

Verbatim Comments from Staff Consultation

Following the Mayor and Cabinet approval in March 2019, LBL conducted a consultation with the public on key changes to the parking policy. This included a consultation with Lewisham Council which ran from 10 June 2019, to 26 July 2019 and was a comprehensive consultation exercise with all stakeholders regarding the proposed policy updates, including the impact on air quality and the Council's approach to the proposed introduction of emissions based charging in the borough.

This document includes all verbatim comments received during the consultation. These comments were considered by the Council as part of the overall report and summary of the consultation presented to the [Lewisham Mayor and Cabinet Committee on 15th January 2020](#) as part of the "Parking Policy Update" report.

A summary of the consultation including details of the questions asked and an analysis of the results can be found in [Appendix 2 of that report](#).

- Section 1 – Staff consultation air quality improvements (verbatim comments)
- Section 2 – Staff consultation overall consultation ideas (verbatim comments)

Section 1 - Staff consultation air quality improvements (verbatim comments)

LB Lewisham Staff consultation verbatim comments
63 people commented out of 128 respondents – 49%

Q. What else could Lewisham do to help improve air quality in the borough?

Number	Category	Comments
1	Environment / Road planning	<p>Implement 20mph speed limits</p> <p>Use money from parking fines to fund cycling infrastructure</p> <p>Prioritise walking and cycling in traffic schemes</p> <p>Increase charges for parking in council car parks</p> <p>Improve the area around Catford station</p> <p>Plant more street trees</p> <p>Offer staff more incentives to travel by public transport</p> <p>Close streets around schools</p> <p>Improve measures to stop rat-running</p> <p>Provide better facilities for council staff to cycle, run or walk to work</p>
2	Diesel	<p>The government told people to buy diesel cars and is now saying diesel cars are bad for emissions and should ebb charged extra. This is not fair to diesel car drivers as they were given contradictory advice by the government.</p>
3	Car use/ public transport	<p>Discourage car use entirely for able bodied individuals, especially for staff, perhaps by raising parking costs higher and also traffic offense fines and even road tax (or at least lobby the Government to do so if this is not within the Council's power). For less able bodied individuals, and people with young children, there could be some sort of rebate, or another way of excluding them from most if not all of the costs.</p> <p>Catford has many good transport links including two train stations with direct links to London and the South East, and several bus routes (most of which go to Lewisham station which has even more train links plus the DLR). That said, public transport can always be improved. Additionally it is easy to walk or cycle to Catford, for more locally based staff, and this should be encouraged (especially as keeping fit and active is a scheme the borough already supports).</p>
4	ULEZ timing	<p>Please could the council ensure that the changes in the Parking permit charges tie in with the timeframes of the ULEZ i.e Oct 2021.</p> <p>This will allow those with high emission cars enough time to save up to replace their vehicles.</p> <p>If it is introduced earlier then Oct 2021 then we will end up paying increased charges earlier so have less funds to exchange for a low emission vehicle.</p>
5	ULEZ / Loans	<p>The Low Emission Zone is being introduced so I don't see why Lewisham feel the need to jump on the band wagon and charge extra as well.</p> <p>Unfortunately I purchased my diesel vehicle when it was recommended to do so by the Government. Now that it has been found to be incorrect I am being penalised.</p> <p>Perhaps Lewisham would consider loans for green cars like the bike loan. Instead of charging penalising your employees. I need my car to travel into work from Chatham. What with diesel, the low emission fee and parking fees. (It really does beggar why I would come to work)</p>

