



## **Report to Cabinet**

**Subject** "Gedling 500" Consultation on Concessionary Fares, Car Park Charging and Police Community Support Officers

**Date** 7 April 2005

**Author** Head of Cabinet Office

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

§ To inform members of the results of the consultation exercise on the above issues, as requested at a recent Cabinet meeting.

### **2. Background**

At its meeting held on 2 December 2004, Cabinet considered a referral from Resources and Management Scrutiny Committee relating to that Committee's review of Concessionary Fares.

Cabinet resolved: -

*"To use the Gedling 500 for a consultation exercise in respect of Car Park charging, Concessionary Fares and the funding of PCSO's by the Council, the questions for the exercise to be drafted by Officers in consultation with Group Leaders".*

Research consultant John Hiley was commissioned to carry out the survey and I drafted questions for the questionnaire, drawing on Mr Hiley's expertise, in consultation with Group Leaders as instructed.

### **3. Proposal**

The survey work has now been completed and results analysed.

A copy of the final report from John Hiley is attached at **Appendix A** to this report.

As well as including results, the report summarises the approach employed, which is consistent with all previous Gedling 500 exercises.

Given that the survey was occasioned by a referral from a Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet may wish to draw the results to the attention of Scrutiny Committee members.

#### **4. Resource Implications**

Costs of the survey have been funded from within existing agreed resources for 2004/05.

Resource implications of any further actions that may be decided upon by members, drawing on the results of the survey, have not been assessed.

#### **5. Recommendation**

Members' instructions are requested.

Appendix A

John Hiley  
Research Consultant

# Gedling 500 Residents Survey March 2005

Covering residents views on:  
Police Community Support Officers  
Proposals to introduce car park charges  
Proposals for a bus pass giving free off peak  
travel

Report prepared by John Hiley  
29 Brookside  
Ancaster  
Grantham  
Lincs NG32 3QT

Tel 07940 712089; [john@hiley.fslife.co.uk](mailto:john@hiley.fslife.co.uk)  
[johnhileyresearch.co.uk](http://johnhileyresearch.co.uk)

Report prepared for the Cabinet Office, Gedling Borough Council  
March 2005

## The Sample

501 respondents were interviewed at their homes. The sample was selected at random, substitutions taking place if a respondent declined to take part in the survey or could not be contacted after three visits.

Table 1 shows the location of respondents home, Plains Road is regarded as the boundary between Arnold and Carlton.

| 1. Area | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Arnold  | 183       | 36.5%      |
| Carlton | 208       | 41.5%      |
| Parish  | 110       | 22.0%      |

Table 2 shows the first part of the postcode of respondent's homes.

| 2. Postcode | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| NG14        | 57        | 11.4       |
| NG15        | 38        | 7.6        |
| NG3         | 50        | 10         |
| NG4         | 177       | 35.3       |
| NG5         | 169       | 33.7       |
| NG6         | 8         | 1.6        |
| NG7         | 2         | 0.4        |

Just over half of all respondents were female.

| 3. Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Male      | 243       | 48.5%      |
| Female    | 258       | 51.5%      |

Table 4 shows respondent's ages.

| 4. Age  | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------|-----------|------------|
| Refused | 1         | 0.2%       |
| 17 - 29 | 40        | 8.0%       |
| 30 - 44 | 140       | 27.9%      |
| 45 - 60 | 140       | 27.9%      |
| Over 60 | 180       | 35.9%      |

96 respondents said that they had a long term illness, health problem or disability that limited their daily activities or the work that they did. 405 respondents said that they didn't.

