

Publication version



Proposed changes to off-street parking in South Oxfordshire

CONSULTATION REPORT

A review of the feedback on the proposed changes to off-street parking in South Oxfordshire, to help determine the new parking Order and how the council operates its car parks across the district. The new Order, along with this report and the appendix, is published on our website on the [parking policy page](#).

MARCH 2021

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
WHAT HAS HAPPENED AS A RESULT OF THIS FEEDBACK	5
BACKGROUND	6
ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY	7
KEY FINDINGS – QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA	8
FURTHER INFORMATION	38

The appendix is available to view in a separate document on our website on the [parking policy page](#):

APPENDIX A – SURVEY AND FULL RESULTS including quantitative data and qualitative data with a full list of comments received

To note: We don't report in percentages when there are less than 100 comments. We do state percentages in the analysis when there are 100 or over comments within a specific question. The stated percentages do not relate to the overall survey responses.

Response percentages may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding up over 0.5 and rounding down under 0.5

In the Q&A sections, words that appear in black italics are quotes taken from comments received, spelling is verbatim and stands uncorrected. Blue italics are officer responses.

SUMMARY

This report has been produced by council officers to analyse the results of the consultation survey for the proposed changes to off-street parking in South Oxfordshire. The survey was designed to help determine the new parking Order and how the council operates its car parks across the district.

Thank you to all those who took the time to respond and make comments as these have been extremely useful in helping the district council to determine the details of the new car parking order.

The consultation ran for 21 days from 29 October to 19 November 2020. The online survey received 433 responses, showing a very high level of public engagement for this type of consultation. There were approximately 1,900 individual comments and questions from responders. The response has far exceeded what we were expecting, providing very strong data for us to use.

The council also sought comments from statutory consultees such as the highways authority, police and town and parish councils and these have been considered separately. The statutory consultees in general support the draft order and did not raise any significant issues. A table of the comments received from statutory consultees is available at the end of this report.

The consultation survey included 16 questions and asked respondents to tell us how much they agree or disagree with each of the proposed changes which will form part of a new parking order. Respondents were also given the opportunity to provide comments on each proposal, as well as additional comments on the two orders and general suggestions to improve car park service with our contractor SABA.

The majority of responses, 399 (93%), came from members of the public and there were also single replies from 13 businesses/organisations, 10 councillors, two council officers and six who responded with 'other'.

All comments are summarised individually for analysis purposes and questions raised in the responses have been answered in this report by the Technical Services Manager.

A summary of the findings is collated in this report and will be used to report to councillors for them to make a final decision on the Car Park Order at Cabinet, scheduled to take place in early 2021. Subject to approval of the Order, we will publish the new Car Park Order and this consultation report on our website on the [parking policy page](#).

Summary of key findings

- 63% of respondents agreed with a proposal to introduce a one-hour free parking period in the Kings Road car park in Henley-on-Thames. The same number agreed with a proposal to do the same at Henley's Grey's Road car park too. Both proposals were supported by Henley Town Council.

- 66% disagreed with the proposal to introduce a one-hour free parking period in Goldsmiths Lane car park in Wallingford, instead of the current two-hour free parking, to bring it into line with other town centre council car parks in the district. There were 168 responses and a total of 277 individual comments (about twice as many as Greys Inn / Kings Road Henley responses). 86 respondents stated their strong concerns that the proposal would have negative impact on local trade.
- The consultation document included a proposal to align all of our car parks in the centres of Didcot, Henley-on-Thames, Wallingford, Thame and Goring-on-Thames by introducing the charging period from 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday. Very slightly more disagreed with this proposal than agreed with it – 46% of respondents were against it, and 39% were in favour. 48 respondents commented that there were local differences that mean standardisation is not helpful.
- A very high number of respondents, 86%, disagreed or strongly disagreed with a proposal to introduce charging on Sundays in all charging car parks – in fact 77% of the total respondents strongly disagreed. These responses represent the highest level of disagreement for any of the proposals with responders saying it would have a negative effect for trading in towns (99 comments), a negative effect on leisure (80 comments) and a negative effect on religious services and charity provisions (51 comments).
- The proposal to introduce limited waiting at the High Street Car Park in Chinnor between the hours of 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday with a maximum stay of two hours (no charge) received 22% agreement compared with 14% disagreeing.
- The proposal to introduce parking spaces (bays) reserved for electric vehicles (EVs) while charging, and enforcement for unauthorised parking in those reserved spaces, was generally supported with 69% agreeing. Also, the authority to enforce excess charges on EVs if using a charging bay but not charging was supported with 66% agreeing.
- There was also a proposal to introduce half-price parking tickets for EVs able to run at least 20 miles on zero CO2 while revoking the current offer of half-price tickets for low emission vehicles able to run under 120 g CO2/km. Responders were slightly against this proposal as 42% disagreed while 32% agreed or strongly agreed. The most frequently mentioned comment was that favouring EVs was unfair (55 comments) and that EVs are too expensive to buy (37 comments).
- In 'other comments' for us to consider, roughly a third of respondents (54 comments) wanted the council specifically to encourage commerce and the local economy by offering a period of free car parking, to help with the '*viability and vitality*' of market towns. The concern of the decline of the local high street in some towns and the expectation and desire for the council and residents to join together to supporting Covid recovery is a common theme among the consultation responses.

- Other frequent comments were around the desire for robust enforcement and a need for more parking in general.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED AS A RESULT OF THIS FEEDBACK

Thank you to all those who took the time to respond and make comments as these have been extremely useful in helping the district council to determine the details of the new car parking Order.

The findings in collated in this report and the responses from statutory consultees was used to provide information to councillors for them to make a final decision on the Car Park Order.

In light of the consultation feedback, South Oxfordshire Cabinet discussed the feedback from statutory consultees and the public consultation and considered what changes would be made to the Order when it met on 4 February 2021.

Cabinet considered aligning all town centre car parks to charge 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday including up to one hour no charge. This excludes Goldsmiths Lane car park, Wallingford as below. They also considered introducing free parking for up to one hour in Kings Road and Greys Road car parks, Henley.

The Cabinet at South Oxfordshire District Council met on 4 February 2021 to discuss the feedback from statutory consultees and the public consultation and considered changes to the Order.

Cabinet considered the following:

- Aligning all town centre car parks to charge 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday including up to one hour no charge. This excludes Goldsmiths Lane car park, Wallingford as below.
- Introducing free parking for up to one hour in Kings Road and Greys Road car parks, Henley.

These are the amendments to the Order agreed by Cabinet:

- To maintain the current arrangement where Goldsmiths Lane car park in Wallingford has up to two hours free parking Monday to Saturday. That officers carry out usage surveys of the car parks in order to review this after one year. This is because there is a management arrangement with Wallingford Town Council for the district council to manage their part of the car park on their behalf. The town council did not agree with any of the proposed changes to Goldsmiths Lane car park.
- To introduce charging across all council owned car parks on a Sunday from 10am to 5pm (rather than the proposed time from 9am, and including up to one hour at no charge).

- To introduce half price parking permits for electric vehicles. Feedback from the survey asked how the vehicles would be identified. The report will indicate that this permit includes those vehicles eligible for the 'cleaner vehicle discount' from the London Congestion Charge and as detailed on the Transport for London website page 'Discounts and exemptions' <https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/congestion-charge/discounts-and-exemptions> (due to change on 25 October 2021). Note this is also in line with proposals for the ZEZ (zero emission zone) for the centre of Oxford where only 100 per cent emission vehicles will be able to use the zone free of charge starting in Summer 2021.

Following approval of Cabinet, we will publish the new Car Park Order and this consultation report with the appendix on our website on the [parking policy page](#).

BACKGROUND

Last August the council's Cabinet agreed to a number of options which would go on to form part of the new parking Order and determine how it operates its car parks across the district. We are required to review all car park fees and charges every year to make sure the cost of running the car parks are met by the residents that use them.

When we began this consultation, we were proposing to standardise the charging hours across the district so that all car parks in the town centres are the same, i.e. 9am to 5pm and have one-hour free parking, including in Henley-on-Thames. We were also considering charging on a Sunday and introducing limited waiting to address parking issues in Chinnor. We wanted to be able to enforce charging bays for electric vehicles in preparation for when they are in place: and offer discounted permits for users of electric vehicles.