6	Cycling	More cycle lanes, fewer potholes and bumps in roads, more pedestrianized areas, fewer traffic bottlenecks next to frequented areas, more cycle parking, better pedestrian pavements.
7	Road planning	Lewisham could try and put pressure on central government to make Lewisham Borough less of a cut through by making motorways and other roads easier and quicker to use.
8	Environment	Surely most of the pollution in Lewisham is from vehicles driving through Lewisham rather than staff driving to work. More Green spaces
9	Car use	Target the school run, parents driving to school when it is only a 5-10 minute walk.
10	Environment	Improving the low income areas as a whole
11	Cycling	Improve cycle safety on main routes
12	Environment	Plant more trees along busy roads, improve bus routes, cycle lanes/bus lanes to avoid traffic/improve safety, review the councils energy consumption - is it efficient? , lobby to lower train prices that deter some people from driving
13	Environment	Plant more trees, keep green areas green
14	Emissions/ Cycling	No idling zones Zero emission zones Mini Holland scheme and priority for cyclists and pedestrians.
15	Environment	encourage renewable energy usage
16	Car use	Charge all cars to park, regardless of type. Create a borough wide CPZ split in to zones to discourage driving short distances. Campaign for the ULEZ to go out to the M25 not the South Circular.
17	Road planning	Free flowing traffic I would consider public transport if the journey was easier, quicker and the time more predictable
18	Car use	Encourage car sharing and providing electric pooled cars for staff visits especially where equipment is needed or a joint visit required - to a property giving risk to potential hazards and risks.
19	Road planning	progress the planned redirection of the south circular and fully implement a flexible and agile working policy for staff which encourages and enables staff who have to commute into work to do this in a consistent and supported way.
20	Environment	Pedestrianized Zone
21	Car use/ Road planning	Encourage smaller cars., with (as Germany does) allocated and marked out smaller spaces to accommodate Smart cars and small Toyotas given most commuters do not need large cars as only one occupant per vehicle on average commutes. Provide more charging provision for electric vehicles. Encourage a 'pairing' site for job sharing. Remove speed bumps that penalise small cars more than Chelsea tractors (who straddle them and invariably travel too fast) and lead to drivers accelerating between bumps, thus increasing emissions plus particulates in the form of dust from brakes., and reduce speed to 20mph enforced through the Town and surrounding roads.
22	Road planning	Lewisham could work with TFL to improve the major junctions especially around Lewisham Station for the lanes from London towards Lee. One lane to turn right on major route does not work well, the middle lane should be a bus lane.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - create more pedestrianised areas and cycleways - require planting schemes in new developments that actively contribute to reducing air pollution - the council sometimes using taxis for staff - is there a local taxi company that uses electric or hybrid vehicles?
31	Loans/ Policy Delay	Firstly allow people to change their cars to environment friendly. I was ready to drive to work, however there is no parking facility, no parking permit to staff. It is not fair and not possible all the time to depend public transport it is taking a lot of time. Support the staff to change their vehicle either hybrid or electrical. After they have changed then implement the policy.
32	Road planning / Emissions	There are speed bumps on almost every road. Cars are constantly slowing down and then speeding back up again, I think this must create more fumes and pollution into the atmosphere and makes driving in Lewisham hell.
33	Environment / Public Transport / Road planning	Plant more trees, get traffic flowing by improving roads. Have tram link in borough. Get buses to run on time.
34	ULEZ	Nothing. The introduction of the ULEZ is sufficient
35	Car use	remove parking facilities altogether
36	Emissions/ Road planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Regulating and charging businesses that emit harmful gases. - Improving traffic through-flow so that cars are not stuck in the borough in traffic jams, emitting harmful gases for longer
37	Environment	Plant trees
38	Public Transport/ Loans	Encourage more people to walk/cycle/use public transport. Offer a subsidy to people with ULEZ compliant vehicles.
39	Road planning	Divert traffic from the high street
40	Loans	Provide some type of financial assistance to purchase petrol cars, to those who purchased Diesel vehicles under the impression that it was better for the environment (as previously advertised).
41	Cycling/ Electric cars	Increase, improve & create safer cycling routes. Create or improve the infrastructure for cleaner vehicles e.g. Charge points and/or free parking for electric cars. Have a £0.00 tariff for staff who have electric cars.
42	Road planning	Improve traffic flow on south circular road
43	Loans	Provide interested free loans
44	Public Transport	Reduce parking charges so users are able to afford low emission cars Help to influence improvement to the train service provided by Southeast rail to the Borough.
45	ULEZ/ Public Transport	Petition for ULEZ to be extended to cover the entire borough by 2021 Petition TFL to upgrade buses in the borough
46	Public transport	Work to improve public transport in the south of the borough which is very poor currently, which would give many staff and residents travelling from there a car free option.
47	Diesel	Not penalise users that were directed to buy diesel vehicles by central government.

