission you should have signs saying you should switch of engine while waiting... like taxi drivers or mummy waiting in there cars at the local Whitgift school. The is purely an extra tax to the residents of Croydon this act will not reduce this emissions in the town. This is a tax for parked cars. And must not be allowed to go ahead. I notice these references if these charges are to go ahead suitable charging point must be installed at every parking space to allow people to charge their cars to reduce emissions. And as by this you are not allowed to charge more for parking to fund other schemes! 9.5 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. I object to these plans. And these new rules "cannot" go ahead. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/funding-for-thousands-of-electric-car-charge-points-unused-by-councils Did your council take up on this offer. If you did not, then you where not proactively helping to reduce emissions. And this is just a money making scheme Funding for thousands of electric car charge points unused by councils: Ministers have called for local authorities to do more to help reduce carbon emissions and tackle air quality after it emerged just 5 councils in the whole of the UK have taken advantage of an electric car scheme In 2016 the Department for Transport launched the On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme, offering funding for local authorities to buy and install electric car charge points. But the take-up more than a year later has been extremely disappointing.
938	I live and thus have to park in Croydon, using a permit
939	Those who cannot afford to buy a new car are being penalised.

940	I am not directly affected but I feel this change is unfair.
941	There has not been fair warning. The changes hit the less well off who would need help to change their cars - newer cars are out of their price range. I am concerned for young families, the isolated, the elderly and of course the disabled. It is still cheaper for a family to drive than to take pub,ice transport. I'd love to be able to replace my diesel buy a an electric car but they are too expensive. The well off can afford to replace their cars every three years. You will be increasing the divide between rich and poor. If you care about emissions do something about rail fares and services. The charges will help to increase the divide between rich and poor. It is still cheaper to travel by car than by train. Only the privileged can afford to regularly change their car(s!) and most of them have off street parking! We bought a diesel car in good faith believing that it was good for the environment! We'd love to own an electric car. We need help to change it, not penalties. We live In the Restaurant Quarter. Local businesses are really struggling- ramping up the parking costs could wipe it out. Changes need to be phased in compassionately. Consider young families, the elderly, the disabled, the isolated. More front gardens will be lost as residents can no longer afford permits. Be fair. Think again.
942	I understsand a need fpr CPZs in central croydon, but i do not see why we should be charged to park outside our own homes if they are not in the centre or close to a busy high street or have any issues with regards to too many vehicles, also to discourage people to drive into the centre the public transport infrastructure requires review and improvements, with regards to choice, saftey and frequency.
943	Poorest in borough are being targeted
944	I am a pensioner who has lived in Coulsdon since 1991 and suffer from arthritis in my knees. Obviously on a limited income I can't afford a new car, or to pay for increased resident parking fees. The current system is bad enough with having to pay what is quite a large sum for me to park but with no guarantee that I can indeed park in the road where I live. There are so many terraced houses in Coulsdon - do you really want us digging up our front gardens and thus taking away parking spaces just to get off the road?
945	This scheme should be delayed until all parking bays have been fitted with charge points, otherwise it may simply look like a money-making scheme. You cannot ask people to switch to lower emission vehicles without giving them an option to "fuel" their car. Also, I believe the term zero emission is misleading as the electricity needed to run electric vehicles has to be produced and the batteries needed to hold the charge have a limited lifespan and contain toxic materials. If I were in charge I would insist on charge points at every bay and the electricty dispensed to come from 100% renewable sources. Or, better still, the introduction of hydrogen cars should have nationwide support and subsidy.
946	Objection to the scheme. Whilst I am supportive of the desire to reduce vehicle emissions the proposal to introduce emission based charges for parking permits is not the right way to achieve that goal. The residents parking scheme has been very successful in reducing the number of people parking in our streets and walking to the town centre or East Croydon Station, thereby ensuring that residents can park close to their home. However, the proper way to reduce vehicle emissions is to introduce a ULEZ scheme which would impact all vehicles driving in the borough rather than increasing the financial burden on Croydon residents, in particular those on lower incomes who are more likely to have older vehicles that would incur the highest costs simply for parking outside of their home.
947	I am commeting on this scheme as I feel it is less to do with the enviroment and more to do with making money. I also think the administation of this will be enormous and unnecessarily complicated, Some people I know have a differant car every month how is this going to be managed. why if cars and emmissions are such a big issue has my local bus service been slashed fron a 7-10 minute service to every 20 minutes which means I now often take the car as the bus is often late or cancelled.

948	I don't think you should reduce the surcharge for the third residential permit, In fact, you should increase it. With the new prices a property with 3 band 3 vehicles will only pay £1 per year more than they do now. Other combinations of bands will pay a lot less than they do now. I know lower band cars are good because they reduce polution but you should be trying to discourage multiple cars at a property.
949	I consider the proposed charges a tax - I already pay tax on my car related to it's emissions. The proposals do not seem to make reference to how often a vehicle is used, potentially leading to more polluting cars paying lower fees. I'm not convinced that funds raised will be ring-fenced.
950	I think it's just an excuse by a Labour council to raise more money, a stealth tax
951	This is a great idea. I commend the council for pursuing this policy, which is controversial, but required and will bring benefit to all
952	Already under a great deal of financial pressure and a car is a necessity
953	There are problems with the way it had been thought through, impacting on people least able to pay. The higher charges should be introduced when someone applies for a new permit (NOT a renewal). This would mean over time, more polluting cars will be off the road
954	That parked cars do not cause emissions and therefore to charge extra for cars that are parked is totally inappropriate. Many residents have either no personal parking space or inadequate space and are forced to pay for a parking permit outside their house. It is then inappropriate to charge them additionally based on the emissions that they would cause if being driven but not when they are parked.
955	As i feel the charge if parking is already an issue in Croydon, especially for Croydon residents
956	Newer model diesels like mine have low emissions and are much more environmentally friendly that petrol cars in the borough, yet diesel gets penalised!! Its bad enough paying for a parking permit, possibly not even get a parking space and now possibly get charged even more. And every year Croydon council tax continues to increase. Seems very unfair and encourages people to leave the borough and drive back in, which makes emissions worse not better.
957	Objecting. I drive a diesel car with a complex particulate filter system that costs a lot to maintain to keep emissions as low as they can be. I need a car for work (am a district nurse) and often return home late. I value being able to park close to home. I currently pay £80 a year to park on my road yet many other Croydon residents pay nothing at all. I object to paying more because I live in croydon and I object to being surcharged because my vehicle is pre 2015. I cant afford to acquire another car right now. Objecting also for the older people amongst the populace who have older cars, were encouraged to buy diesel (by government) and are now going to get heavily penalised for it. Lots of our older mobile patients are mobile and able to get out by virtue of a car. [same address and surname as 6201695]

958	I object to paying more for a parking permit due to living in the borough of Croydon, I already pay more as a second vehicle registered at this address, however I am heavily dependent on my car to get me to work, which is a long distance on a very poor transport route, I am also dependent on my car due to numerous health conditions, for the many hospital appointments I have to attend and aiding me in getting about day to day due to having limited physical ability. another reason for my objection is that I have to pay to park to be able to park on my road, however there are many roads within my local area where residents do not have to pay to park, along with many other individuals who live in the Croydon area, why should I have to pay in the first place, when there are many who don't?
959	Our road is in consultation with the council regarding a proposed CPZ.
960	i am a car owner who relies on my car to get to work. I live in Croydon. I object because it is a punitive tax which does not address the transport needs of residents who will find it difficult to make other arrangements. My road is of terraced housing and sub-divided larger houses. there is no facility fro electric charging. To get in and out of work it means an arduous and costly train journey.
961	Cause I think croydon council has become the sherif of Nottingham thieving the poor people of croydon
962	Not everyone can afford to upgrade their existing car to meet any new low emission taxes. It feels unfair that people will be taxed to park outside their own houses when we already pay road taxes to drive and park our vehicles on the roads. I am worried this could really affect people with disabilities, children and the elderly who need to be able to park near their homes or not have the money to upgrade their cars. I believe everyone should have the right to park our cars outside their own homes without extra charges.
963	The increased charges will unfairly penalise drivers of older vehicles and confirm that the council has an agenda against motorists
964	Raising parking charges will kill off foot fall in Croydon and penalise low income families more than higher income.
965	Unfair and punitive tax on my car when it is not moving. CO2 emissions only occur when an engine is running not when a car is parked, so a more fair way is to apply charges to a moving vehicle emitting fumes. Furthermore in the area where I have a parking permit, the permit applies for one hour a day only and I can only park when these people move their vehicles out during that one hour period. I can assure you that if this council increases the parking permit fees as proposed, I will cease to have a permit for my car and ensure your income from it is reduced. I do not have a driveway and need my car for work. I will instead drive further to find a non-permit parking area when I return from work and park in a permit area outside the operating hours.
966	I object because firstly having to pay to park outside my own house that I pay council tax for is outrageous. I have a7 seater car to fit all my children and I can’t afford to buy a new car to avoid the extortionate increase which is far in excess of inflation. Concentrate on the vehicles that aren’t taxed/insured/MOT and plant more trees in the streets to improve air quality. This tax is not going to improve the air quality. People will be forced to pay at the expense of other things because it will be cheaper than buying a new car or they will find new ways of avoiding the tax.
967	I don't think that by increasing the parking tax will get us cleaner air. There are other methods that could be tried first.

968	Living and visiting Croydon is becoming increasing expensive. Salaries are not increasing in line with additional expenses. I feel the Council make sufficient money via Council Tax and parking permits and to enforce further charges would be unreasonable.
969	Because I'm a resident and therefore entitled to. Why is this the first question on the form? Is it because you know people will hate the idea and want to filter the responses by those that give you the answer you want?
970	It is affecting those who are already struggling financially
971	Too sudden without any notice or time to budget. I agree with the emissions reduction sentiment, but to introduce this in October 2019 with over the double the current resident parking permit is very short-sighted. It is also unfair because many of the residential roads are not regulated. Would it not be more sensible to extend the parking charges zone and raise more money/deter parking this way? Why should just a few streets bear the burden?
972	If put into practice this strategy will financially affect me. Once all council owned and private car parks with parking for 50 or more vehicles are provided with 10% minimum electric high power chargers, and all street lights have charging points borough wide, then will be the time to switch to electric cars. The council mustn't tax drivers without an alternative provision in place FIRST, nor force people into debt or off the road without allowing for alternative private transport - and not to rely on the bus! We don't want to be collateral damage in school fights during morning and afternoon times.
973	At the owner of a property in central Croydon I am concerned about any proposals affecting the area.
974	The timescale for introducing this policy is far too short to allow for a reasonable adjustment by residents. The effect of the proposed charges will have a disproportionately adverse effect on poorer residents. The alternative vehicles that would reduce emissions (not everyone can use public transport for work, etc..) are far too expensive at this point. Combined with residual values being further diminished by this policy, if introduced, many people will not be inclined or able to change to cleaner vehicles.
975	These proposals take no recognition of the difficulties that will be faced by the elderly and those who are unable to afford to update their vehicles to conform to these proposals. The result will be that very many elderly and less affluent or on low income will be forced to forgo the use of their existing vehicles and as a consequence have their opportunities for personal travel greatly constrained leading them to become housebound and isolated with reduced human contact.
976	This appears nothing more than increasing tax income for the council. An attempt to tax borough residents and business drivers off the roads without providing an alternative first. If the council were serious about cleaning the air, they'd ensure and guarantee that suitable and adequate electric charging points were in place first, not at any time or years later / rely upon market forces. Whilst I'm considering switching to electric only myself, I live in a Victorian property with no private parking or driveway; often can't park on my own street. How can I buy an electric only vehicle if I can't guarantee being able to charge it for use the following day? If the council want to role out such a strategy, then they should ensure that all council and private shopping facilities with parking of more than 50 vehicles are provided with 10% minimum high power rapid charging points + 50% of all council street lights are fitted with rapid chargers, and no chargers should be out of service for more than 48 hours. This would would be a worthwhile citizens pledge. Presently the likes of Jaguar have released their I-Pace for £75,000, and Tesla for more. This translates to a leased car of approx £800 per month. Car manufacturers are 2-5 years away from making sub-£25k cars available to motorists, so why are the council trying to beat the market? Just to raise income revenue?? Please advise. [same respondent as online response ID6201897]

977	AS a resident I object, reason being its not the cars, its the lorries , trucks and the newly built furnace that`s polluting the air. When a car gets tested and passes the M.O.T why should we it get penalised for it
978	Whilst I fully understand the reasons for cleaner air (recently being prescribed asthma pumps) as the public we are always misinformed and then punished when this misinformation changes affecting us financially and physically. Many are not in a position to keep changing their cars and lifestyle when the government changes the rules, plans or expectations. There needs to be a rational way of not always impoverishinf those in the lower income, people with children, on benefits, disability or elderly etc It's always those who suffer. Maybe of the 1000s of properties being built where there is very little/no parking or social housing is the aim of it all
979	Car tax already takes this into consideration when charging car owners. This just sounds like another excuse for Croydon to make money. You've just introduced permitted to the area. It's very soon to try to be introducing further charges to residents of the area. What does parking have to do with emission? The frequency of use of a vehicle isn't considered in this scheme. How would you charge someone that uses their car on weekends only the same amount as someone that drones daily. There are other ways you could help the environment. I don't think this scheme is the best solution.
980	We need a fair parking system for everyone one senior people over 65 and those with disabled badges should get first hour free,then everyone pays high st should be first hour free for everyone to help shops.council should fund and help replacement car scheme with all the extra money from parking taxes.
981	Proposed large increase in charges will impact upon the elderly and persons on benefits
982	I object to the proposed increase as I feel that pollution would be better addressed via the MOT and car tax system this would mean everyone would be treated fairly across the whole country. The proposed increase for older cars hits those that cannot afford to buy newer cars and could lead to an increase in uninsured vehicles on our roads as people pay to park instead of insure their vehicles which would be a greater risk. My vehicle is a diesel built in 2012 when I purchased the vehicle it was considered better for the environment and now I am being penalised for doing the right thing at the time, I cannot afford to change my car yet. Also my car does not qualify for the diesel scrappage scheme which I believe covers the following: *To qualify for the schemes the car you're trading in must comply with Euro 1-4 emissions standards, which generally means it will have been first registered before 31 December 2009.* If the car is not valid for the government scrappage scheme it should not be included in the parking levy.
983	Most people are unable to immediately change their car to a low emission or electric type for financial reasons. If Croydon Council were to be proactive in introducing electric charging points then people might be able to seriously consider changing to a hybrid or electric vehicle in the future. So I think that simply penalising motorists for the type of car that they currently own is not fair and there should be a more constructive policy to make it viable for change to electric / hybrid vehicles maybe over a 10-year period.