The following changes were being proposed to off-street parking in South Oxfordshire:

(a) to revoke the South Oxfordshire District Council (Off-Street Parking Places) Order 2011;

(b) to make the South Oxfordshire District Council (Off-Street Parking Places)(No.1) Order 2021;

(c) to introduce a one-hour free parking in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks in Henley-on-Thames and Goldsmiths Lane, Wallingford;

(d) to align all car parks in the centre of market towns of Didcot, Henley-on-Thames, Wallingford and Thame, as well as Goring-on-Thames by introducing the charging period from 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday;

(e) to introduce charging on Sundays in all charging car parks;

(f) introduce limited waiting at High Street Car Park, Chinnor between the hours of 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday with a maximum stay of two hours (no charge);

(g) to introduce spaces (bays) reserved for electric vehicles whilst charging and enforcement for unauthorised parking in those reserved spaces for i) parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle and ii) for parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle;

(h) to introduce half price tickets for electric vehicles (able to run at least 20 miles on zero CO2 and revoke the current offer of half price tickets for low emission vehicles (those vehicles under 120 g CO2/km).

The proposals in the consultation are based on the report and decision by Cabinet last summer. You can view the options that were considered at Cabinet in the [Cabinet report under 'item 16' on our website](#).

ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY

A summary of the engagement and reporting methodology is below.

- To help publicise the consultation and encourage wide participation from the public, businesses and all those who use the council's car parks in the district, the communications team updated the council website to explain why we were doing a consultation and provide a link to the survey
- They also helped promote the survey via a press release to local media and promoted it through social media (Twitter and Facebook)
- District councillors, town and parish councils were also informed;
- Public notices were displayed on or near payment machines at all council owned car parks in the district;
- An online survey included 16 questions and offered participants the opportunity to tell us how much they agree with proposed changes to the car park fees and charges and also provide comments on each of the proposals; a copy of the survey is in the appendix;
- Statutory consultees were notified directly via email from John Backley, Technical Services Manager and the responses are being analysed separately from this report (the table of comments is included at the end of this report);
- The consultation ran for three weeks from 29 October to 19 November 2020;
- The online survey received 433 responses; 153 people looked at the survey but didn't answer all of the questions and submit the survey;
- There were approximately 1,900 individual comments and questions from responders; these have been summarised individually for analysis purposes and a summary of comments is in this report;
- Any personal information supplied to us within the comments that could identify anyone has been redacted and will not be shared or published in the report. Some spelling, grammatical and punctuation errors in the original comments were

corrected in this report; a full list of uncorrected comments can be found in the appendix;

- Where questions were raised by survey respondents, officers have provided answers throughout the report;
- The consultation was carried out in conformity with our public engagement charter¹.

KEY FINDINGS – QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA

The key quantitative and qualitative findings from the consultation are summarised below.

Respondents were not required to provide answers to all the questions. The survey asked how far participants agree or disagree with each of the proposals being put forward for the new car park Order.

Q1 Respondents were asked to tell us how they are responding to the survey.

Out of a total of 433 responses, 93% of survey respondents (399) responded as an individual or member of the public. 3% (13) responded as a business or organisation, 2% (10) as a district, county or town/parish councillor and 5% (2) as a district, county or town/parish officer. 1%, 6 responders, chose to respond with 'other' (listed below).

Q1. Are you responding as:										Response Percent	Response Total
1	An individual/member of the public								92.79%	399	
2	A business/organisation								3.02%	13	
3	A district, county or town/parish councillor								2.33%	10	
4	A district, county or town/parish officer								0.47%	2	
5	Other (please specify):								1.40%	6	
Statistics		Minimum	1	Mean	1.15	Std. Deviation	0.61	Satisfaction Rate	3.66	answered	430
		Maximum	5	Variance	0.37	Std. Error	0.03			skipped	3
Other (please specify): (6)											
1	Senior citizen (86) resident of Wallingford.										
2	wallingford town councillor										
3	Councillor D										
4	Churches Together in the Wallingford Area										
5	Individual member of the public and business retailer										

¹ <https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/south-oxfordshire-district-council/about-the-council/get-in-touch/consultations/>

Proposal (c) to introduce a one-hour free parking in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks in Henley-on-Thames and Goldsmiths Lane, Wallingford

Q2 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce one-hour free parking in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks.

Currently, there is a 60p charge for parking up to one-hour in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks in Henley-on-Thames.

A large majority (63%) strongly agreed or agreed with the Greys Road proposal and the same number agreed with the Kings Road proposal. It was also supported by Henley Town Council.

10% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the Greys Road proposal while 9% strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal for Kings Road.

Q2. Currently, there is a 60p charge for parking up to one-hour in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks in Henley-on-Thames. The proposal is to introduce one-hour free parking in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposals?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Response Total
Greys Road car park	31.0% (130)	31.9% (134)	17.9% (75)	4.5% (19)	5.5% (23)	9.3% (39)	420
Kings Road car park	30.8% (128)	32.5% (135)	18.3% (76)	3.8% (16)	5.0% (21)	9.6% (40)	416
						answered	421
						skipped	12

Matrix Charts

2.1. Greys Road car park			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		31.0%	130
2	Agree		31.9%	134
3	Neither agree nor disagree		17.9%	75
4	Disagree		4.5%	19
5	Strongly disagree		5.5%	23
6	Don't know		9.3%	39

2.1. Greys Road car park									Response Percent	Response Total
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.5	Std. Deviation	1.55	Satisfaction Rate	29.9	answered	420
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.4	Std. Error	0.08				

2.2. Kings Road car park									Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree								30.8%	128
2	Agree								32.5%	135
3	Neither agree nor disagree								18.3%	76
4	Disagree								3.8%	16
5	Strongly disagree								5.0%	21
6	Don't know								9.6%	40
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.49	Std. Deviation	1.55	Satisfaction Rate	29.76	answered	416
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.4	Std. Error	0.08				

Q3 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This proposal received 63 responses with a total of 85 individual comments and questions. The most frequently mentioned comments were that 2 hours free parking was preferred (14 comments). 9 comments were made that this represented a loss of income for the council. 6 comments were made that this would be good for local trade. Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

- (15 N/A as not local)
- 14 2 free hours parking time preferred
- 9 loss of revenue for council
- 6 good for trade (encourages economic activity)
- 4 60p for first hour is positive
- 4 barrier to economic activity
- 3 enforcement measures needed
- 3 discourages active travel (walking / cycling)
- 3 free Sunday parking wanted
- 3 proposal will create congestion (one hour free)
- 3 More data needed to inform policy
- 2 agree with alignment
- 2 charging is good deterrent and fits with CC emergency
- 2 Greys Rd / Henley not enough spaces
- 2 residents should park for free
- 2 will make no difference
- 1 high emission vehicles shouldn't be allowed to have free parking
- 1 positive if prevents residents bays being used

- 1 Henley is congested
- 1 will ease morning congestion
- 1 No change needed
- 1 policy variation between towns needed (one size does not fit all)

QUESTIONS

Q. I also think using Greys rd car park as a cut through is a nightmare. Are there any plans to improve the layout? I've never seen this in a town before and the congestion is really bad.

A. No plans to change this. Keeping Greys Road car park as a cut through reduces the amount of traffic that otherwise would go through the centre of town to get to Kings Road car park for example and Waitrose.

Q. How does this fee change affect the rest of the fee structure for the remaining parking time?

A. No change.

Q4 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a one-hour free parking in Goldsmiths Lane car park, Wallingford.

Currently, there is a two-hour free parking in Goldsmith's Lane car park, Wallingford.

Most respondents (66%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposal. There was strong agreement or agreement from 19% of respondents, with 11% saying they neither agree nor disagree, and 4% answered with 'don't know'.

Q4. Currently, there is a two-hour free parking in Goldsmith's Lane car park, Wallingford. The proposal is to introduce a one-hour free parking in Goldsmiths Lane car park, Wallingford. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal?										Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree									5.62%	24
2	Agree									13.35%	57
3	Neither agree nor disagree									10.54%	45
4	Disagree									14.52%	62
5	Strongly disagree									51.76%	221
6	Don't know									4.22%	18
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	4.06	Std. Deviation	1.35	Satisfaction Rate	61.22		answered	427
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.83	Std. Error	0.07				skipped	6

Q5 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This question received 168 responses and a total of 277 individual comments (so about twice as many as Greys Inn / Kings Road Henley responses). 86 respondents stating their strong concerns that the proposal would have negative impact on local trade. 2 hours free parking was preferred by responders (65 comments) with an additional 40 comments saying don't make a change to current policy.

