# Car Parking Consultation Feedback Analysis – May 2019

## Executive Summary

Working on the assumption that each of these options have been voted on by recipients to ascertain the most popular option, the following tables list these four options, in order of popularity.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options |  All |  Drivers | Non-Drivers |  | Options |  All |  Drivers | Non-Drivers |
| **Option 4** | **41%** | **38%** | **47%** |  | **Option 4** | **378** | **251** | **118** |
| Option 1 | 31% | 36% | 19% |  | Option 1 | 289 | 234 | 48 |
| Option 3 | 19% | 19% | 23% |  | Option 3 | 179 | 122 | 57 |
| Option 2 | 8% | 7% | 11% |  | Option 2 | 78 | 45 | 28 |

### Free Text Comment Trends related to options chosen:

* The majority of comments concern the issue of ‘fairness’. The largest trend addressed the possibility that lower paid staff would be penalised by the new proposals:
	+ Many respondents believed that charges based on emissions would penalise those on lower salaries who were less able to afford to switch to a lower emissions car.
	+ Many respondents felt that the proposed salary bands were too broad, and that those on the bottom end of the lowest salary bands would end up paying a higher percentage of their salary towards car parking than those at the higher end of those bands.
	+ Many respondents believed that staff on higher salaries should pay more, i.e. the more you earn, the more proportionally you pay (i.e. cost as a uniform % of salary).
* Many respondents felt that the proposed price increases would penalise those who use a car (especially a larger car with higher emissions) out of necessity, e.g. carers, those with childcare needs, staff with disabilities, staff who work in rural areas with poor or no public transport links.
* However, a large number of respondents felt that a balanced approach that takes into account salary *and* emissions was the fairest approach, and that those who had begun using a car with lower emissions should be rewarded in some manner (e.g. a discount) for doing so.

### Free Text Comment Trends related to alternative options suggested:

The largest trend to emerge from this set of comments related to the need for the University to:

* provide some kind of additional Park & Ride service in order to encourage staff members to park off-site
* expand the current shuttle bus service to a larger number of areas around the city
* subsidise a greater number of Stagecoach bus routes.

## 1. Options for Staff Consultation

The consultation process allowed staff members to choose their preference for a new University of Exeter car parking policy from the following set of options:

* **Option 1**: Price increases on current structure with changes to historic eligibility
* **Option 2**: Price increase calculated on volume of vehicle **Emissions**.
* **Option 3**: Price increase calculated on **Salary Bands**.
* **Option 4**: Price increase calculated on a **Combination** of change to eligibility criteria, volume of vehicle emissions and salary bands.

In total, there were 893 responses from University of Exeter staff members.

## 2. Summary of Findings

### 2a. Analysis on the Assumption of Four Unique Options

Working on the assumption that each of these options have been voted on by recipients to ascertain the most popular option, Tables 1 and 2 below list these four options, in order of popularity.

The responses can be divided into ‘all’ responses, those respondents who identified as ‘drivers’, and those respondents who identified as ‘non-drivers’. The consultation form allowed for multiple options to be selected. For the purposes of the tables below, these multiple selections have been listed as though they were separate, individual selections.

### Key Findings:

* Most popular option across all respondents: Option 4 – Combination.
* Second most popular option across all respondents: Option 1 – Eligibility Criteria.
* Second most popular option for drivers: Option 1 – Eligibility Criteria.
* Second most popular option for non-drivers: Option 3 – Salary Bands.
* Least popular option across all respondents: Option 2 – Emissions

#### Tables 1 and 2: Most Popular Options as % and no. of respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options |  All |  Drivers | Non-Drivers |  | Options |  All |  Drivers | Non-Drivers |
| **Option 4** | **41%** | **38%** | **47%** |  | **Option 4** | **378** | **251** | **118** |
| Option 1 | 31% | 36% | 19% |  | Option 1 | 289 | 234 | 48 |
| Option 3 | 19% | 19% | 23% |  | Option 3 | 179 | 122 | 57 |
| Option 2 | 8% | 7% | 11% |  | Option 2 | 78 | 45 | 28 |

