



Appendix 3: Proposed changes to charges and conditions in council car parks

Consultation responses

1. Introduction

Consultation on Canterbury City Council's (CCC) proposals to change the charges and conditions of council car parks took place between Monday 13 November 2023 and Monday 8 January 2024.

This consultation sought views on changes to 6 items, 6 car park bands as well as car park permits. The details of these are as follows:

- Item 1: Introduce a 'Residents Rate' that provides a 10% discount* on the hourly tariff rate in Band 2 & 3 ANPR car parks and a 20% discount at Park & Ride sites for residents in the district that are registered for an ANPR account *rounded to the nearest 10p
- Item 2: Increase the free parking period for Blue Badge holders in all car parks from 2 hours to 3 hours
- Item 3: Remove the 20% EV discount offered to ANPR account holders and permit holders
- Item 4: Remove free parking period 8.30am -10am weekdays: Gorrell Tank/Middle Wall (excl summer hols period), Keams Yd, Gladstone Rd, Shaftesbury Rd, Victoria St
- Item 5: Remove the free parking period 6pm-9pm for ANPR account holders in William Street
- Item 6: Increase daily capped charges: Band 1 £25 to £30, Band £20 to £25 Band 3 £10 to £15
- Band 1 to 5, and 'Other car parks'
- Car park permits.

A total of 412 responses were received.

2. Executive summary

- Respondents objected to the majority of the proposed changes, excluding the introduction of the 'Residents Rate', the change from 2 to 3 hours free parking for blue badge holders, and the reduced Park and Ride charge.
- Reasons for this included the increased pressure these charges would put on high-street businesses and the likelihood of deterring visitors to urban centres.
- Others felt that the resident's discount was not large enough to outweigh the other proposed increases.
- Respondents near car parks used to access Whitstable schools objected strongly to the introduction of morning charges primarily on the grounds of on street congestion, child safety and cost.
- Most respondents objected to the removal of the electric vehicle (EV) discount, stating that we should be encouraging the use of EVs with discounts to lessen climate change and improve air quality.
- The majority of respondents supported the change from 2 to 3 hours free parking for blue badge holders.
- A large proportion of respondents supported the reduced Park and Ride charge for residents.

3. Consultation methodology

Consultation took place between Monday 13 November 2023 and Monday 8 January 2024. The following methods were used to seek views:

- an online questionnaire, which received 409 responses
- a paper version of the questionnaire, of which two were returned
- written representations were also welcomed and three were received.

The consultation was promoted in the following ways:

- an article on the council's newsroom site
- posts on the council's social media channels.

Additionally, the following stakeholders were emailed directly to encourage them to respond to the consultation:

- Parish councils
- CCC councillors
- Relevant KCC councillors
- Residents' associations
- Local 'Friends of' groups
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District (BID)
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust
- Canterbury Green Party
- Canterbury Inter Faith Association
- Canterbury Society
- Canterbury Society
- Canterbury Action for Sustainable transport
- Canterbury College
- Cathedral Court Residents Association
- C4B
- CPRE Kent
- CPRE Kent
- East Cliff Neighbourhood Panel
- English Rural Housing Association
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council
- Herne Bay and District Chamber of Commerce
- Hi Kent
- Hilltop Community
- Home Builders Federation
- Chamber of Commerce
- Invicta Chamber of Commerce
- Local Democracy Forum
- Moat Housing
- Mono Consultants Limited
- SPOKES East Kent Cycle Campaign
- St Mildreds Area Conservation Society SMACS
- The Crab & Winkle Line Trust
- The Canterbury Academy Trust
- The Gardens Trust
- The Georgian Group
- The Ickham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux Society
- The Open Spaces Society
- The Society of Sturry Village
- The Talk of Tankerton
- The Twentieth Century Society
- Theatres Trust
- Whitstable Improvement Trust

- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Climate Action Partnership
- Canterbury Christchurch Student Union
- University of Kent Student Union
- UCA Student Union
- Age UK Canterbury
- Canterbury Inter-Faith Association (CANDIFA)
- Disability Advisory Panel (DAP)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- HiKent
- Nigerian Community Association
- Polish Educational Club in Kent (PECK)
- Karibu Community Action Kent
- Kwan Ngei Chinese Association
- Canterbury and District Jewish Community
- Canterbury Muslim Cultural Centre
- Kent County Council - Highways
- Stagecoach
- Whitefriars
- Marlowe Society
- English Heritage
- World Heritage Committee
- Pride
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Festival
- Continental Drifts
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Canterbury Tales of England
- Canterbury Archaeological Trust
- Kent Police
- South East Coast Ambulance Service
- Kent Fire and Rescue

4. Findings

NB: Percentages have been rounded to the nearest decimal point

4.1. Questionnaire responses

A total of 409 completed questionnaires were submitted, all but two of which were online.

4.1.1. Respondent profile

Over 86.1% of respondents are residents of the Canterbury district.

Respondent type	Percentage
A resident of the Canterbury district	86.1% (352)
A visitor to the Canterbury district	1.2% (5)
A worker in the Canterbury district	4.2% (17)
A business, organisation or community group	7.1% (29)
A city, county, parish or town councillor, please specify below	0.7% (3)
An MP	-

NB: 3 (0.7%) respondents answered 'Other' and described themselves in the following way 'Church user middle wall Whitstable', 'Regularly dropping / picking up son at Whitstable & Seasalter Endowed Primary School, living in Faversham', and 'Resident and worker'

The majority of people responding were aged between 35 to 54.

Age	Percentage
18 to 25	1% (4)
26 to 34	9.5% (39)
35 to 44	23.2% (95)
45 to 54	19.6% (80)
55 to 64	18.1% (74)
65 to 74	15.9% (65)
75 to 84	8.1% (33)

85 and above	0.2% (1)
Prefer not to say	2.4% (10)

NB: 18 (4.4%) respondents did not give their age

More females responded than males.