984	I am a Croydon resident, interested in the environment and what is happening locally. The car driver is always a "cash cow" for any local authority, but it does seem that there is a war against drivers in the borough. Central parking charges pushed cars out into the surrounding streets. Those areas were then made residents' parking only, for a fee.. Drivers then parked further out and took a train or bus into the centre. Surrounding streets get congested. Parking at stations outside Croydon, encouraging park n ride, would have been good, but these car parks are being shrunk or eliminated and charges hiked. New housing often has no parking at all - pushing drivers onto the streets. Council owned garages are being demolished, pushing more cars on the streets. The car is a reality. For too long Croydon has seen the car as an enemy, to be used as a cash cow when it comes to parking charges. Instead of sensible parking, cars have been pushed out into the residential streets, causing problems and so changed to permit parking - raising additional revenue. Cars have just moved further away. Park and ride at stations would be a good idea, but these car parks are being eliminated, others shrunk in size and charges hiked. Forcing cars onto the surrounding streets. Council owned garages are being demolished and cars again forced onto the streets. New housing has no parking, forcing cars onto the streets. The car is a reality. Time for a carrot and not a stick, which hits those least able to afford the fees.
985	I don’t believe it will work in lowering emissions and will hit hardest financially the residents than commuters. Croydon council has several times brought in schemes that have failed to do what they claimed was the intended purpose. Parking in my own road was ok in areas and the changes just over the problem area at cost of residents. This will hit the elderly most and is unjust.
986	I strongly object to this scheme. It is discriminatory to people who cannot yet afford more up to date and less polluting vehicles. The people who already own these older vehicles are paying higher road fund rates as a penalty. All parking spaces for residents should have the same rates and the owners of older vehicles should not be penalised by the Council. The Council should show equal respect to all it's residents and charge the same amount for all of them. The further part of this proposal regarding introducing a charge for parking on their own frontage or driveway is totally outrageous and even unimaginable to a decent and fair minded individual. The Council should not action any of this proposal because it will cause extra financial worries on residents. I am extremely disappointed.
987	I am concerned for my two daughters who are both new drivers on low incomes. They cannot afford to upgrade their cars to models with lower parking charges but both use their cars to get to work and often have to park on the street in a CPZ. Increased parking charge will hit them hardest and yet they can least afford it. I am concerned for other low income people such as the elderly. I further worry that the Council will use this "environmental initiative" to expand CPZs to areas that are not currently controlled, increasing the financial burden upon those least able to bear it. Finally, I am concerned that the council will also expand Residents Parking zones to areas that are not currently covered, just to raise revenue.
988	As with everything the most needy will be hit the hardest. I could never afford to buy an electric car and where would I charge it anyways? More and more people are moving into Croydon, high rise blocks are going up as quick as we can blink and the majority of them will have cars too but unlike many of us will be able to afford to pay whatever levy is placed on them for owning 'gas guzzling' cars or cars newer than 2001. Will the less well-off be forced to move out of Croydon and if so can they afford to? I know I can't.
989	I object to the emission based charge as I believe it will penalise those in the community who are least able to afford even more stealth taxes. My husband drives a 2003 company diesel vehicle, why should he be penalised because the company will not change his vehicle? He already is taxed highly on the CC emissions. My daughter is a newly qualified nurse working outside the borough and relies on her 2004 vehicle which she purchased last year, as it was the only one she could afford without getting herself into serious debt. She too will be penalised through this tax. I believe it should be the Government who are dictating to vehicle manufacturers to the types of vehicle they manufacture and are available for purchasing in the UK and not business dictating what they will provide.

990	People who own cars built before 2001 don't do that by choice- it is all they can afford! Effectively, this is a tax on the least well off!!
991	Because you have lost sight of the bigger picture. 1) Your banding is unnecessarily complicated and does not align with central London's ULEZ. 2) I read there are 3,600 on-street parking bays in Croydon of which many are occupied by the same car that doesn't move most of the day so no pollution there then, yet you have given permission for approx 9,000 vehicles from outside the borough to vist Westfield in the centre of Croydon every day. (3 x 3000 parking spaces). Only moving vehicles and vehicles stuck in traffic jams cause pollution. 3) Gross unfairness to the older and poorer people of Croydon who are more likely to have an older car, live on streets with no off-road parking and can't afford to replace with a new one. Just rely on natural attrition, peripheral car parks and park'ride
992	Because I disagree with this. The Council are penalising ordinary people not for clean air, but to get more money by any means possible. The Council should look at other cost savings!
993	It's all very well taxing residents (who already pay road tax to central government based upon emissions), but this appears another ill thought through process. Those residents who provide care on zero hours contracts to our elderly who are paid close to the minimum wage will struggle to pay (if at all), they won't be able to afford replacement cars either. The borough's pensioners, with often one caring for their elderly spouse will likely be able to pay either. Those families on low incomes who have more than three children and can therefore only use an MPV to drive their family about using old MPVs will suffer too. Regardless of political persuasion, this can only be seen as a tax in low income families, those who need every penny the most. This is a classic case of running before one can walk. Grab the money before a viable alternative is made available. For those who would like to switch but can't surely ought to be the first step, at least this would start to improve air quality. Others would be tempted follow if suitable and adequate charging was available. Start with the supermarket carparks, those providing parking provision to Centrale, etc. Once they're in place, then those with out off street parking could take the risk of buying electric only cars. [same respondent as email15 and online response ID6201897]
994	This scheme will target the more vulnerable members of our community including the disabled and those on low income. In order to change to an emission zone, surely the council would need permission from the Mayor of London. You have not made it clear as to whether it's a parking control initiative or a low emission zone. If it is a parking control initiative, how you can you legally enforce it against people who park off road ie driveways and private roads/land. Will people who travel into Croydon, therefore be expected to pay yet another charge as they do in London, should the council make Croydon a low emission zone? Surely an emission zone would require an enormous amount of investment to provide the technology needed to monitor, register and charge all outgoing and incoming vehicles. [same address as 6202112]
995	You are hitting those who can least afford it, as usual.
996	I object to this scheme there more urgent problems to sort first, multiple fights between school children(out of control thugs) as seen in Croydon over the last few weeks.Also the so called improvements to Croydons shopping areas and allowing apartments to be built on any piece of land that becomes available.

997	The large increase in parking permits may be a concern for potential developers trying to encourage extra footfall, which is already low, to their retail and entertainment venues, and would certainly put off anyone wanting to shop here. Residents who need to use their vehicles for work may already be strapped for cash - to find the extra for some won't be difficult, and therefore would not improve air quality. To penalise those who have made the switch to hybrid cars, that are already low emission, is grossly unfair. Croydon central is becoming a less attractive place to visit, the extra costs to park will only serve to drive people away from the area than to it. Croydon residents and businesses will be worse off should this scheme be introduced.
998	As a car owner who only uses my car for social and domestic use, I feel it is unfair to charge extra to park outside my own house. I commute everyday using public transport. I do not drive in to London, I always use public transport. I have recently changed my car from a diesel which 7 years ago was the recommended thing to drive, now I am being penalised for owning a petrol car which is free in the ULEZ. I have gone from £30 car tax a year to £140 so already pay a large sum to use the roads. Families on a a low income who cannot afford to buy a new car that conforms to emission standards will also be penalised.
999	1: This is completely flawed! You are basing it mostly on C02 which is completely harmless to Humans! 2: The pricing structure is completely unfair & quite simply bonkers. For example I drive a 2.5 turbo .I pay £540 in road tax and do 1000 miles a year. Next door with his 3 year old 1L eco boost focus does 10000 miles and pays £30 so presume his permit should go down in price! NO even he with have to pay more! 3: Even if I drive my 2006 2.5 turbo into the low emission zone in central London I don't need to pay it!!!! 4: Even someone riding a bicycle puts out more c02 than the cheapest band though their own breath!! 5: This is about parking not driving!! 6: Whatever next? Council Tax based on how efficient your home is?
1000	I strongly object. Whilst I won't be directly affected as I don't live in a CPZ, this is just another stealth tax which will hit the poorest members of the community hardest as they will be the owners of older vehicles.
1001	Object due to additional tax burden that will hit poorest families the hardest.
1002	It is a cynical attempt to raise money whilst targeting vulnerable people. Perhaps the council will only be satisfied when everyone is totally isolated and they control every aspect of our lives?
1003	I wish to oppose the above application where Croydon Council are planning with regards to parking fees for residents. [same respondent as online response ID6184371]
1004	I live, seive and paek in Croydon
1005	Why are you finding more ways to squeeze more money out of us? Next you will be charging us to breathe!!
1006	I object for the following reasons : Proposed bands do not reflect the existing car tax bands. Why complicate things ? Parked cars don't throw out fumes. Westfield will attract more cars whilst tram frequency increase with 'loop'mnow cancelled. You have made a decision to spend council funds purchasing Collonades retail park - a site almost exclusively accessed by cars. You already fail to enforce parking controls (Boxpark) allowing dangerous parking and driving by customers and delivery drivers. Dingwall Road multi-storey is practically empty since you sold it off. Parking restrictions imposed by planning approvals are not enforced - 14b (4 spaces) & 14c (3 spaces) Sydenham Road with 14c regularly exceeding permitted spaces. Construction vehicles used outside of permitted hours.....

1007	I live and go into Croydon to shop etc.
1008	I frequently use Council parking services and so would be adversely impacted by any increase in cost. I am a pensioner who cannot afford to upgrade my car to a fully electric type.
1009	I am 64, unemployed, living on an extremely low private pension on which I am just about able to run my 22 year old car which I have had for 19 years. I use public transport whenever I can but there are times when this is not convenient which is when my car is vital. My average mileage over the past 6 years, is 1,307 pa which I think you would agree is not excessive so does NOT hugely contribute to the emissions you claim you are trying to reduce. Surely the emission levels should be based on usage & not on vehicle age as I'm sure I do way less mileage than the average motorist yet I am being penalised in a disproportionate manor when my vehicle is parked the majority of the time so not causing any pollution at all. I therefore object most strongly against this wholly unfair tax.
1010	There is already enough stress being caused by the problems of parking wherever you go within Central and North Croydon inside the Zones and nearby the zones where people park away from their houses when it is worth a little walk to save a few pounds. As an old person with an old car I would be paying the highest rate but would be a small mileage user therefore causing less pollution than a younger car that does lots of mileage, more pollution but pays less.
1011	My reason for commenting is that this scheme will impact heavily on those unable to own a low emission vehicle for financial reasons . It will therefore mostly effect those on low incomes and those under financial pressure such as families and retired persons . Rather than hike prices surely it would be better to use a carrot rather than a stick policy. ie providing reduced parking charges for low emission cars, for those used infrequently quite often these are older retirees who maybe go shopping /visiting once a week etc.. Working with dealers to offer scrappage schemes not just for new vehicles but also for suitable used vehicles. The proposed scheme smacks of the council raising money from those least able to afford it. For the record I do not live in a CPZ and park my car off road.
1012	The Emission-based charges will prove incredibly expensive and a financial burden for our family who relay on our vehicle to work and make a living. The Emission-based charges will also deter future home buyers to the area, and in the long term putting Croydon at the bottom of lists for places to live. Also, the scheme will only work in favour of wealthier households and the council, it will squeeze the pockets of poorer or less fortunate families. The council should take the charges to businesses only those who commute heavily rather than squeeze citizens of the borough.
1013	We have already had council tax raised and yet pot holes aren't filled and streets remain dirty. People are being made to pay exorbitant amounts for cars, which MOT has already deemed safe to drive with safe emission levels. As a local educator I find this will put necessary stress on my already stretched finances. [same address as 6202326]
1014	I object to the proposal because of the impact on peoples mobility, the effect on business and commuting. You cannot change the motoring ethos that has evolved over years to what it is today overnight by imposing financial pressures to get people to use other forms of transport. Viable, affordable alternatives have to be in place first. Look at the cost of rail travel!!! What about people who live away from accessible transport routes. Emission based parking charges are weird anyway as when your vehicle is parked with the engine off there is no emission. Therefore it follows that people should be encouraged to park for as long as possible if emissions are of real concern to the Council. A parking encouragement discount would be more appropriate and would make Croydon more accessible.

