

Issue	Response
<p><b>Economic Impact</b></p> <p>The proposals will have a negative impact on the city centre economy and local businesses.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“Will drive people to not visit Southampton and businesses will suffer.”</i></p> <p><i>“These proposals are so negative towards the number of retailers who rely on people driving by and buying from their shops, especially those who are elderly or have mobility issues. This discourages people from visiting the city centre when we should be supporting people visiting, the proposals combined with those on shutting roads, creating cycle lanes and eliminating vehicles from the city centre are so far away from the mind set of the majority of Southampton residents”</i></p> <p><i>“It represents a fine on visiting the city in the evening especially cultural activities such as the Mayflower theatre. It will cost more to monitor and patrol than it will raise. Stupid idea.”</i></p>	<p>There is no conclusive link between the health of the city centre economy and car parking charges.</p> <p>The cost of parking is just one of numerous variables which influence the economic success of the city centre. As well as many factors unrelated to parking, the availability and quality of parking provision play a role in making the city centre an attractive destination. The implementation of a revised charging structure would be expected to facilitate these two elements.</p> <p>The parking services team have carried out a benchmarking exercise and have found that Southampton is currently one of the cheapest parking destinations among urban centres with a comparable retail offering. The revised tariffs maintain a competitive offer in comparison to local and regional destinations.</p> <p>The retail and leisure destinations within Southampton city centre are well served by private sector alternatives. If the implementation of parking charges was detrimental to businesses, the major retail centres within city centres would not charge for parking within their car parks. However, this is not the case.</p>
<p><b>Cost of Living</b></p> <p>Significant increases in the cost of living have reduced the ability of many to pay additional parking charges.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“This is a very poor proposal to increase the cost of parking at a time when household budgets are under pressure.”</i></p> <p><i>“Cost of living crisis now is not a time to increase pain for residents”</i></p>	<p>Overall parking charges have not increased for a period of over 10 years, and as such no longer align with policy objectives to manage car usage and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport to the city centre.</p> <p>As noted above Southampton is currently one of the cheapest parking destinations among urban centres with a comparable retail offering. The revised tariffs maintain a competitive offer in comparison to local and regional destinations.</p>

<p><b>Lack and unsuitability of public transport</b></p> <p>Public transport options to the city centre are not suitable or available for many people as such there is a requirement to drive and use parking.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“The proposal says it is to encourage alternative means of transport. As a retired couple who enjoy going to the cinema and Mayflower theatre, where will we find alternative means of transport during the evening at an affordable cost. Taxi is at least £15 each way. Buses, few and far between or fail to run late in the evening for people like us we mobility issues.”</i></p>	<p>There are a range of Bus Services that operate during the evening including late night services and Sunday morning.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with bus operators on fare offers, including;</p> <p>£1 Evening Fare continuing to March 2025 for £1 evening fares in Southampton after 1800</p> <p>Group Fare Offer (£5 for 5) for Summer 2023 &amp; 2024 (six week school holiday period only) and Christmas 2023 and 2024 (six-seven week period prior to New Year’s Day)</p>
<p><b>Personal Safety</b></p> <p>Using public transport or walking from alternative parking locations will create a safety issue for vulnerable individuals.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“I am against the changed proposals in evening parking charges for the main reason that they will make the city inaccessible for many people due to the poor provision of the public transport network in the evening.</i></p> <p><i>For example, I can access one bus per hour in the evening, which ends too early for me to get home after events like concerts, shows, theatre etc. Furthermore, this bus is still at least 15 minute walk away from my home and I do not feel safe walking home in the dark given the prevalence of attacks on women across the city. This is also true for waiting for the bus - hanging around anywhere in the evening waiting is a recipe for danger.”</i></p>	<p>The Council recognises that night-time safety is a concern amongst the public particularly if travelling home alone.</p> <p>However, it is not within the function of parking charging policies to manage these issues.</p> <p>The Council works closely with the Police and other partners on supporting Safer Neighbourhoods to improve public safety at night.</p>

<p><i>"I now have to rely on the car for late evening and early night driving I don't feel safe enough walking in the dark."</i></p>	
<p><b>Revenue raising</b></p> <p>The evening and overnight parking charges are only being introduced to raise money for the Council.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>"Removal of the evening rate provides no benefit to residents, only increases income for the council"</i></p> <p><i>"Since the Labour council took over it has admitted a shortfall in revenue and by hitting the motorist again seems their way to claw back funds."</i></p> <p><i>"Much like the last consultation, no good reasons proposed or a clear statement of what the actual problem is other than a generic series of bullet points. Indicative of a decision already made in order to increase revenue from parking and from fines."</i></p>	<p>Parking Charges are not implemented to raise revenue, but to address policy goals as outlined in the proposal. Any surplus revenue is used for the public good, with on-street surplus specifically ring fenced for transport related expenditure.</p>
<p><b>Impact on residents</b></p> <p>Residents within the city would be unfairly impacted by the revised charging hours. The cost of parking would be unsustainable for them and their visitors.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>"For residents that live in apartments with no parking (of which you continue to build more and more of), this is the only option. The introduction of the evening charge means that I now pay £230 a month, as there are no permits available, for this area."</i></p>	<p>The Council maintains a series of City Centre Season Tickets by means of a mitigation for residents who need to own a car.</p> <p>However, part of the reason for the revised parking tariffs is to manage demand for parking by City Centre residents. There is only a limited amount of parking available relative to other residential areas and the Bargate Ward (which covers the City Centre area) is projected to have a population of circa 28,000 by 2024.</p>

