

Reasons for call-in - KD 5546 Changes to Controlled Parking Zone Permit Charges:

1. It is not the right time to be increasing CPZ charges on hard working families during this current cost of living crisis. This is particularly true for motorists who need their cars to get to and from work. This includes teachers, nurses, doctors and other key workers who have no option but to use their cars. Due to Russian aggression against the heroic Ukrainian people fuel prices have also gone up and therefore the Council making this decision now is further proof the administration wants to penalise car users.
2. This has nothing to do with finances as the report shows and is simply a political attack on motorists:
 - a. Reference to London Plan (2021) – *“The current London Plan includes policies relating to the management of car parking demand to encourage a shift to more sustainable modes. The Plan goes on to set out how private vehicle ownership should be addressed in spatial planning, by making it clear that low or car free development should be the norm and setting lower maximum car parking standards for new developments.”*
 - b. Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy (2018) – *“the Mayor’s Transport Strategy made it clear that, in order to deliver this sustainably, the use of active and sustainable transport must be increased and overdependence on private vehicles reduced”*
 - c. Enfield Transport Plan (2019) – *“encouraging sustainable and active travel”*
 - d. Climate Action Plan (2020) – *“Limit the provision of car parking spaces on new developments in line with the New London Plan and better manage existing kerbside space.”* The fundamentals of this report have nothing to do with new developments.

The above within point 2 therefore contradicts Para. 15 of the report:

“Taking into account the above policy framework, the key objectives of the review of charges are to:

- *Ensure that the cost of operating CPZs are fully recovered.*
- *Help rebalance kerbside space so that streets are less vehicle dominated.*
- *Increase the proportion of trips made by active and sustainable modes in line with the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy.*
- *Encourage a switch to vehicles which produce less pollutants and greenhouse gases while in use, which will support the carbon reduction targets in the Council’s Climate Action Plan.*
- *Provide consistent and clear charges for permits for residents CPZs.”*

The Council is clearly confused as to the primary purpose of the report, is it to take cars off the road or to action paragraph 15 of the report? If the answer is the latter, then surely the Council can implement most of these changes without taking more money from hardworking residents. If all cars became electric would therefore charges fall?

3. There is no way the Council can make a decision without seeing the complete breakdown of responses to the alleged consultation.
4. The new policy to charge more for additional cars is not sensible. If multiple people in the household each have a job that requires a car they are now being penalised for not being able to use alternate modes of transport.

EQIA Report

1. The Councils own EQIA report shows that in areas of higher deprivation there is more car usage therefore showing this policy would harm those least able to pay. It is true to say that some residents in these areas will have the CPZ permits free of charge already but that doesn't mean all will be in this position.
2. The elderly will be disproportionately impacted – As the report states *“Between 1995/1997 and 2020 the proportion of people aged 70+ holding a licence increased from 39% to 77%. We are aware that some older people with a pensionable income may have a fixed income and could potentially be disproportionality impacted by increases in CPZ costs”*
3. Pregnant women would be negatively impacted – As the report states *“It is possible that an increase in permit prices could disproportionately negatively impact those who are pregnant, as they may find it difficult to walk short distances and as such rely on private vehicles for door-to-door transport”*
4. Those from an ethnic minority are likely to be negatively impacted – As the report states *“It is possible that the uplift in permits for multiple cars registered at one house may have a disproportionate impact on ethnic minority communities. This is because minority ethnic groups in the UK have greater proportions of multigenerational households compared with the White ethnic group. Which may mean that they are more likely to have multiple cars at one property”*
5. This will harm those that are socio-economically disadvantaged – As the report states *“The increase the cost of CPZ permits will affect all car users living in these zones and may have a disproportionate impact on those who are socio-economically disadvantaged”*