48	Public transport/ Road planning	Better public transport within the borough as well as better traffic management.
49	Road planning	I understand that a smooth and steady driving style is more fuel efficient and less polluting. Therefore, it might be an idea to review the traffic calming measures in place in the borough. I would expect that removing some of the road humps would lead to an improvement in air quality.
50	Road planning	Prioritise road building plans that have been around for years to re-route the south circular in Catford to decrease the bottleneck and subsequently keep traffic moving and not stationary. Develop a park and ride system to allow people to park on the A20 or at Blackheath and bus them into Catford and Lewisham etc.
51	Loans/ Car use/ Cycling	Encourage staff to use alternatives to cars when travelling to work within Lewisham either by providing some form of subsidy for use of public transport, participation in and/or wider communication of schemes such as cycle purchase schemes and encouraging staff that do need to drive into work to car share where possible.
52	Road planning	Widening of single lanes through the numerous bridges on the South Circular would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion and idling engines
53	Employment policy	Perhaps Lewisham should just employ Lewisham residents, without disabilities and they could then walk to work...
54	Environment	Don't let developers take green spaces. Provide free parking to staff. It helps in reducing workplace stress and commuting stress.
55	Environment	grow more trees
56	ULEZ	TfL's data base is not accurate. Japanese import cars which are compliant with ULEZ Nox emission are not listed as being compliant. TfL state that a "certificate of conformity is necessary to prove compliance - however it is impossible to have a certificate of conformity for car not originally manufactured for European market. Official emissions data produced by the Japanese Manufacturers (eg Nissan) is not being accepted by TfL
57	Public Transport	Work with TfL to improve the bus services especially East to West across the borough as the train lines tend to be North to South. Look at the cost with the rail operators of travelling short distances by train which can be out of proportion
58	Environment	Air pollution does not just affects outside. The air quality in Eros House and the housing service in Laurence House is poor. It affects staff, customers and visitors. Unsure of how regular the carpets are cleaned as they contain a lot of dust and pollutants. In fact consideration should be given as to whether carpet is good at all compared to wood or tiles. The cleaning standards would have to improve. Introduce small plants behind the counters which could absorb bad guys like benzene, formaldehyde and trichloroethylene from the environment. such as Peace Lilly or Snake Plant. The revolving door at the front of Laurence House would save energy by way of drafts and electric if it was sensor controlled. Southwark Council have this and it is warm in their lobby during winter. A reminder either by the monitors or a message that flashes to staff reminding them to turn them off and not leave on standby would be practical, safe and save energy and money within the council. A page on the web which advises tenants how to improve air quality in

- their homes such as ventilation, good maintenance, pet care and home made cleaning products?
- 59 Loans give interest free loans for lower emission cars
- 60 Environment plant more trees
- 61 Environment Plant trees on the Broadway
More trees in parks
Ivy growing on walls and fences
Wall gardens
Roof gardens
More community gardens / wildlife gardens
Air purifiers in schools and hospitals
- 62 Loans Previously Lewisham provided support to individual that have to drive whilst at work due to their role.
Support staff to be able to purchase a new car with interest free loans, where their role requires them to drive whilst at work.
- 63 Cycling/
Environment Create more pedestrian only routes
Improve cycle routes
Plant more trees

Category	Count	Percentage
Diesel	2	2.4
Emissions	4	4.8
Cycling	8	9.6
Public Transport	10	12.1
ULEZ	5	6.0
Employment policy	1	1.2
Environment	18	21.7
Road planning	16	19.3
Loans	8	9.6
Car use	9	10.8
Policy Delay	1	1.2
Electric cars	1	1.2
<i>Sub-total</i>	83	99.9

NB Some comments covered more than 1 category, so total is more than the total of comments

Section 2 - Staff consultation overall consultation ideas (verbatim comments)

London Borough of Lewisham – Staff consultation verbatim comments

70 people commented out of 128 respondents – 54.7%

Q. Do you have any other comments that you would like to add about this consultation?

Number	Category	Comment
1	Other	It is welcome - and if anything it is long overdue.
2	Car park issue	The car in behind Laurence House is in a disgusting state. Staff are asked to currently pay £500 a year and the council has not even tarmacked the car park. The amount of dust and dirt that flies around the car park is atrocious. The money we spend should be put to use to improve the actual car park so we have adequate parking facilities which I believe we currently do not have. The car park should be tarmacked!!
3	Go further	Lewisham should discourage car use entirely for able bodied individuals, especially for staff, perhaps by raising parking costs higher and also traffic offense fines and even road tax (or at least lobby the Government to do so if this is not within the Council's power). For less able bodied individuals, and people with young children, there could be some sort of rebate, or another way of excluding them from most if not all of the costs. Catford has many good transport links including two train stations with direct links to London and the South East, and several bus routes (most of which go to Lewisham station which has even more train links plus the DLR). That said, public transport can always be improved. Additionally it is easy to walk or cycle to Catford, for more locally based staff, and this should be encouraged (especially as keeping fit and active is a scheme the borough already supports).
4	Delay implementation	Please could the council ensure that the changes in the Parking permit charges tie in with the timeframes of the ULEZ i.e Oct 2021. This will allow those with high emission cars enough time to save up to replace their vehicles. If it is introduced earlier then Oct 2021 then we will end up paying increased charges earlier so have less funds to exchange for a low emission vehicle.
5	Loan	As above. How about consider offering employees an incentive to purchase a green vehicle by offering a low interest loan like the bike loan/computer loan
6	Environment	I enjoy walking around the borough, but few areas are well kept enough to make it that enjoyable. Maybe take better care of the trees, parks and verges in the borough? A lot of them feel like social clubs for smokers and drinkers.
7	Financial concerns/ Public transport subsidy	I already can no loner afford to live in Lewisham so have had to move to cheaper parts of Kent. Now I may no longer be able to afford to work in Lewisham either. Lewisham could introduce a scheme to reward staff who travel in on Public Transport, or make it easier for staff to request to start outside of peak time and therefore not need to pay the peak fares. (My fares into work when I don't drive are almost £25 a day if I need to be in by 9am as apposed to £12.40 if I arrive just after 10.15am but more often than not you have to do a flexible working request to amend your working hours and you can only change this once a year - hardly flexible)