Over 85% of respondents lived in owner occupied homes.

| 5. Tenure                       | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Owner occupier                  | 428       | 85.4%      |
| Rented from the Council         | 33        | 6.6%       |
| Private rented                  | 25        | 5.0%       |
| Rented from Housing Association | 13        | 2.6%       |
| Refused                         | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Other (say)                     | 1         | 0.2%       |

Table 6 shows the composition of households.

| 6. Household                   | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Lone adult                     | 78        | 15.6%      |
| Couple, no dependant children  | 184       | 36.7%      |
| Couple with dependant children | 147       | 29.3%      |
| Lone parent                    | 25        | 5.0%       |
| Other all adult households     | 62        | 12.4%      |
| Other                          | 5         | 1.0%       |

Respondents were asked 'do you or any member of your household own or have regular use of any motor vehicle?' Those who had were asked how many.

| 7. Vehicle Number | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| No vehicle        | 78        | 15.6%      |
| One               | 232       | 46.3%      |
| Two               | 154       | 30.7%      |
| Three             | 27        | 5.4%       |
| More than three   | 10        | 2.0%       |

Nearly one quarter of respondents didn't know the Council Tax Band of their property.

| 8. Council Tax Band       | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Not answered / don't know | 120       | 24.0%      |
| A                         | 77        | 15.4%      |
| B                         | 112       | 22.4%      |
| C                         | 66        | 13.2%      |
| D                         | 79        | 15.8%      |
| E                         | 30        | 6.0%       |
| F                         | 8         | 1.6%       |
| G                         | 8         | 1.6%       |
| H                         | 1         | 0.2%       |

72 respondents households were in receipt of Council Tax benefit, 427 were not and 2 respondents did not know.

97% of respondents described themselves as 'white'. 4 respondents refused to describe their ethnicity.

| 9. Ethnicity                      | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Refused                           | 4         | 0.8%       |
| White - British                   | 475       | 94.8%      |
| Indian                            | 3         | 0.6%       |
| Pakistani                         | 2         | 0.4%       |
| Asian - Other                     | 2         | 0.4%       |
| White - Other                     | 10        | 2.0%       |
| White - Irish                     | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Mixed - White and Black African   | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Mixed background - Other          | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Black - Caribbean                 | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Black - British                   | 1         | 0.2%       |
| Mixed - White and Black Caribbean | 0         | 0%         |
| Mixed - White and Asian           | 0         | 0%         |
| Black - African                   | 0         | 0%         |
| Black - Other                     | 0         | 0%         |
| Chinese                           | 0         | 0%         |
| Bangladeshi                       | 0         | 0%         |
| Other                             | 0         | 0%         |

Table 10 shows the employment status of respondents.

| 10. Employment         | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Full time employment   | 183       | 36.5%      |
| Retired                | 166       | 33.1%      |
| Part time employment   | 84        | 16.8%      |
| Looking after the home | 40        | 8.0%       |
| Unemployed             | 10        | 2.0%       |
| Full time student      | 5         | 1.0%       |
| Carer                  | 4         | 0.8%       |
| Other                  | 9         | 1.8%       |

## Police Community Support Officers

Respondents were told that the Council pays for 6 Police Community Support Officers for the Borough in addition to the 6 Government funded PCSO's. They were then asked how effective the Officers were.

| 11. PCSO effectiveness | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Very effective         | 60        | 12.0%      |
| Quite effective        | 150       | 29.9%      |
| Not very effective     | 67        | 13.4%      |
| Not at all effective   | 76        | 15.2%      |
| Don't know             | 148       | 29.5%      |

They were then asked to give reasons for their replies.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| <b>12. Reasons that PCSO's are Very effective:</b>   |    |   |
| Visibility / presence  | 33 |   |
| Effective with youth   | 13 |   |
| Local knowledge / Community involvement  |    | 6 |
| Deterrent  | 4  |   |
| Personal experiences   |    | 3 |
| <small>(crime levels reduced of crime / nuisance 2; of reduction of problems with youth at Bingham 1 each)</small>   |    |   |
| Reduce fear of crime   |    | 3 |
| Effective against nuisances / low level problems   |    | 2 |
| Others (1 each): Effective with prostitutes, Reports in local press, Release police for other duties, Keep drugs off street, Good image, The system works, Easy to contact, See things happening first, Criminals have someone to consult so they avoid re-offending, Tackling problems, Friendly and helpful, Visit schools |    |   |
| <b>Reasons that PCSO's are Quite effective:</b>  |    |   |
| Visibility / presence  | 79 |   |
| Deterrent  | 25 |   |
| Effective with youth   | 13 |   |
| Reduced problems in the area   |    | 8 |
| Release police for other duties  | 6  |   |
| Local knowledge / community involvement  |    | 4 |
| Prompt response  | 4  |   |
| Reduced fear of crime  |    | 4 |
| Identify possible trouble makers / prevention  |    | 3 |
| Respondents has been told that they are effective  |    | 2 |
| Others (1 each): Approachable, New powers, Value for money   |    |   |

