Subject: Fwd: Communicating your views on Free after 3 parking plans

I am writing to express our opposition to the Free after 3 parking proposal.

- At a time when we should be looking at ways to reduce our carbon footprint and CO2 emissions to reach the targets agreed by government in the Paris Agreement this proposal makes no sense and flies in the face off all reason. It goes against advice offered by DEFRA, Asthma UK and the Royal College of Physicians (RCP) which is, when possible, to ' leave your car at home'. Their advice to walkers and cyclists is to 'avoid busy roads' so those trying to live more sustainably and reduce air pollution will be unfairly punished for doing so. The main roads into Carlisle are already busy and dangerous and this policy would only make them worse. The leader of the council, Mr. Mallinson, has himself identified the need to encourage more cycling and walking with better infrastructure and safety.

- Many people, but especially children, are vulnerable to air pollution especially Particulate Matter (PM's), tiny particles that that can penetrate deep into our lungs and get into the bloodstream. These PMs worsen heart and lung disease and are reportedly responsible for around 29,000 early deaths each year in the UK.

- A recent progress report by the RCP says around 40,000 deaths per year are attributable to outdoor air pollution through cancer, stroke and heart disease, diabetes, obesity and changes linked to dementia and can cost the health service and businesses more than £20b a year.

- The World Health Organisation announced as far back as 2013 that it classified air pollution as carcinogenic to human beings and has continued to say that we need to take urgent action locally, regionally and globally.

- A recent six year study led by Prof. Chris Griffiths ( principal investigator at the Medical Research Council and Asthma UK Centre in Mechanisms of Asthma) shows children's lung development is being stunted by high levels of pollution in cities from diesel vehicles and that they have 10% less lung capacity that could be permanent.

- Jonathon Grigg, a consultant paediatrician at the Royal London Hospital and professor researching the effects of pollution on children at Queen Mary University of London says " If you are going to design something that would effectively deliver a toxic substance into the lungs, you couldn't do better than the diesel soot particle. We need to get the current polluting toxic diesel fleet off our roads as soon as possible."

- Many people do not own a car either through choice or because they cannot afford one. They rely on public transport. Why should they be punished with increased air pollution as they wait at bus stops or have their travel disrupted by increased traffic jams and road congestion brought about by this policy?

In conclusion, this policy proposal makes absolutely no sense from either a people's wellbeing point of view or as a way to help fight climate change. It would in fact put our health at risk ( especially children's) and deepen the climate crisis we are facing.

 Henry Goodwin

Director

Sustainable Carlisle

Dear Sir / Madam ,

 I must strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons.

1. Inequality. This proposal is regressive and only benefits those constitutes lucky enough to own a car, have free time in the late afternoon and have disposable income to spend. Those with no personal transport, day time jobs, low incomes, visual impairments or other medical conditions do not benefit.

2. Climate Crisis and Carlisle's climate emergency motion passed in march. Pollution in the city centre and area of the car parks concerned is already in excess of WHO Limits. World Health Organisation Global Ambient Air Quality Database (update 2018) shows Carlisle exceeded the limit of 10 micrograms per cubic metre. The scientific evidence that our planet is heating towards an uncontrollable catastrophe is incontrovertible, Carlisle City Council has already accepted this. If this proposal is enacted , and successful , it will push CO2 and NO levels even further beyond acceptable limits to the detriment of residents health. "Air pollution is the biggest environmental threat to health in the UK, with between 28,000 and 36,000 deaths a year attributed to long-term exposure. There is strong evidence that air pollution causes the development of coronary heart disease, stroke, respiratory disease and lung cancer, and exacerbates asthma” (https://www.gov.uk/government/news/public-health-england-publishes-air-pollution-evidence-review). My children are terrified about climate change. As a family we have made many changes to reduce our Carbon output however as individuals we can only do so much. It is imperative that Local , regional and National Government also take a lead in these matters and are key drivers in changing the culture of consumption that is on the edge of sealing the fate of our society and our species. In March Carlisle determined it would be such a key driver, but has so far failed to act convincingly regarding its commitment. It is appalling to introduce a policy that promotes car use at this time, it shows an utter lack of commitment to action on climate change.

3. Questionable use of public funds. Our services are being cut, recreational facilities deteriorating, homelessness and food poverty are major issues. The parking revenue is needed. For Carlisle to choose to spend this income for the benefit of a very small section of its demographic, and private businesses , at this time, under the prevailing circumstances is an unacceptable use of public funds.

4. Carlisle has here an opportunity to be a leader. If it really can afford to spend this revenue it would be far better being spent on more effective public transport and making it available to all. From my location , if i walk a mile , i can only get a bus to town once a week , and it returns after an hour and a half!

Faithfully

Ian Burrow

Dear Sir,

I am strongly against the proposed waver of parking charges in Carlisle after 3pm. The following points illustrate my reasoning.

1. POLLUTION.

Making parking free after 3pm, undoubtedly to attract more people and revenue to the city, would inevitably attract more CARS to the city. Petrol and diesel vehicles causing an inevitable increase in the already high pollution in Carlisle city centre and surrounding streets. World Health Organisation Global Ambient Air Quality Database (update 2018) shows Carlisle exceeded the limit of 10 micrograms per cubic metre. Carlisle needs to follow the example of places like London, where emissions have begun to fall through various pollution limiting schemes, not increase our already woefully high levels. The major artery roads into and out of the city are already severely congested, and hence polluting, at certain, and lengthening, times of the day. Even busier roads would be even more detrimental to the health of cyclists and pedestrians.

2. NON-PROGRESSIVE ACTION

Free parking after 3pm does not benefit all members of society equally. It is a perk for car-owning members of society only. The shortfall in Council funds gained from parking revenue will have to be made up elsewhere. As such it is a questionable use of public funds raised from all members of society. This is an anti-progressive policy.

3. CLIMATE EMERGENCY DECLARATION

In March this year the Carlisle City Council declared a climate emergency. Actively encouraging the use of cars and the concurrent increase in CO² emissions flies in the face of this declaration. Far better to encourage sustainable modes of transport with the city: investment in public transport and 2 for 1 bus ticket schemes, improving cycle paths into and within the city, bike-share schemes (like many other cities in Britain and across Europe), etc. These actions would indirectly benefit every member of the community and not just those directly using them as CO² and pollution would decrease.

The short-sightedness of this scheme shocks me and, frankly, I and the citizens of Carlisle deserve better than a rushed through decision which could have the long-term detrimental effects highlighted above.

Regards,

Fiona Prior

Thanks Helen,

V little time but have sent the following:

Good morning,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed 'free after 3' parking plan for the following reasons:

1. Inequality. This is regressive and only benefits those lucky enough to own a car. Those with low incomes, visual impairments or other medical conditions do not benefit.

2. Climate crisis and Carlisle's committment in the climate emergency motion passed in march. Our children are terrified about climate change. It is apalling to introduce a policy that promotes car use at this time of climate crisis. It shows a lack of committment to action on climate change.

3. Poor use of public funds. Our playparks are crumbling, our services are being cut, homelessness is a major issue. The parking revenue is needed. It is disgusting to allow a cut in revenue that only benefits the better off

4. Air pollution - any policy that encourages car use increases air pollution and flies in the face of the joint public health strategy which Carlisle recently adopted.

The council must take its committments around climate change, health, air pollution and equality seriously. This proposal goes against all of them. I strongly oppose it.