

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

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

Section 1 - Collaborative working

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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

s?
sport links.
r parents and elderly neighbours with their shopping.
by current legislation to warrant a disabled parking badge.

Section 2 - Parking management

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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

Section 3 - Controlled Parking Zones

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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

t to the Outer London areas

de my house.

Section 4 - School Streets

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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

n.

Section 5 - Parking charges

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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

yellow lines.

Section 6 - Innovation and technology

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

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

Most frequent negative comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent positive comments (all respondents):

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

Most frequent 'other' comments (all respondents):

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

Highlighted comments that are relevant to groups with protected status:

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