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>13. Reasons that PCSO's are Not very effective:</b>   |                                       |
| Too few / rarely seen  | 32                                    |
| Limited powers   | 18                                    |
| Not preventing local problems  | 4                                     |
| Present at wrong times   | 3 (includes not present after dark 1) |
| Ignored by offenders / young people  | 2                                     |
| Poor police attitudes  | 2                                     |
| Others (1 each): Detection rates depend upon the quality of Officers, Little trouble in the area, Local PCSO is a lone female, More appropriate for inner city areas, No support from the courts, They don't act promptly, They seem to do nothing |                                       |
| <b>Reasons that PCSO's are Not at all effective:</b>   |                                       |
| Too few / rarely seen  | 38                                    |
| Limited powers   | 22                                    |
| Not preventing local problems  | 13                                    |
| Not respected  | 3                                     |
| Police service ineffective   | 3                                     |
| Others (1 each): Emphasis should be on serious crime, Not available after dark, Not needed, Poor attitudes, Poorly trained, Rarely close to the scene of a crime, Slow response times, Too young   |                                       |

Respondents were asked if there were any more effective ways of reducing crime and disorder that the Council could pay for instead. Many respondents gave replies which were not within the remit of the Council, including 141 who raised policing issues, including the need for 'real' police Officers. These were often recorded as additional comments.

Other comments in this section were that More PCSO's needed (3), PCSO's should patrol defined areas (2). Others were:- There are less people in uniforms around today than before when there were uniformed Park Keepers, Bus Conductors etc; PCSO's should be seen at shopping centres, estates, after dark and on bikes (1 each), they need more training, they need more powers, they should only be supported until Gedling is properly policed, that PCSO's are policing 'on the cheap' and that it is too early to evaluate their effectiveness

Replies which fell within the conventional remit of the Council are shown in table 14.



**14. Are there any more effective ways of reducing crime and disorder that the Council could be paying for instead?**

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| Youth facilities / activities   | 34 |   |
| CCTV  | 20 |   |
| ASBO's  | 5  |   |
| Better lighting   |    | 5 |
| Support for Neighbourhood Watch   |    | 5 |
| Youth education projects  | 4  |   |
| Home security measures / projects   |    | 4 |
| Sports facilities   | 3  |   |
| Checks on car boot sales  | 3  |   |
| Crime prevention advice   | 2  |   |
| Park keepers  | 2  |   |
| Vetting tenants   | 2  |   |
| Others (1 each): Action against scams, After School Clubs, Drug prevention projects, Fencing around sheltered housing projects, Help lines, Parenting projects, Quicker repairs after vandalism, Village Wardens, Youth curfews |    |   |

Respondents were shown a card showing three possible courses of action and asked to select one.

**15. Which of these three alternatives would you support?**

|   | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Not answered  | 24        | 4.8%       |
| The Council should pay for 6 Officers in addition to the number that the Government pays for  | 168       | 33.5%      |
| The Council should reduce the number of Officers that it pays for as Government support increases to keep the number to at least 12 for the Borough | 82        | 16.4%      |
| The Council should spend its money on providing traditional Local Authority services and leave policing to Government and the Police                | 227       | 45.3%      |

**Brief comments**

PCSO's are a fairly recent introduction and many respondents were unsure about their effectiveness. The main reason that respondents thought them to be ineffective was that they were rarely seen or too few in numbers.