Gender	Percentage
Male	45.5% (186)
Female	48.2% (197)
Prefer to self-describe (for example, non-binary, gender fluid etc)	-

NB: 26 (6.3%) respondents did not give their gender

4.1.2. Item 1

This item proposed to introduce a 'Residents Rate' that provides a 10% discount* on the hourly tariff rate in Band 2 & 3 ANPR car parks and 20% at Park & Ride sites for residents in the district that are registered for an ANPR account (*rounded to the nearest 10p).

Just under half of respondents supported the discount, but many said it was not large enough given the other proposed increase in charges.

Many stated the charges were too high, and some questioned the approach of adding discounts whilst increasing charges at the same time, describing it as overcomplicated.

These respondents stated that the changes would reduce visits to town and city centres which would threaten the viability of high street businesses.

Level of support for Item 1	Percentage
Support	47% (134)
Object	33.3% (95)
Neither	17.5% (50)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Increase the parking discount for residents: 43 comments
- Charges make it hard for local businesses: 41 comments
- Resident rate is over complicated/not worth much: 22 comments
- Charges are too high: 19 comments
- Support for resident discount: 10 comments
- High charges increase pressure on parking spaces in local streets: 8 comments
- Parents need free or cheap car parks for school runs: 5 comments
- Support for 3 hours free disabled parking: 4 comments
- Charges will damage tourism: 3 comments
- Give resident discount for Whitstable: 3 comments
- Encourages residents to shop locally: 3 comments
- Parking charges make essential trips (e.g. Medical) more difficult: 3 comments
- Charge more for visitors and less for residents: 2 comments
- Explain how to create an ANPR account: 2 comments
- Introduce permits for parents of children at st peter's school: 2 comments
- Charges unfairly affect charity workers: 2 comments
- Increase tax on holiday homes and second homes instead: 2 comments
- Public transport isn't a viable alternative to car travel: 2 comments

- General objection: 2 comments
- Increase discount for park and ride: 2 comments
- Whitstable is hit too hard by the proposals: 2 comments
- Doesn't help businesses and workers: 2 comments
- Do discounts fo based on vehicle emissions: 2 comments
- Support for park and ride discount: 1 comment
- Focus proposals on the entire district not just Canterbury city: 1 comment
- Charge encourage public transport use: 1 comment
- Resident's discount helps those who are struggling: 1 comment
- Helps residents who can't get an on street permit: 1 comment
- Supports people who drive to town: 1 comment
- Penalises Herne Bay residents: 1 comment
- Villages do not have parking elsewhere other than the car park: 1 comment
- What is the definition of a resident: 1 comment
- Create an annual car parking ticket: 1 comment
- Lower charges in off season: 1 comment
- Other car parks should be included: 1 comment
- Residents discount should apply to all bands: 1 comment
- Keep existing system: 1 comment
- What area counts as a resident: 1 comment
- Increase will reduce visits to churches: 1 comment
- Objection to the company who runs the digital parking account: 1 comment
- Residents often have permits, so the resident discount are largely irrelevant: 1 comment
- Increase discount for those with ANPR account: 1 comment
- Park and ride for Whitstable: 1 comment
- Make disable car parks like best lane hybrid for late night parking: 1 comment
- Charges are unfair to Whitstable and Herne Bay: 1 comment
- Anpr doesn't work with classic cars: 1 comment
- Don't increase Reculver: 1 comment
- 1 hours should be free to encourage shopping: 1 comment
- It's unfair to charge visitors more than residents: 1 comment
- Not enough ANPR car parks in Whitstable: 1 comment

4.1.3. Item 2

This item proposed to increase the free parking period for Blue Badge holders in all car parks from 2 hours to 3 hours.

A majority of residents support this proposal.

Of those who objected, some said those with disabilities only require reserved spaces that are close to amenities and that having a disability does not mean you need zero cost spaces.

Some also cited concerns around what they perceived to be fraudulent use of blue badges.

Level of support for Item 2	Percentage
Support	60.7% (173)
Object	16.5% (47)
Neither	20.7% (59)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Support 3 hours: 29 comments
- Support 2 hours only: 10 comments
- General objection: 8 comments
- Disable users don't need free spaces, they need priority spaces: 5 comments
- May increase the cost for non blue badge users: 4 comments
- Stop improper use of blue badges: 4 comments
- More than 3 hours free for blue badge holders: 3 comments
- Increase to 4 hours: 1 comment
- This will fill up car parks that the elderly rely on: 1 comment
- Roadside parking is important for blue badge holders also: 1 comment
- Canterbury isn't disable friendly, so increasing disabled parking won't help: 1 comment
- Provision for blue badge holders is sufficient: 1 comment
- General support: 1 comment
- Free time should be according to the needs of the disabled person: 1 comment
- This will reduce free spaces in car parks: 1 comment
- There isn't the money to support this measure: 1 comment
- Benefits elderly: 1 comment
- Benefits vulnerable: 1 comment

- More off street time not needed given how many places blue badge holders can park on street: 1 comment
- Held disable access town centres: 1 comment

4.1.4. Item 3

This item proposed to remove the 20% EV discount offered to ANPR account holders and permit holders.

Just under a quarter of residents supported the proposal with around 40 people stating that EV use should be encouraged. Reasons for this emphasised that they lessen climate change, reduce air pollution and that removing the discount contradicts the CCC's other environmental objectives.

Approximately 20 respondents also said EV owners do not need a discount anymore. These people said that we should be encouraging car use whatsoever with discounts.

Others doubted that a discount like this would influence whether or not people buy EVs.