- 8 Part-time/
PAYG option
- By definition this is a tax aimed at those of us who cannot afford to purchase a new vehicle. Of course you conveniently forget that a few years back it was the Government that encouraged us to purchase Diesel cars and now we are being punished.
- In addition to this, you propose to charge me £700 per year to park in LH Car Park, yet I am only in the office 2 or 3 days per week, so how is this fair?
- The technology exists to charge permit holders on a pay as you go basis with number plate recognition, so why not use it? Of course the answer is the cost, so instead you take the easy option and propose to introduce this blanket charge where those who park 5 days a week pay the same as those who park 2.
- I live some distance from a station and 35 miles away in Kent, the train service is far too expensive and does not suit my needs (I have an 8 yr old at local school), so I will be very interested to hear what other options I have.
- As stated, ultimately this is a tax break for those who can afford nice new clean vehicles and a tax hike for those of us who cannot. This is morally wrong.
- 9 Diesel penalty/
No practical
alternative
- I don't understand why we diesel drivers are being penalised for this, we were told by the government not too long ago about switching to diesel cars as it is better for the environment and economy and now they have done a full 360 turn..... this is ridiculous we cant afford the cars they are asking us to pay for.
- I brought this car as it fitted the criteria and ULEZ law for the government before they went ahead and changed their mind.
- This is totally irrational , we pay enough for car parking in the borough, and to pay to drive to work is ridiculous. some people are unable to get public transport or walk for personal reasons and feel safe within the means of their cars. I know most of the time these consultations are out only to follow procedure however the minds are already made up as what is the next steps. The parking area that I park in now is not even substantial for the money that I pay, its dusty, dirty and muddy the car always get damaged as stones hit the car when you wash the car its pointless and totally wrong we pay all this money for an unkempt car park, there should be tarmac down on the ground which I have said for years. also the holes in the ground are enormous.
- 10 Other
- This consultation seems to be based on recent protests and media coverage and not due to the effect on the residents health. If it was solely based on their health, staff parking permits wouldn't be the first point of call.
- 11 Delay
implementation
- This seems unfair on people who have older vehicles and cannot afford to change them. There has been insufficient notice . I think the proposal should be made a few years before implementation in order to let people make an informed choice when changing their vehicles. I hope the scheme will be implemented for all staff regardless of where they park. Senior management who can probably better afford it don't require a permit at all so it feels like it's the squeezed middle who are disadvantaged again. In addition, staff who use their vehicles for work are penalised for doing so and I think staff who go to and from sites carrying out their duties should not be charged at all.
- 12 Unfair charge
comparison
- I strongly disagree with charging staff the same as businesses. A business can claim the parking permit as a tax deductible expense where as staff pay tax on their earnings before they pay for their permit. This means that a business pays around £440 for a permit and a staff member,

- / Public transport subsidy
- on basic rate tax, pays around £660. Hardly equitable!
- Has any thought been giving incentives to use public transport, for example, by subsidy, rather than punitive measures by increasing costs (further taxation for drivers)? Or a discounted car leasing scheme to help those that have to drive to have access to cleaner vehicles?
- Whilst I appreciate, and agree, with efforts to improve air quality, it must be remembered that those that commute who don't live in London have not got the luxury of the capital's comprehensive public transport system. Many of us have no option but to travel by car, even if it is to drive to the nearest station.
- 13 Financial concerns/ No practical alternative
there are some staff with mobility issues that are unable to use public transport, walk or cycle to work and have to drive.
Not everyone can afford to purchase a newer car with lower emissions. Most of us do our utmost to ensure the cars we drive are in good condition with regular services etc. to keep emissions as low as possible.
- 14 Diesel penalty
so unless you are in a position to purchase a car with lower emissions you are penalised with having to pay more for a staff parking permit, when the car you drive is the only way to get to work.
Stop penalising those people who have diesel cars and can't afford to change it and treat everyone the same no matter what car they have.
- 15 Go further
Even zero emission and low emission vehicles have negative impacts. Walking and cycling needs greater priority. Car parking takes up space which could be better used across the borough for open space, new homes etc.
- 16 Financial concerns
With paying ALL the extra charges (not just Lewisham's) applied to having an older car, I feel that I am penalised for not being able to afford a newer and greener car.
- 17 Unfair charge comparison
I am not in a position to take out a loan to get a newer car.
The charges for parking a car should be the same for everyone that drives to work in the borough, regardless of NHS or LBL or ARGOS or BOOTS. The difference of £160 to £650 for the same car due to my employer is discriminatory and unjust - I am still polluting the same amount and I am still going to be as physically inactive if I drive to work.
All cars, injure pedestrians and cyclists and take up road space. All cars and vans should be charged the same. This may encourage people out of their car and on to the bus or better still to walk or on to their bike.
- 18 Delay implementation
I do not think that owners of existing vehicles should be penalised, not everybody is in a position to change their vehicle regardless of their views on pollution. Maybe it should be phased in
- 19 Go further
In Cuba local government officers are duty bound to offer lifts to the public. If staff are using a pooled car offering lifts to the public -especially these with mobility issues and elderly could greatly enhance the good will and reputation of the Council.
- 20 Financial concerns
There is no justification for the high charges for permit parking as it is just another form of revenue for the borough.
- 21 Financial concerns/
What is the borough planning to do for vehicles that travel through?
I do not agree that increasing the cost to staff or other vehicle users who purchased their vehicles in good faith and often by necessity is a

