

Council

Date: **Monday 14 December 2015**

Time: **10.00 am**

Venue: **Council Chamber, County Hall, Norwich**

Supplementary Agenda

6. Recommendations from Service Committees

- Policy & Resources – 30 November 2015.

2. Staff Car Parking

(Page B2)

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 11 December 2015

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda please contact
Greg Insull on 01603 223100 or email greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk**



If you need this agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Greg Insull on Tel: 01603 223100 or Minicom 01603 223833 or Email: greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk and we will do our best to help

Recommendations from the Policy & Resources Committee
Meeting held on 30 November 2015

Report of the Executive Director of Finance

2. Staff Car Parking

1. Proposal

- 1.1. In referring the decision of the P & R Committee on the package of measures to manage demand for workplace car parking to Full Council, it was resolved to include the results of the staff consultation as part of the final decision making.
- 1.2. The staff consultation survey, which opened on 2 December 2015 and closed on 9 December 2015, received responses from nearly 800 employees.
- 1.3. Overall 60% of the respondents agreed that the recommendations taken as package was a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues and 19% disagreed.
- 1.4. Respondents agreed that most of the recommendations would help to manage car parking at County Hall, as well as strong support for building more car parking spaces and stopping staff who are not based at County Hall from having parking permits.
- 1.5. There was no consensus about whether the recommendations to introduce a second non-parking day and to allow staff to pay to park on their non-parking day(s) would help manage the car parking situation.
- 1.6. Whilst staff agree that the majority of the recommendations would help to manage the car parking situation, concerns were raised about the impact on staff who regularly need their car during the working day, those with caring responsibilities and the support to work from home.
- 1.7. The full numerical analysis of the responses received together with a summary of the dominant themes of comments and concerns raised by respondents is attached. This feedback along with suggestions for operational management will be considered in implementing the final decisions made by Full Council.

Analysis of the County Hall car parking survey

Report: 9 December 2015

Executive summary

- Overall, 60% of the 796 members of staff who responded to the survey agree the recommendations are a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues, whilst 19% disagree.
- Whilst staff agree that the majority of the recommendations would help to manage the car parking situation, the following concerns were repeatedly raised:
 - a) Staff that need to regularly use their car during the day, often at short notice, such as social workers, are very concerned about the impact of the recommendations on their ability to do their job and to provide an effective service to residents. They would like a return to essential car users having priority parking at County Hall.
 - b) Members of staff are willing to work from home, however they don't always feel supported to by their manager, and they have concerns about the reliability of their equipment to enable them to work from home efficiently.
 - c) There were many concerns about the impact of the recommendations on employees work/life balance, particularly for those with childcare / caring responsibilities.
- This is what respondents thought of the specific recommendations:
 - 1a) There is agreement that stopping members of staff who live within a mile of County Hall from being eligible for parking permits would help manage the car parking situation. However, respondents questioned how many people live that close and thought the impact would be relatively small.
 - 1b) There is agreement that not allowing new employees who live within three miles of County Hall to have parking permits would help manage the car parking situation.
 - 1c) There is very strong support for stopping staff who are not based at County Hall from having parking permits.
 - 2 & 3) There is no consensus about whether the recommendations to introduce a second non-parking day and to allow staff to pay to park on their non-parking day(s) would help manage the car parking situation.
 - 4) There is very strong support for seeking planning consent for increasing car parking capacity within the County Hall campus.

Methodology







We emailed a link to an online survey to all staff on the County Hall campus. The survey was open from 2 to 9 December 2015. 796 people responded.

We asked staff whether they agree or disagree that the recommendations will help manage car parking at County Hall. It should be noted that whilst some staff agreed that the recommendations would help manage car parking at County Hall, in the free text boxes they set out their concerns about the impact they thought the proposals would have on their service and on them personally.

A lot of respondents reported that they found it hard to judge how well the recommendations would help manage car parking because they had no data to inform their decision, for example they said they do not know how many people live within a mile of the building.

Recommendation 1a. Revise eligibility for workplace parking permits at County Hall with effect from 1 April as follows:

Employees living within 1 mile of County Hall will no longer be eligible for parking permits

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 1a will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		36.96%	289
2	Agree		34.91%	273
3	Neither agree nor disagree		9.46%	74
4	Disagree		8.95%	70
5	Strongly disagree		5.63%	44
6	Don't know		4.09%	32
			answered	782
			skipped	14

72% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 15% disagree.