*N.B. The ‘All’ column is not the sum of the other two columns because not all respondents chose to identify whether they were a driver or a non-driver.*

**Key:**

|  |
| --- |
| **1st choice – Combination** |
| 2nd choice - Eligibility Criteria |
| 3rd choice - Salary Bands |

#### Tables 3 and 4: % and no. of respondents who voted for Option 4

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Options | All | Drivers | Non-Drivers |  |
| Option 4 | 41% | 38% | 47% |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Options |  All |  Drivers | Non-Drivers |
| Option 4 | 378 | 251 | 118 |

### 2b. Free Text Comment Trends related to options chosen

Respondents were asked to comment on why they had selected a particular option as their preferred choice. Below is a list of the top comment trends across all these responses, regardless of which option was chosen. Top comment trends for each question can be found in the appendices.

### Key Findings:

* The majority of comments concern the issue of ‘fairness’. The largest trend addressed the possibility that lower paid staff would be penalised by the new proposals:
	+ Many respondents believed that charges based on emissions would penalise those on lower salaries who were less able to afford to switch to a lower emissions car.
	+ Many respondents felt that the proposed salary bands were too broad, and that those on the bottom end of the lowest salary bands would end up paying a higher percentage of their salary towards car parking than those at the higher end of those bands.
	+ Many respondents believed that staff on higher salaries should pay more, i.e. the more you earn, the more proportionally you pay (i.e. cost as a uniform % of salary).
* Many respondents felt that the proposed price increases would penalise those who use a car (especially a larger car with higher emissions) out of necessity, e.g. carers, those with childcare needs, staff with disabilities, staff who work in rural areas with poor or no public transport links.
* However, a large number of respondents felt that a balanced approach that takes into account salary *and* emissions was the fairest approach, and that those who had begun using a car with lower emissions should be rewarded in some manner (e.g. a discount) for doing so.

#### Table 5: Top 10 Comment trends: Why is this your preferred option?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Basing price on emissions is discriminatory towards lower paid staff and doesn't take into account personal circumstances (e.g. the need for a larger car) | 172 |
| Those who earn more should pay more as this is fairer to lower paid staff | 147 |
| Option 4 is the most balanced option, taking into account salary and emissions | 130 |
| Having a car with low emissions should be rewarded / is key to helping the environment and sustainability targets | 118 |
| Car is essential as public transport is not available, too expensive, not reliable enough / not an option for other reasons (e.g. childcare, cost of living in Exeter) | 108 |
| Current system works well / this level of increase is unacceptable (e.g. no visible improvement in parking or guarantee of a space) | 59 |
| Would be happy to see changes to eligibility criteria / better enforcement to make them more equitable | 38 |
| Would be happy with a price increase if it is used to invest in alternative transport | 28 |
| Charges are unfair as car is essential for job / parking should be provided as a matter of course | 20 |
| Salary band charges should be separated out further in Option 4 proposal | 10 |

### 2c. Free Text Comment Trends related to alternative options suggested

Respondents were asked whether they had any alternative options, ideas or suggestions for the new car parking policy. Below is a list of the top comment trends across all these responses, regardless of which option was chosen. Top comment trends for each question can be found in the appendices.

### Key Findings:

* The largest trend to emerge from this set of comments related to the need for the University to:
	+ provide an additional Park & Ride service to encourage staff members to park off-site
	+ expand the current shuttle bus service to a larger number of areas around the city
	+ subsidise a greater number of Stagecoach bus routes.
* The next largest trend related to making clearer what alternatives to car travel were available to staff and incentivising these, as well as providing more facilities for non-drivers (e.g. more showers and bike storage).
* As well as this, respondents were in favour of increasing the number of parking spaces and introducing greater restrictions on current spaces (e.g. restricting or removing the right to park for students and members of the public.
* Another key trend was the issue of flexible working. Many respondents felt that staff would bring their car to work less often if the University encouraged working from home, flexible working, and/or working off-site. This tied in to making permits more flexible in terms of the number of days per week they covered.