Level of support for Item 3	Percentage
Support	23.5% (67)
Object	37.2% (106)
Neither	35.1% (100)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- We need to encourage EV use: 42 comments
- Evs owners don't need a discount: 18 comments
- Encourage EVs to lessen climate change: 13 comments
- Car parking charges are too high: 8 comments
- Encourage EVs to reduce air pollution: 8 comments
- Contradicts the council's other stated objectives: 7 comments
- Unclear objection: 5 comments
- Explain all acronyms before using them: ANPR and EV: 2 comments
- Evs contribute to emissions as they add to traffic congestion: 2 comments
- We shouldn't be encouraging car use: 2 comments
- Keep discount until it no longer influences buying decisions: 1 comment
- Unaware of the discount: 1 comment
- People will get EV regardless of parking discounts: 1 comment
- More charging points in Whitstable: 1 comment
- Remove it for old hybrids: 1 comment
- Increase the discount: 1 comment
- More EV charging points: 1 comment
- Adding and removing these discounts is overcomplicated: 1 comment

- Discount never worked for EV: 1 comment
- Stop improper use of chargers: 1 comment
- Fix chargers more quickly: 1 comment

4.1.5. Item 4

This item proposed to remove free parking periods 8.30am -10am weekdays: Gorrell Tank/Middle Wall (excl summer hols period), Keams Yd, Gladstone Rd, Shaftesbury Rd, Victoria Street.

A clear majority of respondents objected to the proposal. These objections centred around two areas: school runs and businesses.

As before many said the proposal was likely to reduce spending in high-street business, as the increase in charges will make other out of town retail parks like Westwood Cross, Bluewater and Ashford Retail Outlet, which offer free or cheaper parking.

Many respondents were concerned about the impact of the proposal on school runs, stating that it would make parents' lives more financially and logistically difficult, as well as increasing congestion from more illegal and legal on street parking as people try to avoid using car parks with higher charges.

Some within this group of respondents said this proposal increases the likelihood of injury to school children. They believe this would occur through the increased risk of incidents between children walking to school and vehicles trying to park in busy on-street conditions near schools.

Level of support for Item 4	Percentage
Support	5.3% (15)
Object	76.5% (218)
Neither	16.5% (47)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Reduces spending in local businesses: 68 comments
- Makes parents and carers live more difficult: 55 comments
- Increases obstructive street parking and congestion: 45 comments
- Increases financial hardship for families/struggling people unfairly: 31 comments
- Increases danger for children travelling to school: 26 comments
- It's a short sighted/unimaginative way to raise money: 8 comments
- Keep this benefit for local residents: 8 comments
- Reduces viability/admission rates in of town centre schools: 5 comments
- Unspecified objection: 5 comments
- Unfair for residents shopping locally: 3 comments

- Wastes car parks that will be otherwise underused at this time: 2 comments
- Discriminates against disadvantaged children who already struggle with attendance: 2 comments
- Increases air pollution from added congestion: 2 comments
- Unspecified support: 2 comments
- Discriminates against SEN students who have to be driven in to schools: 1 comment
- Tailor the tariff to each car park according to the local area: 1 comment
- Compromise: free parking until 09:15: 1 comment
- Increases pollution through longer trips out of town retailers: 1 comment
- Increases hardship for less able people: 1 comment
- The free rate is not needed: 1 comment
- Money raised is not spent fairly across the district: 1 comment
- There is enough on street parking: 1 comment
- Improve enforcement of improper parking: 1 comment
- This will increase peaks in car park use: 1 comment
- This will increase visits to shops during quiet periods: 1 comment
- Keep winter rate for off season use by residents: 1 comment
- Free parking is needed for short visits: 1 comment
- For day visitors, create park and ride using long reach car park or near section 106 "new care home and Tesco": 1 comment
- Prioritises profit from visitors over access to community by local residents: 1 comment
- Residents struggle to find parking already: 1 comment
- Hourly charge should be reduced: 1 comment
- This will encourage use at less busy times: 1 comment
- Children should be encouraged to walk or use public transport.: 1 comment

4.1.6. Item 5

This item proposed to remove the free parking period 6pm-9pm for ANPR account holders in William Street.

A majority of respondents objected to the proposal, support was extremely low at under five percent.

Most respondents said businesses would be impacted and many mentioned specific premises such as the cinema and leisure centre.

Level of support for Item 5	Percentage
Support	4.6% (13)
Object	58.6% (167)
Neither	34% (97)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Negatively affects businesses (cinema, Heron Leisure Centres, cafes, restaurants): 48 comments
- Increases on street parking and congestion: 7 comments
- It's a short sighted/unimaginative way to raise money: 6 comments
- Unspecified objection: 5 comments
- Increases financial pressure on people who are already struggling: 4 comments
- Keep existing system: 3 comments
- The free periods encourage efficient use of car parks, as they are under used at these times: 2 comments
- Worsens health of residents by discouraging leisure centre use: 2 comments
- Plenty of on street parking available: 1 comment
- Tailor the tariff to each car park according to the local area: 1 comment
- Encourage ANPR as it saves council money : 1 comment
- Increase costs for tourists, decrease costs for residents: 1 comment
- Public transport isn't a viable alternative: 1 comment
- Residents struggle to find parking already: 1 comment
- Charge affect volunteers: 1 comment
- Changes will help disable users as many ANPR users are disabled: 1 comment
- Increase revenue by improving enforcement: 1 comment
- Explain acronyms: what is ANPR?: 1 comment

4.1.7. Item 6

This item proposed to increase daily capped charges: Band 1 £25 to £30, Band £20 to £25 Band 3 £10 to £15.

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal and the proportion that supported it was very low, at under 10%.

Many said the charges were too expensive especially in the context of the current cost of everyday essential expenses.

As before, many also stated the proposal was likely to reduce spending in high-street business, as the increase in charges will make other out of town retail parks like Westwood Cross, Bluewater and Ashford Retail Outlet more attractive, as these locations offer free or cheaper parking.