29 people who responded to the survey live within one mile of County Hall and would be directly affected by this recommendation. 45% of them (13 people) agree with the recommendation, whilst 52% (15 people) disagree.

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- There are plenty of alternatives for staff who live within one mile of County Hall – they can walk, cycle or get the bus.
- Children have to live more than three miles from school before the County Council offers them transport – one mile is not far enough.

- This would make more space available for members of staff who live further away and have less alternatives for getting to County Hall.
- This would be good for the environment and for the health of staff who live locally, but currently drive to work.

As one person summed-up: “Staff living so close to County Hall have plenty of options regarding getting to work – walking, cycling, bus, taxi. I live 24 miles away and the alternatives to driving and parking at County Hall are very expensive and very time consuming. I already have an 11 hour day. I know it my choice to live far away but jobs out in the countryside are few and far between and I cannot afford to move into the city either. I car share for two days already and sometimes even more which helps alleviate the problem.”

People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:

- There cannot be that many staff who live within a mile of County Hall, so this is unlikely to make much difference to the car parking situation.
- Staff who live locally don’t park at County Hall very often, so it wouldn’t make a big impact on the car parking situation, it would just be inconvenient for those rare occasions when they do need access to their car.
- This recommendation would be very difficult for staff who need to regularly use their car during the day, often at short notice, such as social workers. It would make these teams less productive and reduce the quality of the service they provide.
- This recommendation does not take account of the needs of staff with childcare / caring responsibilities.
- This recommendation is not environmentally sound as it rewards people who drive a long way to get here.
- It is up to people where they choose to live. Staff who choose to live closer to work shouldn’t be penalised for doing so.

Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:

- “I live within one mile, but have a permit as I occasionally need to park for work for going out on site. I know others in similar situations and we do not tend to park unless necessary. If this is the norm for those under one mile then removing parking wouldn’t make a difference as we already park sparingly.”
- “I think that personal circumstances dictate this. If an employee has to do the school run it could mean returning home to walk in and then leave early to get their car to do the school run again.”
- “This is not helpful to essential car users like myself who go out daily on home visits using their car. This would mean going home to pick up the car before going on a visit which is very time consuming. I do feel it would work for people who do not need access to their car during the day for visits.”
- “It is important to consider community worker who rely on their cars to undertake work. The working day would be highly interrupted for those that require access to

the office in between visits with often unplanned trips, this would not be effective time wise and would waste money and time with staff walking backwards and forwards to their cars or finding alternative methods of getting to county hall.”







- “I don’t think that where I choose to live should be of any relevance to the Council or affect my employment terms or conditions.”
- “The fact that people choose to live a long way from County Hall is their decision. They shouldn’t be treated more favourably than others who chose to live closer to their work.”
- “1 mile is within walking/cycling distance for most people. However, some people have disabilities preventing them from walking one mile/or it would cause difficulty to do so (without qualifying as blue badge holders).”

Frequently asked questions about this recommendation:

- How many staff live within one mile of County Hall? Respondents reported finding it hard to make an informed decision because the report does not include any details about the number of staff this recommendation would affect.
- How would you measure whether staff live within one mile of County Hall? Would this be done as the crow flies or the length of their journey, for example you might be the other side of the river and live within a mile, but your journey would be longer than a mile?

Recommendation 1b. Revise eligibility for workplace parking permits at County Hall with effect from 1 April as follows:

New employees living within 3 miles of County Hall will no longer be eligible to receive workplace parking permits

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 1b will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		21.98%	171
2	Agree		36.38%	283
3	Neither agree nor disagree		16.84%	131
4	Disagree		14.40%	112
5	Strongly disagree		7.58%	59
6	Don't know		2.83%	22
			answered	778
			skipped	18

58% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 22% disagree.

124 people who responded to the survey live between one and three miles of County Hall. 44% of them (53 people) agree with the recommendation, whilst 38% (46 people) disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 52% (15 people) agree with the recommendation and 41% disagree (12 people).

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- There are alternatives for staff who live within three miles of County Hall – they can walk, cycle or get the bus.
- Children have to live more than three miles from school before the County Council offers them transport, so this seems fair.
- This would make more space available for members of staff who live further away and have fewer alternatives for getting to County Hall.
- It would be easier and fairer to implement than recommendation 1a as people applying for jobs would understand the car parking situation before they decide whether or not to accept a job offer.
- It would have more of an impact on the car parking situation than recommendation 1a because there are more staff who live in this area.