PAYG option/
unintended
consequences

balanced way of viewing the pollution issue. As a member of staff, there are very few benefits that would attract people to stay in Lewisham and the constrictive agile working policies alongside charging for parking permits without tax relief and limited pay increments is likely to have an adverse effect.

Certainly, if the intention is to charge more, then I would expect there to also be a proportional charging model so people only pay for parking on the days that they use this vs. the round the year approach currently in place when for at least 26-34 days in the year there is annual leave and the parking is not used.

I would also advise considering the impact of people discontinuing paying for permits and choosing to park on residential roads which will present an unintended consequence with potentially minimal contribution to the environmental policy objective.

22 Diesel penalty

Modern diesels are not as polluting as old ones, so not sure the figures presented actually are representative of ALL diesels.

23 Staff duties

If you expect employees to complete visits outside of Laurence House using their car, to attend appointments outside of Laurence House, to remove children and place them in foster care, to transport parents to meetings - then give them a parking space without question - we are losing social workers to other local authorities as your systems are complicated and other boroughs support workers better.

24 Cycling

Cyclist's need to be encouraged to use cycle routes where possible. The new crossing on Thurston Road is a great improvement.

25 Go further

This is a good initiative. What about hosting talks about the Climate Crisis with key people to raise awareness of the issue on the Broadway Theatre and libraries in the borough? What about creating workgroups to discuss policies and actions?

26 Diesel penalty/
financial
concerns

When is this proposed increase to be introduced?

Are you planning on charging more for general parking for diesel cars? If not then why should permits holder be charged more?

I think it is discriminatory against poorer residents that live near the ULEZ borders being charged to use their diesel cars. Not all residents can afford to change their Vehicles in the time limits imposed, when they have a fully functioning car that has taken resources from the environment to produce.

- We are now producing more vehicles at a cost to the environment to replace older cars that have a cost to dispose of and cause more environmental issues in disposal. Can we not find an alternative cleaner option to make diesel cars more environmentally friendly.

- Could we not divert resources raised by ULEZ and other charges to subsidise residents to enable them to purchase electric or Hybrid Vehicles.

- What is to stop the Government changing the ULEZ category in the near future to include petrol cars causing residents a need to purchase yet another vehicle

- Many small businesses cannot afford to replace their vehicles and this could make the difference between a small business staying afloat or going under.

- Smaller businesses may lose customers as residents choose to shop else where due to the parking costs..

- 27 Profiteering Stop trying to make more money from us as this is what its all about really. Stop playing lip service to environment/pollution factors.
- 28 Loan Does the council intend to introduce some scheme to assist staff/residents with purchasing more environmentally friendly cars?
- 29 Diesel penalty/
Profiteering your statement that all diesel vehicles are more pollutive than petrol equivalents is incorrect as euro 6 diesels are far cleaner than most petrol cars!
increasing permit charges from a captive market is just a way of raising more money using air quality as justification. when these increases start there should be a commitment with evidence that ALL the additional revenue is being directly invested in clean air iniatives and more staff in E.Health to action them, rather it being syphoned off as jut another revenue generating scam
- 30 Financial concerns/ Go further By penalising owners of older cars with higher emissions Lewisham Council will generally be penalising lower paid workers who cannot afford to change their vehicle. The proposed change to charging would mean that I would personally in fact be better off by £100 per annum. Nevertheless I feel strongly that because of the poor public transport in South East London as I have described in my response above that Council workers and residents should not be penalised in this way. However I do believe that drivers of 4 x 4s should be charged more. 4 x 4s are generally not necessary in a city. They take up more width on congested city streets and make visibility around them difficult for regular sized vehicle drivers and cyclists.
- 31 Profiteering You do want you want at the end of the day and the fees will just end up in the Council coffers and will not go towards improving air quality
- 32 Profiteering Penalising staff by having them pay more in order to get to work is unfair. The volume of 'staff' cars involved is minuscule compared to all the lorries, coaches, buses, cabs and cars that pass through the borough yet they face no negative consequences of the proposed changes.