48 comments related to the negative impact on leisure (for example parking, then going for a walk or combining errands, shopping and lunch or spending leisure time with family and friends in cafes, pubs and restaurants. 10 comments come forward about the impact charging for car parking would have; creating issues for residents as people who would otherwise park in the car park would seek free parking in nearby residential streets. Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

86	not good for local trade
65	2 free hours preferred
48	not good for leisure
40	don't make a change
10	negative impact on residents (people will seek free parking in resi areas)
3	N/A not local resident
3	Blanket all car parks with the same charging method
3	be Covid aware - things take longer
3	People will go to Didcot where this is 2 hours free
2	provide more public transport
2	negative impact on those going to Church
2	council being 'greedy'
1	more data needed / impact assessment required
1	enforcement measures needed

QUESTIONS

Q. There may be a second order impact to local business in Wallingford if the 2 hour free parking is reduced to 1 hour. How is this considered within the proposal?

A. Please see the report to Cabinet. Other town centres in South Oxfordshire have only one free hour parking and so this proposal brings Goldsmiths Lane car park in line with them.

Q. The Cabinet Report from August 2020 mentions that Officers have estimated that the impact would be de minimis [sic] because it's difficult to estimate the change in usage. Where's the evidence then to support the benefit or need for a change in the current charging arrangements?

A. Goldsmiths Lane car park used to have only one free hour parking when Waitrose was situated adjacent to the car park. When the new Waitrose was opened at the other end of

Wallingford in mid 2000s, Goldsmiths Lane car park usage dropped dramatically. In order to encourage shoppers to the Southern end of the town the council increased the one hour free parking to two hours. Now that the usage has returned it is consistent with the offer in other car parks in South Oxfordshire to reduce this to one hour free.

Q. People are not coming to Wallingford now, why put up the parking charges?

A. See response directly above.

Proposal (d) to align all car parks in the centre of market towns of Didcot, Henley-on-Thames, Wallingford and Thame, as well as Goring-on-Thames by introducing the charging period from 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday

Q6 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to align all car parks in the centre of market towns of Didcot, Henley-on-Thames, Wallingford and Thame, as well as Goring-on-Thames by introducing the charging period from 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday.

Currently, not all car parks have the same charging period.

There was a slight preference towards disagreement with 46% of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing and 39% agreeing or strongly agreeing. 15% said they neither agree nor disagree with the proposal.

Q6. Currently, not all car parks have the same charging period. The proposal is to align all car parks in the centre of market towns of Didcot, Henley-on-Thames, Wallingford and Thame, as well as Goring-on-Thames by introducing the charging period from 9am to 5pm Monday to Saturday. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	Strongly agree		12.12% 52							
2	Agree		26.81% 115							
3	Neither agree nor disagree		14.92% 64							
4	Disagree		14.92% 64							
5	Strongly disagree		31.00% 133							
6	Don't know		0.47% 2							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	3.27	Std. Deviation	1.45	Satisfaction Rate	45.44	answered	429
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.11	Std. Error	0.07			skipped	4

Q7 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This question received 151 responses covering 175 individual comments and questions. When combined a total of 63 comments relate to free parking being a positive to local economic activity. 48 comments disputed the usefulness or need to standardise due local differences. An additional 5 comments saying this should decision made at a local level. *“Cost should relate to value, not be homogeneous”* said one responder, supply and demand on car parking should be a factor in charge setting, some mentioned the potential gain for the council to charge more in a high demand car parks (Henley). Other reasons given for non-standard charge scale being size of the town, degree of tourist attraction and the cost of running any given car park. 15 comments were positive to the proposal of uniformity (5 of the 15 on the condition of a period of free parking).

The next biggest clusters are interlinked and have the same numbers - 22 comments clustered around free Saturday afternoon specifically being a positive and 22 comments focussed on the issue of supporting local trade with free parking at quieter times. 8 comments are around loss of trade that the car parking changes would bring about. Additionally, 7 comments are positive about 2 free hours and 7 comments telling us they wanted to keep the current policy of one hour free. When combined a total of 63 comments relate to free parking being a positive to local economic activity. A request for further data and evidence base was requested in 7 comments.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

- 48 local differences mean standardisation not helpful
- 22 free Saturday afternoon positive
- 22 Incentivise to generate local trade. ie. free quieter times (after 2 weekday, Sat pm and Sunday)
- 15 Uniformity across district positive (with free caveats x 5)
- 8 changing things will impact negatively on local economy
- 7 2 hours free wanted
- 7 keep current policy - 1 hour free / 10-5 during the week is good
- 7 more information and data requested: why? Are running cost of different car parks the same? Are they running at a loss? Does free parking generate economic activity?
- 5 local decision for length of free period / needs of residents and businesses
- 2 Remove cash from parking situation / pay by card at all
- 3 first thing free (before 10am) plus an hour free supports local economy
- 3 remove all town centre parking charges / should be free
- 3 increasing charging will incentivise active travel
- 2 think Covid (residents loss of income) / delay b/c of Covid
- 2 provides parking for residents when bays full
- 2 only creates revenue for council
- 1 information not clear to lay person
- 1 will create congestion looking for roadside parking spots
- 1 Wallingford church goers shouldn't have to pay
- 1 all CP should follow current GSL Wallingford car park policy
- 1 waiting list for annual pass too long (over year)
- 1 free parking supports volunteer activity
- 1 nationwide standard parking tariffs would bring benefit

- 1 unfair to (low pay) shop staff
- 1 Enforcement needed
- 1 restrictions on high emission vehicles
- 1 All parking should be 2 hours free and 60p/minute after that. Sat/Sun/Public Holidays should be free
- 1 Bad idea
- 1 Consultation not clear - two different propositions (1. Charging hours and 2. charging days)
- 1 Next, Didcot will then lose it's free 2 hours

QUESTIONS (7 are referred to in list above as more information and data requested)

Q. Will the Vale of the White Horse car parks be doing the same? I live in Didcot but often go to Abingdon and Wantage, and have to keep double checking the different rules

A. Please refer to a similar consultation exercise carried out in Vale of White Horse, on the website: <https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/vale-of-white-horse-district-council/parking-roads-and-streets/parking/parking-policy-consultation-have-your-say/>

Q. I thought it was Monday to Sunday your proposal? [this says Mon – Sat].

A. The Sunday charging is a separate proposal so we can consider, analyse and agree each proposal separately.

Q. How will this affect the fees?

A. All fees increased by 20p on 1 December 2020. Please refer to the Cabinet report about the financial implications.

Q. I did not see any reason given for aligning. To remain consistent with the objective "to make sure the cost of running the car parks are met by the residents that use them", presumably the costs of running each car park and their use are comparable.

A. Parking charges in South Oxfordshire continue to be very low compared to many areas across the region and we are one of the few local authorities that haven't raised fees in recent years. However, with maintenance costs continuing to rise, we are now, for the first time, forced to look at making some changes.

We do not consider individual use but look at the total income across all car parks and the total expenditure. The parking policy aims to have an income which at least meets the cost of running all car parks.

Q. The proposal does not explain why the harmonisation is necessary.

A. There is no evidence to suggest that one town is less or more busy or requires more free parking than another therefore a consistent district wide approach of one hour free across all car parks has been adopted.

Q. Pointless reason given for the changes. Why do they all need to be the same???

A. See response directly above: There is no evidence to suggest that one town is less or more busy or requires more free parking than another therefore a consistent district wide approach of one hour free across all car parks has been adopted.

Q. *What is to be gained by this?*

A. See above response to question on harmonisation: *There is no evidence to suggest that one town is less or more busy or requires more free parking than another therefore a consistent district wide approach of one hour free across all car parks has been adopted.*

Q. *As stated in response to No.3, this alignment of car parking charges across the district makes no sense, as it assumes that firstly, all the market Towns are the same, which they are clearly not, given the car parking spaces per capita details from 2011 and SODC usage figures from 2013. Secondly, there is no updated usage data to provide the evidence to support the benefits of aligning all car parks and also the impact of charging in Saturdays up to 5pm. The Cabinet Report for 2013 stated that the impact on the car parking account of introducing the free charge for the last three hours on Saturday in the first place was negligible and depended on the individual car park. Further surveys were required to assess the full impact, so where are these further surveys to support the introduction?*

A. Usage surveys to be published on car park website pages in early 2021 to show that all town centre car parks are nearly at maximum usage

Q. *Where is the market research that justifies this proposal? Local circumstances may vary (I presume this the reason for the historic differences) - unless you have evidence that a "one size fits all" proposal is appropriate, this is change cannot be justified*

A. The council is aiming to have a consistent approach across all towns by offering one hour free parking in all town centre car parks.

