

Appendix A – Outcomes of Statutory Consultation on the review of parking charges and charging policy.

Analysis by Communications & Consultation Section

Methodology of Analysis

A majority of submissions to the Consultation have been received as emails; with the balance taking the form of letters and other paper-based submissions. Each submission has been assigned a unique sequence number. This facilitates tracking of responses and helps avoid duplication of responses. Duplication can occur where respondents have, for instance, copied their submissions to several councillors; which have then been forwarded to officers.

Once the process of collating forms, allocating sequence numbers and assigning a ward identifying number (where possible) is completed, the analysis is undertaken.

Written comments and remarks are assigned to categories through a process of editing and coding familiar in market research. Numeric codes are applied to these categories. The same edit coding process is applied to the specific objections set out by respondents.

While every effort is made to represent views as accurately as possible; it is inevitable that the grouping and categorisation of views, comments and objections will lose some of the emotion and 'immediacy' of the comments made by respondents. To offset this, a wide selection of free text comments made by respondents is also included in this report. Furthermore, the original submissions are of course available for inspection.

Once the codes have been defined and checked for their accuracy in representing the views of respondents; the data are entered on to a computer file and analysed using SPSS. This enables the range and pattern of responses to be clearly represented and quantified.

Classification of Submissions

Many respondents, who have chosen to send their submissions by email, have not provided addresses. Those who have provided details are grouped into wards and the results are set out in Table 1, below.

Table 1

ward

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Alexandra	3	.6	.6	.6
	Bounds Green	19	3.5	3.5	4.1
	Crouch End	15	2.8	2.8	6.9
	Fortis Green	8	1.5	1.5	8.3
	Highgate	46	8.5	8.5	16.9
	Hornsey	8	1.5	1.5	18.3
	Noel Park	26	4.8	4.8	23.1
	Stroud Green	29	5.4	5.4	28.5
	Woodside	26	4.8	4.8	33.3
	Bruce Grove	1	.2	.2	33.5
	Harringay	54	10.0	10.0	43.5
	Northumberland Park	1	.2	.2	43.7
	St Anne's	13	2.4	2.4	46.1
	Seven Sisters	13	2.4	2.4	48.5
	Tottenham Green	14	2.6	2.6	51.1
	Tottenham Hale	18	3.3	3.3	54.4
	West Green	30	5.6	5.6	60.0
	White Hart Lane	1	.2	.2	60.2
	Cross boundary petition	2	.4	.4	60.6
	Outside Borough	3	.6	.6	61.1
	No data	210	38.9	38.9	100.0
	Total	540	100.0	100.0	

The ward data, while incomplete, does indicate a reasonable representation of views across the wards and this information is complemented by information about the origin of submissions (Table 2). 76% of submissions are from private addresses or personal email addresses. 13% of submissions are from respondents who have written either from their place of business or using business letterheads.

A small proportion (5%) of submissions originates from respondents employed by public bodies, community organisations and residents' groups. A similar proportion originates from lobby groups who have issued 'pro forma' submissions for residents to complete and send in to the designated freepost address set up by Haringey Council.

Table 2

Originating address of Response

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Residential address	433	76.5	76.5	76.5
Business address	69	12.8	12.8	89.3
Public sector /VCS/Residents Assn	5	4.6	4.6	93.9
Lobby/campaign group	33	6.1	6.1	100.0
Total	540	100.0	100.0	

A total of 540 submissions have been received.

Principal Objections

Table 3

(Multiple Response) Objections

	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent of submissions	
Objections ^a			
Not based on mileage/vehicle usage	94	10.4%	17.4%
Excessive charges/penalise residents	296	32.6%	54.8%
Visitor Permits - disproportionate impact-families/elders	201	22.2%	37.2%
Inconsistent with green agenda/gardens paved	99	10.9%	18.3%
Agree with principle but not the execution	30	3.3%	5.6%
No objection - support Council plans	46	5.1%	8.5%
Bands incompatible with DVLA/not cost neutral/penalise average cars	118	13.0%	21.9%
Non-specific queries/observations	23	2.5%	4.3%
Total	907	100.0%	168.0%

a. Group

Objections fall into several categories. The largest of these is the complaint that the Proposals represent a sharp and excessive increase in costs which penalise residents who happen to live in Controlled Parking Zones. A majority of respondents make multiple objections – this is why the number of objections (Table 3) exceeds the number of submissions. Thus many respondents who object to what they regard as excessive and punitive costs also object on the grounds that parked cars make no emissions; and that the proposals cannot be justified on environmental grounds or the ‘green agenda’.