Staff have been without pay rises for many years and whilst this has now come to an end we are possibly going to have to pay more to come to work.
- 33 Profiteering Council should not charge for issuing parking permit. It has to be the duty of council to issue parking permits to the staff as they are working for the council.
- 34 Financial concerns/
Carrot not stick The policy proposed will hit those on low incomes the hardest.
Many who drive do so out of necessity not a lifestyle choice. The pressures of being carer, having young families, juggling two jobs means it is the only way to make ends meet.

How many of those on low income can change their diesel car due to change of policy?

This is imposing hardships on those who are poorest in our society.

What will happen to the diesel car? Many will try to sell them to areas where there are no restrictions on diesels, mainly outside of London. Why are we shifting the problem of diesels to other areas?

My diesels is a low emissions diesel which means a low road tax of £30. Some petrols produce higher emissions. Yet when using the permit price calculator it will be cheaper to get a permit for a higher emission petrol

than a low emission diesel. How can that be?

Policy makers need to look at less stick and more carrot ideas to promote cleaner air.

Norway has been successful in this approach. In 2018 between 21.6% and 45.3% of the monthly sales of new cars sold have been electric. The financial benefits promoted this. Exempt Road tax, free parking, Increase charging points, free energy, ability to drive in bus lanes.

- 35 Part-time/
PAYG Where are the benefits in Lewisham?
I feel I am penalised as a part-time worker because I am charged the same as a full time worker, even though I use the car park less days a week, this amounts really to sexual discrimination as the majority of part time workers are female.
- 36 Part-time/
PAYG Reduce the parking permit cost in accordance with how many days you work in the office - e.g., I work from home two days and week and therefore don't drive to work on those days. My permit cost should be reduced to reflect this.
- 37 Diesel penalty Are cyclists going to be charged as a road user towards this? How will this extra money benefit the local areas? Will the roads be re-done and potholes fixed?
This is so bad, Yes I Have a diesel car reg: Mar 14 with very low emission yet I will have to pay a surcharge and the ULEZ.
- 38 Profiteering I fully expect that you will raise the cost of using the staff car park irrespective of the results of the survey.
Will you improve the road surface within the car park? All that dust cannot be healthy for pedestrians!
- 39 Diesel penalty/
profiteering Rather than penalising all diesel can, get a better understanding of how some of the latest diesel car editions have low emission and cleaner diesel. These cars lets out lower emissions than most petrol cars. They are fitted with devices which cuts off the engine when static whether in traffic , stops at junctions and stops at traffic lights. The additional charge will not deter drivers who use these cars but rather can be seen as another money making scheme to enrich the council's pocket. Driving into work is a necessity for some due to ill-health rather than for convenient. I feel this point needs to be consider a factor for any proposed changes.
- 40 Financial concerns I have been a Lewisham employee since 1986. At the time I lived in the borough.
When my partner and I were buying a property a 3 bedroom new build house in the Medway towns was the same price as a one or two bedroom flat within the borough. We were told travel to and from work in London on new extended motorways and improved rail links with the advantage of living in a nicer environment. Government was encouraging people to move out and commute into London for work, since moving each consecutive government has added more and more expense onto my daily travel to and from work. Now I find my parking will be as high as £900 per year!!!
1. I cannot afford to move back the property prices are way too high in Lewisham in comparison to Medway.
2. I do not earn enough to afford a new electric or hybrid car.
3. I feel let down by Government penalising people like me. I am a single mother, brought up my two girls for the last 18 years single headedly and on one wage!!