1015	I have a parking permit and I live in […]. After looking at the costs of the permits I think emission based parking is a good idea. We have 2 cars in our family home, one of them registered before 2001. We will be getting rid of this car as we don't really need it, or drive it much. It is a higher polluting vehicle and it will save us money in the long run if we dispose of it and hopefully help our environment. Yippee. Well done Croydon Council. Now we need wildflower verges everywhere to help our insect population.
1016	Already pay too much in parking charges to park at my own adddress When cpfc are playing at home I can't usually get parked so the council get 2x payment for the same space
1017	I think you are misjudging the mood of the local electorate. With council tax rises, no decent pay rises and the cost of living going up and up the last thing we need is to now have pay for parking on our own driveway/street/garage on an emission based basis. Money only goes so far and these back door taxes are going to push us over the brink - please keep things as they are - we cannot afford to live as it is!
1018	Croydon has some of the worst road layouts in the country. It seems they want cars to be sitting stationary for longer, spewing more pollution than is necessary. They also seem happy to allow family houses to be "developed" into blocks of flats that have more cars per building than car parking or street parking allows. Any park and ride schemes want to cream as much money out of drivers through excessive charges than encouraging them to split their commute between the necessary car and train/tram/bus. The bus service is erratic and unreliable - in the morning you have to either travel stupidly early or face full trains, full buses or full trams; having to let full trains/buses/trams go by, waiting for the next, then the next. I object to the stick being employed instead of carrots.
1019	While I agree with the aim of protecting the environment, and would love to see further similar initiatives from our borough to do so, I strongly believe that this initiative will simply harm working class families who in an area such as ours heavily rely on personal vehicles to get to work or perform their work (I.e van drivers for self owned businesses). We would be better targeting residential approaches to improving this area. https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/a-local-approach-to-reducing-co2-emissions
1020	I object - Croydon Councils road & traffic flow changes & the use of 20mh speed limits across the borough have created traffic flow issues & therefore increased the amount of car emissions. At this speed engines are not operating efficiently thus more CO2 emissions. You have created the congestion issues & thus raised the CO2 levels & you want to charge drivers/car owners for a problem you have deliberately created. You want us all to have electric cars but where are the charging points for all these cars? Yes we know that they don't exist. Charge first & put the infrastructure in afterwards! You state you want residents to have "Happy, healthy & independent lives" but how can we be independent & happy if you dictate how we live & travel? + where & what will this new tax be used for?
1021	I object. The proposals are punitive and indiscriminate, and not a rational, proportionate or evidence based means of achieving a reduction in numbers of vehicles or increase in air quality, or any other legitimate policy outcome. It is grossly unfair to charge residents simply for parking their vehicle at home, even if they do not use it and therefore cause emissions. This risks discriminating against those with limited mobility, the elderly, parents of young children, etc who may rely on their vehicle. Emissions are already targeted through road tax.
1022	Raising charges does not improve the air

1023	As a long term Croydon resident I am totally against this proposal. The cars coming to the borough are more of a problem. Croydon is already decimated after the Westfield disaster . Any decent residents will just move to another area . Croydon has become dangerous now you are wrecking lives by preventing transportation without extreme costs is Croydon as a nice area going to not excist. Labour council is ruining what is left of a decent area
1024	Objection - charges in and around the central Croydon area are exorbitant
1025	I object most strongly to the proposed charges for having a vehicle in Croydon . It will deter visitors shoppers and businesses from entering Croydon. It also smacks of big brother dictating to the masses. I think it will encourage civil unrest in response to the proposed charges. Croydon is in severe decline and this proposal will only accelerate that decline. Any local political party that opposes this or states that it will rescind this proposal will win by a landslide. Please use your common sense don't keep penalizing the motorist they pay enough in taxes. The debate 're pollution needs to be addressed on a national basis not local whims to raise more money. I look forward to the proposal being rescinded.
1026	NO, NO, NO to the proposed scheme. It is grossly unfair on current resident permit holders. Other residents who do not require permits (those with a driveway, for example) will pay nothing, irrespective of the type of vehicles that they own. Pollution is not only caused by vehicles owned by resident permit holders. ALL vehicles going through the borough are polluting, whether they are from Bromley or from Brighton. Why should Croydon permit holders be penalised? To reduce pollution, it is car usage that should be charged, not car ownership or parking space permits - driving 50 miles is more polluting than driving 10 miles. Now I know why the council was SO keen to implement the residents' parking scheme in my area. Squeeze them for the permit, then squeeze them again for surcharges!
1027	I do not feel a borough I live and pay tax in, I should also pay for an emissions tax. I have no choice but to travel in and around Croydon. My children go to school here, I work here, it would be unreasonable.
1028	You're doing it backwards. The reason I have a car is because public transport is woefully insufficient in this area. You should read Caroline Criado-Perez's book about the misogyny of our transport system to understand how not everyone goes into and out of town, and how women's journeys are frequently *across* the existing branches of the network. If you offered sensible public transport options people would use them, but until you do, don't punish citizens for your failure to do so.
1029	Having to pay car tax and council tax another additional tax on my already taxed salary is going to put not just me but other families in a very difficult position. I object to the scheme as it seems this is just another money making project . By taxing local people all you will do is force people further into hardship and not have a big impact on air quality. You should be able to find schemes to encourage people into public transport instead of taxing taxing taxing. Quick fix money making schemes.
1030	It is surely just another way of Croydon council making extra money. Penalising those like me who can't afford to buy a new car.
1031	Me and my partner use public transport back an forth work every day of the week. The car is only ever used for our independence. Things like food shopping and weekends away. Why should we have to pay to park outside our property when the vehicle is barely used.

1032	I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce emissions-based parking charges. Firstly, I do not agree with your proposal to charge people for their car use at precisely the spot where their cars emit nothing: parked outside their houses. Presumably you have decided that using a fairer way (such as using ULEZ technology to tackle cars when in motion) is too impractical/expensive? So why then make it even more unfair by ignoring sensible emission levels, such as those used in the ULEZ scheme? I own a car which I bought brand new in 2004, fifteen years ago. It's a Panda Dynamic 1.2 with emissions of 133g/km - sold to me on the basis of it having extremely low emissions. Occasionally, due to the nature of my freelance work, it is necessary for me to travel into central London by car so that I can return home late at night. On hearing about the new ULEZ scheme being introduced in Central London, I was relieved to find on checking that, due to my good decision 15 years ago, my car's emissions are classed as low enough for it to be exempt from the charge. Why then have you classed my car in Band 3 and are therefore threatening me with an increase of £24, a 30% rise, per year to park it in the road outside my flat? This can't be justified on the basis of air quality and looks to be simply a revenue-collecting exercise. Additionally, I use my car only occasionally at all - I value public transport and use it every day for work and leisure. I needed my car when I lived in rural Scotland and saw no reason to get rid of it when I moved to London. I do not use my car every day; I use it mainly for driving to my parents in Kent and to my parents-in-law in Somerset (neither is easy by public transport). I never drive into Croydon town centre - why would I when the tram is so useful?! Furthermore, at the moment, mine is one of only three roads in Addiscombe in which I need a parking permit at all (presumably due to my proximity to the tram stop). Many of my neighbours in other roads in Addiscombe have cars (larger, more modern, with greater emission levels) and therefore charging only those who already pay to park their cars close to their homes is not an efficient or fair proposal. Rather than penalising personal car use, I would suggest that the driving patterns of taxis - both black cabs and private cabs - and of council vehicles need to be addressed urgently. Often there are cars parked up in my road (a one-way road) with engines running for up to half an hour. I ask them frequently to stop their engines. Walking through the roads between Addiscombe and Croydon town centre, I come across countless stationary vehicles with engines running - this is a big problem. Fine them. Please reconsider this proposal. [same respondent as online response ID6183295]
1033	I leave in Croydon and this will affect me and my family. Not happy with council/ Gov's plan.
1034	Opposed to additional taxation on parking and vehicle use.
1035	I live in and around streets that require parking permits. The permit charge is already very high. The proposed scheme will only penalise those who can’t afford newer cars
1036	I object to this policy being implemented so quickly. The poorest residents will be hit hardest. The richest the least impacted. The timescales are too rapid to be fair to the low paid who need their vehicles for work. The extension by 2022 of the policy to cover on and off road parking for all residents is frankly a money making scam for the council. We already pay VED and fuel taxes that address car type/consumption/emissions and Croydon council is not justified in adding a local burden in this way. This policy will make this borough a no-go area for out-of-borough shoppers. How will big-spending Westfield shoppers struggle home with their shopping on the buses and trams? Croydoners will be further impacted by higher prices as tradespeople defray these higher charges.

1037	I live in the borough of Croydon.
1038	Want to have a say on yet another charge put on residents and car drivers!
1039	Whilst I agree that action is needed to address air pollution I think this approach is inequitable. My reasons for saying this are: Vehicles passing through Croydon will be unaffected The charge is not based on use and it is use that creates the pollution Vehicles parked off street are already paying a graded charge based on emissions through VED and car tax Alternates: Perhaps pressure should be brought on the government to address this nationally through VED or car tax Could the Mayor of London ULEZ scheme be extended to Outer London to include Croydon? Thanks
1040	Impacts poorest in Croydon, richest are least affected. There are already central govt taxes (fuel, VED) that tax older vehicles. Those with older vehicles are taxed higher and they'll get nothing for them this sort of tax cannot be standalone, there must also be a scrappage incentive too.
1041	I pay t park outside my house or to park in the vicinity of the station. I am retired and make good use of the freedom pass. I am retired and am concerned for personal safety when I return late at night. My annual mileage is low and is incurred when I drive to the Hampshire to visit my mother in a care home. The consultation does not address the question of visitors to those of us who live in CPZs. What will be the rules for tradesmen or delivery vans?
1042	I am a council tax paying resident with cars and disagree with increased parking charges. Other Boroughs are not ad hifh
1043	I support environmental policies. Older inefficient vehicles should be penalised. However owners of diesel vans either run businesses which contribute to the Croydon economy or use them as motor homes which actually reduces their carbon footprint since they fly less or take package holidays. Furthermore, an environmental policy needs to focus on promoting other sustainable means of transport. Improve the cycling, walkways, and penalise households of multiple vehicles who's carbon emissions are greater than a household with one van. We have a diesel campervan but only use bicycles to get around locally as we have no car. Therefore I oppose this particular money spinner. We already pay £1200 in Council tax.
1044	You will be forcing older and low paid people off the roads. They very often need their cars for work, getting to the shops, getting to appointments or to see their families and friends.
1045	I support any efforts to improve air quality and reduce emissions, however all policies should be considered holistically. It is likely that many people that will be affected will be the least well off in our community, and alternatives to parking their high emissions vehicles must be considered, e.g. means testing to vary the rates charged, any revenue generated can go towards grants to purchase lower emission vehicles, better provision of car clubs, exceptions/reductions for people with or working with elderly and disabled etc.
1046	I object to Croydon trying to slip this one under the radar The proposals are ill-conceived & clearly more a money grabbing exercise dressed up as being enviro-friendly: Stricter emissions criteria incl DP & PP levels & enforcement?!! Locally taxing people for having a vehicle that was promoted by central government is about as cynical as it gets If every LA used the same parking meter system that took 'Touch-in, touch-out' cards it would be a miracle Why do you propose to tax plug-in hybrids the same as conventional? Surely, they should be encouraged as being more enviro-friendly Rather than tax plug-ins why don't you put some thought to encouraging their use when a lot of Croydoners don't have driveways & leads could only cross pavements. No I don't own one I'm just thinking objectively!
1047	The cost is extortionate and I see it as purely a money making scheme for Croydon Council. It unfairly penalises poorer members of our community.

1048	my concerns are around visiting and working in the borough. I lived in Croydon for 32 year of my life and have strong family and friendship ties to the borough. I also work there too. so I'm concerned how this is going to affect me. especially as I regularly visit my elderly parent in the borough.
1049	Once again I find out about proposals from Croydon Council via a neighbour and not by any attempt by Croydon council to engage with it's residents. Successive governments have actively encouraged the use of diesel cars for many years, initially providing financial incentives via cheaper fuel costs and now has swung completely against diesel as scientific opinion has done yet another u turn. Your proposals discriminate against anyone who owns a diesel vehicle over 4 years old. Do you believe that everyone is in the financial position to change vehicles because government got it wrong? Your proposals are a thinly veiled money grab and will cause even more difficulties for local shops and businesses whose interests you are supposed to serve.
1050	Because I am unhappy at the proposals. [same address as 6183453]
1051	We do not want this scheme introduced. We already have parking bays, red route and yellow lines in our cul de sac. We often struggle to find parking for all the current residents!!!
1052	The cost is outrageous. I am fed up with the corrupt Croydon council literally stealing money from hard working honest folk. How is this justifiable? If you want to raise revenue through parking then please come to Suffolk rd SE25 6EY on a Sunday where people park their cars all over the pavement to go to that wretched church and think they have the right to park all over people's drives/ front gates etc. This would be fairer but then of course you wouldn't do that would you, eh?
1053	I do not agree with adding another tax to the cost of running a car. I do not believe the scheme will reduce the use of cars and is merely a cash cow for the council. We should be looking to fix the numerous potholes that exist around the borough. Look at how you are wasting money, an example is the signage for the introduction of 20 mile limits, a signpost was erected about 6 foot from the end of the dead end road, what a waste of money!
1054	The proposals are disgusting. Once again, the poor and the elderly are being targeted by unfair taxation. This on top of the council's constant increases in community charge is just too much considering the poor quality of their services.
1055	I am objecting to the scheme as I already pay to park on street at home pay emissions related road fund tax and the tax on the fuel I use as always the council regard residents and drivers as an easy source of revenue to prop up the boroughs income. The air quality is suffering but from the over development of east and central Croydon.
1056	This is clearly just a revenue generating scheme
1057	Would like to know why there have been no leaflets from the Council posted to residents affected by this stealth tax. Parked cars do not cause pollution and will not stop the amount of cars already owned on the streets. Building more and more luxury high rise flats in and around the town centre without providing more social infrastructure eg Doctors Surgeries etc will cause more damage to the community along with the Beddington Incinerator spewing out pollution.