Q. *For what purpose s the alignment? As a customer, not all car parks I use are run by SODc so doesn't give me consistency, and not all towns have the same supply and demand for spaces.*

This proposal seems on paper to be an exercise that is in reality not required.

I understand car parks must cover their operating costs and see no evidence that this is not happening, or reports to say that the current car parks are not serving the needs of the customers well.

A. Please refer to the Cabinet report on running costs and the notes above on consistency of charging across the district. The council only has control over the car parks in its ownership so cannot make any changes to other car parks.

Proposal (e) to introduce charging on Sundays in all charging car parks

Q8 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce charging on Sundays from 9am to 5pm in all off-street car parks where we currently charge.

Currently, we do not charge for parking on a Sunday in all off-street car parks.

The large majority (77%) strongly disagreed.

A very high number of respondents, 86%, either disagree or strongly disagree with this proposal. A very high number, 77%, strongly disagree. These responses represent the highest level of disagreement for any of the proposals. 10% of respondents either strongly agree or agree.

Q8. Currently, we do not charge for parking on a Sunday in all off-street car parks. The proposal is to introduce charging on Sundays from 9am to 5pm in all off-street car parks where we currently charge. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal?								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							5.14%	22	
2	Agree							4.44%	19	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							3.50%	15	
4	Disagree							9.11%	39	
5	Strongly disagree							76.64%	328	
6	Don't know							1.17%	5	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	4.51	Std. Deviation	1.11	Satisfaction Rate	70.23	answered	428
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.23	Std. Error	0.05			skipped	5

Q9 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This question received 211 responses and 447 individual comments and questions. The comment mentioned most frequently, by 99 respondents, was that this proposal will have a negative effect for trading in towns. A similar view, regarding having a negative effect this time on leisure (which in some cases overlaps into local economic activity), was held by 80 respondents. 51 comments concerned the negative effect this proposal would have on religious services and associated charity provisions. 42 comments report it would affect residents and trade – Sunday's should be kept free. 37 comments mentioned allowing some periods of free parking, such as early mornings, 2 (or in few comments 4 hours), Sundays, Bank Holidays or after lunchtime. Also, on the theme of attending religious service, 24 comments want Sunday mornings free for those attending worship.

Some comments ask if this policy may disproportionately effect and disadvantage seniors (*old people*) and those on very low incomes. 23 comments think Sunday charges is a way for the council to make money without due regard to the impact. 21 mention this proposal would have a negative impact on residents (who out of necessity park in the car parks for free on Saturday afternoons and Sunday due lack of street parking and or lack of securing permits). 19 comments were made questioning the availability of where the data is to back up the proposal. Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

99 Negative effect for trading in towns

- 80 negative effect on leisure in town
- 51 Negative effect on religious services & charity provisions
- 42 Affects residents and trade: keep free Sundays
- 37 Allow some free parking (early morning free, 2 hours, 4 hours, Sundays, Bank Holidays, free after lunchtime)
- 24 Sunday morning free for worship
- 23 A way to make money for council (*greed, mean spirited, unjust*)
- 21 Negative impact on residents (creating problem street parking in nearby residential areas)
- 19 more info needed. Henley produce surplus? Revenue generated? To be spent on what? Low use car parks? How benefit local economy?
- 11 No change needed
- 8 more residents permits needed / extend resident permits to include a car park
- 7 No enforcement currently / enforcement needed
- 5 Residents have no alternative but to park in car parks
- 5 Positive effect for trading in town
- 3 will create problem parking in residential areas
- 1 would put a stop to weekend free parking
- 1 agree to proposal on condition of no upper 3 hour limit
- 1 personal story
- 1 Explore alternative income generators: pay Cllrs less. no free lunches or cars
- 1 restrictions and higher charges on high emission vehicles
- 1 Wallingford's shops not open Sundays
- 1 Council shouldn't subsidise car parks, use income to improve public realm and cycle storage
- 1 Be consistent with shop opening hours (11 to 4 on Sunday not 9 - 5pm)
- 1 charge a flat rate £1 on Sunday
- 1 Unnecessary and onerous
- 1 Charges should be made in town centre and retail park car parks
- 1 Sunday is a shopping day therefore charge is OK

QUESTIONS and PROPOSAL

Q. You should demonstrate that the current levels of income do not support the expense required to run the car parks. I understand, for example, that the car parks at Henley produce a significant surplus which should mean free parking on a Sunday (which encourages people into our towns) should remain.

A. Please see Cabinet report of 6 August 2020 that shows overall a relatively small surplus in the car park account.

Q. You do not state the reason or benefit of doing this. More revenue? Ok—for what purpose, how will that money be used? In contrast, no fee parking on Sundays helps to draw in local tourism, helping businesses. In contrast, adding Sunday fees would penalise locals and detract visitors.

A. As in response directly above, refer to Cabinet report on financial implications. The fees are set at a level that mean the users pay for the parking rather than the tax payer (income at least meets expenditure)

Q. *For what purpose is this being introduced? Extra revenue which would be nominal.*

A. To ensure the cost of parking falls to the users and not the council tax payer.

Q. *How does this benefit businesses?*

A. Charging and enforcement on Sunday will mean a regular turn over of spaces in the short stay car parks which will mean more.

Q. *have you done an E&D assessment? (equality and diversity)*

A. No, this is not included in the car park policy.

Q. *What do you think you are achieving? The cost of staff against the money taken can't add up!*

A. Please refer to Cabinet report for estimates on income vs expenditure.

Q. *Very few businesses are open in Wallingford on Sundays, what would you be charging for?*

A. For use of the car park and visitors to Wallingford o Sundays.

Q. *What is the benefit to be sought here? Has the impact to local businesses been considered?*

A. That the cost of running the car parks falls on the users not on the council tax payers.

Q. *You do not state the reason or benefit of doing this. More revenue? Ok—for what purpose, how will that money be used?*

A. To ensure the income raised from car parks at least meets the cost of running them.

Q. *Where are the surveys conducted by SODC that support this or indeed where is the data that suggests that a Sunday Charge will 'secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic' within the various Market Towns?*

A. Not relevant. Sunday charging meets the first car park policy which is ensuring cost of the service falls on the car park users not the council tax payer.

Q. *Is this a tax on religion?*

A. No.

Q. *Why might anyone pay to park in Didcot on a Sunday?*

A. Most shops are open on a Sunday.

Q. *This is bringing in revenue which isn't required to meet the current ruling costs of the car parks and therefore with only add to the surplus, of which SODC should not run much beyond operating costs.*

A. Refer to Cabinet report the surplus projected is minimal.

Q. *This charge will hit 3 groups, church goers...tourists (not many shops open on a sunday) and residents with no off street parking.*

It appears to be a cynical move to charge for periods that are not leaving car parks overwhelmed with customers without actually proving the need for the additional income.

A. No, it is to have a car park service that is paid for by users not council tax payers.

Q. *this alignment of car parking charges across the district makes no sense, particularly given the differences that exist between Market Towns in the District. The Cabinet Report in August states that the current and forecast car parking account currently runs at a surplus of around 12%, so how does this additional charge satisfy the legal requirements under Section 32 of the 1984 Road Traffic Regulations Act? Where are the surveys conducted by SODC that support this or indeed where is the data that suggests that a Sunday Charge will 'secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic' within the various Market Towns? You cannot use anecdotal evidence as a basis for introducing such a charge, as referred to in Para. 48 of the 2020 Cabinet Report.*

A. [See replies to reply directly above.](#)

PROPOSAL: *Looking at the numbers in the Cabinet report you are proposing to charge people parking in all the towns to park on Sundays just so those visiting Henley Monday-Saturday get free parking for an hour.*

I cannot see how this is fair as the 4 towns are not all the same either in their individual make-up nor with regard to the mix of parking. In Henley the SODC car parks are the only off-street option in the town centre and the other car parks charge on Sundays. Didcot and Wallingford have large non-SODC town centre car parks which are free on Sundays and Thame has the two High Street car parking areas which, whilst they are technically not off-street act in that way - and are free on Sundays

I would propose that the Henley car parks have charges introduced on Sundays but that the other SODC car parks do not.