- 41 Financial concerns/ Pool cars Charging council staff for parking will not significantly help to lower emissions as it will merely impact on those less able to afford the additional cost. Many staff are essential car users ie need a vehicle for their daily jobs. Unless the council are going to provide a fleet of hybrid/electric pool cars for staff to use?
- A greater reduction in emissions will be seen by improving traffic flow in the borough. A great deal of traffic in Catford is from road users on the South Circular who are passing through the borough.
- 42 Unfair charge comparison You are not treating everyone the same, my staff permit will be £550, however for the same vehicle under the NHS it is £130. Same emissions ??? Also depending on your work location you wont have to pay for a permit ie wearside
- 43 Staff duties As a social worker for Lewisham council, I feel that I do a valuable job for relatively low financial reward. I need my car for my work as I carry equipment to work with children. I can not afford to change my car due to my salary- and feel that I should not be penalised financially for this. If I were in a position to buy a new car I would buy one with low emissions- but I can't afford to do this. This policy penalises low income people.
- 44 No practical alternatives Some staff have to drive in as their commute is quite far and not doable via public transport. Work/Life balance needs to be considered, especially for staff on lower salaries.
- 45 Part-time/ PAYG There should be a further discount for staff who work part time. Cost should be charged per day.
- 46 Car park issue Please could the car park in Laurence House be re-surfaced as there is always a large amount of glass on the ground; large pot holes and huge sharp pieces of stone which can inflict damage to tyres and paintwork. The dust that also goes into the air in dry conditions must be contributing to air quality.
- 47 Diesel penalty I support the steps the Council are taking to reduce air pollution in the borough, but as a Diesel Car driver, I am disappointed that I had purchased a Diesel car after being persuaded that it was better for the environment, only to now be told that it is not.
- 48 Unfair charge comparison/ Staff duties If petrol cars are accepted within the ultra low emission zones then they should not have to pay any additional fees to drive in Lewisham.
- I do not have good public transport links from home to Laurence House so driving is necessary. I also visit early years settings all over the borough as part of my role, which when I applied stated 'car user desirable'. Using public transport would impact on my capacity to visit/support our providers.
- 49 Carrot not stick The problem relating to the increased usage of diesels is due to the Government's encouragement and focus on CO2 as an environmental measure.
- The stick method of "encouragement" (rather than the carrot) creates resentment.
- 50 Car park issue If a greater number of clearly marked staff parking bays were provided at an even lower cost, staff would not have to park on nearby streets near schools.
- 51 Unintended consequences Increasing the price of Staff Parking Permits will not prevent staff from driving their cars. All they will do is not park in the designated areas but use the surrounding streets, which are near schools and homes.
- You will have empty staff car parks but more congested streets.

		Penalising staff by increasing the permits by such a vast amount (some will increase from £500 - £800) the annual salary didn't even increase by that amount. What happen to Lewisham's commitment to Work Life Balance. This is going to have a major impact to those who have to drive into work and have small children that they have to take and collect from school before and after work. This increase their journey time as they will have to drive around looking for somewhere to park as they now cannot afford to pay for the permit.
52	Unfair charge comparison	My car is currently exempt from ULEX so why do I have to pay a high charge to park in the car park?
53	Diesel penalty/ Delay implementation	Only a couple of years ago people were encouraged to buy Diesel cars, people need time to be able to afford to change. Also, consideration should be given consideration of diesel cars that have been fitted with low emission mechanisms (that do not have to pay the London emission zone charges) why should they pay more as they have been deemed by government as "low emission"
54	Unintended consequences/ environment	Currently staff car parking is having a harmful impact on Culverley Green Conservation Area, to the south east of the Town Hall, as the pressure for parking has led people to convert their front gardens to car parking. The reduces their ability to act as SUDS to combat rainwater runoff, reduces vegetation that could contribute to filtering air pollution; reduces the green space available to wildlife, and harms the area's appearance.
55	No practical alternative	I live over 50 miles away, I have no choice but to drive.
56	Financial concerns	I am Lewisham staff and according to your calculator it will cost me £700 to park at work. This is ridiculous, I would love a new car but I cant afford one and I am even less likely to afford one if I send £700 a year to park. Parking at work should be free, otherwise salaries should be increased by the amount that it costs to pay to park at work. My salary is effectively £700 less than the advertised pay band because I have to pay to park.
57	Other	Please regulate permits, my colleague has had a permit for the last 5 years and has not driven to work but gets the bus. this then stops someone else being able to park at Laurence House. I feel it should be regulated or you lose it.
58	Other	I hope that this consultation is actually going to mean something rather than going through the motions in order to eliminate any recriminations that persons affected were not properly consulted.
59	Financial concerns	By raising the process of permits for older cars, those resident in the borough who can't afford to buy a new car are being penalised. Not everyone has surplus income to allow them to go out a purchase a new car.
60	Car park issues/ staff duties	We are already paying a lot of money for parking in a car park, that is barely maintained, often has lights not working and leaks to a degree that I think would affect the structure of the building. By using my car for work I am able to carry out more home visits in one day than I would be able to by using public transport. In certain weather conditions, public transport doesn't operate !!
61	Financial concerns	You cannot charge your own employees? if you do then you are likely to face more work related stress and commuting issues. It will also cost more on staff absences, occupational health,etc.
62	Other/ Loans	1) Senior officers using the dedicated car park under Laurence House should also have to pay this charge and should lead by example in using public transport. 2) Staff should perhaps be waived the £50 diesel charge if this is

- considered as a contribution towards them replacing their diesel vehicle with a different one e.g. give them back the £50 if they switch vehicle within the year
- 63 Delay implementation I think period of implementation is too short. I think 5 years will be ideal.
- 64 Part-time/
PAYG I think you are right to be considering the effects on the climate and that we should all take some responsibility however we need to see the Council being part of the 'we are all in it together' culture and perhaps looking at other things.
Eg single use plastic cups in the civic suite being replaced by compostable or reusable
Look at part time parking permits so that people are encouraged not to always use their car - once my husband had paid for his permit there was no incentive to not use the car every day
- 65 Profiteering/
car park issue/
public
transport
subsidy The consultation limits its self to tackle a money making incentive rather than dedicating its self to a holistic approach in regards to what can be responsibly done.