1058	It feels as though this scheme will be penalising those who have chosen to park their cars rather than use them. In my example I used to drive to work everyday, therefore I did not need a parking permit and therefore never bought one. I have since changed jobs and have decided to use public transport to get to work, leaving my car at home and paying for a permit. With this proposal I will pay more even money to leave my car at home. This seems to fly in the face of the general push to stop the public using their cars as much and encourage them back into them. In my case it is still cheaper to use public transport and leave the car at home, but I'm sure that it isn't as clear cut for other road users.
1059	I am a permit holder living on Croydon
1060	PARKED CARS DO NOT GIVE OFF EMISSIONS. I have a resident's parking permit to park outside my house. I am not increasing emissions by parking there.The Council is using people's concerns about air pollution. to make money I am an OAP with an eleven year old car Wealthy residents with newer cars will pay less while older people will be penalised. Manufacturing new cars and scrapping old ones is in itself environmentally unfriendly. I have a prking permit for my own convenience so that I do not have to be going in and out of my garage. However if the new charges are introduced I shall not buy a permit. A lot of residents choose to park in front of gargaes and block access rather than pay for a permit. This practice can only get worse with the new proposed charges..
1061	Cannot afford to be paying. Use public transport as is and the car rarely useful. Another way for Croydon council to tax taxpayers. Having a car cost enough as it is.
1062	I'm a Croydon resident, and work on environmental policy. The Council cites air quality and congestion as justfications for this policy, but C02-based charging tackles neither. Every car contributes to congestion, so why should the C02 output determine the level of charge? The main driver of air quality issues in urban areas is particulate matter from exhaust fumes, tyres, brake pads and road dust. Again, C02 charging does nothing to solve this. Even the proposed diesel surcharge is only a partial solution. Even if you were to accept that an extra C02 charge was justified on climate change grounds, why should a resident who lives on one particular street pay the charge, whilst those on an adjacent street do not? All C02 emmissions are bad, and already taxed via VED and Fuel Duty. [same respondents as email22 and same address as respondent 6202935]
1063	Car owner in Croydon. I object to this scheme and proposal because it will penalise owners of older cars - particularly those on low incomes and the elderly - who cannot afford to replace their car. The proposal is also encouraging electric cars, however, Croydon does not have sufficient electric car charging infrastructure to make owning an electric vehicle (without a driveway, garage etc.) a viable option. A scheme like this would make sense once Croydon had many thousands of on-street electric car chargers - one for every parking space (residents permit, pay and display, council car park). Otherwise, as it is at the moment, it is 'cart before horse'.
1064	I believe charges should be reasonable and fair.
1065	Croydon Resident
1066	Do not believe this is a fair tax as car is needed because of wife’s illness . 2 alternative transport is not safe due to high knife crime in Croydon
1067	I’m a resident in Croydon and jointly with my partner own a car. which we only use occasionally - mostly for journeys to the south coast or to visit relatives in Cheshire, if train services are poor/more expensive than petrol. The charges will affect me directly. My daily work and leisure commute is by bike or train, depending on weather conditions. I have a strong interest in helping the council reduce air pollution in the area but don’t agree current proposals will deliver the desired outcome.

1068	I object to this scheme because it is targeting the wrong people if you truly want to target emissions. Emissions are caused by vehicles entering Croydon, not parked. A congestion charge would be more appropriate. Also most properties in the zone do not have off street parking so this is a very unfair tax on the less wealthy. This would only be fair if every property in Croydon was subject to this charge. [same address as 6202997 and 6202940]
1069	I object to this scheme as I feel increasing the price of residents permits is merely a revenue raising scheme and nothing to do with controlling air pollution. Residents parked cars do not emit pollution, however the thousands of people who travel into Croydon everyday to work by car from outside the cpz pollute the air morning and evening, 5 days a week. That's without the hundreds of shoppers that drive into Croydon. Why are you not implementing a congestion charge to control air pollution as has been successfully implemented in central London? [same address as 6202929 and 6202997]
1070	Your penalising those who are are low or middle earners and can't afford to change their car. While helping the wealthy get extra parking spaces for their new vehicles. I suffer with a condition that prevents me from using public transport but does not qualify me for a disabled badge and I feel that you are pricing me out of Croydon. We already pay what I consider to be a high price for a permit that does not even guarantee us a parking space.
1071	Can't afford the increase. Didn't have parking permit on my road when I bought the house now feel penalised. I pay a mortgage I have to drive to work as transport is not appropriate and I am a carer so need the car to be as close to my house as possible.
1072	I object. It is massively unfair to target the permit holders. We're easy targets & it takes no effort as you already have our car details. It's the wrong way round, its not the permit holders that are responsible for the old air quality. I personally need a permit because I DON'T drive my car to work as I travel on the train. My car is used in the evenings & weekend when the roads are quite. The Council should be looking at the people who are causing the problem & that's the people who drive their cars everyday through central Croydon to work or drop off/pick up from school. Most won't have permits because they are driving their cars between 9-5. You should be targeting them. A congestion charge in central Croydon would encourage people to take train/bus
1073	I am resident in this borough and own a car in the highest category It is used very little and a charge truly based on actual emissions would find little to charge for. As a pensioner I cannot afford to buy a new car. I also do not believe that electric cars really have any saving since the power stations producing the electricity to power these vehicles produce plenty of emissions in their turn. Moreover I understand that the cars' batteries are very large, heavy and extremely difficult to recycle. One day will there be a sudden about-turn as with diesel cars when the expense of dealing with these redundant batteries starts to be felt? I also wonder if you have thought of the realities of having all electric cars. Do we find ourselves tripping over countless wires across the pavement?
1074	There should not be any changes in the current permit policy. The proposed policy is unfair and low income families and oap will get affected. Keeping 20mph i some roads will increase air pollution, bring it back to 30mph
1075	I am opposed to Croydon Council's plan to increase parking permit costs by 275% - an unaffordable tax on Croydon's elderly residents, those on low-incomes and those who rely on their vehicles for work. This will penalise the poorer people in Croydon who cannot afford to change their cars nor buy expensive cars I know that the Council is proactively trying to force people out of their cars but it is no practicable particularly for the elderly and disabled to shop by walking, cycles or public transport which do not stop outside or very near to their homes. Eventually, after the government encouraged people to buy diesel cars (and which I expect many made a good profit from) very soon it will be realised that batteries in electronic car are a greater pollutant than many other things.

1076	Whilst I agree that reducing pollution caused by traffic is very important, I object to the scheme that is being proposed, as the increase in cost for parking permits is very steep. This will adversely affect those on low incomes, those on fixed incomes (e.g. pensioners) and those who have to have a car in order to get to work. I am a resident who would be affected by the increase in the cost of a parking permit. One of the causes of increase in traffic levels, is the increase in density of housing in some areas. Whilst I accept the need for more housing, the huge increase in the number of flats in central Croydon is leading to a large increase in traffic volumes, road congestion, and hence more traffic pollution. This is caused by the Council's policies.
1077	Totally against this. An absolute disgrace. We pay enough to park outside of our houses. All that will happen is more people will create drop kerbs and park in front of their houses that way. All this is going to do is hit those who use their car the most and have the smallest incomes: the working the poor, older people, those with kids, those with disabilities, zero hour contract workers etc. There are more effective ways to cut emissions such as improve the transport infrastructure rather than do this. [same address as 6203003]
1078	I am utterly outraged by these proposals and strongly object to this scheme as I feel increasing the price of residents permits is merely a revenue raising scheme and nothing to do with targeting and controlling air pollution. Residents parked cars do not emit pollution. However, the thousands of people who travel into Croydon to work everyday by car from outside the cpz pollute the air morning and evening. That's without the hundreds of shoppers that drive into Croydon - which will rocket with a Westfield. Why are you not implementing a congestion charge to control air pollution as has been successfully implemented in central London? Charging ONLY car owning residents living in the cpz is not a fair and equitable air pollution charge. I am disgraced with Croydon Council. [same address as 6202939 and 6202940]
1079	This is an unfair assault on those on minimum wage who are not able to afford newer vehicles. We have only just been forced into having parking permits in my area and now the Council plans to increase the rates exponentially beyond the means of many residents. Already there is dangerous parking in streets near my home Where it is still free.
1080	This is a joke. The price to park is high especially if you have two cars. This may sound like a luxury but if one is the means of earning an income and the other is to too plus to help with the kids, elderly parents etc then your not thinking clearly. The cost of public transport vs driving means that the car wins hands down. However, once you do something like this is means what? I can't afford to do my job via public transport, I would have to leave and go on benefits as it wouldn't pay. Every penny would go on train fares. My kids couldn't continue their sports careers and my mother-in-law couldn't come and visit as it's £30 to come by train to us. Selfish nonsense from the council. Build better and cheaper public transport and I'd happily ditch the car but as it is I can't
1081	I am a Croydon resident and we use a council parking permit. From the draft table of charges included as part of your consultation, it seems that the new cost spread of residents' parking permits is far too polarised. While I agree with the principle of using vehicle emissions as a factor in the charges, the spread from £6.50 to £300 seems extreme. There is a real risk that those with the oldest cars may be the least likely to have the means to replace them - while residents with newer, low emissions vehicles are more likely to fall into a higher income bracket. Additionally, the supplementary charge for second or third cars appears to have no relationship to the main charges. Why is this? Under this system a family whose main vehicle is a low emissions hybrid car, but who also register a gas-guzzling 4x4 as a second car, would pay less than a family with a single older car. It also seems counter productive to lower the charge for registering a permit for a third car, as you have proposed. Finally, I'd like to add that even though we hold a residents' parking permit (and the council holds our details for this), we were not contacted about these proposed changes. The council should carefully consider the way in which it conducts public consultations in the future, to ensure that affected parties have the opportunity to have their opinions heard.

1082	Resident. Entirely unclear how increasing cost of parking permits will reduce traffic - what proportion of cars driven through croydon are owned by residents? Looks like a shameless cash grab dressed up as environmental concern.
1083	My objective to this is charges are astronomical. My thoughts would to be put x amount on petrol not on permits, everybody needs to buy petrol. People cannot afford to buy new cars to lower the amount that has to be paid .Its very unfair ,and what about visitors to the Borough will they pay as it is in London. Croydon has aloud an Incinerator to be built in Beddington Farms (EMISSION) Big lorry's that will be going through the Borough. School that have been aloud to be built on main roads. All very unfair for residents. Not any of this has been thought.
1084	I believe the introduction of an emissions based parking permit scheme is the wrong thing to do. There are many flats where I live, with no charging points, so how are people to charge their electric cars, park their cars in Morrisons overnight, or run a 200m extension cable to their cars as most flats do not have their own parking spaces? I would have thought most peoples cars fall into the category that costs £104 so therefore the largest increased costs are likely to be faced by the residents with older cars which are likely to be the less well off. A £220 increase for some people is a massive increase and will probably cause people not to renew their permit and either park illegally, or park in nearby visitor spaces which some flats have, even though they are not visiting.
1085	Whilst at first glance this may seem a good idea, in reality, it is nothing more than another "cash cow" for Croydon Council with huge increases in the number of fees you get which will then NOT be passed on to residents or lower local already vastly high taxes. I will also mean many more cars being left in local streets so that further fines will follow for those who do not remember to pay the parking fees/remove the vehicles before the 30 mins have elapsed.
1086	diesel and old car owners are already penalised by different policies people who are paying council tax already should be treated equally
1087	I want to register my objections to your proposed increase in parking permit charges, because I cannot afford it.
1088	Do not agree that residents should pay emission charges for vehicles which are already exempt for road tax (hybrid). The council are just makes money for nothing
1089	There is no reason to increase the fee. This is just a stealth tax and has no basis or reasoning for an increase.

1090	As a Croydon resident, and as someone who develops economic and environmental policy for a living, I was struck by how poor the policy case is for the parking charging regime that Croydon Council is proposing, and would like to take the opportunity to lay out the arguments against it. You claim that the proposals are "in response to feedback we've had from our communities who have told us that they are concerned about air quality, and that traffic levels should be reduced". Yet a CO2-based charging regime targets neither of these things effectively. 1. Air quality Research by Defra and the EU Commission shows that broadly half of the harmful air pollution emitted by vehicles comes from particulate matter emitted by brakes and tyres, alongside what is sometimes called "road dust", which can account for up to 90% of PM10 in certain urban environments. Every car contributes to this air pollution, regardless of fuel type or carbon emissions. So why does targeting CO2 emissions make sense in this context? You propose a diesel surcharge for pre-Euro 6 vehicles alongside your CO2 bands, in recognition of the higher NOx outputs of diesel vehicles. But the £50 charge is in no way proportionate to the £300 upper CO2 band. Because diesel vehicles tend to have significantly lower CO2 emissions than many petrol vehicles, the likely effect is that people driving around older, dirtier diesels could pay significantly less that those driving newer petrol vehicles. This make no sense from an air quality perspective. A further point - and one that applies across the board - is why, exactly, residents of certain streets should be penalised for owning a car for its assumed effect on local air quality irrespective of how often the vehicle is driven, when someone literally the next street over may pay nothing at all. (This is exactly what will happen in the case of my street) 2. Congestion Every car driving on a given stretch of road at a given moment contributes equally to congestion, irrespective of its CO2 emissions. An electric vehicle has much the same impact on traffic congestion as a diesel van. Why then does it make sense to scale a charge aimed at tackling congestion to a car's CO2 emissions? Whilst it is perfectly defensible to charge more to visitors for metered parking, or high street parking etc, to deter people from driving to shops and high streets, it does not follow that local residents should foot higher residential parking permits when there is no necessary link between the fact of their car ownership and local congestion. 3. Fairness and distributional impacts As implied above, congestion and air quality are functions of road use, not car ownership, but your charge penalises the latter. An example: As a Croydon resident, I own a car, but rarely use it to travel around the local area. I usually cycle or use public transport if travelling locally. My car is used almost solely for weekend trips outside of London. Why should a local resident pay an additional charge aimed at curbing congestion or improving air quality when, for instance, parents driving short journeys every weekday morning to drop off their children at school or nursery (a key driver of local congestion and air quality issues in my neighbourhood) would escape this charge? More broadly, it is Croydon's poorest who will end up suffering the most from this charge, as they are least likely to be able to afford to buy a newer or electric vehicle.