<p><i>I invite you to treat inner city and residential areas on-street parking separately. Do your research!"</i></p>	
<p><b>Impact on community groups</b></p> <p>The proposals will have a negative impact on many charities, societies and other community groups which operate in and around the city centre. The cost of parking would make it impossible for some participate in these groups.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>"I play in an amateur orchestra that meets once a week during term time. We start rehearsing at 7.30pm, but before then in time means I pay £1 for parking. With the new proposals, that will be £2.50 which is high cost. If we meet 30 times a year, an orchestra member will have to pay £75 per year instead of £30 per year - that is £75 on top of our members subscription of £100 per year. That seems a lot of money extra, and may well discourage community groups from meeting in the city centre."</i></p>	<p>The aim of the proposals is to have a consistent charging structure for the purpose of managing car trips at times when there is parking demand. Many similar urban centres have charges that apply during these times.</p> <p>Regardless of the purpose of a visit there is still a need to manage car trips and parking demand.</p>
<p><b>Impact on groups attending Places of Worship</b></p> <p>There are currently no City Centre parking charges on Sunday morning or Sunday evening (after 6pm) during which periods some community groups attend Places of Worship. Parking charges may be payable by groups who have previously parked during these times without charge.</p> <p>Some respondents have also stated that introducing parking charges on Sunday mornings and Sunday evenings could be discriminatory against some community groups.</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>"As a church member and a voluntary server of the City community, I think it is sad that the council are implementing charges on a</i></p>	<p>The aim of the proposals is to have a consistent charging structure for the purpose of managing car trips at times when there is parking demand. Many similar urban centres have charges that apply during these times on Sundays.</p> <p>The Council currently applies parking charges Monday to Saturday, 8am – 8pm (on-street) and 8am – midnight (off-street). These charging periods encompass times of worship and meetings for other community groups. So therefore, the revised charging structure constitutes an equal parking structure for all daytime/evening activities.</p> <p>The Council would not be able to consciously provide a preferential parking tariff structure for one community group.</p>

*Sunday morning in particular. I would find it a real financial burden and a disincentive to continue in my current serving roles in the community if these plans go ahead.”*

*“We attend Church every Sunday, with many others. To begin charging for parking would be to threaten the ability of some families to afford to attend. This would be contrary to the Council's policy on allowing residents of Southampton to practice their religion and attend worship without hinderance. Please do not charge on a Sunday morning around Churches, or in fact for Saturday mornings around the Mosques either. Thank you.”*

*“We have a lot of Church members who come to serve the City community very regularly. They are providing food, community, debt help, and numerous other facilities for the needy in our city. We love our city and want to continue serving it but having these extra charges will make it impossibly expensive for people to attend church on Sunday's and come to evening meetings, as well as serving in the day. These evening and Sunday mornings were previously not charged but if the charges are made, people will not be able to come to church and serve the city. Please reconsider, at least for Sunday mornings and evenings so we can continue to love our city.”*

*“I am writing to protest most strongly that your current proposals regarding city centre parking discriminate against the church-going community in the city on Sunday mornings, which amounts to several thousand people. I am primarily opposed to the timings rather than the charges themselves, although I do consider the price increase to be too great. As for the timings, I wish to request that the current commencement of charges at 1pm be continued, in order to facilitate public worship by the sizeable church-going community which, in addition to its own corporate gatherings, is involved in many community-related & charitable events, which benefit the wider*