Superficially it may seem contradictory that 45% of respondents thought that the Borough Council should leave policing to the Government and the police while surveys have consistently shown a desire for Councils to be involved in crime prevention and community safety. However surveys in the Nottingham area have regularly shown that while more police foot patrols are regarded as a priority, Special Constables were not seen as a priority. PCSO's may be seen as having

more in common with the 'Specials' than with 'real' police officers, for the moment at least.

## Car Parking charges

Respondents were told that car parks in the Borough are free for up to 3 hours use and that the cost of their upkeep was £180,000 per year which was paid from the Council Tax. Proposed charges (which would not include Calverton and Ravenshead) were suggested to cover the upkeep of 20p for the first hour rising to £1 for up to 3 hours.

423 respondents households owned or had regular use of at least one motor vehicle.

46% of respondents regularly used the car parks at Arnold.

| 16. Car Parks used regularly (ie on average at least weekly). Vehicle using households only. | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| None   | 119       | 28.1%      |
| Arnold   | 195       | 46.1%      |
| Calverton  | 28        | 6.6%       |
| Carlton  | 70        | 16.5%      |
| Mapperley  | 80        | 18.9%      |
| Netherfield  | 42        | 9.9%       |
| Ravenshead   | 24        | 5.7%       |

Table 17 shows car park use by area of residence.

| 17. Car Parks used regularly (ie on average at least weekly) by area. Vehicle using households only. | Arnold residents | Carlton residents | Parish Residents |
|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| None   | 36 (30%)         | 53 (45%)          | 30 (25%)         |
| Arnold   | 108 (55%)        | 48 (25%)          | 39 (20%)         |
| Calverton  | 4 (14%)          | 1 (4%)            | 23 (82%)         |
| Carlton  | 2 (3%)           | 62 (89%)          | 6 (9%)           |
| Mapperley  | 24 (30%)         | 47 (59%)          | 9 (11%)          |
| Netherfield  | 4 (10%)          | 33 (79%)          | 5 (12%)          |
| Ravenshead   | 2 (8%)           | 0 (0%)            | 22 (92%)         |

A majority of users of the Arnold car parks stayed for over one hour. The proportion that stayed over one hour at the other car parks was significantly lower.

| 18. Average length of stay | Arnold   | Calverton | Carlton  | Mapperley | Netherfield | Ravenshead |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Up to 1 hour               | 88 (45%) | 27 (96%)  | 66 (93%) | 75 (94%)  | 39 (89%)    | 24 (100%)  |
| Up to 2 hours              | 93 (48%) | 1 (4%)    | 4 (6%)   | 2 (3%)    | 4 (9%)      | 0 (0%)     |
| Up to 3 hours              | 11 (6%)  | 0 (0%)    | 1 (1%)   | 3 (4%)    | 1 (2%)      | 0 (0%)     |
| Over 3 hours               | 2 (1%)   | 0 (0%)    | 0 (0%)   | 0 (0%)    | 0 (2%)      | 0 (0%)     |
| Based upon (number)        | 194      | 28        | 71       | 80        | 44          | 24         |

Table 19 shows the average duration of stay of those respondents who used car parks for less than one hour. Percentages are based on all regular users of the car parks.

| 19. Proportion of all users staying | Arnold   | Calverton | Carlton  | Mapperley | Netherfield | Ravenshead |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| <15 mins                            | 5 (3%)   | 9 (32%)   | 13 (18%) | 11 (14%)  | 7 (16%)     | 11 (46%)   |
| 16 – 30 mins                        | 22 (11%) | 8 (29%)   | 32 (45%) | 32 (40%)  | 19 (43%)    | 8 (33%)    |
| 31 – 45 mins                        | 5 (3%)   | 2 (7%)    | 2 (3%)   | 6 (8%)    | 2 (5%)      | 0 (0%)     |
| 46 – 60 mins                        | 1 (<1%)  | 0 (0%)    | 19 (27%) | 26 (33%)  | 11 (25%)    | 5 (21%)    |
| Based upon (number)                 | 194      | 28        | 71       | 80        | 44          | 24         |