	4. Double taxation Both Vehicle Excise Duty and Fuel Duty already tax motorists for the CO2 emissions and efficiency of ICE vehicles respectively. The proposed Croydon charge amounts to double taxation on this basis. Moreover, it is arguably unfair taxation, as residents may have made purchase decisions based on assumptions about the relevant taxes and costs associated with their vehicle will now face higher charges without necessarily being able to respond (e.g. if they are locked into leasing arrangements for several years). 5. Spurious arguments on purchasing incentives Finally, you argue that a recurrent CO2 based parking charge will encourage people to switch to lower emitting vehicles when they make their next car purchase. This is simply not borne out by the research. The reason that the Treasury reformed VED in 2016 so that CO2 emissions were captured in the 'first year rate', followed by a flat rate charge of £140 for subsequent years, is precisely because research showed that it is up-front price that affects purchase decisions, not the prospect of recurrent charges. People tend to heavily discount the prospect of paying higher recurrent charges when making purchase decisions, which is why the old VED system was deemed less effective and scrapped. I am sorry that I have had to waste a perfectly nice evening writing the above. I want to stress that I am a committed environmentalist; a cyclist, a vegan, and someone who takes many steps in daily life to minimise my carbon footprint. However, the proposed policy is incredibly poorly targeted. Just because the functionality exists to base parking charges on CO2 emissions, and happens to have been done elsewhere, does not mean it is a good environmental policy. Reducing CO2 emissions is of course a vitally important thing to do - but local residents' parking charges is not the right policy lever for the job. [same respondent as online response ID6202904]
1091	The scheme penalises residents who have the right to peaceful enjoyment of their home, including their mode of transport which they are already taxed on. Your source of an air pollution is people travelling into Croydon and parking here, whether on private property or roads. These people cause the pollution and should be taxed.
1092	I believe to increase the parking charge our road is highly unacceptable. We have already had to pay to park in our own road plus admin. charges, although when the earlier survey was taken it appeared that our road had voted against permit parking. You are forcing residents to either purchase a newer vehicle or to even give up their cars altogether. Many of the residents rely on their cars for getting to work, visiting friends and relations and their shopping. These trips would not be able by public transport.. You are taking monies from our residents because of the permit parking, I wonder if you will be taking monies from other car owners in the immediate area who do not have residents parking, but may have old cars and some that give off high CO2 emission. [same address as 6203109]
1093	I live in the borough and currently pay for an annual parking permit to park in my road outside my house.
1094	We did not know anything about this proposed increase in the permit parking until a neighbour told us. We feel that individual households should have been contacted. This increase is so ridiculous because when the cars are park in the road, their engines are not running, therefore not giving out any emissions, so how can this charge be added to a parking fee. I only hope that ALL the cars lorries bikes etc are also going to be charged in

	the Borough of Croydon are going to be made to pay this very costly increase, that so many people will find it hard to pay. When are you going to enforce the 20 mph in the local roads.
1095	I oppose introducing emission-based charges for Resident Parking Permits ("RPP") as an exploitative measure and object to the proposal on the following grounds: • Because I own a 1999 vehicle I am being disproportionately discriminated against by the Council who consider it legitimate to increase my "RPP" by a 375% price hike: this is exorbitant and unfair. • Every year I pay for my car to be serviced so it gets a clean bill of health to satisfy the DVLA and meet standards for emissions. I specifically purchased it to help keep tax/insurance costs down and for its small engine size. • I do not have the disposable income to afford to buy a newer vehicle and as I do not want to take out a loan, or get into debt, this proposal penalises me and those in lower socio-economic groups.
1096	I feel it is unfair to charge diesel cars owners only as all cars and other vehicles also pollute the atmosphere. Just a few years ago, people were encouraged to buy diesel cars as it was marketed as safe and good for the environment. My car has an "ego" system which helps to minimise pollution while driving. London area has introduced a charge 24/7 which we have to pay when entering the zone. This will be extended to cover the north and south circular roads. As a community nurse, I use my car for work, hence, I will be paying twice each day i.e. Paying at my home base and paying going to work which is within the London area. I feel that this is just another form of TAX on the motorists.
1097	Introduction & Background While the concept of reducing vehicle generated pollution across Croydon it highly laudable, desirable and supported by the majority of Croydon residents, this proposal is not a credible means to achieve it. In light of this, it appears to be nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to generate additional income for the council from a largely small number of Croydon residents & businesses that, if the proposal is implemented, will have the choice of either; • Paying the increased charge • Refusing to pay the increase and face fines for not having a valid Residents / Business Parking Permit • Disposing of their vehicle • Moving house to an area outside of the CPZ's. This proposal bears significant similarities to Croydon Council's earlier attempts to impose massive price increases for Resident & Business Parking Permits. The earlier attempts attracted considerable opposition largely I suspect because they were better communicated by the Council. Despite impacting upon a significant proportion of the residents & businesses in the middle of Croydon, there is a very low level of awareness of the proposal and its impact. Divisive Inequity Creates Community Division This proposal is highly divisive and inimical to the creation of a cohesive borough-wide sense of community. It imposes punitive sanctions on one relatively small group of residents and businesses, while not applying it to others. It is additionally iniquitous as from Council provided data it

	would appear that those not liable to pay this punitive charge are the heaviest users of the CPZ area roads, and thus creators of the pollution in the first place. (see below) In the context of Croydon's Local Plan based on "Places", this proposal extends the theme of imposing the heaviest burdens for change and cost on the Inner Areas, while incentivising those unaffected to supported the proposals. As much as the majority of areas in Croydon are sheltered from the demand to create thousands of new homes through Croydon's planning rules, this proposal also shelters them from being required to bear an equal share of the burden for reducing pollution in Inner Croydon. Inevitably this distinction between the Inner and Outer areas will create resentment and anger among Inner Area communities, and this will foster unreconcilable division. Had for instance the Council proposed to create Park & Ride points around the borough at sites such as Lloyd Park, Purley Way playing fields, Monks Orchard, Ashburton Park etc to reduce the overall volumes of traffic coming into Inner Croydon, then the report might have been credible and acceptable. Significantly reducing the volumes of slow moving traffic coming into Croydon during daily rush hours would have had a massive impact on air quality. This proposal does nothing to address this, and simply punishes the residents of CPZ's for having petrol and diesel vehicles while applying no sanction at all to equivalent vehicle owners in the rest of Croydon. In all other interactions between the Council and residents, there is service equality regardless of the differences in cost in delivering those services. As the residents of the CPZ areas live closer to the council's operational centres and in higher density, the costs of delivering services to them is inherently much lower than it is to provide the same level of services to those residents who make the life style decision to live away from those operational centres. In practice the residents of inner Croydon subsidise those of outer Croydon. It is the same inner Croydon residents that have experienced massive inward population migration with the high density central developments, when the communities outside of these central areas have been specifically sheltered from such developments and their local environments remain largely intact. These outer communities actively resist shouldering their share of the burden of providing new homes in the borough, and actively seek to sustain their established car-centric life styles that create so much of the pollution in Croydon. The council actively collaborates with these advantaged communities to the disadvantage of the central communities, who bear the burden of increased costs and the high levels of pollution created by the car culture. Lack of Evidence the Source of Vehicle Pollution in Inner Areas The report lacks any hard data on traffic movements and their source. The inane statement that "every car journey starts and ends with a parking space" is absolutely meaningless in the context of justifying price increases for Resident & Business Parking Permits if the report does not determine the proportion of journeys that start and / or end in a CPZ area, and if those vehicles are owned by residents or businesses liable to pay the increased charges.

	Any casual observer of traffic movements through Croydon's CPZ areas could readily comment "Yes, every car journey starts and ends with a parking space, in Ashburton, Monks Orchard, Shirley, New Addington, Selsdon, Sanderstead, Riddlesdown, Coulsdon etc all outside the CPZ and free to own and operate as many cars of any type as they wish." Council data for the East Croydon area shows that the volume of vehicles traversing the "ladder streets" between Addiscombe Rd and Lwr Addiscombe Rd exceeds the number of vehicles owned in the area. Data showing average daily volumes of traffic crossing survey points and ranked in descending order. This data was collected by Croydon Council and shared with the resident's associations identified in the right-hand column. The council is currently carrying further traffic volume surveys in the area. [Table of vehicle movements at 25 survey points provided] From the above Council data, it is evident that the majority of vehicles on these roads are highly unlikely to be local resident / business vehicle owners. This corresponds closely with resident traffic surveys carried out on Lebanon Rd from 2000 to 2013, that indicated that in the region of all vehicles travelling through the area did not bear a Residents / Business Parking Permit in the windscreen and were thus unlikely to be from within the CPZ areas. Resident surveys also indicated that many residents in the inner areas do not use their cars on a daily basis, but use public transport for commuting. As a consequence, the imposition of the Parking Permit charge increases is highly unlikely to have a significant impact on pollution levels in the Inner Areas, as the majority of road users are not required to purchase a Residents Parking Permit as they do not appear to reside within the CPZ areas. It possible and probably likely that as the impact of the dramatic price hike induces people to dispose of their vehicles, and rely on public transport, thus clearing the inner roads of parked cars. As happened following the establishment of the CPZ's in the 1990's and the massive reduction in on-street parking in the Inner Areas, the cleared Inner Area residential roads become "clear ways" for through traffic, and the overall volume of traffic increases. Had the Council undertaken, as a parallel measure, to enforce speed limits, No Entry and traffic control measures in the Inner Areas then these proposals might have been a credible proposal to reduce pollution. The additional funds could have been used to procure the means to enforce traffic control measures.

	As it is the Council makes no attempt to enforce Speed Limits, No Entry or other traffic control measures, and seemingly the police do not have the resources or will to enforce them either. The report lacks any traffic data or evidence, even though officers have access to data collected by the Council. Without this data how may any credence be afforded to this report, despite the extensive texts? To be credible this report needs to identify the composition of traffic passing through the CPZ's and report upon the ratio between CPZ residents and others. Surely no competent professional local authority officer could present an acceptable argument for major change to members without providing detailed evidence to support the change? As the proposals do not contain any analysis of traffic movements, the only conclusions can be that either; that data doesn't exist because there has been no requirement for it, or that the data does exist but doesn't support the recommendations in the proposal. In either case, the only rational explanation can be is that this proposal has nothing to do with traffic movements or pollution and is exclusively about raising additional funds for the council from a "captive" group. Alternative vehicle infrastructure Applying punitive charges on petrol and diesel vehicle owners is unacceptable, as the alternative electric powered vehicles have access to only one (1) charging point in the East Inner CPZ. As this is insufficient, were residents to switch to electric vehicles they would have to resort to charging their cars from the home mains electricity. Even if they could do this in compliance with electrical safety regulation, it would mean electric cables trailing across pavements. It is inconceivable that the Council could roll out sufficient charge points in the area to make switching vehicles attractive or viable. This should be self-evident to the professional officers who have authored this report, and it should have been reported on. Incoherent and Inconsistent Traffic Management Policies & Practices The data set above shows the volumes of traffic in the "ladder streets" in Addiscombe East & West wards that resulted from a sequence of traffic management changes that diverted traffic out of Addiscombe West into Addiscombe East. This diversion inherently deliberately transferred and concentrated air pollution onto specific streets. As with other traffic management changes dating back to pre-2000 the council did not carry any traffic impact surveys. The council, in the form of the Traffic Management Advisory Committee, has failed to take an area-wide review of traffic management that may have had a positive impact on the levels of pollution in the area. In conjunction with TfL it failed to carry out a traffic impact survey and implement a meaningful traffic management strategy following the installation of the tram system. Council officers have repeated to several traffic campaigns that the council has not undertaken any detailed traffic impact modelling for any of the proposals going back to the 1990's, and as a consequence has made no provision for the results of implemented change.

	Conclusion The proposed introduction of emission-based charges for resident and business parking permits is nothing more than a crude statement of intent to take more money from those residents and businesses in CPZ areas. The claims are not supported by any evidence linking car ownership in the CPZ areas and the levels of pollution. There is no evidence to support the suggestion that the application of the charges will reduce pollution. In light of the above, what the proposal does provide ample evidence of is the complete disregard for the residents and businesses in the CPZ and more broadly Inner Croydon. In effect Croydon Council applies a form of "apartheid" in terms of services, charges and quality of life that favours residents of Outer Croydon and supports their life style choices. [same respondent as online ID6189816]
1098	The only people you're penalising by introducing this are those on a low income who are unable to upgrade their car to fit your criteria. Diesel owners are already heavily hit by road tax they do not need further 'taxes' to push them into poverty. Ironically, they purchased their polluting vehicle when the government was heavily pushing the benefits of driving diesel. Government incompetence should not have an impact on those affected. How about another scrappage scheme and highly subsidised car purchase scheme to get diesels off the road? I also have concerns about how long it will be before you extend CPZ into all areas under Croydon Council thus affecting even more people. STOP PENALISING THOSE WHO CAN'T AFFORD IT.
1099	1. Poorer people have older cars and will be penalised more than those with more money who have newer, cleaner cars. 2. The scheme takes no account of the actual miles driven. A person with an older car that uses it infrequently will pay more than a person in a new one who commutes regularly, and the commuter will be generating more emissions. 3. Visitors using temporary parking do not have to pay based on emissions. The emissions scheme means Croydon council will be discriminating against its own residents.
1100	I live in Croydon and own a car in a permit-holders zone.
1101	Because I am about to move into Croydon where one of these schemes will be active. We have budgeted for everything including parking permits. And now you are making it even more expensive for me to park my car. You're taxing the residents lowest earners. If I could afford an eco car trust me I would buy one. But right now I can't. This should be introduced in a number of years, giving myself and other residents time to change their car. Not just slapping them with an increase in parking costs. It's unjust and morally wrong to increase prices on something up until now the residents did not know was a problem.
1102	I am objecting to the proposed scheme. This will hit low income households and the elderly, particularly affecting those who may not be able to afford a new vehicle, but for whom a car may be a lifeline. Often these drivers only do a low mileage because they take short journeys. It is those who take long journeys who will be creating more pollution even if they have a newer car. It is the mileage that is done which matters, not the age of the car. I support improving air quality in Croydon and I would like to see an increase in the number of trees in streets which would help improve air quality and improve the look of a road.