Level of support for Item 6	Percentage
Support	8.8% (25)
Object	69.5% (198)
Neither	18.2% (52)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 63 comments
- Will reduce visits to urban centres and negatively affect high street businesses: 43 comments
- Increases financial pressure on people who are already struggling: 14 comments
- It's a short sighted/unimaginative way to raise money: 9 comments
- Increase on street parking and congestion: 5 comments
- Unfair for workers/Extend reduced bus fares to enable workers to have an alternate cost effective choice: 5 comments
- New charges are justified: 4 comments
- Large proportional increase on bands 2 and 3: 4 comments
- Public transport not a viable alternative (reliability, safety, coverage, carrying shopping): 3 comments
- Tailor the tariff to each car park according to the local area: 1 comment
- The charges aren't justified given the poor upkeep of the car parks: 1 comment
- Discourages overnight stays from visitors, reducing spending: 1 comment
- Increases use of park and ride: 1 comment
- Daily caps are good, but cap too high: 1 comment

- Unspecified objection: 1 comment
- Revenue will decrease overall from fewer visits: 1 comment
- Decrease charges for short stays, increase charges for longer stays: 1 comment
- Encourages use of park and ride: 1 comment
- Increase charges for tourists decrease charges for residents: 1 comment
- The council will lose revenue to private car parks: sainsburys day rate is cheaper than 2 hours at sainsburys: 1 comment
- Increases are not adequately justified: 1 comment
- The car park charges are getting close to the penalty charge, so people may take the risk of the penalty: 1 comment
- Station road west car park is under used and requires better signage: 1 comment
- Increased charges are unfair given poor quality of car parks: 1 comment
- Save money in other ways rather than increase charges: 1 comment

4.1.8. Band 1

Area	Car park	Current tariff	Proposed tariff 2024/25	Proposed residents' tariff 2024/25
Canterbury	Watling Street	£3.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Queningate	£3.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Pound Lane	£2.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Whitefriars	£2.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Gorrell Tank	£3.10/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.60 (Oct-Mar)	£3.70/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Keams Yard	£3.10/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.60 (Oct-Mar)	£3.70/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Beach Walk	£2.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Oyster	£2.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Whitstable Harbour	£2.50/hour	£3.70/hour	N/A

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal and the proportion that supported it was extremely low, at under 5%. Many said the charges were too expensive especially in the context of the current cost of everyday essential expenses.

As before, many also stated the proposal was likely to reduce spending in high-street business, as the increase in charges will make other out of town retail parks.

Some respondents supported the use of public transport in theory but said it was not a viable alternative currently citing a mixture of poor coverage, service frequency, safety and reliability.

Level of support for Band 1	Percentage
Support	4.7% (6)
Object	93% (120)
Neither	2.3% (3)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 63 comments
- Will reduce visits to urban centres and negatively affect businesses: 55 comments
- Increases financial pressure on people who are already struggling: 11 comments
- Public transport not viable alternative/improve public transport first: 9 comments
- Makes parents and carers live more difficult: 8 comments
- Reduce charges for residents: 6 comments
- Keep off season low charges for Whitstable: 6 comments
- Increases obstructive street parking and congestion: 5 comments
- Increases danger for children travelling to school: 3 comments
- Will reduce Whitstable visits: 3 comments
- Too expensive: winter months at Gorrell Tank: 2 comments
- Reduces viability/admission rates in of town centre schools: 2 comments
- Increases not fair given poor upkeep of car parks: 2 comments
- Objection to all increases: 2 comments
- Charges should be greater: 1 comment
- Overall revenue will decrease from fewer visits: 1 comment
- Park and ride: services are too infrequent: 1 comment
- Penalises church goers: 1 comment
- Forces people to park further away and walk unsafe routes at night: 1 comment
- Hard for workers who work at businesses in urban centres: 1 comment
- Free time for blue badge holders should be consistent: 1 comment
- Increase number of disabled parking spaces: 1 comment
- Expensive for less able users visiting healthcare appointments: 1 comment
- Unfair for workers: 1 comment
- Make first 2 hours cheaper, then ramp up charges: 1 comment
- Business owners did not know about the consultation: 1 comment
- Make an exception for traders of Canterbury Record Fair: 1 comment
- Resident's discount should apply to all car parks: 1 comment

4.1.9. Band 2

Area	Car park	Current tariff	Proposed tariff 2024/25	Residents' tariff 2024/25
Canterbury	St Radigunds (291 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Canterbury	North Lane (41 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Northgate (57 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Longport (119 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Canterbury	Castle Row (93 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Canterbury	Millers Field (43 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Canterbury	Riverside (222 bays)	£2.50/hour	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Whitstable	Middle Wall (90 bays)	£2.50/hour (Apr-Sept), £1.60 (Oct-Mar)	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Whitstable	Neptune (93 bays)	£2.30/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.50 (Oct-Mar)	£2.70/hour	£2.40/hour
Herne Bay	Reculver Towers (65 bays)	£2.30/hour (Apr-Sept), £1.60 (Oct-Mar)	£2.70/hour	N/A
Herne Bay	Reculver Country Park (121 bays)	£2.30/hour (Apr-Sept), £1.60 (Oct-Mar)	£2.70/hour	N/A

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal and the proportion that supported it was very low, at under 10%.

Many said the charges were too expensive. As before, many stated the proposal was likely to reduce spending in high-street business, and a few comments specifically mentioned the impact of the Marlowe Theatre.

Respondents were against the removal of the off season discounts in Herne Bay and Whitstable and a number said that the increase to Reculver Country Park was ill-considered as the car park was in their opinion already under utilised.