Respondents with vehicles were asked which of the car parks, at which charging was being proposed, they would pay to use. 77% would pay to use Arnold car parks, a significantly higher proportion than the others.

| 20. Car parks which respondents would pay to use (all respondents from vehicle using households) | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Arnold   | 221       | 77.3%      |
| Carlton  | 106       | 37.1%      |
| Mapperley  | 124       | 43.4%      |
| Netherfield  | 103       | 36.0%      |

Table 21 shows which car parks respondents with vehicles would pay to use by the car parks that they currently use on a regular basis.

| 21. Would pay to use | Users of Arnold | Users of Calverton | Users of Carlton | Users of Mapperley | Users of Netherfield | Users of Ravenshead |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Arnold               | <b>94%</b>      | 100%               | 54%              | 65%                | 46%                  | 82%                 |
| Carlton              | 22%             | 46%                | <b>72%</b>       | 35%                | 54%                  | 41%                 |
| Mapperley            | 29%             | 46%                | 35%              | <b>80%</b>         | 35%                  | 59%                 |
| Netherfield          | 20%             | 41%                | 37%              | 26%                | <b>92%</b>           | 48%                 |
| Based upon (number)  | 245             | 51                 | 91               | 111                | 59                   | 39                  |

Respondents were asked the reasons for their visits to the car parks that they used regularly.

| 22. Reasons for car park use | Arnold | Calverton | Carlton | Mapperley | Netherfield | Ravenshead |
|------------------------------|--------|-----------|---------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Shops                        | 177    | 20        | 64      | 66        | 32          | 24         |
| Bank                         | 18     | 1         | 1       | 23        | 13          | 13         |
| Leisure                      | 7      | 1         | 5       |           | 2           | 2          |
| GP                           | 5      | 5         | 1       | 1         | 1           | 1          |
| VFR                          | 4      | 2         | 3       | 2         | 1           | 1          |
| School / children            | 2      | 1         |         | 1         |             |            |
| Business / Work              | 2      |           | 4       | 2         | 2           | 2          |
| Library                      | 1      | 1         | 1       |           |             |            |
| Church                       | 1      |           |         |           |             |            |
| Market                       | 1      |           |         |           |             |            |
| Voluntary work               |        |           |         | 1         |             |            |
| Recycling                    |        |           | 1       | 1         |             |            |
|                              | 245    | 51        | 91      | 111       | 59          | 39         |

**Notes:**

Leisure – The 7 respondents using Arnold were all using the Leisure Centre.

Leisure use at other car parks includes public house visits and general socialising.

VFR – Visiting friends and relatives (at their homes)

School / children – dropping off or picking up children

Respondents were asked whether providing free car parking makes a significant difference to levels of vehicle use.

| <b>23. Do you believe that providing free car parks makes any significant difference to levels of vehicle use?</b> | Households with a motor vehicle | Households without a vehicle | All respondents |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Don't know   | 11 (3%)                         | 7 (9%)                       | 18 (4%)         |
| Big difference   | 120 (28%)                       | 35 (32%)                     | 145 (29%)       |
| Small difference   | 84 (20%)                        | 22 (28%)                     | 106 (21%)       |
| No difference  | 208 (49%)                       | 24 (31%)                     | 232 (46%)       |
| Based upon (number)  | 423                             | 78                           | 501             |

Respondents were asked whether it was fair that all Council Tax payers, including those without cars, pay for the cost of the upkeep of car parks. Although this could be regarded as a leading question, a majority did not believe it to be unfair.

| <b>24. Is it fair that all council tax payers, including those who don't have cars, pay for the cost of car user's free use of shoppers car parks?</b> | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Not answered   | 17        | 3.4%       |
| Yes  | 251       | 50.1%      |
| No   | 233       | 46.5%      |

A majority said that they agreed in principle to the introduction of car park charges in the urban areas.