1103	The objective is regressive and monetary based. Would the council be kind enough to state what it has implemented without already to see any improvements and if they have failed. Have you done more accessible transport system? Have you done more towards free parking to improve commercial business in Croydon? Have you done more towards cycling? Have you laid enough cycle lanes in the council and see people not utilising? Have you educated drivers to be wary of cyclists? Ridiculous another money milking option by the council. Include some sensible people in the committe to work on plans that would be welcoming.
1104	This is penalising local residents who cannot afford to have newer vehicles-and young people who are looking forward to learning how to drive. The council have reduced air quality by allowing the incinerator to be built near the Purley way. This is just another stealth tax on those who have property in the town centre. [same address as 6187333]
1105	I object to the proposal: - The policy misses its target by penalising parked vehicles (zero emissions) rather than vehicle use - an illogical incentive. My old car has very light use and hence low emissions. The proposed policy incentivises unnecessarily replacement (bad for the environment) and increased car use to justify the cost of a new vehicle, i.e. the opposite of what the council claims to be seeking. - The incremental cost to residents such as myself is huge, apparently much higher than neighbouring boroughs. - There is no reasonable warning. For a policy with such a dramatic cost impact on residents I would expect a notice period of years, e.g. there was over 3 years' notice before the London congestion charge was introduced.
1106	I think this is a tax on elderly and poorer people who have very limited resources with which to replace older vehicles. I understand the environmental issues but people can contribute to the environmental cause in other ways than by being coerced into buying a newer car. I am happy to charge car parking, but residents parking is a fait accompli, older people use their vehicles infrequently, but need the flexibility to have the option to use their vehicles when necessary. Also most of their journeys would be outside the Croydon locale and are therefore, not directly polluting the centre of Croydon.
1107	Objecting: I don't believe variable residents parking charges based on vehicle emissions will change the air quality. It may even encourage people to use there cars more frequently "I've paid a lot for parking in this zone, I'll make the most of it and drive to X". It risks unfairly penalising the less well off. General Parking charges might make more sense- based on people moving around to another zone or driving into the borough. Could there be a credit system whereby people receive credits (to be used for council services - green collections for e.g.) or partial refunds for not using their cars? Or like the London City, could there be an emission zone at the centre of croydon, or around schools that during peak hours drivers a charged a small fee for entering and polluting
1108	Whilst I agree in principle with the scheme, I'm concerned about the cost disproportionately hitting the less well off in the borough who are more likely to run older cars. Introduction in Oct 2019 doesn't give people sufficient time to make alternative arrangements so I would hope Croydon provides either longer implementation period or staggers the permit cost increase over next 18 months.
1109	This seams to be another tax on the motorist. Those on low pay or with two vehicles who rely on them will yet again be hit by a stealth tax from Labour. Motorists are already hit by high Road Tax, High insurance, High petrol costs, High repair costs if you continue to hit the motorist they will in the end stop driving then where is the extra income going to come from.
1110	I object to the proposed scheme. A system of charges based on CO2 emissions is fundamentally flawed, and illogical (indeed counter-productive) in terms of what the council is trying to achieve. The direct dangers to health from CO2 emissions pale into insignificance compared to the issues posed by the fine particulate matter that result from diesel use. The survey results quoted in the policy statement are perfectly understandable, and no rational person could argue with the desire to reduce dangerous emissions. However, there is no logical connection between this, and the

	proposals that are set out in the policy. The proposed policy actually represents a disincentive to leaving cars at home. I can only conclude that this policy is more related to generating income.
1111	I think that the scheme is most unfair. My petrol-fuelled car, although old, has a low mileage of only 79,000 miles and gives off far less pollution than my neighbour's comparatively new diesel which frequently belches out pollutants. To be forced to scrap it when it is in good condition is bad for the environment; moreover, due to the loss of my salary as a result of ill health, I cannot afford to replace it. Finally, as I drive infrequently, I am already doing my bit to combat pollution by keeping my emissions to an absolute minimum. The irony is that the council has removed a number of beautiful cherry trees from our street, trees that would have helped combat pollution, as do Croydon's green spaces that, sadly, are currently under threat.
1112	Social cohesion and the discrimination effects on old and disabled. [same address as 62003348]
1113	I have to drive into South Croydon for work …. and have to park my car while at work. this charge will significantly increase the cost of my travel to work
1114	Strongly object to another tax being put upon residents. I pay road tax based on my vehicles emissions when I use it, now Croydon Council want to tax my vehicle based on its emissions when it is parked and not emitting any thing.
1115	Council's current policy in place is contradicting the proposal to reduce CO2/ improve air quality in the borough. Council keeps increasing congestion in the borough by increasing the population density by allowing to convert existing buildings into blocks of flats and also more houses building more which is exerting extra pressure on existing infrastructure. This policy of council's is not only making the air quality poor but also making it worse- as it is said garbage in garbage out. Unless council addresses the root cause of the issue this problem is not going to go away. Patch work only mask the problem for so long what happens afterwards?
1116	to assist in decision making
1117	The social cohesion effects are detrimental to residents, risk identifies some but need emphasis. Rapid demographic change in the borough and economic factors mean greater distribution of people. Public transport cannot replace this for disadvantaged groups (old/disabled)and to financially penalise unacceptable. Whilst the need to improve air quality/control climate change is necessary. polluter pays is well established and is a fair and responsible method. We all have to ensure a responsible attitude to vehicle use, best way to apply a national system . It is not the age but the usage that pollutes and economic discrimination wrong. For the many not the few.
1118	This isn't about being environmentally friendly, but just Croydon Council jumping on the 'green' bandwagon and looking to hit the motorist as an easy target. Once again a dubious consultation that I am sure will be railroaded though without thought of the impact on the resident of the borough who rely on their car to get them to and from work. The time scale for this is crazy too as many people cannot afford to just go out and replace the vehicle they have at the drop of a hat! Also the impact on small businesses in the borough will be immense, which I suspect will see Croydon go down the drain even further and faster than it already is, the Whitgift Centre is a disgrace. I can see there being many legal challenges to this also if it go ahead, which I would wholeheartedly support! [same address as 6203365]

1119	I oppose introducing emission-based charges for Resident Parking Permits ("RPP") as an exploitative measure and object to the proposal on the following grounds: • Because I own a 1999 vehicle I am being disproportionately discriminated against by the Council who consider it legitimate to increase my "RPP" by a 375% price hike: this is exorbitant and unfair. • Every year I pay for my car to be serviced so it gets a clean bill of health to satisfy the DVLA and meet standards for emissions. I specifically purchased it to help keep tax/insurance costs down and for its small engine size. • I do not have the disposable income to afford to buy a newer vehicle and as I do not want to take out a loan, or get into debt, this proposal penalises me and those in lower socio-economic groups. • I changed my driving behaviour more than 20 years ago i.e. I only use the car at weekends to leave/return to Croydon (once, sometimes twice a month to visit friends/family). Occasionally, the car is used locally to transport heavy items e.g. recycling. Otherwise, I walk everywhere and travel by public transport. My "RPP" is a fee I pay to park my car where I live … NOT because I am driving it and emitting fumes. On the contrary, I have taken steps to reduce the risks of contributing to air pollution in the home, garden, DIY around the house and driving my car. • CityMetric announced on 17 June 2019 that TfL "just cut its bus service" and previously stated on 5 April 2019 that: "London should clean up its air pollution – but it must ensure the right people pay. Proving highly controversial because it hits the wrong people the hardest and is a perfect example of what happens when environmental policy is imposed from above, without actively listening to those who are the most impacted." • I am highly sceptical of the merits you advocate for this scheme (predominately based on children's health and asthma suffers). According to a report by Newham Council: "There is currently no evidence that air pollution causes asthma; although it is likely to be a 'trigger' and can worsen symptoms." So, how do you explain schools being built adjacent to busy roads? By erecting 'West Thornton Primary Hub' in Canterbury Road, 'Whitehorse Manor School' in Brigstock Road and the 'Harris Invictus Academy' in London Road, for example, surely this smacks with a disregard to due diligence and irresponsible planning permission. • The Council is showing very poor judgement in the way it is penalising "RPP" Holders and its failure to understand the real impact of air pollution on health at a national level NOT just at a local level. How can you justify implementing this proposal when Bromley (to our right) has rejected the scheme while Sutton/Merton (to our left) have accepted it. Does air quality change from one borough to the next? Fundamentally, and as CityMetric corroborate: "Without local authorities seriously listening to the people who are most affected by environmental problems, they risk either playing down the scale of the problem, developing policy that will disadvantage the already disadvantaged, or both." So a disjointed approach is certainly not the answer. • According to Friends of the Earth, who published a report on 11 April 2019: "We need to actually cut traffic levels, not just have cleaner cars and the government isn't really tackling this." They also highlight that: "a lot of the road traffic pollutants are actually generated from brakes, tyres and

	road wear." So, someone like me who is: • a careful/low usage driver; • uses public transport wherever possible; • avoids short journeys because they're less efficient; • drives smoothly, at the same speed and at the speed limit to use fuel more efficiently and reduce emissions; while • diligently maintaining my vehicle to meet standards for emissions. Then how can your proposal be anything but an environmental policy which discriminates, penalises and ultimately operates as a disproportionate fiscal measure: it doesn't make sense, unless you have ulterior motives. • Furthermore, this cannot be considered to be a legitimate consultation when the "RPP" Holders have not been duly informed. I have spoken to my neighbours who tell me they are not aware a consultation is taking place. Residents should, therefore, have been informed by letter and/or a leaflet drop. If the Council can do this for something as insignificant as changing the Wheelie Bins, then why has it not followed this procedure for something as important and with far reaching consequences for all motorists? Your proposal is not an efficient solution to the effects air quality has on our health. However, I look forward to you providing me with a keychain air quality measurement device (called "the Flow") so I can monitor the Council's effectiveness concerning this matter; along with everyone else in Croydon. [same respondent as online ID6203119]
1120	It seems to me that this is another consultation/proposal that will be pushed through by the Council regardless of any objections by the residents it will affect the most. There has been little or no publicity regarding this and therefore any residents that do not have an online account or access to email cannot raise any objections. The timescale involved is ridiculous and so many people are already struggling to pay house hold bills, is it really a good idea to penalise them all over again because they have the nerve to own a car!! It wasn't that long ago that Government was encouraging us to buy diesel cars and now they are going crazy about emissions and want to get rid of them. How on earth do the council expect people to fund this pathetic tax hike!!
1121	There is too much inequality with regard to parking locally. Drivers are being priced off the road.
1122	I strongly object to this scheme because it singles out a small proportion of the residents of Croydon - only those in controlled parking zones. Those car owners who do not live in these zones still contribute to air emissions in the same way but are not penalised for doing so in the same way. It will also affect people in poorer areas whilst those who live in more affluent areas don't have to pay this charge as the cpzs are not in these areas. Also when a car is parked it is not emitting any emissions, so why not penalise those who are using the roads as well .
1123	Car ownership and car use behaviour changes having an excessively adverse economic impact on residents, enterprises and businesses. The parochial approach proposed is likely to drive traffic away from Croydon, further reducing footfall. Those in the south of the Borough may decide to drive to e.g. Bromley or even Bluewater if Croydon becomes a less car-friendly destination. Over-complex technical solutions required, with onerous demands on elderly drivers. Where is the corresponding improvement in public transport to help persuade drivers to leave their cars behind? The 412 service is being reduced, not improved. Carrots not sticks are what is required.