Here are some quotes to illustrate what people liked about the recommendation:

- “New employees living within that radius can take this into consideration when applying for posts.”
- “Many places of work in the city do not offer car parking, if people know this then it is their choice if they choose to accept a job here at County Hall.”
- “It is still possible to walk, take public transport or share a lift.”
- “We ask children who live within 3 miles of school to walk or bike in, why can't this be the same for a work place. This area would actually affect more people who currently use the car park.”

People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:

- This recommendation would be very difficult for staff who need to regularly use their car during the day, often at short notice, such as social workers. It would make these teams less productive and reduce the quality of the service they provide.
- This recommendation does not take account of the needs of staff with childcare / caring responsibilities.
- There are not good public transport links everywhere within a three mile radius of County Hall.







Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:

- “This will effect recruitment and business flexibility.”
- “There are not enough reliable public transport links to support this proposal.”

- “You don't know everyone's circumstances - people may have a specific reason for using their car even if they only live 3 miles away.”
- “What about workers (previously essential car users) who require a car for work e.g. the increasing number of social workers based at county hall?”

Recommendation 1c. Revise eligibility for workplace parking permits at County Hall with effect from 1 April as follows:

Employees whose main work location is not County Hall will no longer be eligible for workplace parking permits

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 1c will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		40.79%	319
2	Agree		36.83%	288
3	Neither agree nor disagree		11.64%	91
4	Disagree		5.24%	41
5	Strongly disagree		2.81%	22
6	Don't know		2.69%	21
			answered	782
			skipped	14

78% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 8% disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 69% (20 people) agree with the recommendation and 17% disagree (5 people).

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- Members of staff who are visiting County Hall should use the short stay spaces or book a visitor space.
- Members of staff can use teleconferencing and other technology to avoid having to come to County Hall for meetings.
- Many respondents said they thought this is the current policy and they were surprised that there are staff who park at County Hall, but don't work in the building.

Here are some quotes to illustrate what people liked about the recommendation:

- “To determine this would need to know how many people park at county hall who do not work there. But again is a sensible approach and should be supported.”
- “It seems ridiculous that anybody would have such passes so, again, the impact will be limited but it definitely needs to be done.”
- “If they are not based at County Hall they should not get a parking permit for this site. They should only have permits for the site they are based at. How this wasn't there in the first place I do not understand. This feels like a simple part of policy.”
- “They can book a space if needed like external visitors.”
- “County Hall staff do not get a permit to park elsewhere. They could park on the odd day as a visitor.”
- “County Hall is not their workplace. ICT has enabled easier communications with colleagues remotely.”

People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:







- There cannot be that many staff who park at County Hall but don't work here, so this is unlikely to make much difference to the car parking situation.
- People coming to County Hall for meetings will still need to do so in future. Whether they park here using their pass or as a visitor is almost irrelevant, as there would still be pressure on parking spaces.
- People who work at Carrow House should be able to park at County Hall until they move in.
- Some respondents are concerned about how it would be enforced and said that they believe there are members of staff who are currently flouting this rule.

Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:

- “I'm not sure how many of these people actually use the County Hall car park anyway. Presumably they are not a major issue. It would reduce the usefulness of the County Hall touch-down desks.”
- “Again - don't know how many staff not based at County Hall have permits. But even then, colleagues coming in for meetings will still need a parking space, so unless the proposal includes disallowing parking in those circumstances, then I can't see it having much impact.”
- “Additional visitor parking will be required in order to run services efficiently, as managers based all over Norfolk often need to meet at County Hall and need their cars. This should not be charged as otherwise they will just claim it back and it becomes more expensive to the Council due to processing time for claims.”
- “Not sure what this is about. Is this saying those who work at Carrow House would not be entitled to park? If so, I would not agree as SW's need urgent access to their cars. If this only applies to County Hall, then I would support this and I do not know why anyone not based there would be entitled to a permit.”
- “As a peripatetic worker I am often called to attend meetings at County Hall. If I was unable to park there, I would lose time for other key activities in the course of the day.”

- “We have workers based at hospital sites who are expected to come to County Hall to cover the crisis desk which involves going out on urgent home visits, will they still be able to park at County Hall?”
- “I have known people to work here for a number of months from another office and park on the forecourt every day, which doesn't seem fair to employees based here searching for spaces.”

Recommendation 2. Introduce a second Non Parking Day at County Hall for all employees eligible for workplace parking permits.