#### Table 6: Top 10 Comment trends: Do you have any alternative options, ideas or suggestions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Introduce / subsidise park and ride scheme | 70 |
| Actively promote / reward alternative forms of transport (e.g. bike rental, electric car rental) | 61 |
| Expand shuttle bus service (including pick up from P&R and Penryn) | 56 |
| Supply more car parking (underground or multi-storey) | 48 |
| Stop / restrict student / public parking / prioritise staff parking | 42 |
| Encourage and support more off site / flexible working | 41 |
| Better deal for car sharers / expansion of car share programme / include car sharing across organisations | 37 |
| Improve / expand Stagecoach bus service  | 31 |
| Permit for only some days of the week / for a limited number of hours | 30 |
| Subsidise greater variety of Stagecoach tickets | 27 |
| More facilities for non-drivers (e.g. buses, shuttle buses, showers, bike storage) and safer cycle routes, etc. | 27 |

# Appendix A – Full List of Comment Trends

#### Table 14: Why is this your preferred option? Option 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Car is essential as public transport is not available, too expensive, not reliable enough / not an option for other reasons (e.g. childcare, cost of living in Exeter) | 67 |
| Charging based on emissions is discriminatory towards lower paid staff or those who require a larger car (e.g. with a family) / Doesn't take into account personal circumstances (e.g. caring, commuting costs, other costs, e.g. children) | 50 |
| Current system works well / this level of increase is unacceptable (e.g. no visible improvement in parking or guarantee of a space) | 59 |
| Would be happy to see changes to current eligibility criteria / better enforcement to make them more equitable | 33 |
| Charges are unfair as car is essential for job / parking should be provided as a matter of course | 16 |
| Alternative travel ideas need to be more clearly detailed and costed | 6 |
| Those who work part-time and flexi-time will be penalised | 6 |
| Would be happy with a price increase if it is used to invest in alternative transport | 6 |
| Charging based on income is unfair (higher earners already pay more tax, should not be penalised for earning more, etc.) | 5 |
| No mention of the Authority to Park option | 5 |
| Just increase the price first (possibly a stepped increase) and then review the situation to see which other changes need to be made | 4 |
| Increasing parking charges will make the University a less appealing employer | 2 |
| CO2 emissions targets will encourage use of diesel vehicles, which are more polluting | 2 |
| Cost should be the same for everyone, regardless of car or salary | 2 |
| Already taxed more for higher emissions | 1 |
| Would like expansion of shuttle bus service | 1 |
| Transport options being invested in by UoE do not benefit the respondent | 1 |
| Need a car as have a disability | 1 |
| A price increase will encourage staff to use their cars more and exacerbate the problem | 1 |
| This option is fairer to drivers who car share | 1 |
| Other options will lower staff morale | 1 |
| Price increases will have a greater impact on lower earners | 1 |
| The University should build more parking spaces | 1 |

#### Table 15: Why is this your preferred option? Option 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Having a car with low emissions should be rewarded / is key to helping the environment and sustainability targets | 50 |
| Charging based on income is unfair (higher earners already pay more tax, should not be penalised for earning more, etc.) | 11 |
| Public transport is not available, too expensive, not reliable enough / not an option for other reasons (e.g. childcare, cost of living in Exeter) | 6 |
| Those who work part-time and flexi-time will be penalised | 1 |
| Current system works well / this level of increase is unacceptable (e.g. no guarantee of a space) | 1 |