Level of support for Band 2	Percentage
Support	8.5% (10)
Object	87.2% (102)
Neither	4.3% (5)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 28 comments
- Will reduce visits to urban centres and negatively affect businesses (e.g. Marlowe): 26 comments
- Keep out of season rate/increase out of season discount for Whitstable and Herne Bay: 11 comments
- Makes parents and carers live more difficult: 10 comments
- Don't increase Reculver car park: 8 comments
- Increases obstructive street parking and congestion: 6 comments
- Increases financial pressure on people who are already struggling: 5 comments
- Decreases safety for schoolchildren and other pedestrians: 4 comments
- Decreases revenue overall from fewer visits: 4 comments
- Decreases viability of schools in urban centres: 3 comments
- Will reduce attendance of churches and clubs: 2 comments
- Remove residents discount: 2 comments
- Invest in park and ride: 2 comments
- Public transport is not good enough to be a viable alternative: 1 comment
- Short sighted way to increase income: 1 comment
- Many car parks aren't ANPR, so don't allow for resident discount, and so will become under used.: 1 comment
- Charge more for non-residents: 1 comment
- Discriminates against children with SEN: 1 comment
- Forces people to park further away and walk unsafe routes at night: 1 comment
- Hard for workers who work at businesses in urban centres: 1 comment
- Objection to all increases: 1 comment
- Make the first two hours cheaper: 1 comment
- Don't increase charges in middle wall car park: 1 comment
- Introduce an off season reduction in charges (e.g. October to March): 1 comment
- Include Reculver car parks in resident's discount: 1 comment
- ANPR and barrier control should be introduced at all sites to improve revenue and all more use of resident's discount: 1 comment

- How can you charge more if maintenance costs haven't gone up significantly?: 1 comment
- Discourages walks in nature: 1 comment
- Proposed charges unfairly target Whistables relative to Canterbury: 1 comment

4.1.10. Band 3

Area	Car park	Current tariff	Proposed tariff 2024/25	Residents' tariff 2024/25
Canterbury	Castle Street Multi-Storey (430 bays)	£1.80/hour	£1.90/hour	£1.70/hour
Canterbury	Holmans Meadow (215 bays)	£1.80/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Station Road West Multi-Storey (380 bays)	£1.80/hour	£1.90/hour	£1.70/hour
Canterbury	Toddlers Cove*	£1.70/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Victoria Rec Ground**	£1.70/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Cow Lane	£1.30/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Canterbury	Maynard Road	£1.30/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Gladstone Road (56 bays)	£2.50/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.60/hour (Oct-Mar)	£1.90/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Shaftesbury Road (48 bays)	£2.50/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.60/hour (Oct-Mar)	£1.90/hour	N/A
Whitstable	Victoria Street (56 bays)	£2.50/hour (Apr-Sept) £1.60/hour (Oct-Mar)	£1.90/hour	N/A
Herne Bay	William Street (229 bays)	£1.50/hour	£1.90/hour	£1.70/hour

Herne Bay	Market Street (135 bays)	£1.50/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Herne Bay	Beach Street	£1.50/hour	£1.90/hour	£1.70/hour
Herne Bay	Memorial Park*	£0.50/hour	£1.90/hour	N/A
Herne Bay	School Lane	£0.60 30 mins, £1.10 2hrs, £2.20 24hrs	£1.90/hour	N/A

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal and the proportion that supported it was very low, at under 10%.

Many said the charges were too expensive. As before, many stated the proposal was likely to reduce spending in high-street businesses.

There was strong objection to the increase in School Lane car park which was described as an essential facility due to the restricted options for parking elsewhere.

Level of support for Band 3	Percentage
Support	8% (11)
Object	79.7% (110)
Neither	12.3% (17)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 36 comments
- Will reduce visits to urban centres and negatively affect businesses: 26 comments
- Don't increase school lane car park as there are limited options for parking here, Herne Bay: 20 comments
- Increase on street parking and congestion: 18 comments
- Difficult for parents and carers: 8 comments
- Increases danger for children travelling to school and other pedestrians: 7 comments
- Increases financial hardship for families/struggling people unfairly: 7 comments
- Impacts community clubs and events: 5 comments
- Its a short sighted/unimaginative way to raise money: 3 comments
- Decreases viability of schools in urban centres: 2 comments
- The charges aren't justified given the upkeep: 2 comments
- Penalises workers who need to park at non-standard hours: 2 comments

- Different for families with school children: 2 comments
- Memorial Park too expensive: 2 comments
- Stop all car park increases: 1 comment
- Don't remove free evening car parking for ANPR users in William Street as it will affect Herne Bay Swimming Club: 1 comment
- Introduce reductions for workers: 1 comment
- Forces workers to walk further at night, through unlit areas, to save money: 1 comment
- Make first 30 minutes free: 1 comment
- Decreases revenue: 1 comment
- Free parking for residents before 10am: 1 comment
- Keep free parking 0830 to 1000: 1 comment
- Governor of Whitstable & Seasalter Endowed Church of England (Aided) Junior School: free morning parking essential: 1 comment
- Increase at Toddler's Cove unnecessary: 1 comment
- The increase (280%) memorial car park in Kings Road Herne Bay will damage local businesses: 1 comment
- Gladstone Road car park, Whitstable (Item 34): charge less for short stays to encourage more visits and increase income e.g. £1 for 30 minutes.: 1 comment
- Elderly residents in School Lane have nowhere to park close to their homes for unloading shopping: 1 comment
- Object to stopping free parking for ANPR members in William Street car park Herne Bay: 1 comment
- Introduce ANPR at all sites for increased revenue: 1 comment
- Keep free parking after 1800 William Street, as it is under utilised otherwise: 1 comment
- Makes essential or medical visits expensive: 1 comment
- Unfair for small towns like Herne Bay as they don't have alternatives like park and ride: 1 comment
- Not enough car parks are eligible for resident's discounts: 1 comment
- Some villages properties have no off street parking, no on street parking nearby and rely heavily on car parks and permits, both of which are increasing: 1 comment
- Advertise prices on major routes, so motorists can make informed decisions on prices: 1 comment

4.1.11. Band 4 (Leisure Car Parks - All Day Tariff)

Area	Car park	Current tariff	Proposed tariff 2024/25
Herne Bay	Ocean View	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Whitstable	Tankerton Road	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Herne Bay	Reculver Drive	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Herne Bay	Hampton	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Herne Bay	Bishopstone Lane	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Herne Bay	Swalecliffe Avenue	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Whitstable	Faversham Road	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols
Whitstable	Gorrell Valley Nature Reserve	£1.50/day Mon-Fri £3.00/day weekends, B/hols	£1.60/day Mon-Fri £3.20/day weekends, B/hols

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal.