A similar connection exists between those who object on the grounds that the proposals for charging are not based on car usage or mileage. Many see the proposed charges as a tax on parking and a money-making scheme whose only purpose is to raise revenue for the Council. If a clearer link between the proposals and environmental objectives could be set out, then many residents might well be persuaded to be less hostile to the proposed charges.

Those who object to the proposals for Visitor Permits typically comment that families and elders will be affected as a result of the proposed reduction in time and that this is compounded by the charges remaining at current levels. Many respondents comment that they can see no environmental benefits by reducing the time period for Visitor Permits.

Many respondents have specifically objected to the proposed charging bands. There is considerable resentment at bands which are seen as classifying average family saloons with high performance ‘gas guzzlers’. A small number of objectors have decided to investigate what cars fall into the lowest bands and have concluded that the Council has set the bands in such a way that only the most experimental or hybrid vehicles will attract lower charges.

There is a widespread view that the Proposals are unfair; not only because of the perceived substantial increase in charges coming ‘so soon’ after the establishment of CPZs, which a majority of residents supported; but also because many see the

proposals as encroaching upon an area of policy more appropriate to Central Government rather than local councils.

This is linked to an undercurrent of resentment that of all the people who have occasion to drive cars in or through Haringey; it is only a proportion of residents who have to pay. A significant minority of respondents comment that they would feel less aggrieved if all motorists had to pay to drive and park in Haringey.

There is some resentment that wealthier residents will not only have no difficulty in paying the charges but they are also likely to benefit by owning properties with drive ways or gardens where they can park their cars with impunity. Table 4 (next Section) illustrates some of these views.

Additional Views and Comments

Table 4 summarises additional views and comments expressed by respondents which help place objections into their wider context. Thus 29% say that the proposed charges are little more than a means of raising extra revenue for the Council. 24% say that they understand the need for fuel and road tax but have difficulty understanding what they see as a 'parking tax'. Those who comment that the Proposals are unfair and inequitable generally do so because they perceive the measures as penalising residents.

12% do welcome the Council's Proposals, while many others accept the principle but resent the Council's approach. Much of the support for the Council comes from those who would like to see 'gas guzzlers' and 4 by 4s 'taxed off the road'.

Table 4

(Multiple response) Issues raised by Respondents

	Responses		Percent of 'occurrences'
	Number of occurrences	Percent of submissions	
Views ^a			
Residents penalised	168	14.7%	31.1%
Visitor permits-reduced time/double cost	137	12.0%	25.4%
Wealthy can afford to buy new/LE cars	18	1.6%	3.3%
Understand fuel/road tax but not parking	132	11.5%	24.4%
General non-specific objection	2	.2%	.4%
Disproportionate/high percentage increase	114	10.0%	21.1%
Good idea	66	5.8%	12.2%
This has little to do with environment	115	10.0%	21.3%
Encourages paving-over of gardens	20	1.7%	3.7%
This is a revenue-raising device	158	13.8%	29.3%
Car usage should determine costs	73	6.4%	13.5%
Unfair and inequitable approach	142	12.4%	26.3%
Total	1145	100.0%	212.0%

a. Group

Comments by Respondents

Your recent survey would have had different results if we'd known what you planned
Being pensioners, this increase is unfair
Even Central London allows free parking after 6pm
I for one will be going back to the Conservatives
Hard to see the visitors permit charges as anything other than revenue-raising
Charges disproportionately high - most cars will fall into band 4
How will this apply to those with access to off-street parking?
What about the cars outside the controlled zones?
A money-making racket that serves no purpose for residents

Blanket policy takes no account of individual circumstances
Vehicles clamped often within minutes of parking notice being issued
You are trying to take away my dignity and self sufficiency
Proposals critically misconceived and indeed opportunistic
A cynical attempt to raise yet more money for the council
Charges very unfair on those who happen to live in CPZs or with older cars
Stationary cars do not produce CO2 gas. Hits OAPs & family visits
Aimed at drivers of large cars - but only affects residents in CPZs
£160 represents an extortionate increase of 220%