If this was to encourage a less pollutant way of approaching "The Car Park" why not consider laying an environmentally friendly road covering on the dusty pollutant space currently in place ? Enfield council used plastic bottles collected from waste to lay roads just last year.
Introduce electric charging spaces.
Consider cheaper public transport travel cards for staff to encourage them to leave their cars at home. RB of Kensington do this for their staff after 12 months.
Its hard to accept that this isn't a revenue raising exercise as there is so many other issues which are smaller that the council could lead in.
Understandably Lewisham need to start somewhere but again it hits staff and business owners in their pockets. Get them on board with other things first then carry this out. I have never seen the car park full and I guess this will reduce the numbers further may be the overall space could be reduced slightly and a small green area introduced to cut down on pollutants from cars running idly.
- 66 Car park issue/
(Wearside)
Unfair charge
comparison The Council is not obligated to provide parking for staff, however as it is provided and staff are prepared to pay, the facility should be of a condition where basic cleanliness is a must. People using the car park (have seen on staff parking floor) as a toilet is unacceptable. Have it swept at least once a week, remove dog muck. questionable waste water flowing from pipes, laying on the surface of the car park where people have to walk is unacceptable.
CCTV / Security - Having CCTV Which is not monitored during the full operational times the car park is a waste of time. All users, more so the vulnerable should not have to rely on the security guard to walk them to their vehicles. If he is not around then what happens.
I require justification for not charging staff at Wearside Depot to park within council operated car park. I worked at Wearside and paid £500 a year to park, what has changed and why are these staff being given this concession. With the additional parking bays that I am installing I would like a free staff parking bay. This is a form of discrimination.
Why are the prices for hospital staff so much lower than the charges for staff who work for the council and contribute equally to the residents of the borough. Again I require justification.
I am asthmatic so a reduction of emissions would be brilliant however if you want to charge staff based on the fact they work for a Lewisham

service and drive any type of vehicle, this has to be fair and consistent.

- 67 Staff duties I would appreciate a response to my queries.
I think that one of the things that employers forget about is that for a lot of working mums we are not just doing a journey from home to work but our journey to work is on from another journey ie school. School allocation nowadays does not mean that your child gets a place in the school at the end of the road you live in (so for me that would be a 40 min walk to school as it was for my childrens primary school and in the case of their secondary school 3 buses and far to far to walk)to then try to get to work on time via public transport is near on impossible. My job for the council involves a lot of teaching and training off site and I would struggle to do my job properly if I couldn't drive. I find the council very intolerable when I need to pick up and drop off training material at Laurence House as you aren't allowed to park in the car park at all.
- 68 Other You have acknowledged the deaths, however you haven't listed the health problems that occur and the impact they have on children, old people and people at large.
- 69 Diesel penalty The government implied through the media and television that it was better for people to buy diesel vehicles, a lot of people when out and did as the government advised. Some people went out and brought a diesel vehicle, if it is not an old vehicle eg a vehicle brought in 2014, you will not get any incentive or support from the government to buy a new vehicle, individual are in a loop and are unable to do anything about it, as they don't have the money.
- 70 Financial concerns I can't afford to change my car when the ultra emission zone is extended and hiking up parking prices will kill my finances because I travel from Gravesend Kent by car because it's cheaper than train. I will basically lose my job and not be able to feed my child or pay my mortgage.

Category	Count	Percentage
Go further	5	5.7
Cycling	1	1.1
No practical alternatives	4	4.6
Carrot not stick	2	2.3
Pool cars	1	1.1
Unintended consequences/ environment	3	3.4
Loans	3	3.4
Delay implementation	5	5.7
Part-time/PAYG	6	6.8
Profiteering	8	9.1
Public Transport Subsidy	3	3.4
Car park issue	6	6.8
Staff Duties	5	5.7
Unfair charge comparison	6	6.8
Financial concerns	14	15.9
Diesel penalty	10	11.4
Other	6	6.8
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>100</i>

70 people commented out of 128 respondents – 54.7%

NB Some comments covered more than 1 category, so total is more than the total of comments