If that is unacceptable then I would suggest that charges on Sundays only apply from 11am which - with the 1 hour free period - allow churchgoers to continue to enjoy free parking.

Response: [To consider as part of review](#), if Cabinet wish to start charging later on Sunday ie from 10am but this may not bring in sufficient income to ensure that car park income meets expenditure.

Proposal (f) introduce limited waiting at High Street Car Park, Chinnor between the hours of 9am to 5pm, Monday to Saturday with a maximum stay of two hours (no charge)

Q10 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a limit of 2 hours free parking between 9am - 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

Currently, there is no limit to the number of hours you can park your vehicle in the High Street car park in Chinnor.

Most people neither agreed nor disagreed with this proposal (39%) or replied with 'don't know' (25%). The number who agreed or strongly agreed (22%) was slightly more than those who disagreed or strongly disagreed (14%).

Q10. Currently, there is no limit to the number of hours you can park your vehicle in the High Street car park in Chinnor. The proposal is to introduce a limit of 2 hours free parking between 9am - 5pm, Monday to Saturday. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the above proposal?

			Response Percent	Response Total						
1	Strongly agree		5.74%	24						
2	Agree		16.51%	69						
3	Neither agree nor disagree		39.23%	164						
4	Disagree		4.55%	19						
5	Strongly disagree		9.33%	39						
6	Don't know		24.64%	103						
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	3.69	Std. Deviation	1.6	Satisfaction Rate	53.83	answered	418
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.55	Std. Error	0.08			skipped	15

Q11 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the following proposal:

Currently, there is no limit to the number of hours you can park your vehicle in the High Street car park in Chinnor. The proposal is to introduce a limit of 2 hours free parking between 9am - 5pm, Monday to Saturday.

This question received 59 responses and 74 individual comments and questions. 12 comments were made about wanting to have 2 hours free parking, there is broad agreement that 2 hours is sufficient to shop / run errands. 10 comments concerned and agree with the need for standardisation. 7 thought there would be a negative impact on local shops. 5 comments said that there is a contradiction with earlier proposal to standardise – “either the times are aligned or they are not”. Receiving 3 comments each were: standardisation is unfair and there should be free parking on weekends and public holidays. Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

- (17 N/A)
- 12 2 hours free parking wanted / 2 hours sufficient
- 10 standardisation needed
- 7 concern negative impact on local shops
- 5 contradiction; either the times are aligned or they are not
- 3 standardisation unfair
- 3 Sat/Sun/Public Holidays should be free
- 2 Enforcement needed
- 2 After 2pm Saturday should be free
- 2 How to weight data according to local connection
- 1 suggest annual review with annual increases
- 1 Requests council consults with Chinnor village Centre
- 1 Where are shop workers going to park for work in town

- 1 Option needed to buy a season ticket for people who work in town
- 1 Change justified if there is a problem with congestion and traffic
- 1 first hour free
- 1 include the parking issues for residents that pay for parking permits
- 1 Hope to encourage active travel day for free?
- 1 Need to encourage churn

QUESTIONS

Q. Where is the impact assessment?

A. There is no specific assessment. This change has been requested by the Chinnor parish council and supported by local councillors.

Q. Is it to stop people parking all day for free?

A. Yes, it is to ensure a turn over of spaces and reduce the risk of people parking all day in the car park.

Proposal (g) to introduce spaces (bays) reserved for electric vehicles whilst charging and enforcement for unauthorised parking in those reserved spaces for: i) parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle ii) parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle

Q12 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce enforcement for: i) parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle ii) parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle.

Currently, we don't have the authority to enforce parking bays where electric vehicles are charging.

This question was generally supported with 69% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Also, the authority to enforce excess charges on EVs if using a charging bay but not charging was supported with 66% agreeing or strongly agreeing.

Q12. Currently, we don't have the authority to enforce parking bays where electric vehicles are charging. The proposal is to introduce enforcement for: i) parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle ii) parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the above proposals?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Response Total
i) enforcement for parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle	33.5% (141)	35.2% (148)	12.4% (52)	7.4% (31)	9.5% (40)	2.1% (9)	421

Q12. Currently, we don't have the authority to enforce parking bays where electric vehicles are charging. The proposal is to introduce enforcement for: i) parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle ii) parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with the above proposals?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Response Total	
ii) enforcement for parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle	30.4% (129)	33.0% (140)	14.9% (63)	9.4% (40)	10.4% (44)	1.9% (8)	424	
							answered	426
							skipped	7

Matrix Charts

12.1. i) enforcement for parking in those spaces with a vehicle that is not an electric vehicle								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							33.5%	141	
2	Agree							35.2%	148	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							12.4%	52	
4	Disagree							7.4%	31	
5	Strongly disagree							9.5%	40	
6	Don't know							2.1%	9	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.31	Std. Deviation	1.36	Satisfaction Rate	26.13	answered	421
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.86	Std. Error	0.07				

12.2. ii) enforcement for parking an electric vehicle in those spaces but without charging the vehicle								Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Strongly agree							30.4%	129	
2	Agree							33.0%	140	
3	Neither agree nor disagree							14.9%	63	
4	Disagree							9.4%	40	
5	Strongly disagree							10.4%	44	
6	Don't know							1.9%	8	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	2.42	Std. Deviation	1.37	Satisfaction Rate	28.4	answered	424
	Maximum	6	Variance	1.89	Std. Error	0.07				

Q13 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This question received 102 responses and 150 individual comments. 19 comments focussed on the perceived lack of current need for EV charging bays and this would leave

potential parking bays idle. *“There are insufficient electric vehicles at this time to justify leaving spaces empty most of the time.* In addition to the 19 saying it is too soon, 13 commented that more parking needed / already under strain with an additional 4 comments stating that spaces should be distributed evenly.

The same number of comments (19) commented on the need for enforcement – and in both directions, for EV cars to be ticketed when not charging and for non EV cars to be ticketed when in an EV charging bay. The successful administration was questioned. One responder said *It's not clear from the question whether "vehicle charging" constitutes just being plugged in or actually requiring charge. If the former, then plugging-in would seem an easy way around charges*”. There is a seam of comments (18) are on the theme of fairness and the council giving, what is reported to be a further advantage to those already higher income residents. 13 comments agreed that this proposal would encourage electric vehicles including for residents without drives or at home charging points.

8 commented that there should be no exemptions for any cars and 6 suggesting EV should (and can afford) to a. park and b. afford to pay for charging facility and electricity. 5 commented why not support and potentially incentivise greener minded residents by including all greener cars (low emission, hybrid and hydrogen) rather than being EV / zero emission exclusive?

Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

- 19 Not needed yet (will leave spaces empty when spaces are at premium)
- 19 Enforcement needed regards EV and non EV as charging bays only
- 18 Benefit / exclusive to wealthy
- 13 More parking needed / parking already under strain
- 13 Encourage electric vehicles is positive (including for residents without drives or at home charging points)
- 9 More electric charging points needed
- 8 No exemptions for any cars
- 6 Should charge EV as well to park and for the facility / electricity
- 5 Greener cars not just EV
- 4 Should distribute all spaces evenly
- 3 EV cars create pollution in production / make air pollution (PM2.5)
- 3 Consider other greener options too P&R, improving active travel, cycle parking (more affordable too)
- 3 Charge up at home
- 2 Cables safety risk
- 2 possible loss of trade if car park full and only EV space left
- 1 Consider free parking bay for retailers
- 1 Signage must be clear
- 1 creating preferential space and pricing for just electric not viable
- 1 Link charges with income (EV owners can afford a car park tkt / non EV will subsidise via increase)
- 1 Penalty for non EV car in charging bay

- 1 *Another way for the council to rob more money off people*
- 1 Electric charge points expect them to get vandalised quickly
- 1 Positive short term measure to encourage EV and reduce pollution
- 1 Charging bays for charging sensible
- 1 Charging points should be installed in less busy areas.