How far do you agree or disagree that recommendation 2 will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		11.25%	88
2	Agree		37.47%	293
3	Neither agree nor disagree		18.16%	142
4	Disagree		11.89%	93
5	Strongly disagree		19.57%	153
6	Don't know		1.66%	13
			answered	782
			skipped	14

49% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 31% disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 55% (16 people) agree with the recommendation and 17% disagree (5 people).

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- It would have the biggest impact in terms of reducing the pressure on parking spaces.
- It is better than being charged.
- It could work well if staff are supported to work from home.
- It would encourage staff to find alternative ways of getting to County Hall which are better for the environment, such as using public transport or car sharing.

Here are some quotes to illustrate what people liked about the recommendation:

- “I think this is the best suggestion and much better than charging all employees - at least this keeps everyone equal.”
- “Will have a massive impact on reducing car park pressure as it will affect nearly all staff. However 90 minute bays need to remain to ensure ability to do job is not undermined.”

- “However much I don't like this idea I do think it will alleviate some of the problem. Although on the flip side this will have a massive effect on team work!”
- “Will encourage staff to work from home if management are in agreement and/or to find alternatives such as car sharing working from different locations.”
- “Agree if working from home is an option and is implemented and supported by managers.”

People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:

- This recommendation would be very difficult for staff who need to regularly use their car during the day, often at short notice, such as social workers. It would make these teams less productive and reduce the quality of the service they provide.
- This recommendation does not take account of the needs of staff with childcare / caring responsibilities.
- The ICT equipment is not good enough to enable members of staff to work efficiently from home.
- Non-parking days are particularly difficult for people who live a long way from County Hall and have fewer alternatives for getting for getting to work using public transport.
- Staff working part-time should only have one non-parking day.
- The Harford Park and Ride service is being cut when this recommendation would mean that more people would need to use it.







Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:

- “Well, it will help, but again I feel this is completely unfair for employees such as myself, social workers needing their car to make frequent visits during the day, sometimes at very short notice. Where do we park?! Are we expected to walk the 20-25 minutes in with laptops and confidential information or get the park and ride? This will reduce productivity.”
- “I agree that a second non parking day would ease demand on spaces. However, I am a front line social worker. I do not park at County Hall for convenience, I park because at short notice I need access to my car to respond to emergencies.”
- “We are aware that there are a number of people based at County Hall who do not require their cars during the day/for work and feel strongly that an exercise to establish ‘essential car users’ takes place so that those professionals who have to use their cars as part of their job get priority parking and are not penalised for needing their cars. This is the case at Vantage House where only ‘essential car users’ have parking rights and all others are expected to use Park and ride or find other ways of coming to their office base.”
- “The School Library Service is a business, which charges schools - the majority of the team won't be able to do their jobs with 2 days a week non parking implemented. The team are in and out of County Hall constantly driving around the County to schools, taking boxes of books and equipment that are heavy. They currently park at County Hall and drive in to the tunnel loading bay when they need to pick up equipment. Even the time to allow for doing that bites in to the working

day. It would be expensive and inefficient for staff to build in enough time to return to a park and ride after an hour in the office and that would make it impossible to run the traded service if 2 days a week they couldn't park at County Hall."

- "The proviso of this is that managers must have a flexible approach to home working."
- "It's a nonsense if we want to ensure staff are productive. The ICT kit does not support home working effectively and staff will not come into the office on non-parking days. Productivity will suffer."
- "It would have an impact on the number of cars parking in local areas surrounding County Hall, including Trowse."
- "The rural transport network is appalling and those who live in the countryside are penalised disproportionately as a result."
- "I have to arrange meetings and some people simply refuse to come in if it's their non-parking day - I think it needs to be stressed that just because it's your non-parking day does not exclude you from coming into County Hall for meetings."
- "Allocation of a 2nd non-parking day needs to be in consultation with staff members."
- "Employees working 4 days or less should only have one non parking day."
- "Why is the Harford shuttle bus stopping in January? The above change will surely mean more people needing this service!!!"

Recommendation 3. Introduce charging for employees for the use of workplace parking on their Non Parking Day at County Hall on a "pay as you go" basis with a charge set at £5 per day.

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 3 will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree			8.46%	66
2	Agree			21.28%	166
3	Neither agree nor disagree			19.49%	152
4	Disagree			21.28%	166
5	Strongly disagree			27.95%	218
6	Don't know			1.54%	12
				answered	780
				skipped	16

30% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 49% disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 28% (8 people) agree with the recommendation and 62% disagree (18 people).