Most said the charges were too expensive, that the proposal would increase on-street parking and congestion and would reduce visits to independent businesses on the high-street which is of particular importance to Whistable's tourism economy.

Level of support for Band 4	Percentage
Support	14.9% (13)
Object	69% (60)
Neither	16.1% (14)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 15 comments
- Increase on street parking and congestion: 11 comments
- Will reduce visits to urban centres and negatively affect businesses: 6 comments
- Difficult for parents and carers: 3 comments
- N/A: 3 comments
- Increase is fair: 3 comments
- Increases financial hardship for families/struggling people unfairly: 2 comments
- Discourage people from enjoying natural spaces: 2 comments
- Charges have led to less use of the car parks, not more income: 2 comments
- Increases danger for children travelling to school: 1 comment
- Stop all parking increases: 1 comment
- Charge low rates Ocean view car park: 1 comment
- Reduces tourism: 1 comment
- Summer months increases are too large: 1 comment
- Item 42 and 44 will increase congestion at Reculver Drive and danger to pedestrians: 1 comment
- There should be a residents discount: 1 comment
- Will affect volunteers of community groups that save CCC money: 1 comment
- Unfair given costs of upkeep haven't risen significantly: 1 comment
- Objection to extension of days and time during which the tariff is payable.: 1 comment

4.1.12. Band 5 (Park and Ride)

Area	Car park	Current tariff	Proposed tariff 2024/25	Residents' tariff 2024/25
Canterbury	Sturry Road	£4.00/vehicle/day	£4.00/vehicle/day	£3.20/vehicle/day
Canterbury	Wincheap	£4.00/vehicle/day	£4.00/vehicle/day	£3.20/vehicle/day
Canterbury	New Dover Road	£4.00/vehicle/day	£4.00/vehicle/day	£3.20/vehicle/day

Around half of respondents supported the proposal.

People supported the reintroduction of the Sturry Park and Ride and that the proposal would encourage visits to the city centre.

Level of support for Band 5	Percentage
Support	50.7% (36)
Object	29.6% (21)
Neither	19.7% (14)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Unspecified support: 7 comments
- Resident discount good: 3 comments
- Introduce Sturry park and ride: 3 comments
- Lower prices to encourage use and increase overall revenue: 2 comments
- Encourages city centre visits: 2 comments
- Will not encourage more usage as bus is cheaper: 1 comment
- Discount for residents doesn't encourage park and ride, and other non-private care ways of travelling: 1 comment
- Extend discount to people who work in Canterbury: 1 comment
- Environmentally friendly: 1 comment
- Residents have difficulty parking: 1 comment
- More park and ride services required: 1 comment
- Encourages spending at local businesses: 1 comment
- Encourages tourism: 1 comment

- Stop people using concession passes on park and ride after parking at supermarket car parks: 1 comment
- Demand for Sturry park and ride isn't there, as car parks are still not full in town: 1 comment
- Reduces congestion: 1 comment
- Overall charges are artificially designed to promote park and ride: 1 comment
- Keep existing prices and increase revenue through increased use: 1 comment
- For park and ride to be successful, make sure there is a high frequency of services, good lighting and toilet facilities.: 1 comment
- Park and ride is irrelevant to non-Canterbury shoppers: 1 comment
- Clearly advertise prices on entry to Canterbury: 1 comment

4.1.13. Other car parks

Area	Car park	Proposed change
Canterbury	Kingsmead Leisure Centre	Remove car park from the OSPPO for Active Life to manage
Herne Bay	Kingfisher Close	Add a defined area into the OSPPO for permit parking only
Canterbury	Simmonds Road, Wincheap	Remove car park from OSPPO as tenant no longer wants to issue permits

The largest group of respondents neither supported nor objected to the proposal. Levels of objection were slightly larger than the levels of support.

Level of support for other car parks	Percentage
Support	15.9% (10)
Object	23.8% (15)
Neither	58.7% (37)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Will reduce visits to urban centres and damage local businesses: 2 comments
- Support activelife management: 1 comment
- Private company should take on liabilities if gaining financially: 1 comment
- Increases pressure on local roads: 1 comment
- Stop all car park increases: 1 comment
- Proposals jeopardise community access, fairness, and well-being: 1 comment
- Private companies will make charges too high: 1 comment

4.1.14. Car park permits

Increase permit charges by approx 10% - see [Appendix 2](#) for details.

A clear majority of respondents objected to the proposals.

The most common objections were that the charges were too expensive, especially in the context of the cost of everyday expenses.