<p><i>city population in general, and the less fortunate segment of that population in particular.”</i></p> <p><i>“The proposed parking charges will Kill off places of worship, such as St Michael's, St Josephs, Above Bar, Community Church, James Street, St Nicholas, Central Baptist Church to name but a few. The actions can be classed as discriminatory. To go from £0 to £8 for four hours on a Sunday morning (before 1300 hrs) is totally outrageous and unforgivably greedy. I am aware that councils need money, but stealth taxes are immoral. St Michael's the oldest building in constant use in the City and was once the site of Mayor Making as it was the Civic Church. If all that is lost, be it on your conscience. If all of these proposals go ahead, the whole council should be ashamed of itself for helping to destroy the economy of the city.”</i></p>	
<p><b>The proposals are an attack on motorists.</b></p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“This is yet a further attack on the motorist by Southampton City Council.”</i></p> <p><i>“Usual fleecing of the motorist so the council can build more unused cycle lanes.”</i></p> <p><i>“Just another tax on the everyday motorist. It will make the city less attractive to visit.”</i></p>	<p>The aim of the proposals is to have a consistent charging structure for the purpose of managing car trips at times when there is parking demand.</p> <p>The Council’s key transport policies are focused on encouraging the use of alternative transport modes, particular for local trips. This would provide an overall benefit for those who have to drive by reducing traffic and congestion.</p> <p>The Council provides a range of parking facilities and tariff options for those who need to drive and also offers season tickets for regular users.</p> <p>The Council is also investing in charging infrastructure for electric vehicles within the city to support the use of electric vehicles going forward.</p>
<p><b>The removal of previously available tariff options such as charges for 1 hour and other short stays</b></p>	<p>The removal of short stay options has been proposed for facilities which are primarily aimed at long stay users. Short stay tariff options</p>

<p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“Not happy about removal of 1hour option in Gloucester Square, a visit to Telephone House surgery rarely takes much more than 30 mins. A charge of £2.80 is a lot to pay and the 2 hour time is excessive for a surgery visit.”</i></p> <p><i>“Very much against the removal of the shorter time parking charges from the Bedford place area , given the number of businesses in Bedford place , dentists , hairdressers, shoe and clothes shops , art shop to name a few , a single two hour parking time is simply not acceptable ! Is the expectation that all these businesses will close and we are to have another area like Portswood which has nothing but coffee shops and takeaways ?”</i></p>	<p>have been maintained in short stay car parks in the vicinity of local shops and other similar destinations.</p>
<p><b>The proposals will not have any meaningful impact on the environment.</b></p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“It is highly unlikely this will make a meaningful difference to the environment. The steady move already in progress to less polluting vehicles will already deliver improvements.</i></p> <p><i>We should be encouraging visitors to the city, and there is no need to copy the behaviour of other councils without good cause.”</i></p> <p><i>“This is another cost lumbered on the public in the middle of a cost of living crisis. It will impact the night time economy and will have little or no impact on air quality.”</i></p>	<p>The aim of the proposals is to have a consistent charging structure for the purpose of managing car trips at times when there is parking demand.</p> <p>This aligns with the Council’s key transport policies which are focused on encouraging the use of alternative transport modes, particular for local trips for the benefits of reducing congestion and improved air quality.</p>
<p><b>Removing the separate evening charges tariff will increase costs for evening visits.</b></p>	<p>The aim of the proposals is to simplify the tariff structure to make it more straight forward for users to understand. The Council has</p>

<p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“The new proposals are particularly detrimental to visitors to the city in the evening as removes the maximum fee of £2 for parking up to midnight with the introduction of the hourly charge. This will particularly affect theatre goers as shows are typically over 2 hours and then additional time needed to get to the theatre and be seated and then return to the vehicle afterwards. This potentially means you now need to buy 4 hours of parking instead of the £2 max charge currently and will directly impact Mayflowe and MAST theatre attendance.”</i></p>	<p>received a number of complaints over the last 10 months that a separate evening charging tariff is confusing particularly for users arriving during the daytime charging period and seeking stay into the evening.</p> <p>The Council has retained the £150 Overnight Season Ticket for residents and overnight workers.</p>
<p><b>Rockstone Place Permit Parking Restrictions</b></p> <p>Proposals will impact on the Zone 18 Permit Parking Restrictions on Rockstone Place</p> <p>Example comments:</p> <p><i>“We strongly object to any further parking restrictions in Z18, and petition again for residents to be permitted to apply for a limited number of visitor permits (for example 10 per annum, for Z18 or even in adjacent zone 5 or zone 1). Rockstone Place is principally a residential street, though is also used sporadically by visitors to the nearby court buildings, "The Workstation" at no.15, and patrons of St Edmund's church (two or three evenings a week, and Sunday Mornings). Current limits on P&amp;D parking (8am--6pm, max 4hrs) are already a serious hindrance to friends or family visiting for a few days, resulting in unnecessary movement of vehicles from one road to the next hopping between various restrictions, or "dumping" them on other residential streets further away... all of which is both inconvenient and detrimental to the environment. In the evenings and at weekends the road is typically at least half empty, and it is a rare occasion (apart from during mass) when there are no spaces</i></p>	<p>Officers are recommending a further consultation on the days/hours of operation of the Zone 18 Permit Parking Restrictions on Rockstone Place</p>



*available at any time of day/night/week. We struggle to see any benefit to the residents and users of Rockstone Place from the proposed changes.”*