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- Charging staff to park is the most effective way to change their behaviour.
- It would work well if by paying you could guarantee that you would get space and if the short stay spaces continue to offer people the opportunity to come in to County Hall briefly.
- It gives people a choice so that they can park if they need to.

Here are some quotes to illustrate what people liked about the recommendation:

- “Seems good - rather than penalising everyone by charging all the time, this will prove a BIG incentive to make people look at alternative ways of getting into work. Also makes it fairer for charging on usage, rather than a flat charge.”
- “People will think twice before paying out money.”
- “It’s a fair price and if you need your car here then worth the cost.”
- “I think this will be a good alternative, giving people the option that if they really need to park at County Hall on their non-parking days they can.”
- “Seems reasonable. I hope this doesn't mean getting rid of the 90 minute spaces for those days. They are very useful if you just want to come into the office for a short while on your non-parking day.”
- “It's OK if a parking place could be guaranteed for the money.”

People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:

- Allowing people to park here every day of the week would not reduce the pressure and car parking spaces.
- It would reduce the effectiveness of the other recommendations.
- It is too expensive.
- This is fine for people on higher pay grades who can afford it, but not for lower paid workers.
- It is not fair for members of staff who need their car to do their job.
- It is just a way to make money.
- A daily rate is not fair. Some people only come to County Hall for half a day, which means they would be ineligible to use the 90 minute short stay spaces.

Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:







- “How will allowing people to park on their non-parking days help to alleviate the problem of lack of spaces at County Hall? This gives people an option to park on days they couldn't previously park.”
- “The councillors said they were against charging. It rather defeats the point of having no parking days if you can just ignore that and park anyway, albeit for £5. This doesn't free up any more parking spaces.”
- “£5 is a lot of money, especially for people on lower wages.”

- “Those on higher pay grades will pay and take up all the spaces leaving none for those who have no choice but to come in by car and park on site.”
- “This would penalise those that for business reasons need to come to County Hall. I cannot see that I should have to pay to undertake my business duties.”
- “I only see this as a money making option, I don't think this is for the benefit of the staff or for spaces. You suggest increasing our non-parking days so that it is more likely people will pay on their non-parking day. It's a way of charging us but making it our choice to pay. If the problem is that there is not enough space, how does allocating spaces for specific non-parking day people help those who can park on that day, but then can't find a space?”
- “I was offended to have received an email talking about raising revenue from staff - we already pay our Council taxes (and many of us including me would happily pay more to protect public services) and we work in the public sector, giving often many hours of unpaid work to do as good a job as we can in increasingly challenging times. Please do what you can to protect us from an additional tax!”
- “I don't agree with a flat fee of £5 - this is unfair to those employees who only need to visit campus for part of the day (such as shorter working hours, working part of the day off site, or needing to attend a meeting). Either have an hourly rate which tops out at £5 a day or a morning and afternoon fee of £2.50 each.”

Frequently asked questions about this recommendation:

- “Will there be a set number of spaces set out for these cars? What if they are not filled? What if the demand is greater than the number of spaces?”
- “Gives choice, but how will we know whether a place will be available or not? Will it have to be pre-booked?”
- “If you only need a half day will there be an option to pay £2.50?”
- Would staff be able to claim for parking at County Hall if they are coming here for a meeting?

Recommendation 4. Seek planning consent for increasing car parking capacity within the County Hall campus

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 4 will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		66.45%	519
2	Agree		21.13%	165
3	Neither agree nor disagree		5.25%	41
4	Disagree		3.97%	31
5	Strongly disagree		2.82%	22
6	Don't know		0.38%	3
			answered	781

How far do you agree or disagree that Recommendation 4 will help manage car parking at County Hall? Please select one only:

	Response Percent	Response Total
	skipped	15

88% of respondents agree the recommendation will help manage car parking at County Hall, whilst 7% disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 66% (19 people) agree with the recommendation and 24% disagree (7 people).

People who were positive about this recommendation felt that:

- We need extra car parking as more members of staff are going to be working here and there is plenty of space.
- More car parking would make life easier for staff and visitors.
- The temporary car parking currently being used by the building contractors has worked well and should be continued.
- Creating more car parking spaces would negate the need to implement some of the other recommendations.
- It could generate additional income by charging staff, football supporters or the general public at weekends.
- Reducing the number of staff parking on the surrounding streets would improve our relationship with local residents.