Car park permits	Percentage
Support	4.9% (5)
Object	77.5% (79)
Neither	16.7% (17)

The following themes were identified in the comments:

- Too expensive: 43 comments
- Increases are not justified given poor state of car parks: 16 comments
- Hard for those struggling financially: 11 comments
- Stop parking of visitors in resident only car parks: 7 comments
- Not enough street parking permits in (Canterbury Whitstable): 5 comments
- Discriminates those who are less physically able (disabled, elderly): 4 comments
- Drug dealing/poor lighting in car parks make people feel unsafe: 3 comments
- Increase to business permits are a burden for businesses: 3 comments
- Short-sighted/unimaginative: 3 comments
- Install more ANPR: 3 comments
- Increases pressure on struggling businesses: 2 comments
- Discourages visits to urban centres: 2 comments
- Put revenue from increases into new EV charging points: 2 comments
- Increases were meant to be capped at inflation, which is 6.7%: 2 comments
- The reason for such large increases is not adequately explained: 2 comments
- Many people have no on street parking rely heavily on car parks: 2 comments
- Stop all increases in car park charges: 2 comments
- Allocate car park spaces to residents: 1 comment
- Makes essential trips difficult (medical): 1 comment
- Public transport not a viable alternative/make park and ride better: 1 comment
- Allow payment by direct debit: 1 comment
- Street parking permits for residents: 1 comment
- Increases are valid for funding the council: 1 comment
- Reduce council costs rather than increase revenue: 1 comment

- Council broken promise that School Lane Car Park in Herne Bay was not to rise above £500: 1 comment
- Middle Wall car park's automated ANPR barrier doesn't work: 1 comment
- Discourages living in urban areas, which is mean to be good: 1 comment
- Increase should match inflation: 1 comment
- Will make it hard to recruit workers in urban centres: 1 comment
- Introduce car park specific permits: 1 comment
- Don't increase school lane: 1 comment
- In the USA, local town businesses do well and they have 3 or 4 hours free parking: 1 comment
- Enforcement of on street parking by visitors is poor: 1 comment
- Is Notley terrace car park included?: 1 comment

4.2. Written representations

A total of 3 written representations were received.

4.2.1. A resident

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

This proposal is crass in the extreme and only serves to support the contention that car parks are a cash cow to be milked at every opportunity regardless of any consideration of the needs of local people and the environment. Those in the cabinet who have supported this (and I know that some do not)are clearly myopic as to the unique situation that applies in Whitstable.

Some years back I initiated this move with support across party from other councillors. Whitstable is unique having three primary schools in close proximity to the main street (High Street and Oxford Street) which even at the best of times can be congested with no suitable drop off points particularly having regard to young children.

This measure was introduced to facilitate the school run, to mitigate congestion in the main street with consequences of pollution and to boost local trade particularly with the excellent butchers, bakers and greengrocers in the town. It only applies in the week and not at the busy weekends when car parking is in heavy demand.

A cabinet member was quoted in the press saying that that children could walk or go on the bus but this is already the case with many children but it ignores the fact that many parents have busy lives and that bus stops at the other end might be distant from homes and that with very young children this is neither safe nor convenient.

I have no objection to raised charges at busy times elsewhere and outside of term time. Tourists normally expect to pay high charges and certainly those from London are more than used to it. When matched against the price of a pint parking charges remain low.

4.2.2. A resident

A resident submitted the following comments via email:

Further to Canterbury council's consultation document on proposed increases to car parking I wish to register my objection to these large cost increases for parking which have already increased by more than inflation in recent years.

I live in Whitstable and consider these proposed charges to be excessive and will result in less visitors which harm trade in the town and also adversely affect council income.

Council will be aware of considerably higher costs for eating/drinking/shopping in the town. Increased parking costs will have to be passed on to customers which will result in businesses becoming unviable in what is already a very challenging environment.

In my view the lack of investment and very little maintenance and upkeep within the town not just by CCC but also KCC means that the councils are continuing to draw a lot of income whilst only putting a very small fraction back.

If however some real improvements to roads, footpaths and other infrastructure (currently in poor condition) were undertaken, to improve the appeal of the town then perhaps residents like myself would look more favourably on modest increases to current parking charges in the town.

I look forward to seeing the results from the consultation.

4.2.3. Canterbury BID

Canterbury Business Improvement District (BID) say that increasing parking charges without sufficiently improving public and active transport could harm businesses in Canterbury.

They made a number of strategic and practical points, including that the council should:

- Ensure charges are based on economic analysis and integrate with the wider transport policy.
- Identify and communicate the positive aspects of visiting Canterbury vs other cities e.g. 'parking from £1.70ph /£1.90ph ... 3 minutes from the city centre'
- Put up clear maps and routes for visitors to follow from the car parks to the shops.
- Reconsider collection points to incentivise shoppers.
- Introduce season tickets for park and ride.

Canterbury BID also welcome:

- The investments in the Castle Street Multi Storey Car Park.
- The proposal to re-open Sturry including the later evening services.

Canterbury BID's comments were submitted by email and can be viewed below:

[...] Canterbury BID has run two consultation workshops and surveys on transport and parking in recent years, and they are available on the BID website <https://www.canterburybid.co.uk/representation/>.

For this year's consultation, we welcomed Richard Moore, Head of Transportation and Environment at CCC, and Cllr Alex Ricketts, Cabinet Member for Tourism, Movement and Rural Development, to the BID Board meeting on 15 November 2023 and extended invitations to representatives from the city's business quarters.

We recognise that we are in a "transport transition" and that a reduction in carbon emissions and congestion is essential. However, we also have to recognise that increasing car parking prices alone – without any other change to our transport infrastructure – will have a negative impact on businesses, on their employees and on our residents. Measures discouraging car use need to be supported by additional public and active transport, which is necessary in order to achieve environmental objectives without adversely affecting city centre footfall.

If businesses – many of whom continue to struggle post-pandemic due to rising costs and disruptions to the supply chain – fail as a result of these changes, there will be a further increase in vacant units and a negative impact on the Council budget through business rates.

We understand that local authorities are underfunded and we want to work with the Council to ensure Canterbury can remain a thriving city for everyone who uses the city. We very much welcome investment in Castle Street Multi Storey and investment in marketing / incentive strategies. We would like to be involved and support a clear strategy to focus on positive messaging and signposting.

Below is a summary of questions and points of feedback.