1124	1. Our cars are already taxed based on co2 emissions 2. We as permit holders who cannot always get a parking space due to non-residents and illegal parking,. Will non residents be charged the proposed additional charge ie casual parkers on meters. 3. We live in a poorer part of Croydon, where many people who rely on a car cannot afford latest models. 4. This is a Labour council which party is supposed to be the champion of the less advantaged in society.
1125	The policy is targeted to the reduction to CO2 emissions. Whilst all in Croydon share in this ambition the driver for such policies needs to be led by national government and GLA regional government policies (e.g., the London ULEZ), who in addition to pan-European and international agencies, determine the supply and suppression of emissions. Accordingly, it is wrong to punitively sanction residents at the Croydon Borough level with increased costs by effectively increasing taxes through the proposed parking permit and other parking-emission related charges. The policy is going to hit disproportionately vehicles registered by lower income citizens and sole traders with major adverse implications to their living costs and reductions in their standard of living and the right to a family life and undertaking their occupation with by increasing their transport costs. I object to the charges being based depending on the date of the applicant's vehicle registration, the vehicle's CO2 emissions and any surcharges that may apply. In addition, some vehicles which are registered prior to March 2001 actually produce CO2 emissions lower than the level prescribed in Band 2 after March 2001. There is no evidence to the desire of residents to accept such harsh policies by the local authority and many see the policy rightfully as a way to increase income at their expense without justification or representation. Residents however appear particularly concerned at the local level with possibly seeing policies advances from the Council to suppress the level of nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions and particulates at school and other public institutions and in the use of public transport vehicles and by the Council's and contractors fleet of diesel vehicles. In conclusion I object to the proposals for the reasons mentioned, and request the Council instead deals with the control of NOx emissions and particulates which would have more immediate influence on improving the air qualit
1126	I strongly object to the scheme firstly because I do not believe it has anything to do with environmental issues but just yet another money gathering scheme from the council. I do not see how charging people for parking in the street they live in reduces emissions. Secondly, the scheme will punish people, such as me, who are on a relatively low income and cannot afford a new car so will be punished for having a 20 year old car with a higher rate. I use my car on average once a week to get my elderly grandmother to appointments. My car is a lifeline for her so introducing such a scheme could mean me having to sell my car and therefore take that away from her who is also a Croydon resident.
1127	In principle I agree with the idea of linking emissions to this charge & I also want to buy an electric to replace our petrol car. But your proposal should not be implemented until an electric car with the range of an av petrol model is available & is a practical alternative for UK hols. Cornwall, Wales, Yorkshire are totally beyond the capacity of current electric cars. You are using a stick but with no carrot yet in existence! I live in a terraced house, no drive, nowhere to charge an electric car. When & where are you going to put in chargers in terraced roads? Do that & then £300 may be reasonable. Your proposal clobbers the poor with no driveway to park or charge an electric car & looks like a revenue based idea, not a practical 'green' one. You need to nudge people, not put them off.
1128	Croydon is extremly polluted
1129	Concerned about the Air Quality in and around Croydon

1130	This is very unfair system.
1131	While I agree we must tackle air pollution, this is completely wrong way to do it. More effort should be put in to improving public transport, which is actually going to get worse for a lot of commuters due to bus routes changing in Croydon.
1132	I am a resident that will be affected by the outcome. I do not wish for you to introduce parking permits in this area.
1133	Local resident. I object to this proposal on the grounds that it will unfairly prejudice the elderly and hard up people. There is no evidence that it will encourage people to not use cars or buy greener models. It is a money making scheme for the Council.
1134	It is unnecessary unfair and ludicrous
1135	As senior citizens with only state pension we are obviously worried about any extra burden on our finances.
1136	It penalises those of us who cannot afford a newer vehicle and makes it even less likely that we will ever be able to do so. I think most people would like to do their bit to reduce pollution but many simply cannot afford to buy a new car.
1137	I object to this scheme, It is not fair to make the huge increases proposed to permit charges and to charge vehicles based on their age when they are parked - if they are parked they are not causing any emissions. It also penalises classic car drivers and those who cannot afford to replace older vehicles. Older vehicles (apart from classics) will naturally disappear from our roads and it is a pointless and expensive waste of time and money to create & administer this scheme for a short term benefit. I used to (& might again in the future) live in an area where I had to purchase & use parking permits. As a driver in the borough huge hikes in pay & display parking prices will simply mean I go elsewhere to shop. Neighbouring boroughs are already cheaper and have far better shops.
1138	this proposal is unfair to disabled andpeople on a lower income. Itis just a way for the council to make money from drivers.It is the amount people use their car that causes pollution. [same address as 6203350]
1139	It's just taxation and unfair
1140	You have not given due consideration to drivers who were advised that they should invest in diesel vehicles. The people who invested in these vehicles in good faith and are now being treated very carelessly are right to feel hard done by. Where is their compensation? So far, you have shown no consideration for them. Motorists in Surrey feel that you have no care for them - there are appalling potholes and passing points on single track roads where fly tiping points occur. What aren you doing to solve this?

1141	I am opposed to the scheme as a political tool by the council the tax motorists that will not improve air quality. Cars not subject the the central London c charge or ULEZ will still be charged in Croydon just for their age and regardless of the emissions they emit. This policy will penalise the elderly and low income residents unable to buy new vehicles just because the council is continuing to penalise car drivers. Hybrid car owners, who have taken the conscious decision to buy low emissions vehicles will also be punished through the unrealistic bands. Overall this policy is poor, does little to improve vehicle emissions and will simply be a tax on Croydon residents.
1142	I object as car drivers are always targeted. Other road users e.g cyclists should be made to pay something too
1143	Everyone should be involved in transport and environmental issues.
1144	We already pay a lot of money to live in a London Borough. Croydon itself has increased its housing by building more properties and allowing multiple occupancies so it has increased the amount of properties paying council tax. Therefore increasing revenue considerably. I feel that this is another stealth tax. By starting this new scheme and increasing existing scheme is just another nail in Croydon's coffin. Local Shops have closed down due to no parking nearby. This will create an exodus of home owners.
1145	This is another tac on drivers. How will charging up to £300 for a permit, address air quality? How will the extra levy be used to tackle the problem? It won't stop people driving or make them sell their car - they'll just pay so it's not reducing emissions. Just like the congestion charge - if you pay it you can still drive in the zone, how is that addressing congestion? I am whole opposed to this needless unfair tax. I have an older car, which is well maintained and serviced regularly and meets all MOT requirements, but now I'm going to be penalised, yet again because its not new or electric. There are no guarantees that the extra revenue will be used to tackle air quality. With council budgets being cut, I suspect this is simply a way for Croydon recoup lost funds.
1146	I live in the area
1147	To many restrictions are already being put onto drivers.
1148	I object to this proposal as all this charge is, is another way of taxing croydon residents. Are we not taxed enough on our council tax by Croydon Council How is charging people going to make the air cleaner, there will still be the same amount of cars on the road, producing the CO2.

1149	I am writing to oppose the latest money making scheme initiated by this council to introduce emissions based charges for all parking permits throughout all controlled parking permit zones within Croydon. I note you state that it is to improve the air quality in Croydon & reduce emissions which we all agree is a big problem. But I fail to see how charging me £300 to park my car in my road, which I use very infrequently as I use public transport whenever I can, will improve the air quality. Especially as most of the cars driving along my road are not in the CPZ. Surely it should be based on usage rather than vehicle age as I'm sure I pollute a lot less than most other car users. It is not feasible nor affordable for me to change my car as I only do on average 1,300 miles per annum. I suppose I will just have to park my car in a non CPZ road so will pollute the same as before but not pay you so what does that achieve apart from massive inconvenience to me & the residents of the road I will have to park in? I think if the council reviewed a lot of its highway policies & initiatives which have resulted in increased congestion & pollution (ie the Canning Road one way system) would have a greater impact on air quality than charging some residents to park their cars which creates no pollution! It's also grossly unfair to only charge some drivers & not others. I think this policy could do with a rethink. Also why were the residents not notified of this policy change? I only found out about it from an email from Mario Creatura, or was that your intention so you wouldn't get any opposition to it? I saw this council's attitude to democracy at the planning meeting to introduce the CPZ to my area and quite blatantly the opposition to the CPZ being introduced to 3 of the 7 roads canvassed was deliberately ignored after discussion as their wishes didn't fit in with the council's plans. Absolutely shocking!! [same respondent as online response ID6202247]
1150	I object to the above proposal on the following grounds:- (1) A securely parked and unattended motor vehicle, whether fuelled by petrol or diesel, with its engine switched off, cannot possibly emit anything. (2) Outside the operating times of a Controlled Parking permit zone, within the London Borough of Croydon, it is currently lawful without any financial payment required, to park most motor vehicles, owned by Residents, Businesses and Visitors of and to our borough, unless causing obstruction of the highway, any where and at any other time, on a space which is not a bay, for which a permit is required. (3) As a consequence of the greed of the council and unrequited cost to all those above, there would obviously be less revenue to Parking Services due to responsible motorists leaving vehicles in such places above, displaced to, for example yellow lines etc. (4) Other than writing to 70 elected members of the council, three Members of Parliament and the GLA member for Croydon and Sutton plus an unknown number of official or statutory permit holders, to whom borough wide parking permits are issued issued free of charge, none of the current permit holders have been written to. No impact assessment has been carried. Please acknowledge my objection.
1151	I cannot work out what action is planned or what vehicles are affected.

1152	I object to the above proposal on the following grounds:- (1) A securely parked and unattended motor vehicle, whether fuelled by petrol or diesel, with its engine switched off, cannot possibly emit anything. (2) Outside the operating times of a Controlled Parking permit zone, within the London Borough of Croydon, it is currently lawful without any financial payment required, to park most motor vehicles, owned by Residents, Businesses and Visitors of and to our borough, unless causing obstruction of the highway, any where and at any other time, on a space which is not a bay, for which a permit is required. (3) As a consequence of the greed of the council and unrequited cost to all those above, there would obviously be less revenue to Parking Services due to responsible motorists leaving vehicles in such places above, displaced to, for example yellow lines etc. (4) Other than writing to 70 elected members of the council, three Members of Parliament and the GLA member for Croydon and Sutton plus an unknown number of official or statutory permit holders, to whom borough wide parking permits are issued issued free of charge, none of the current permit holders have been written to. No impact assessment has been carried. Please acknowledge my objection. [same respondent as online response ID6203604]
1153	Dear Person, Reference: PD/CH/K16 I object to the above proposal on the following grounds:- (1) A securely parked and unattended motor vehicle, whether fuelled by petrol or diesel, with its engine switched off, cannot possibly emit anything. (2) Outside the operating times of a Controlled Parking permit zone, within the London Borough of Croydon, it is currently lawful without any financial payment required, to park most motor vehicles, owned by Residents, Businesses and Visitors of and to our borough, unless causing obstruction of the highway, any where and at any other time, on a space which is not a bay, for which a permit is required. (3) As a consequence of the greed of the council and unrequited cost to all those above, there would obviously be less revenue to Parking Services due to responsible motorists leaving vehicles in such places above, displaced to, for example yellow lines etc. (4) Other than writing to 70 elected members of the council, three Members of Parliament and the GLA member for Croydon and Sutton plus an unknown number of official or statutory permit holders, to whom borough wide parking permits are issued issued free of charge, none of the current permit holders have been written to. No impact assessment has been carried. Please acknowledge my objection. Thank you. Yours faithfully PD/CH/K16 I object to the above proposal on the following grounds:- (1) A securely parked and unattended motor vehicle, whether fuelled by petrol or diesel, with it [same as email27]
1154	The scheme will unfairly impact lower income residents. Higher income families have space to park their cars in their drives or in private parking spaces. I absolutely support lowering carbon emissions. This is not the way to do it.
1155	Being a household that needs to pay for the permit. We struggle to pay for the permit every single year and are not able to afford a newer car. Having to pay £300 means paying More than our car is even worth.

1156	This is a money making venture . Alternative forms of public transport which are more environmentally friendly should be offered. People are already struggling with bills and those who need their cars for work are to be penalized. Car owners already pay road tax tax on fuel insurance mot this is ridiculous idea and would not improve air quality.
1157	I am a resident of Croydon and the financial impact that this will have on me during this financial year will plunge me into severe financial hardship. You have not given residents sufficient time to budget for this additional cost . Whilst I totally understand the objective of this charge I think that you should give residents an opportunity to sell their vehicle, therefore I would ask that the introduction of this charge is delayed for at least another 12 months.
1158	I believe that emissions based charges would be a blunt instrument. The charges would be be unfair on drivers from lower income groups that drive older small-engined petrol cars, because they cannot afford newer cars - in effect it would operate like a regressive tax. Older petrol cars are less polluting than more modern diesel cars. The new policy would lead to scrapping of older cars, bad for the environment. Rather than penalizing low income individuals and families, the council should focus its efforts on preserving our green space - instead of cutting down fewer trees from residential streets, planting new trees, and refraining from development on green space areas - e.g. the loss of valuable green space opposite Lloyd Park, to develop Coombe Wood School.
1159	The proposal will have an unfair detrimental financial effect on Croydon residents on lower incomes and pensioners . If extended to on and off street parking it will reduce the usage of local shops and service with resulting loss of income , impacting employment
1160	Whilst I agree air pollution should be tackled, I think it's a cynical money making scheme with very high prices, plus it generally fails to say what will be done with the revenue to help the poorest in the borough; I don't see people spending £25-75k on an electric car to save a couple of hundred pounds of extra tax, so I doubt it will do much to emission levels and will hit the poorest hardest. IMO the council would be far better to incentivise (give grants to electric vehicles) than to penalise (charge people).
1161	I have friends and family that live in the Croydon area
1162	EMISSIONS PARKING CHARGING CONSULTATION SUBMISSION 1. Because it was only two days ago that it was realised what the potential impact on Norbury might be of the proposed introduction of emission parking it has not been possible for a definitive view of each of the […] to be agreed. 2. There are four Residents Associations along London Rd in the Norbury & Pollards Hill Ward: Norbury Green, Norbury Village, Pollards Hill and Scots Estate. 3. The following submission is based on the network discussion co-ordinated by the Associations' Planning & Transport Group. 4. Air pollution is an issue that is raised at Residents Associations' meetings for members. Residents are aware of the monitoring equipment on London Rd and that there is a high level of air pollution in the area. 5. The discussion has identified support for the principle of emission based charges in order to reduce CO2 air pollution from vehicles subject to further clarification (including details of the feedback from communities concerned about air quality). 6. The areas covered by the […] include: • the London Rd which has high levels of air pollution along with increasing development for residential, meaning that more and more residents are being exposed to emissions; • a high level of parking in the residential side streets by commuters using Norbury Station;