#### Table 16: Why is this your preferred option? Option 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Charging based on emissions is discriminatory towards lower paid staff or those who require a larger car (e.g. with a family) / Doesn't take into account personal circumstances (e.g. caring, commuting costs, other costs, e.g. children) | 67 |
| Those who earn more should pay more / fairer to lower paid staff | 50 |
| Public transport is not available, too expensive, not reliable enough / not an option for other reasons (e.g. childcare, cost of living in Exeter) | 17 |
| Would be happy to see changes to current eligibility criteria / better enforcement to make them more equitable | 5 |
| Would be happy with a price increase if it is used to invest in alternative transport | 4 |
| Charges are unfair as car is essential for job / parking should be provided | 4 |
| Using an older higher emissions car means saving on being wasteful and buying a new car / disposing of old car | 2 |
| This option is fairer to drivers who car share | 2 |
| The University should build more parking spaces | 1 |
| No mention of the Authority to Park option | 1 |
| Stricter enforcement of parking rules | 1 |
| Change proposed bandings / just charge as % of salary | 1 |

#### Table 17: Why is this your preferred option? Option 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Most comprehensive / balanced option | 130 |
| Having a car with low emissions should be rewarded / is key to helping the environment and sustainability targets | 118 |
| Those who earn more should pay more / fairer to lower paid staff | 97 |
| Charging based on emissions is discriminatory towards lower paid staff or those who require a larger car (e.g. with a family) / Doesn't take into account personal circumstances (e.g. caring, commuting costs, other costs, e.g. children) | 55 |
| Would be happy with a price increase if it is used to invest in alternative transport | 28 |
| Public transport is not available, too expensive, not reliable enough / not an option for other reasons (e.g. childcare, cost of living in Exeter) | 18 |
| Should be based on salary, not on bands and not with bands linked together / emissions bands have been changed | 10 |
| Would be happy to see changes to eligibility criteria / better enforcement to make them more equitable | 3 |
| Using an older higher emissions car means saving on being wasteful and buying a new car / disposing of old car | 1 |
| The University should build more parking spaces | 1 |
| Those who work part-time flexi will be penalised  | 1 |

#### Table 18: Do you have any alternative options, ideas or suggestions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment Trend** | **No. of responses** |
| Introduce / subsidise park and ride | 70 |
| Actively promote / reward alternative forms of transport (e.g. bike rental, electric car rental) | 61 |
| Expand shuttle bus service (including pick up from P&R and Penryn) | 56 |
| Supply more car parking (underground or multi-storey) | 48 |
| Stop / restrict student / public parking / prioritise staff parking | 42 |
| Encourage and support more off site / flexible working | 41 |
| Better deal for car sharers / expansion of car share programme / include car sharing across organisations | 37 |
| Improve / expand Stagecoach bus service  | 31 |
| Permit for only some days of the week / for a limited number of hours | 30 |
| Subsidise greater variety of Stagecoach tickets | 27 |
| More facilities for non-drivers (e.g. buses, shuttle buses, showers, bike storage) and safer cycle routes, etc. | 27 |
| Train subsidy / salary deduction | 24 |
| Stricter enforcement of parking rules | 23 |
| Greater number of charging stations | 21 |
| Reduced rate for carers / those with disabilities / staff over a certain age  | 20 |
| Change proposed bandings / just charge as % of salary | 18 |
| No reserved spaces | 9 |
| Changes to eligibility criteria | 7 |
| Use of off campus facilities | 6 |
| Increase prices still further / make more expensive than public transport / harsher penalties for emissions | 5 |
| More frequent reviewing of eligibility | 4 |
| Rent parking spaces to staff | 3 |
| More term time contracts | 2 |
| Close all car parks and pedestrianise the campus | 2 |
| Competition to encourage alternative forms of transport | 1 |
| Free parking for those who live a certain distance away | 1 |
| Limit permit to one per staff member and on car per staff member | 1 |
| More visitor spaces | 1 |
| Scrap the shuttle bus service | 1 |
| Limit the University's Sustainability objectives | 1 |
| Staff with reserved places in Northcote House should pay a flat rate of £1000 pa | 1 |