INFORMATION, PROPOSAL AND QUESTIONS

INFORMATION: *Following the governments announcement today [18.11.2020] that all new cars by 2030 need to be electric, the need for an incentive (free parking) is not needed and will significantly reduce your income.*

Officer response: EVs will still have to pay the same parking fees as vehicles with internal combustion engines (ICE).

INFORMATION x 2 responders: *As for penalising EV's that aren't on charge - I don't think you understand the requirements of the vehicles or their batteries. They can't simply be left on charge when they don't need it.*

Electric vehicles do not need charging every time they stop. This is onerous.

Officer response: EVs can park in any space in the car park it is just for charging that the spaces are reserved.

PROPOSAL: *In the Thame Cattle Market car park, I am concerned by the number of cars idling and illegally parking by the entrance to Barley Hill Primary School. For the safety and health of the children, please either remove parking from this area or failing that place these proposed electric car parking bays and charge points in the current bays next to the entrance to school.*

Officer response: Electric vehicles will not idle or pollute. We are currently reviewing the exact location of potential EV charging bays and will consider your comment.

QUESTIONS:

Q. *Why not just say EV's can park for free?*

A. No, they should pay for parking like any other vehicle.

Q. *Why are you offering preferential parking?*

A. It is not preferential, just to encourage take up and so EV owners know where there are EV charging points if they don't have them at home.

Q. *Why support the rich and not the poor or business owners?*

A. EVs are becoming more affordable and installing EV charging points will encourage more take up which will eventually bring down the purchase cost.

Q. *In Didcot there are 20 empty disabled spaces, how many will you set aside for electric vehicles?*

A. To be agreed.

Q. X 2 responders *how many bays or what proportion of bays will be reserved for charging points?*

A. To be agreed.

Q. If there are no spaces left except electric vehicles, will you be allowed to park?
 A. No, not if you are not an EV.

Q. Define charging? What if the vehicle is fully charged and has stopped charging? A.
 They then must leave the charging point bays.

Q. The challenge will be what happens once a vehicle completes charging?
 A. They must leave the bays and we will enforce EVs parking but not charging.

Proposal (h) to introduce half price tickets for electric vehicles (able to run at least 20 miles on zero CO2 and revoke the current offer of half price tickets for low emission vehicles (those vehicles under 120 g CO2/km)

Q14 Respondents were asked how far they agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce half price parking tickets for electric vehicles able to run at least 20 miles on zero CO2, and revoke the current offer of half price tickets for low emission vehicles able to run under 120 g CO2/km.

Currently, we have half price tickets for vehicles that produce less than 120 g of CO2 per km.

The responses to this question were slightly against this proposal as 42% disagreed or strongly disagreed while 32% agreed or strongly agreed. Nearly a quarter, 23%, neither agreed nor disagreed.

Q14. Currently, we have half price tickets for vehicles that produce less than 120 g of CO2 per km. The proposal is to introduce half price parking tickets for electric vehicles able to run at least 20 miles on zero CO2, and revoke the current offer of half price tickets for low emission vehicles able to run under 120 g CO2/km. You can find out more information on our website. How far do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

		Response Percent	Response Total							
1	Strongly agree		11.79% 50							
2	Agree		19.81% 84							
3	Neither agree nor disagree		23.11% 98							
4	Disagree		16.75% 71							
5	Strongly disagree		25.47% 108							
6	Don't know		3.07% 13							
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	3.33	Std. Deviation	1.42	Satisfaction Rate	46.7	answered	424
	Maximum	6	Variance	2.02	Std. Error	0.07			skipped	9

Q15 Respondents were asked to provide comments on the proposal above.

This question received 140 responses and 232 individual comments. The highest grouping at 55 is comments around a negative response to what responders see as the council favouring EV owners which they deemed as unfair. Coupled with this are 37 comments on EV being too expensive and therefore this incentivising offer is out of reach for the majority of people. 23 comments clearly state that *"any and all vehicles should pay"* as they are all equal in their use of the car park. Paired with this is a common sentiment that *"if they can afford EV car they can afford a full price ticket"* (21 comments).

Next in commonality at 18 comments is the suggestion to increase the offer and incentive to a wider range of greener cars (low emission, hydrogen) not just EV. 9 comments indicate they fully support this proposal. 6 comments are on the financial advantages already afforded to EV car owners (linked to the unfair commentary above). 7 comments tell us the need for car parking tariffs to be kept simple, easy to understand and implement.

Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

55	Favouring EV unfair
37	EV too expensive to buy
23	Any and all vehicles should pay
21	If afford EV can afford full price tickets
18	Greener cars (low emission, hydrogen) not just EV
9	Fully support
8	EV manufacturing creates Co2
7	Confusing to understand / implement / administer- keep it simple.
6	Already get reductions in Road tax etc
5	Ineffectual - in increasing EV use
4	Encourage public transport and active travel bikes and walking
4	Long term loss for council as EV use increase
3	go further and waive charges for fully electric and Hydrogen powered vehicles
3	Discount for EV won't increase EV use
3	Take valuable space away when already restricted
2	Charge older cars more
2	Favour greener incentivisation that is more affordable to all
2	Penalise diesel and heavy polluting vehicles
2	Too soon to make the switch
1	Locals decide not SODC
1	Not enough charging points / increase charge points (which need to be paid for)
1	National government should incentivise not LA
1	Positive towards EV charging points
1	EV have embodied Co2
1	Increase availability half price season tickets

PROPSALS and QUESTIONS

PROPOSAL:

The scheme should be run concurrently otherwise you are rewarding those with the financial capacity to upgrade to electric vehicles that satisfy the proposed criteria.

Officer response: See response above.

Following a period of concurrency the policy should be reviewed to remove vehicles that are not electric; perhaps the timeframe could be 5 years to ensure affordability is increased for electric vehicles.

Officer response: Policy will be reviewed each year as part of the review of car park fees and charges

PROPOSAL: *use levy from polluting cars to improve walking and cycling facilities .*

Officer response: It is difficult to have a workable charging system for higher polluting vehicles. How to identify them? How to enforce?

QUESTIONS

Q. How would this be validated?

A. From the formal VQ5 documents held by the owner of the vehicle.

Q. How would you monitor if the said vehicle produces less than 120g of CO2? Please consider this

A. The missions are normally in the VQ5 documents if not we would look for information from the manufacturer.

Why not free 3 hour parking for all EVs whether charging at the charging points or just parking ?

A. Currently cabinet do not wish to offer any further incentives to EV owners. These vehicles should pay the same for parking as all other drivers, unless they want a permit which means paying up front.

Q. Think outside the box, can you work with a manufacturer to give townspeople a deal or some perk if they purchase one?

A. To be considered as a separate project looking at an electric vehicle strategy across Oxfordshire. www.parkandchargeoxfordshire.co.uk

Q. You have previously said you want to 'standardise' charges throughout, not everyone can afford these electric vehicles, so you intend to persecute those that can't. That's not very fair now is it?

A. No EV drivers will pay the same for parking even when they are charging.

Q. Why? Don't see why the district needs to take this measure.

A. There is no evidence as to why one town or another should receive any preferential parking arrangements.

Q. Fair enough but I fear that this is a cosmetic change. How many users benefit from the current provision and buy half price tickets?

A. The majority of ticket sales are the half price option

Q. Did not know half price tickets were available, why is this not promoted to get us to use cleaner vehicles?

A. We will promote via social media and the website once confirmed at the cabinet meeting on 4 Feb. 2021

Q. I object to those less financially fortunate having to subsidise motorists to park and charge their electric vehicles, because lets face it that is why the Sunday charges for example are being implemented. When the percentage of electric charging spaces required increases to say 50%, are those motorists still going to be subsidised? When would this be stopped? And who would be paying for this?

A. The parking policy is for the income to at least meet expenditure so that the cost of running the car parks falls on the users and not the council tax payer.

EV drivers have to pay parking fees when they are charging their EVs.

Anything else?

Q16 Do you have any additional comments on the revoking of the 2011 order and the proposals relating to the 2021 order, that you would like us to consider as part of the proposals to changes to off-street parking in South Oxfordshire?

This question received 153 responses and 221 individual comments. Roughly a third of respondents (54 comments) wanted the council specifically to encourage commerce and the local economy by offering a period of free car parking. In addition, 17 commented on 2 hours free parking as helpful to the “*viability and vitality*” of market towns.