| <b>25. Do you agree in principle to the introduction of charges for those car parks in urban areas?</b> | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Not answered  | 5         | 1.0%       |
| Yes   | 318       | 63.5%      |
| No  | 178       | 35.5%      |

Respondents were asked to give reasons for their replies.

| <b>26. Reasons for supporting car park charges</b> |    |     |
|--|----|-----|
| Reasonable costs proposed                          |    | 109 |
| Fairness / User should pay                         |    | 75  |
| Financial  |    | 55  |
| Cover costs  | 31 |     |
| Release funds for other purposes                   | 13 |     |
| Increase Council income                            | 6  |     |
| Save Council Tax                                   | 5  |     |
| Reduce vehicle use / congestion                    |    | 32  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Reduce abuse / use as 'park & ride'   | 17 |
| Encourage shorter stays / easier to find a space  | 14 |
| To finance improvements / security  | 7  |
| Good quality of car parks   | 2  |
| Reduce pollution  | 2  |
| Others (1 each): 'Car parking is not comparable to other services that we all pay for, such as education, which are essential for the future of our society', Car parks use valuable land, Charges would encourage people to shop locally, Crime prevention, Free parking means that Council Tax payers are subsidising non Borough residents, Gedling is too lenient, I don't use them, Polluter pays principle, To reflect the true cost of vehicle use |    |

|   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| <b>27. Reasons for respondents being opposed to car parking charges:</b>  |                         |
| Damage to traders   | 74                      |
| Should be from Council Tax / public service   | 34                      |
| On street parking   | 28                      |
| High costs of vehicle ownership (fuel, road tax etc)  | 23                      |
| Costs / can't afford to pay   | 11                      |
| High proportion of very short visits<br>Mapperley' 1)   | 6 (includes 'especially |
| Shops should pay or contribute to costs   | 6                       |
| Current system works well   | 4                       |
| Stealth Tax   | 4                       |
| First hour should be free   | 3                       |
| Free elsewhere (Supermarkets 2, Sherwood 1)   | 3                       |
| Probable future price increases   | 3                       |
| Accident risk from on street parking  | 2                       |
| Free parking benefits Senior Citizens / disabled  | 2                       |
| Inconvenient  | 2                       |
| Introduction costs  | 2                       |
| Unlikely to lead to Council Tax reduction   | 2                       |
| Others (1 each): Abusers of the current system should be penalised instead, Administration costs, Car parks are too small (except Arnold), Council won't take responsibility for what happens on car parks, Difficulty carrying shopping, Free parking encourages Leisure Centre use, Free parking encourages Library use, Increase in vehicle use (as shoppers go elsewhere), Most people have cars, People will park at the Council offices instead, Poor public transport, Restrictions on street parking, Vehicles are more secure in car parks than on streets |                         |

Additional comments (Arnold residents)

More security needed for car parks (2 respondents)

Car parks in good condition; Scheme needed for longer car park stays - Three hours plus; Leave system as it is; £1 would be too excessive; On street car parking may increase and Drives blocked; Disabled should not be charged; Public transport must be kept at current levels; There are too many side streets

with yellow lines; More taxi ranks are needed; Permits needed for all day workers; Changes about right - no more necessary; More free car parking is needed; Shops should provide own car parks; Changes sufficient at this level; Car parking a problem on pavements; Changes possibly too modest; Introduction should be provisional; I would agree to charges at Arnold only; I would only support parking charges if enforcement wasn't given to a private company; Cycling on pavements is a problem; Many old people need to use their cars through age or ill health; Some car parks are used by people passing through; 20p is too little; Gedling residents should have a free car park pass with photo of vehicle number

#### Additional comments (Carlton residents)

Worried about on street parking (3 respondents)

Worried that charges will continue to rise (3 respondents including 'Would cost increase if enforcement costs rise')

It would still be unfair because rural areas would be free (2 respondents)