Here are some quotes to illustrate what people liked about the recommendation:

- "It seems only reasonable that if the number of staff working at County Hall will increase then so the car park should be increased too."
- "All of the previous measures will only go so far, it seems ridiculous to keep trying to squeeze more people into the same limited spaces."
- "Martineau Lane side of county hall previously used before works and has been used by workman during works so could this not continue?"
- "Will make it a lot easier for staff and visitors."
- "Very good idea. Assuming you have more capacity is there a commitment to making it easier for parkers, perhaps getting rid of the non-parking day(s)."
- "We have a lot of ground that is not being used on campus. People who live on the surrounding streets do not like it and your car gets damaged and rude notes left on them - so use the space we have. If they are closing offices down and moving staff into County Hall they should provide more parking to help with the situation."
- "There is demand and there is the opportunity to generate additional cash by making it open to the public if a multi storey was to be built."







People who were concerned about this proposal felt that:

- We should be trying to reduce demand for parking, not just build more spaces.
- It is not good for the environment.
- It would be expensive and not the best use of our finances.
- It is not that likely we would get planning permission to do this and we need to be mindful not to set a precedent as the planning authority.

Here are some quotes to illustrate the concerns about this recommendation:

- “We should look at solving the problems causing the demand, not building more spaces.”
- “It will have the desired effect but this will need to be offset against the cost of developing the new car park. Other measures therefore should be adopted first with this option held in reserve”
- “If we got the "temporary" space at the front back that we used to have and perhaps expand it a bit it would make a difference. Would hate to see the green "meadow" lost.”
- “The additional places at the front would help but I can see the problem of getting the car park agreed with District Council as the traffic problem on Martineau Lane. Think it would be rejected on these grounds. Need to be careful not to set a precedent as the planning authority.”

Overall, do you agree or disagree that these recommendations are a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues?

Overall, do you agree or disagree that these recommendations are a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues? Please select one only:				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Strongly agree		8.09%	63
2	Agree		51.86%	404
3	Neither agree or disagree		20.03%	156
4	Disagree		10.78%	84
5	Strongly disagree		7.83%	61
6	Don't know		1.41%	11
			answered	779
			skipped	17

60% of respondents agree the recommendations are a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues, whilst 19% disagree.

Of the 29 people who live within one mile of County Hall, 45% (13 people) agree the recommendations are a reasonable way of addressing car parking issues and 41% disagree (12 people).

Other comments and suggestions made include:

- “Distinguish the essential car users from those whom do not need their car. I currently work at Carrow House and I find it infuriating that some business support colleagues have parking here when myself and other assessors - whom need our car - are treated the same with non-parking days. When I worked in the city and didn't need my car, I didn't expect to be provided with parking.”
- “I suggest adapting the car park further, such as a multi-storey so there are more spaces within the grounds.”
- “No mention is made about retaining the 90 minute bays. I use this on my non-parking day. If these spaces are removed in favour of the charging option this would be a very backward step.”
- “I suggest re-designing the purpose and use of the short stay spaces. These are currently used for non-parking days, however on occasions these are empty and workers who are on a parking day cannot use them. Could these spaces be increased and used for ‘essential car users’ only, regardless of parking days or not? The length of time for these spaces also needs to increase.”
- “It all seems rather complicated and a faff to be honest. A simple resolution is pay and display, first come first served. If we worked in the city centre we wouldn't have free car parking in most cases, we would have to pay for it.”
- “You need to treat members of staff already alleviating this car park issue by cycling with some respect. The bike racks are full, badly located, badly lit. The bike access points to County Hall are poorly maintained and gravel/potholes in cycle lane is dangerous. The new showers are unreliable and frequently out of order. You need to provide functioning alternatives for people to use.”
- “There should be flexibility to allow for temporary changes in an employee's situation, e.g. pregnancy, illness etc.”
- “I do think however that the parking rules could be relaxed during the whole of the Christmas school holidays and the summer holidays.”
- “It would be very helpful to have agreements with outlying facilities with car parking for us to make use of them. For example I live in Beccles, which is a challenge to all but the superfit to cycle in on a regular basis. But if I could leave my car half-way or close-by, I would do so regularly. Could I park at Loddon library or the fire station? Or can we speak to parish councils to leave cars at village halls?”
- “Might be useful to have a waiting list so when one employee leaves and a permit becomes available, then the first name on waiting list can have it. This was how the car parking system worked about 15 years ago.”
- “You need to review when people have their non-parking days - you need fewer on a Friday when the car park is evidently less busy. Why not incentivise people positively to use alternatives to cars? You could have a system where staff can give up one or more of their parking allowed days in return for additional annual leave.”