The related comments of benefits to free parking on Sundays and disagreement over weekend and public holiday charging (both receiving 8 comments) brings this area to a total of 87 comments. So, in combination, close to half of the responders want the council to offer free parking periods to support local economic activity. The concern of the decline of the local high street in some towns and the expectation and desire for the council and residents to join together to supporting Covid recovery is woven amongst the consultation responses.

Robust enforcement was the second most singular theme generating 19 comments. 9 comments identify a need for more parking in general. There are 8 comments relating to parking permits: for residents “*permits are like hens teeth*” says one responder. There are interesting suggestions of reduced permits to support low pay retail staff and reserved free bays for retailers who deliver to vulnerable community members.

Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

- 54 Council should encourage local businesses / independent retailers / post Covid support
- 19 Robust enforcement needed (street parking)
- 17 Want free parking (2 hours) generally to support local trade
- 9 More parking is required in car park and generally
- 8 Want free parking on Sundays
- 8 Disagree with weekend/ public holidays charging
- 8 Parking permits: for residents /shopworkers / reduced fee
- 7 Keep the proposals as they are
- 7 Standardise parking (rates, times etc)
- 7 Proposals shouldn't be discussed until this Covid crisis is over
- 4 Support proposals
- 4 *'Council greedy'*
- 4 promote public transport post Covid / cheaper public transport / small hop on buses should be considered
- 3 Need electric vehicle charging points
- 3 Improve car park safety (for pedestrians /motorists /cyclist facilities)
- 3 car park machines contactless /via app
- 2 No evidence that shows a need for any change / need for additional income
- 2 no need for uniformity between car park charges between the various towns
- 2 1-hour free parking
- 2 Increase bicycle parking
- 2 Pushed towards abandoning my local shops and buying on line
- 2 Free parking should be increased and not decreased!
- 2 No thought gone into the proposals
- 1 Introducing increased costs based upon an environmental agenda is disingenuous
- 1 fifteen-minute leeway before a penalty is incurred
- 1 charging those people who have driveways
- 1 parking ticket machines retain coin payment method
- 1 reducing the ticket price for electric cars is totally unfair
- 1 changes need to be part of a transport strategy that includes better, safer, more promoted cycling and walking routes and cycle parking
- 1 A free time should be introduced in all car parks. Allowing for a quick shop
- 1 Parking spaces need to be wider
- 1 Emission based charging doesn't work
- 1 Charging won't reduce vehicle travel
- 1 Charging affects low income families.
- 1 Parking should be made more conducive for people
- 1 discriminatory against the young and low income households / destroying communities in local businesses
- 1 Parking charges are a penalty
- 1 Small fee acceptable (50p per hour)
- 1 Idling and air pollution
- 1 Electric vehicle bays stopping you from parking
- 1 Free parking for volunteers
- 1 local people should be able to decide local matters

- 1 Should define vehicles as Zero or low emission
- 1 Price of electric cars needs to reduce

PROPOSALS/ FLAGGED / QUESTIONS

PROPOSAL *I also think that a reduced fee for those who require a parking permit for work purposes would help people on low wages remain in employment. I feel that it would be better to change the discount available for workers from 50% to 33% would be suitable alternative to removing the discounted permit entirely.*

Officer response: Existing permits will continue to be offered at reduced rates for all.

PROPOSAL: *I feel that a business permit should be issued to staff members who drive to work, potentially offering an exemption to off street car parks maximum stay limit. Allowing staff members who work in the town to utilize off street parking and reducing the number of cars parked on the residential roads, making parking better for the residents who occupy said roads.*

Officer response: Permits may be available for some of our car parks, and discounted rates available if you live outside of the town and will be parking there for work. See our [permits page](#).

PROPOSAL: *Please allow residents with permits to park free in car parks. We already pay a yearly fee and often cannot park. I have often had to pay for parking as there are no residents spaces or beg a space on a friend's driveway! Maybe residents should be limited to one car for on street parking. We need a solution to some people owning as many as 3 vehicles in one road! Encourage the use of parking in car parks (ie Station carpark in Henley) that are not utilised to full capacity.*

Officer response: Residents permits are issued by the Town Council and currently they cannot be used in district council car parks, but I note the request.

PROPOSAL: *I believe that the current proposal is far more complicated than it needs to be (though it is an improvement on the current system), and I believe that a universal system across all of the SODC-run car parks would be more beneficial. I also feel that reducing the free parking period across the towns to 1 hour will have an overall negative effect and actually decrease the total revenue in the mid- to long-term, whereas a universal free parking period of 2 hours across all SODC car parks (rather than just the ones in towns as proposed) in conjunction with universal fees would help both local businesses, vulnerable and elderly residents who may rely on the free parking periods to ensure that they are able to shop, socialise, visit the doctors, etc. while providing the increase in revenue that the council needs.*

Officer response: Increasing the free period to two hours would mean that the car park account would not balance and the income would not meet expenditure. Therefore the cost of running the car parks would fall on the council tax payer which is against the car park policy.

I also think that a reduced fee for those who require a parking permit for work purposes would help people on low wages remain in employment. I feel that it would be better to change the discount available for workers from 50% to 33% would be a suitable alternative to removing the discounted permit entirely.

Officer response: same response as above

FLAG: Wood street by green tree - dangerous road Also that corner on wood street where you come out at the green tree (the road by the car park) should be double yellows! It's such a dangerous corner people fly round there and you can't see

Officer response: this needs to be raised with the highways agency - OCC

QUESTIONS – WALLINGFORD:

Q. There was talk of a multi storey layer being added to Wallingford Cattle Market (from the old ice rink site - mentioned in one Town Council meeting)

When is this likely to happen?

A. There are no plans to build a multi-storey car park in Wallingford

Q. Please review the number of disabled parking bays allocated in the Wallingford cattle market car park. There appear too many which are never used and there is a lack of spaces for general drivers at peak hours.

A. The number of bays for the disabled is based on national guidelines (5% of total number of bays)

Q. please will you consider, for the Goldsmiths lane car park: Fixing all lighting and installing additional lighting where there is currently none. Specifically the main car park pedestrian exit from GSL to the Wallingford town centre. Improving the ticketing system so tickets can be paid for/increased/changed via app or online.

Removing paper tickets and installing ANPR. Discounts for residents of Wallingford, instead of the discounts for working in Wallingford.

A. Yes, we will review the lighting and we are considering a mobile ANPR system. There is already an App to pay for parking Connect cashless – see details by the pay stations in the car parks

Q. More parking is required in the centre of Wallingford, can the old regal centre be converted into a multi-storey car park?

A. The building belongs to the Town Council.

Q. Why do these proposals not bring SODC car parks into alignment with those operated by the Vale of White Horse District Council? You share the same office building and other infrastructure, why not align the rules for the car parks?

A. the two councils are separate and have different parking policies

Q. This survey makes no mention of the changes to Sunday parking. Why has this change been excluded from the consultation?

A. Sunday charging was included in the consultation

Q. *The survey relates to town centre car parks, yet it appears that both St George's Road and Castle Street car parks in Wallingford have been excluded. Both car parks are in the centre of Wallingford but appear to not meet the term "town centre car parks"; why is this?*
A. Castle St and St Georges St are long stay car parks on the edge of Wallingford.

QUESTIONS – DIDCOT:

Q. *Why can't Edinburgh drive in Didcot gave 2 hours free parking*
A. the car park account is not able to offer any more free parking periods as the income must at least meet the expenditure

Q. *The yellow lines on Cow Lane in Didcot need finishing and you need to see the cars that still park there all day, including those now parking on the double yellow lines*
A. This is OCC responsibility and they are reviewing the signs and lines.

Q. *More people are working from home - where is this in the councils consideration to reviewing the number so spaces available?*
A. We will review the number of permits and spaces in car parks when we have updated usage figures (due December 2020) and consider in the next parking review.

Q. *Also with an increasing elderly population, parking needs to be available close to where it's needed and at minimal cost. An annual off street charge?*
A. The district council is only responsible for off-street parking.