There should be more enforcement against people using disabled spaces; The new road and parking layout at Netherfield is dangerous; I would stop visiting Netherfield - I am proud that Gedling provides free car parks. Maybe traders could contribute to costs; I don't have a car but use car parks when my family take me shopping; There will need to be parking restrictions at Mapperley; Initial cost of machines not justified; I can't see what £180000 is spent on; More of these car parks needed; Better idea to have short stay car parks 2 hours max. 20p per hour; There should be a short free period; There should be residents only parking in Netherfield; Changes must not be excessive; I would stop using car parks because I use them for short visits to buy small items; High bus fares are a major factor in increasing vehicle use; Suggestion discriminates against those visiting one shop briefly; Lower nominal fee would be OK - more car park supervision needed; I would use other free car parks ASDA at Arnold or West Bridgford; If charges are introduced there should be more security; This area (Carlton) has few problems despite the close proximity of the school; Shop keepers should pay; Steep jump from 20p to £1; Insufficient disabled spaces; Better public transport is needed; Better security needed; More street permit parking needed in Carlton first before car park charges; Changes should be varied according to the day of the week; More permit areas needed in surrounding streets to counteract effects of resultant street parking

#### Additional comments (Parish residents)

More car parking needed generally (2 respondents)

Those who use buses pay high fares and shouldn't contribute to car parks as well; Disabled should pay for parking as well; I would pay but visit less often. Cuts to Calverton Library have affected community spirit. Calverton Parish Precept is too expensive; Would pay but £1 is too much 20p not enough. Would the £180000 be used to benefit the council tax payer. Charges shouldn't be increased; The public will go where parking is free; Car park security should be part of the package - car parks should be a service not just a community;



Sometimes car parks are used as park and ride site; A pass scheme should be introduced; Charges should remain nominal; Charges should be used to pay for extra security; I agree to charges at Arnold only; More information about Council matters is needed - e.g what happens to our recycling. Local income tax would be better than the Council Tax; Danger of on street parking; Increase is too steep; Need to provide security at car parks; I would pay if council took responsibility for vehicles.

### **Brief comments**

Although a majority of respondents supported car park charges, the strength of feeling of those who were opposed was clear to interviewers on the doorstep.

Gedling is a diverse Borough. Average lengths of stay and willingness to pay are higher at Arnold than the other car parks in the urban area. Arnold is significantly larger as a shopping centre and has a major supermarket in the town centre.

Some respondents felt that charging at Arnold would make it easier to find space through discouraging unnecessary journeys and reducing the average length of stay.

Average lengths of stay are sometimes very short at other car parks. The Carlton Hill and Mapperley areas may also be vulnerable to on street parking. Carlton and Mapperley shopping centres could be seen as being in competition with other areas offering free parking - for example Sherwood or Hyson Green. Some of the smaller shopping areas could be seen as vulnerable or in decline.

## Bus passes

Respondents were told that senior citizens in Gedling could apply for a free bus pass allowing them half fare travel, and of a proposal to allow them to buy a pass giving free off peak travel. It was explained that the proposed change would cost £400,000 per year if the cost of the pass was £100, and would be likely to result in Council Tax increases and possible cuts to services.

182 respondents qualified for a bus pass of which 118 (65%) had applied. 127 other household members were qualified of which 75 (59%) had applied. In total 193 of 309 household members who qualified (62%) had applied.

Those who had not applied were asked why not.

| <b>28. Reasons respondents qualified for a bus pass had not applied.</b>             |    |
|--|----|
| Vehicle user   | 32 |
| Difficulty walking / health / disability   | 11 |
| Inconvenient to apply / haven't got round to it                                      | 10 |
| Lack of information / unaware  | 6  |
| Poor public transport<br>(includes Poor routes (2), Few buses, Buses at wrong times) | 5  |
| Don't use / like buses   | 2  |
| Family member gives lifts  | 2  |
| Rarely Travel  | 2  |
| Rarely visit City  | 2  |
| Others (1 each) Cost, Currently applying, Only just reached 60, Prefer to walk       |    |

Respondents with a pass were asked how often they used it. All those with a pass replied.