Strategic

- *What is car parking for? Is parking about raising revenue for local services? Is it a service to the public, residents and visitors alike? Or, is it to support businesses as part of an economic regeneration strategy?*
- *What was the strategic decision-making process for the proposed increases? How does this proposal link to Canterbury's wider transport strategy?*
- *Canterbury welcomed 16 million + visitors in 2023. Was the consultation sent proactively to visitors?*

Economic Development oversight

- *Has there been a cost/benefit analysis done in terms of economic impact?*
- *Businesses are still in a very precarious position. Footfall is recovering but the cost of doing business remains very high, which means profit margins are low with many businesses carrying debt from the pandemic. Hospitality and ENTE are at most risk. This impacts on employment and eventually on business rates.*

- *The vast majority of businesses who participate in our car parking consultation workshops and questionnaires say that increasing car parking charges has a significantly negative/damaging impact on business and significant revenue will be lost.*
- *Car drivers are the biggest spenders. With business margins so tight due to rising costs, this puts jobs and businesses at risk. Strong view that car parking increases will put businesses at risk.*
- *Customer decision making in our key catchment area is impacted by price. Customers in this zone are almost exclusively car driving customers with limited public transport. These are our biggest cash spenders and they will drive further, adding to the climate emergency, to drive down their parking costs out of principle.*
- *Competition – Canterbury is in direct competition with nearby shopping centres that offer free parking. This must be a consideration.*

Incentive strategies, marketing and comms

- *Incentive strategies and positive marketing are crucial. We understand that some funding will be available for marketing and comms. Can we be involved in the development of the strategy and campaign? We would like to see a clear incentivising strategy focussed on positive messaging and wayfinding. For example, ‘parking from £1.70ph /£1.90ph ... 3 minutes from the city centre along the Kings Mile/Castle Quarter’, showing how close these car parks are to shopping / key destinations – this could also be a good way to show the value of some of the LUF investment. The city’s car parks are perfectly reasonable walking distances and in some cities, you wouldn’t be able to park this close. If we push the positive narrative, we could win back some customers.*
- *Can you look at peak and off peak, matching this with low footfall days, to encourage people to try Park & Ride? The idea being that this wouldn’t negate existing income but could serve as a boost – financial for the Council (also from a decarbonisation / congestion perspective) and boosting economic impact.*
- *Will there be new incentives for EVs?*
- *Park & Ride – Is it true that some/all Stagecoach buses can be used to return to Park & Ride? If so, what can be done to promote that?*

Specific questions / points

- *Rosemary Lane has been shut now for 3 years+. Why can’t it be reopened for business use? Whilst it’s not in use, it needs to be kept tidy – otherwise, the broken window syndrome kicks in.*
- *Castle Street Multi Storey. Very pleased to hear that £300,000 is being invested to improve Castle Street Multi Storey (cleaning, lighting) as it is much needed. We receive regular stories like this one:
Recently a client parked in Castle Street Multi-storey. She was concerned about returning to her car after her appointment, so I walked her back and used the stair well to enter. There was human faeces and stank of urine. Women do not feel safe using this car park.*

- *Public transport is unreliable and not always accessible, not least for people who arrive early and leave late for work, and in many cases remains costly, so not a viable option for many.*
- *Do you have to park in order to ride? What if you cycle or walk to a Park & Ride – can you then jump on a bus? Can this be communicated explicitly.*
- *Park and Ride:*
 - *We welcome the proposal to re-open Sturry and agree this needs to run later in the evening to serve the night time economy and enable people to return home after work.*
 - *Can every bus that passes Park & Ride stop there?*
 - *Could there be season tickets for Park & Ride?*
- *Wayfinding is absolutely crucial. How will these proposals link to LUF?*
- *Better wayfinding is essential, especially the signage as you enter Canterbury. We understand that KCC are responsible for the signage outside the city centre. WiFi / connectivity is so poor which is partially why the digital signs (indicating number of spaces available) don't work. How can this be addressed?*
- *Suggestion to reconsider collection points as a direct mitigation to the impact of car parking prices increases to incentivise shoppers.*
- *What incentives will be provided? Suggestion to offer discounts at low peak times.*
- *Suggestion to include maps and visual marketing collateral as part of the marketing campaign, as discussed with the BID team, so people know how close they are to their designation. Include “concentric circle” style maps around the city with an indication of how long it will take to walk from point a to point b, for example.*
- *University perspective – 1/3 of students are commuters. Both students and staff would like to reduce their carbon footprint, but the reality is that some still need to park. What conversations are CCC having with other transport providers?*
- *Why remove the 20% EV discount offered to ANPR account holders and permit holders?*

5. Conclusions

Overall, respondents objected to the majority of the proposed changes.

They said net increases to car park charges were too large, would reduce visits to urban centres and increase pressure on high-street businesses.

The Canterbury BID also mentioned the potential of harm to Canterbury businesses, highlighting the risk of losing customers to retail parks that offer free parking. This was also mentioned by other respondents.

Many stated that the resident's discount was not large enough. Those responding to the proposed increase in charges for car parking permits often said the increases were not justified given the poor state of car parks.

Parents who use car parks for drop offs to schools with otherwise limited parking objected strongly to the introduction of morning charges. They said the proposed changes would make their lives more difficult, increase obstructive on-street parking and therefore pose a danger for school children.

Other points included that the morning charges may reduce admissions to some Whitstable schools in particular and would generally increase financial hardship of families already struggling with cost of living.

Most objected to the removal of the electric vehicle (EV) discount. They stated that we should be encouraging the use of EVs with discounts to lessen climate change and improve air pollution.

The majority of respondents supported the change from 2 to 3 hours free parking for blue badge holders. However, there were still some that objected.

Most respondents supported the proposal to reduce the Park and Ride charge for residents.

It is hoped that the findings from this consultation provide useful insight as to how the council will proceed during the next stages of the decision-making process.