Just an exercise in increasing Haringey Council's revenue
Should allow residents permits without having a car registered to the address
I support the proposed changes to the permit charges for parking
This is outrageous - having to pay to park outside one's own house
Will drivers now park in free zones adjacent to the CPZ?
This has nothing to do with saving the environment
Why are Business permits allowed to use residents' areas?
Proposal no more than a surcharge on the national approach
Why not charge everyone who has a car?
Residents' parking now used as a means of raising stealth taxes
No justification in increasing the cost at this point

Doubling the charges so soon clearly indicates the purpose is to raise revenue
I would be able to have visitors for less than 5 hours/week
Unfair application of taxes and charges - affects residents in CPZs only
A true green policy would address every car in Haringey
I previously thought it would help environment -now I've changed my mind
We also have an older second car which will result in a 400% permit charge increase
I approved the original CPZ but this ratcheting up of charges is wrong
Ours will rise from £50 to £160 - Haringey dictates number of visits
Should charge all car owners - why only residential parking?

It is not the council's job to penalise people for their choice of car
Most people, seeing the new bands, assume Haringey's primary motive is money
They discriminate against the less affluent citizens and residents
Does not take into account cars converted to run on LPG
Would support if revenue-neutral; reality is stealth tax on hard-up ratepayers
Used concerns to identify new sources of revenue
Just an excuse to raise further revenue for the council
Very unfair to residents living in Haringey
Of course we all know this is merely a money-making exercise
How will residents be able to afford to pay you?

Working visitors e.g. decorators would soon use up all the allowance
Do something about incoming road users - don't penalise the residents
CPZ has been hijacked for purposes for which it isn't appropriate
As a pensioner will I be able to by more (permits) when my children visit?
Council is using this to promote its own agenda of taxing a captive audience
...new proposals shocked me with the gigantic increases proposed

Fully support you - far too many Haringey tractors clogging up the roads

OAPs and those who don't use cars often have been targeted
Old cars are penalised - hurts the majority in Haringey who aren't rich
Please be fair to the residents as I and many others will leave
Delays at Shepherd's Hill lights created by TFL make nonsense of environmental
Should be a concession for residents over 60 and disabled re RP permits
Have 2 profoundly disabled sons and have to use a mini bus (for wheelchairs)
Using engine size rather than emissions is flawed, as old cars pollute more
One hour is too short to be practical

The fee of £90 should be at least doubled to deter high polluting cars

Proposed charges not based on actual emissions - unfair
Those owning a car under 1400cc are OK while all others pay twice as much

Happy about large engine cars - not so happy about increases in Visitor Permits

The measures to properly inform have been inadequate
Unlike others, disabled people cannot choose whether to drive or be driven
We will never be able to afford to buy a newer car
How does a second car cause more pollution than the first?
Motorists already overtaxed with fuel road tax congestion charging etc
What about households without a car but who regularly need temporary permits?
I would be seriously aggrieved if funds weren't used to promote greener lifestyles
How can a 200% increase for occasional visitors be justified?
The road tax is a good way - but not being charged for parking
A new way to raise revenue without offering anything in return
Not reasonable to increase charges while still allowing illegal parking
You intend to increase the charges for EVERYONE not just 4wd drivers
There is no thought in the proposals other than to raise yet more money
My carer comes once a week - she will now have to use two or more permits
We already pay road tax and council tax - parked cars do not emit exhaust
Taxes those who have to park on-street - fundamentally inequitable
We've paid road tax and insurance - why do we pay to park at our home?

Excellent - get those tanks off our streets

To follow your recommendations, we would have to buy a brand new car
87% of vehicles fall into band 2 - this is again a stealth tax
My car is causing no pollution at all while it is stationary
No leaflets distributed here nor any notices displayed
What about the substantial overall increase in revenue?
Which is the first car and which is the second?
Will only increase emissions as cars are moved around between various bays
Haringey effectively charges some residents for their friendships
The only car in the £15 cat is the Gwhizz - it requires a driveway to recharge