Q. *Not directly related, but I'd like to point out that the parking strategy for Didcot Parkway station is a mess. The multi-storey car park is not fit for purpose (too far, too inaccessible, unsafe especially for lone women), so does not provide a viable disincentive to commuter parking in town, on-street etc. This needs a complete rethink. Also we need residents' parking permits for streets near the station.*
A. Noted and consider as overall Didcot Gateway strategy

GENERAL QUESTIONS:

Q. *Is this part of a wider look at all transport in South Oxfordshire. Better public transport and provision of bicycle routes and safe pedestrian routes for instance. (This assumes a non-covid restrictions future).*
A. No, we are just looking at fees of the current car parks

Q. *Why are you running a consultation or proposing charging when you are unable to provide civil enforcement.*
A. We are working with OCC to consider how to implement civil parking enforcement. That is in a separate report considered by cabinets in December on CPE. Copy and paste link below into your browser:

<http://democratic.southoxon.gov.uk/documents/s21148/Report.pdf>

Q. The towns are increasing housing substantially... how is this being catered for in the car parks???

A. We are looking to encourage more sustainable modes of transport.

Q. Who's going to enforce this? When are we getting traffic wardens?

A. We are working with OCC to consider how to implement civil parking enforcement

Q. Can you use the revenue to pay for traffic wardens to enforce traffic in the towns as there is currently an 'anything goes' attitude and double yellow lines are for decoration only.

A. We are working with OCC to consider how to implement civil parking enforcement

Q. There is no reference to the link with On-street parking, the proposals to apply for CPE and the need for a wider review of the parking arrangements in the 4 towns

A. That is in a separate report considered by cabinets in December on CPE. Copy and paste link below into your browser:

<http://democratic.southoxon.gov.uk/documents/s21148/Report.pdf>

END OF MAIN CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

General car park suggestions

Q17 We would like to take this opportunity to hear any other suggestions you may have on how we could improve the car park service in general that we provide across the district, in partnership with our contractor Saba.

This question received 170 responses, representing 39% of the total responses. There were 238 individual comments and 1 question.

30 comments were made about the enforcement on illegally parked vehicles being wanted or needed in car parks across the district. 21 comments mentioned the desire to keep the 2 hours free parking, partly as it is good for trade/business. A similar number of comments, 20, were about the lack of reliability of current parking machines and use of contactless for payments, which is related to the 16 comments made about wanting the use of parking machines to be easier. 15 comments were made about more parking spaces being needed, while 14 said no changes are required.

Traffic management and infrastructure was mentioned by 11 respondents. 9 mentioned wanting to increase the parking time to encourage use or remove the 3 hour maximum stay time. 8 respondents would like to keep free parking on Sundays, 7 would like bigger

parking bays, 6 would like improved car park maintenance and the same number, 6, would like the car parks kept clean.

Other comments are listed below.

Comments analysis summary and frequency:

30	Enforcement wanted/needed on illegally parked vehicles
21	Keep 2 hours free / good for trade
20	Reliability (lack of) of parking machines / contactless
16	Ease of use on parking machines
15	More parking spaces are needed
14	No change required
11	Traffic management required / Infrastructure
9	Increase staying time to encourage use / remove 3 hr max stay
8	Keep free parking on Sundays
7	Bigger parking bays as vehicles are now larger
6	Improve car park maintenance
6	Keep car parks clean
5	Negative impact on residents / pushes parking to residential areas
5	Covid concerns! parking machines be be contactless
5	Residents require permits
4	Blanket charge on all car parks across the county
4	More baby/toddler bays needed with enforcement for unauthorised use
4	More parking facilities needed in Henley
4	N/A
4	Bring service back in house
4	Increase public transport for surrounding villagers
3	Turn Wallingford Cattle market car park into a multi storey
3	Questions?
3	Cash payment option on all parking machines
2	Electronic display or app system for car parks full or available
2	Improve cycle parking facilities
2	Motorcycle bays
2	Better lighting / security
2	Parking fees to high / shop online
2	No to EV parking/charging
2	Unacceptable waiting list for resident permits
1	More parking facilities needed in Chinnor
1	EV spaces wanted
1	Traders should pay same price for permits across the county
1	Introduce a park & ride service to Henley
1	Higher charging rate for larger vehicles
1	protect small beauty spots with huge influxes of day trippers
1	How will this effect trade?
1	Share EV bays with regular vehicles
1	Car park needed in Benson
1	Upgrade toilets in Greys Rd car park Henley

- 1 Allow tickets with time remaining to be passed on / remove car reg
- 1 EV's to contribute to parking
- 1 Introduce ANPR to all car parks

QUESTIONS

Q. As a resident of Wallingford who is on a waiting list for a permit, I have to use the Saba App everyday. And everyday I pay 8% "convenience fee" on each transaction I make. Please introduce the concept of a weekly or monthly paid permit - and then only one "convenience" fee needs to be charged.

This fee presumably cover the licensing and support costs for the App, but at 8% is beyond any industry standard for such support services.

A. This is noted.

Q18. How did you hear about this consultation?

The majority of responders, 59%, told us that they found out about this consultation via Facebook. 13% heard by word of mouth and the same number by email, 10% through their town or parish council and 6% through the district council website.

Q18. How did you hear about this consultation? Tick all that apply.							Response Percent	Response Total	
1	Council website						6.12%	26	
2	Email						12.71%	54	
3	Facebook						59.29%	252	
4	Read it in the newspaper (online or hard-copy)						2.82%	12	
5	Twitter						4.00%	17	
6	Via Town or Parish Council						10.12%	43	
7	Word of mouth						12.94%	55	
8	Other (please specify):						4.71%	20	
Statistics	Minimum	1	Mean	3.81	Std. Deviation	1.88	answered	425	
	Maximum	8	Variance	3.53	Std. Error	0.09			
Other (please specify): (20)									
1	I saw the increased charge proposal on the car park								
2	Friends								
3	Through email from my church in Wallingford								
4	Email from the pastor of our church.								
5	Accidentally when on the website.								
6	Thame hub								

Q18. How did you hear about this consultation? Tick all that apply.

		Response Percent	Response Total
7	Notice in Thame car park		
8	Community Facebook page		
9	From concerned residents		
10	Oxford Mail website		
11	Church		
12	Sent by parish meeting		
13	Social media - Wallingford matters		
14	Wallingford Piper Facebook page		
15	cant remember		
16	Notices in the car parks.		
17	shopkeepers in the town...		
18	As district councillor		
19	From one of the local churches I attend		
20	From a church member		

Formal consultee results: car park order consultation

Consultation with statutory consultees on South Oxfordshire District Council draft car parking Order 2021

Organisation	Comment made
Thames Valley Police	Thank you for the consultation documents addressed to The Chief Constable. .
	I have no objection to these proposals..
	I would however raise one slight concern with the South Oxfordshire amendment relating to the introduction of charging on Sundays. . Might this lead to displacement back on to the public highway with a likelihood of increasing further illegal parking.
	I can confirm that based on the information provided at this time there will be no impact for OFRS and there are no concerns raised.
	a. one hour free parking in Greys Road and Kings Road car parks in Henley - This will be seen as positive approach and may help cut illegal street parking. Cutting illegal street parking will help avoid escalation in frustrations between pedestrians and the vehicle user. Parking issues are often incorrectly directed towards the Police by a complainant which results in an unnecessary demand and diversion of policing activity and ultimately frustration from that complainant by a perceived lack

	of immediate resolution. I imagine the provision of one hour free parking will benefit the local economy.
	b. charging on Sundays - This clearly is a fiscal decision for the Council. My guidance would be to ensure that such a change is extremely well advertised.
	c. limited waiting of two hours 9am to 5pm, Monday to Sunday in the High Street car park, Chinnor - This proposed action does not appear to present any issues of contention. It will also ensure that enforcement measures are available to deal with potential abandoned/non road worthy vehicles being left at the location beyond the 2 hours.
	d. spaces reserved for electric vehicles whilst charging - This is becoming more common and will be seen positively from an environmentally friendly perspective. Will the Council be able to undertake any enforcement if a non-electric vehicle blocks the ability for a genuine electric vehicle user from taking advantage of the charging facility?
Oxford Fire and Rescue	Further to your email below dated 29 th October 2020, I can confirm that based on the information provided at this time there will be no impact for OFRS and there are no concerns raised.
OCC Highways	No objection to the consultation taking place. No issues to the making of the order.

FURTHER INFORMATION

For information about the consultation or the results presented in this report, please contact:

Consultation and Community Engagement Team
South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils
01235 422125
haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk

To enquire about the councils' car parks, please contact:

John Backley
Technical Services Manager, Housing and Environment
South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils
07917 088317
john.backley@southandvale.gov.uk

END