| <b>29. Frequency of Bus Pass use</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percentage</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Daily                                | 7                | 5.9%              |
| Most days                            | 17               | 14.4%             |
| Weekly                               | 43               | 36.4%             |
| Monthly                              | 26               | 22.0%             |
| Less often                           | 25               | 21.2%             |

Bus pass users were asked 'what is the most regular journey that you make using the pass?'

| <b>30. Most regular journey of respondents with a bus pass living in Arnold</b>  |        |
|--|--------|
| To Nottingham City Centre (from the Borough)   | 37     |
| from Arnold 31   |        |
| Woodthorpe 3   |        |
| Daybrook 1   |        |
| Within Arnold  | 3      |
| Arnold to Q.M.C  | 2      |
| Woodthorpe to Arnold, Within Woodthorpe, Woodthorpe to Mapperley, Redhill to Arnold, Arnold to City Hospital, Wilkinson Street to City (tram), Arnold to Carlton, Daybrook to Carrington | 1 each |

| <b>31. Most regular journey of respondents with a bus pass living in Carlton</b>  |    |
|---|----|
| To Nottingham City Centre (from the Borough)  | 39 |
| From Carlton 26   |    |
| Gedling 6   |    |
| Netherfield 4   |    |
| Mapperley 3   |    |
| Within Carlton  | 2  |
| Carlton to Bilborough, Mapperley to Arnold, Within Mapperley, Racecourse Park and Ride to City, Not answered, Gedling to Bulwell, Not used, Mapperley to Morrisons 1 each |    |

| <b>32. Most regular journey of respondents with a bus pass living in the rural area</b>      |        |
|--|--------|
| To Nottingham City Centre (from the Borough)   | 11     |
| From Burton Joyce 5  |        |
| Calverton 2  |        |
| Lambley 1  |        |
| Ravenshead 1   |        |
| Bestwood 1   |        |
| Woodborough 1  |        |
| Calverton to Arnold  | 3      |
| Hucknall to City (tram)  | 2      |
| Not answered 1, Bestwood to Bulwell, Woodborough to Arnold, Never used, Papplewick to Sutton | 1 each |

Only 10 (6%) of those who qualified for a buss pass said that they would pay £100 per year for free off peak travel.

| <b>33. Would you buy a pass giving free off peak travel if the cost was</b> |            |             |             |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Respondents who were qualified for a bus pass                               | <b>£75</b> | <b>£100</b> | <b>£150</b> |
| Yes   | 30 (17%)   | 10 (6%)     | 2 (1%)      |
| No  | 148 (83%)  | 169 (94%)   | 177         |

(99%)

A majority of respondents were opposed to the proposal in principle.

| 34. Support for the 'free' Pass in principle | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Not answered                                 | 10        | 2.0%       |
| Yes  | 238       | 47.5%      |
| No   | 253       | 50.5%      |

Three quarters of respondents were not willing to pay extra Council Tax and see possible cuts in services to finance the proposed scheme.

| 35. Willing to pay extra Council Tax and possibly see cuts in services to pay for a 'free' pass | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Not answered  | 15        | 3.0%       |
| Yes   | 109       | 21.8%      |
| No  | 377       | 75.2%      |

| 36. Additional comments   |    |
|---|----|
| Free pass should be given free  | 19 |
| Too much to pay   | 12 |
| (including 'if they can afford £100 they probably don't need the pass')                                   |    |
| Prefer current system   | 11 |
| Should be means tested  | 5  |
| Don't only want to travel off peak  | 4  |
| Council Tax increase yes; Cuts to services no   | 3  |
| Would not benefit occasional bus users  | 2  |
| Others (1 each): There should be a choice between the two schemes; How much does the current system cost? |    |

### **Brief comments**

The survey was complete before the measures recently announced by the Chancellor.

Although almost 40% of those eligible for a bus pass had not applied, take up of the scheme proposed would be likely to be very low. 43% of bus pass holders use it less than once a week and believe that they would not benefit from the introduction of the scheme.

It was clear to interviewers that there is concern about Council Tax levels and that a scheme that would have a major impact on this would be unpopular.