	• a high level of people on low incomes; • a growing number of residents who are required for work purposes to have a vehicle and to park it where they live. 7. There is concern that by being Borough wide the proposals fail to address the particular air pollution problems along and off the London Rd running through Norbury & Pollards Hill Ward from the Lambeth border to Pollards Hill South/Strathyre Rd. 8. There is also concern that the proposals are discriminatory against those on low incomes, the elderly and younger adults with reduced mobility who are not eligible for a disabled parking badge, and against those with vehicles made before March 2001 which have lower emissions than many vehicles made afterwards. Further they could be counter-productive in terms of other way sin which air pollution could be tackled. 9. With these concerns in mind it has been suggested that the proposals should be withdrawn for a fundamental re-think to develop a strategy, policies and actions which tackle the differing air pollution issues in the different Areas of Place within the Borough, and which seek to ensure there is no discrimination. 10. Ideas for such a strategy that have been suggested in relation to the Norbury and Pollards Hill's stretch of London Rd and the side streets include: (1) consideration of the introduction of a low emission zone along London Rd, with at least two levels of charges: (1) Croydon residents, (2) non-Croydon residents. (2) the re-trenching of public utilities under the London Rd pavements in order to allow for the planting of more trees which will help absorb air pollution. (3) negotiating with Network Rail to stop cutting down trees along the railway tracks, or to plant at least 2 mature trees for every tree cut down. (4) extensively extend Tree Preservation Orders to protect them from being cut down by developers. (5) require all new building developments to include mature trees planting. (6) require all new building developments to be set back from the road to enable tree planting, which will also improve the visual amenity of the road. (7) the re-zoning of railway pricing to reduce the incidence of commuters driving in to Norbury to car and use the Railway Station. 11. The principles involved in these proposals may have relevance to other parts of the Borough, along with the following potential actions: (1) identifying parts of the Borough, including residential side streets, parks and open spaces, where there may be more scope for tree planting. (2) developing charging for diesel vehicles as the first stage in any future proposed emission based charging to encourage owners to change their cars. (3) introducing lower current charges for resident owners of vehicles needed (1) for mobility even if the reduced mobility is not high enough for the owner to have a disabled parking permit; (2) for those who are required to have a vehicle for work and to park it where they live; (3) for those on low incomes such as those on Universal Credit, or those being paid less than the London Living Wage. (4) re-thinking of the 2001 date so as not to penalise the owners of pre-March 2001 cars which are low emission vehicles. 12. Other concerns that have been expressed are: (1) that if the proposals are adopted there will be an incentive for residents to consider turning the fronts of their houses into off-street parking, reducing the number of front gardens, reducing the parking spaces for other residents by the creation of cross-overs, and increasing the risks from surface water draining into gutters. (2) that there will be an increase in motorists trying to park in non-CPZ streets which will increase air pollution in them as well as competition with residents for car parking.

	13. It has been noted that Kingston Council has decided to set up a Citizens Assembly to consider future action on air pollution. This approach to developing a new strategy could be considered. 14. Some of the above points are relevant to the current Council consultation on the Local Plan Review.
1163	I am a local resident in East Croydon. I intend to oppose this increase. Over the last 10 years parking no has become increasingly difficult with increased HMO and flat conversions increasing residential density - as well as misuse of blue badges on top of disabled bays also reducing parking availability. We are rarely able to park near our house and often have to try neighbouring streets. The level of the proposed charge is too substantial given the level of amenity being provided
1164	It is unfair to increase parking permit costs to residents in CPZs above that which is already being charged. Why should Croydon residents bear the unfair charges when there other sources of pollution that can be reduced? Croydon residents chose to live in these areas and they should not be unfairly targeted. There are residents and non-residents that live outside of the CPZs and indeed outside of Croydon travelling into and through Croydon. These are the vehicles that must be targeted. They are bringing in and leaving behind the pollution they produce into the CPZ and central Croydon area. They have a choice but do NOT bear the cost of the increased resident permit charges. It is grossly unfair that vehicles manufactured before March 2001 have to pay the maximum new charge of £300 automatically. Many of these vehicles meet the CO2 emissions of Bands 3 and 4. It is unfair that residents are obliged to change their compliant vehicle at great cost to meet a manufacture date picked by the council. It is counter-productive. It will cause an increase in pollution nationally in the short term to produce additional cars to replace those that comply but do not meet the manufacture date. The energy recovery facility (ERF) run by Viridor is a source of pollution in the centre of Croydon so close to densely populated areas. This ERF should be shut down if Croydon is serious in removing air pollution. At the very least there should be further investment in the pollution capture of its emissions. This ERF will also draw in thousands of large vehicles carrying waste to be incinerated and indeed remove burnt waste to be disposed of. Whether these individual vehicles meet current or new CO2 emissions is irrelevant as the sheer numbers of these vehicles will produce much larger quantities of emissions overall negating any benefit of the reduced CO2 from an individual vehicle. This operation will continue 365 days a year 24/7. 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 bicycle 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.
1165	I am emailing you as a concerned citizen of Croydon with regards to the latest Council proposals being put forward regarding the raising of parking fees for permit holders, by 375% in some cases. Only those wealthy enough or own an electric or hybrid car may benefit from a small discount in their permit fees.

	The council seems to be passing this off as a move to reduce vehicle emissions though many car owners such as myself see this as another stealth tax, which will hit older and less well-off residents the hardest. Croydon Council's press office, or 'propaganda department' as I would call them, have been falsely claiming that this scheme 'could make Croydon London's greenest borough'. The hypocrisy of this statement comes from a local authority who has to pay £10 million per year over 25 years to an incinerator operator to burn domestic rubbish trucked in from across south-east England; all the smoke, fumes and particulates from the chimneys of the Viridor incinerator that will probably be polluting more of Croydon's air than the vehicles do not seem to be taken into consideration in the borough's greener policy claim. It is unclear why permit holders have been specifically targeted since those with off-street parking or those parking on uncontrolled zones within Croydon will be exempt irrespective of how polluting their cars maybe which is totally unfair to people like myself who have no choice but paying for parking their cars outside their own houses. Furthermore, the emissions based proposal seems to have been concocted without proper thought on how the charges have been calculated. The details in the consultation document and my personal investigations have shown that both my vehicles would end up paying the maximum amount of £300 even though these cars are 2004 and 2006 models. I cannot afford to buy newer cars and, even if I could, the only way to pay the lowest band charges would involve downsizing to a small compact car, which would be totally impractical for my large family. Even family sized hybrid vehicles would have to pay increased parking charges since all these actually generate emissions greater than those outlined in Band 2. On average, most vehicles would result in an increase in permit charges between £104 and £300. What the council has also failed to understand is that parked cars DO NOT emit CO2 and do so only when used on the road. However the amount of emissions should have been calculated according to how much the car is being driven rather than the overall emission rating of the car. Deliberating after suppressing details of its on-going consultation from the most affected 9,000 plus residents and blatantly failing to write to parking permit holders to invite their views on the proposals in the consultation is a blatant attempt to avoid getting input from those most affected by this hike in parking charges. This council has been previously accused of 'rigging' its public consultations before, most notably over the introduction of 20mph zones around the borough. Indeed after only narrowly achieving public approval in consultations on the first couple of zones, Croydon avoided putting the matter to residents in the same manner in the south of the borough, because of a well-founded fear it would be roundly rejected. Considering the consultation period ends on 20th of June 2019, it is disgraceful that no direct communication has been received from the council by me and other permit holders. I therefore urge you to investigate this serious and worrying issue that has been raised by many local residents and hold the council accountable for its deliberate and deceitful actions. I look forward to receiving your comments.
1166	I am emailing you as a concerned citizen of Croydon with regards to the latest Council proposals being put forward regarding the raising of parking fees for permit holders, by 375% in some cases. Only those wealthy enough or own an electric or hybrid car may benefit from a small discount in their permit fees.

	The council seems to be passing this off as a move to reduce vehicle emissions though many car owners such as myself see this as another stealth tax, which will hit older and less well-off residents the hardest. Croydon Council's press office, or 'propaganda department' as I would call them, have been falsely claiming that this scheme 'could make Croydon London's greenest borough'. The hypocrisy of this statement comes from a local authority who has to pay £10 million per year over 25 years to an incinerator operator to burn domestic rubbish trucked in from across south-east England; all the smoke, fumes and particulates from the chimneys of the Viridor incinerator that will probably be polluting more of Croydon's air than the vehicles do not seem to be taken into consideration in the borough's greener policy claim. It is unclear why permit holders have been specifically targeted since those with off-street parking or those parking on uncontrolled zones within Croydon will be exempt irrespective of how polluting their cars maybe which is totally unfair to people like myself who have no choice but paying for parking their cars outside their own houses. Furthermore, the emissions based proposal seems to have been concocted without proper thought on how the charges have been calculated. The details in the consultation document and my personal investigations have shown that both my vehicles would end up paying the maximum amount of £300 even though these cars are 2004 and 2006 models. I cannot afford to buy newer cars and, even if I could, the only way to pay the lowest band charges would involve downsizing to a small compact car, which would be totally impractical for my large family. Even family sized hybrid vehicles would have to pay increased parking charges since all these actually generate emissions greater than those outlined in Band 2. On average, most vehicles would result in an increase in permit charges between £104 and £300. What the council has also failed to understand is that parked cars DO NOT emit CO2 and do so only when used on the road. However the amount of emissions should have been calculated according to how much the car is being driven rather than the overall emission rating of the car. Deliberating after suppressing details of its on-going consultation from the most affected 9,000 plus residents and blatantly failing to write to parking permit holders to invite their views on the proposals in the consultation is a blatant attempt to avoid getting input from those most affected by this hike in parking charges. This council has been previously accused of 'rigging' its public consultations before, most notably over the introduction of 20mph zones around the borough. Indeed after only narrowly achieving public approval in consultations on the first couple of zones, Croydon avoided putting the matter to residents in the same manner in the south of the borough, because of a well-founded fear it would be roundly rejected. Considering the consultation period ends on 20th of June 2019, it is disgraceful that no direct communication has been received from the council by me and other permit holders. I therefore urge you to investigate this serious and worrying issue that has been raised by many local residents and hold the council accountable for its deliberate and deceitful actions. I look forward to receiving your comments.
1167	I am emailing you as a concerned citizen of Croydon with regards to the latest Council proposals being put forward regarding the raising of parking fees for permit holders, by 375% in some cases. Only those wealthy enough or own an electric or hybrid car may benefit from a small discount in their permit fees.

	The council seems to be passing this off as a move to reduce vehicle emissions though many car owners such as myself see this as another stealth tax, which will hit older and less well-off residents the hardest. Croydon Council's press office, or 'propaganda department' as I would call them, have been falsely claiming that this scheme 'could make Croydon London's greenest borough'. The hypocrisy of this statement comes from a local authority who has to pay £10 million per year over 25 years to an incinerator operator to burn domestic rubbish trucked in from across south-east England; all the smoke, fumes and particulates from the chimneys of the Viridor incinerator that will probably be polluting more of Croydon's air than the vehicles do not seem to be taken into consideration in the borough's greener policy claim. It is unclear why permit holders have been specifically targeted since those with off-street parking or those parking on uncontrolled zones within Croydon will be exempt irrespective of how polluting their cars maybe which is totally unfair to people like myself who have no choice but paying for parking their cars outside their own houses. Furthermore, the emissions based proposal seems to have been concocted without proper thought on how the charges have been calculated. The details in the consultation document and my personal investigations have shown that both my vehicles would end up paying the maximum amount of £300 even though these cars are 2004 and 2006 models. I cannot afford to buy newer cars and, even if I could, the only way to pay the lowest band charges would involve downsizing to a small compact car, which would be totally impractical for my large family. Even family sized hybrid vehicles would have to pay increased parking charges since all these actually generate emissions greater than those outlined in Band 2. On average, most vehicles would result in an increase in permit charges between £104 and £300. What the council has also failed to understand is that parked cars DO NOT emit CO2 and do so only when used on the road. However the amount of emissions should have been calculated according to how much the car is being driven rather than the overall emission rating of the car. Deliberating after suppressing details of its on-going consultation from the most affected 9,000 plus residents and blatantly failing to write to parking permit holders to invite their views on the proposals in the consultation is a blatant attempt to avoid getting input from those most affected by this hike in parking charges. This council has been previously accused of 'rigging' its public consultations before, most notably over the introduction of 20mph zones around the borough. Indeed after only narrowly achieving public approval in consultations on the first couple of zones, Croydon avoided putting the matter to residents in the same manner in the south of the borough, because of a well-founded fear it would be roundly rejected. Considering the consultation period ends on 20th of June 2019, it is disgraceful that no direct communication has been received from the council by me and other permit holders. I therefore urge you to investigate this serious and worrying issue that has been raised by many local residents and hold the council accountable for its deliberate and deceitful actions. I look forward to receiving your comments.

Equality Analysis Form

Delivering for Croydon | CROYDON
www.croydon.gov.uk

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

Severity of Impact				
	3	3	6	9
	2	2	4	6
	1	1	2	3
		1	2	3
	Likelihood of Impact			

Key

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

Table 5 – Impact scores

Column 1 PROTECTED GROUP	Column 2 LIKELIHOOD OF IMPACT SCORE Use the key below to **score** the **likelihood** of the proposed change impacting each of the protected groups, by inserting either 1, 2, or 3 against each protected group. **1 = Unlikely to impact** **2 = Likely to impact** **3 = Certain to impact**	Column 3 SEVERITY OF IMPACT SCORE Use the key below to **score** the **severity** of impact of the proposed change on each of the protected groups, by inserting either 1, 2, or 3 against each protected group. **1 = Unlikely to impact** **2 = Likely to impact** **3 = Certain to impact**	Column 4 EQUALITY IMPACT SCORE Calculate the **equality impact score** for each protected group by multiplying scores in column 2 by scores in column 3. Enter the results below against each protected group. **Equality impact score = likelihood of impact score x severity of impact score.**
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**

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

		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				

DRAFT

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	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. 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. **If you reach this conclusion, state your reasons and briefly outline the evidence used to support your decision**.	**X**
Adjust the proposed change	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. **If you reach this conclusion, you must outline the actions you will take in Action Plan in section 5 of the Equality Analysis form**	
Continue the proposed change	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. **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.**	
Stop or amend the	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.	

DRAFT

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

DRAFT